Present: *Louie Giambattista, Chair*; Christina Goff, Paula Gunder, Morgan Lynn, April Nogarr, Tue Rust, Tess Shideler, Veronica Turrigiano, Penny Wilkins, Debra Winkler, Trinidad Zavala, Rikki Hall, Natalie Hannum, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, Eileen Valenzuela, and Grace Villegas, and Shondra West (Note taker)
Absent: None
Guest: Josh Bearden, Michael Kean, Joanna Miller, and Catt Wood
Meeting called to order: 2:32 pm   Location: Zoom Meeting

CURRENT ITEMS
_____

1. **Announcements & Public Comment:**
   None

2. **Approval of the Agenda**
   Action: Approved (M/S: Turrigiano/Zavala); unanimous

   Approval of the Minutes:
   Dec. 4, 2019: Approved with change; guest Veronica Turrigiano (M/S: Lynn/Tess); unanimous
   March 4, 2020: Approved (M/S: Lynn, Nogarr); abstain C. Goff
   March 27, 2020: Approved (M/S: Lynn/Turrigiano); abstain D. Winkler
   April 8, 2020: Approved (M/S: Turrigiano/Winkler); unanimous

3. **Consent Agenda - None**

4. **Online Addendum for Course Outlines**

   Joanna Miller's expertise was shared with the committee concerning online addendums and curriculum processes regarding the review of distance education (DE) documents. Subsequently, Veronica read the DE addendum requirements with regards to clarifying whether DE vs. curriculum has the purview to approve. For example, a review of the DE SLOs and if they match the course outline of record (COOR).

   Joanna shared insight about the DE processes at other colleges; i.e., at CCC, the DE Coordinator review DE addendum forms, whereas the person checks whether the DE addendum meets Title 5 standards. Furthermore, DVC is considering a workgroup similar to LMC DE committee to review DE forms.

   Regarding adding addendums to the consent agenda, Title 5 (55206) does not speak to the destination of items on the agenda. Penny shared discussions about whether a COOR can or cannot be offered online should happen at the curriculum; even more, pulling COORs off the consent agenda will delay the process.

   Joanna used LMC's Volleyball DE addendum as an example concerning how SLOs are achievable online. Significantly, there are no requirements for assessments identified in Title 5 (55206). Josh expressed having the rules and procedures written out, specifically the tech review process.

   Nikki asked Joanna to share the process to approve an emergency online addendum requests to offer the class online expeditiously. In hindsight, the process of approving online courses does not include scheduling of the course. Joanna concluded with, online addendums can be placed

on the consent agenda, and DE approval is subjective to determine whether Title 5 requirements are met. Moreover, the curriculum approval process includes reviewing and determining the quality of the course, such as content, grading scheme, etc.

Nancy expressed the evaluation of the course quality being met, which curriculum holds the responsibility to review and approve. Conversely, Penny expressed that DE checks that the online addendum meets the Title 5 checklist without looking at the COOR. Even more, the curriculum quality check will occur at the tech review process to further determine if the addendum and the COOR are consistent. Natalie addresses the quality being predicated on the collaboration of both DE and curriculum to assure the course is deemed to be offered online. As a result, Natalie expressed that offering the department support to assure effective student contact is being met online. Additionally, considering that the online addendum is written to the course for consistency, not to the faculty to assure that different faculty may teach the course, and the faculty has met the credentials to teach an online course.

Furthermore, regarding the online process, the curriculum is charged with reviewing the COOR SLOs and whether the course can be taught online. Even more, determining whether students can meet the assessments is a separate conversation. Outside of this, a question was asked about offering release time for a Distance Education Coordinator to assist with the evaluation of online addendum and assure the quality of DE occurs. To conclude, the committee agreed to divide the online addendums among the members in preparation for approval at the April 29, 2020 meeting. Eileen and Louie will parcel out the 58 addendums being offered for summer.

5. **Position Paper/Discussion of Workflow for eLumen**
    Action: Approved the eLumen workflow (M/S: Lynn/Turrigiano); unanimous

    The committee discussed finalizing the curriculum committee tech review process, specifically, that would help resolve curriculum compliance issues. Nikki addressed the committee's question about developing a tech review committee to follow a linear approval process vs. having the (COOR) branch out to other subgroups. The result being that subgroups can meet virtually and receive an individual email to approve documents after the Dean's approval or the subgroup can meet face-to-face to discuss and approve documents. Further, Nikki developed and read a description outlining the tech review responsibilities:

    > In addition to checking the grammar, syntax, and accuracy the proposal review by the tech review assures that all components of the proposal are present and meet the Title 5 regulations and ACCJC standards. The tech review committee members can work directly with the faculty originators to iron out potential problems, and instructors and department chairs are notified of revisions our approvals after the tech review meeting. Revisions are made before advancing the proposal to the curriculum committee for review.

    The intent of developing a tech review committee, such that the department receives support before the curriculum receives the proposal, thus eliminating courses being delayed at curriculum due to additional requirements needed by the originator. Therefore, eLumen supports a linear (virtual) process or meeting together as a group, in which all members of the tech review would receive notification for review and feedback to move the COOR forward.

Granted that if one person of the tech review committee has a concern about moving the COOR forward, it will be sent to the originator. The committee reviewed the eLumen workflow:

| Initiator | Department Chair | Dean | Tech Review | Curriculum Committee | Organizational and/or State Approval Process |

Even more, the curriculum committee will decide on the tech review members, such as having a General Education (GE) member. Christina asked for clarification regarding the GE approval process concerning having a GE member sit on the tech review committee. The GE process is a discussion required for future meetings whether the GE Chair would serve as the tech review person to provide insight regarding GE's rationale for approving a course via their process, or if the GE process would incorporate an approval process via the tech review, or if the tech review would occur before GE committee approval process. Additionally, the committee concluded that the GE process wouldn't be part of the eLumen workflow and operate outside the workflow, granted that eLumen will notify GE representatives that a course is seeking GE approval either before or after the tech review process. The committee spoke about considering other approval processes; i.e., Distance Education (DE) as an addition to the workflow. To simplify the workflow process that a GE and DE representative would serve on tech review, however, to avoid developing a workflow with subcategories may confuse the originator regarding which workflow to select. Therefore, having a workflow that streamlines the process is a better visual operational process.

The recommendation made by Christina, assure that the process is explained and documented with regards to the subcommittees process along with the tech review process; i.e., for faculty awareness. Nikki shared that eLumen has a process that notifies subcommittees directly, considering that a decision is needed to determine if the GE process would occur before or after the tech review. Louie pointed out having the least number of steps in the workflow prevents the thrashing of a COOR being sent back by several individuals/groups.

Notwithstanding, after the curriculum approval process, the documents will require that the President's or designee's signature, and/or Governing Board, and State Chancellor's Office. Even more, eLumen workflow does not include an organizational/state electronic transmission for signature approval; this will continue as a paper process. The conversation concluded with Nikki will create a workflow process to reflect the process after the curriculum for new, revised (substantial/non-substantial), and inactivations of COORs. Further, Natalie asked to include the SAM and TOP coding within the update/revisions process of COORs too, which the COORs are updated every two years.

6. **Credit Hour – Tabled**
7. **Additional CC Meeting Dates**
   The committee agreed to add April 29, 2020 to the existing CC's calendar.

Adjourned 4:29 pm
Next Meeting Dates:
Spring 2020: April 29, May 6