Present: **Morgan Lynn, Chair**, Sepideh Daroogheha (Mathematics), Christina Goff (Librarian), Dann Gesink (CTE Representative), Paula Gunder (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Aprill Nogarr (Non-Departmentalized Faculty Group - Brtwd), George Olgin (English), Tess Shideler (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Penny Wilkins (Computer Science), Rikki Hall (Director of A&R), Liz McLaurin (LMCAS Representative); Natalie Hannum (Vice President of Instruction), Nikki Moultrie (Dean of CTE and Social Sciences), Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Math and Sciences), Eileen Valenzuela (Articulation Officer), and Grace Villegas (Academic Scheduling), and Shondra West (Note-taker)
Absent: Josh Bearden (Distance Education) and April Nogarr
Guest: Rachel Anicetti (Transfer & Career Services Manager); Ryan Hiscocks (Political Science Faculty); and Scott Hubbard (Mathematics BTWD Faculty)

Meeting called to order: 2:33 pm   Location: Zoom Meeting
CURRENT ITEMS
_____

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

2. **Approval of the Agenda**
    Action: Approved; (M/S: Goff/Gunder); abstain Nogarr

    Approval of the Minutes: March 3, 2021
    Action: Approved (M/S: Gunder/Gesink); abstain Daroogheha

3. **Standing Item: Articulation Update**
    Eileen shared that:
    - Drone Piloting and Forklift Logistics Operation Warehouse (FLOW) certificate of completion (COA) are state approved.
    - Several degrees impacted by the inactivation of courses have been updated.
    - Victor revised the ADT/COA Spanish, which are part of this agenda
    - Several courses will be submitted for CID approval after title changes are made in Assist
    Committee feedback:
    - A request for an inactivation course list will be provided by Eileen, which will help the Transfer Department offer support services to students navigating the system to meet requirements.

4. **Consent Agenda**
    Action: Approved with amendments (M/S: Goff/Olgin); unanimous

5. **Programs**
    - **AS-T, Business Administration 2.0**
      Action: Approved (M/S: Wilkins/Goff); unanimous
      Feedback: add a statement about IGETC for UC requirements, which SPCH is needed.
    - **AA-T, Spanish Action**: Approved (M/S: Goff/Wilkins); unanimous
    - **COA, Spanish Action**: Approved (M/S: Gunder/Goff); unanimous

6. **Online Education Resources (OER)**
    Ryan Hiscocks (Ryan H.) and Scott Hubbard provided information describing LMC's OER committee process. The items discussed:

1. **OER Articulation rules** – Scott shared documents with the committee. Document one covered articulation agreement and the OER process. Document two focused on an in-depth description from the State Academic Senate's curriculum and OER group. The documents are a first read for CC and to start the conversations. Examining that OER does not have an impact on articulation if there are publications listed in the COOR. Whereas, the issue is listing electronic sources as links in the COOR, being that CSU/UC would like to see that the OER are available as published, bound, fixed materials listed in the COOR as oppose to just having an electronic link.
   a. How does the 5-year textbook rule relate to OER – Ryan H. shared that online resources are often updated frequently as a living document that's easier to manipulate to keep the information relevant. However, the publication should still have a date.
   b. Journals and instructional manuals – Ryan H. shared readers are acceptable as an OER. For example, Ryan H. uses a collection of essays as one OER packet.
   c. Scott addressed Cindy's GE articulation question and shared there is a time-sensitive date for maintaining OER materials, up to seven years unless the items are classic in the field.
   d. At a future meeting, Nikki will provide an eLumen textbook submission field demo.
   e. Morgan suggested that the curriculum committee will create an OER sample packet and share that information with the OER committee.
2. **OER Copyright Rules** – The OER committee intent will check curriculum documents for meeting copyright compliance, considering public domain, licensing, and fair use rules.
3. **OER Open Dialogue** – feedback is needed from the committee to develop OER submission rubric, along with creating a vetting process. Ryan H. asked how can the OER committee implement practices that assist faculty with meeting institutional requirements that is internal/external in navigating both articulation and state mandates.
   a. Question about the main users of OER – The OER committee assists faculty with meeting the rubric and forwarding for curriculum review to streamline the process.
   b. Tech review process – in reviewing COORs textbook fields includes confirming the legitimacy of the OER resources. Also, if the fields are incomplete, it's noted for the author to review and revise. One consideration is that instructional materials are of the faculty and department purview. Therefore, OER rubric should consider things that are helpful for faculty to meet the rigger and objectives. Also, incorporate a process at the beginning of the curriculum process to establish efficiencies.
   c. Developing a curriculum handbook is essential to include OER information that helps faculty have resources that explain the overarching process.
   d. Having practices that support and relate to curriculum processes and mission is essential. As a result, feedback to develop OER rubric is a work in progress until the curriculum completes the current task of revising their position paper (PP).
   e. Consider textbook language in light of current practices is not an additional requirement. More so, how do the faculty choose instructional materials.

7. **Position Paper**
   Morgan shared the committee's work of completing the PP to have available after the April 7th CC meeting vetting it to Academic Senate for approval. The committee brainstormed on how to start the process of revising the PP:
   - Begin with addressing the philosophy and purpose of the curriculum committee

- Direction was not provided by AS in how to revise the PP, which is open to the committee to make revisions as needed.
- Morgan shared the current PP does not include a mission and philosophy statement. It includes responsibility, process, support, and evaluation of curriculum.
    - Thoughts of developing a mission could enhance the process of revising the PP
    - Consider that developing a mission is easy when it includes: who you are, what you do, who the audience, and why is it important. The committee discussed examples of how to develop a mission statement using other college curriculum descriptions as an example. Penny Wilkins also provided an example using the four criteria to develop a mission:
        - Who we are: A group of faculty (employees/intradisciplinary team)
        - What we do: Reviewing and recommending curriculum
        - Who are we doing it for: for LMC community
        - Why is it important: produce relevant curriculum

In continuation of the mission statement conversation,
    - Incorporate LMC's mission, vision, and values
    - Reference ideas from the spring task – focused on curriculum development
    - Reflect from Skyline college's curriculum committee mission statement as being a backbone that represent diversity of all employees; speaks to developing supporting the members of the community. Also, recognizing Skyline's purpose was well-liked.

Morgan summarized the conversation in thinking about key terms for developing a mission:
    - Backbone of the college, reflect diversity of the disciplines, represent different pedagogical philosophies, offer different strength and training, faculty is charged with the responsibility of developing new and revising existing courses and programs. Consideration, the curriculum committee will actively support that development.
    - The committee discussed developing a curriculum handbook. Currently, the processes are living in different places and the goal is to combine all the information into one source and have it available online.
    - Consider the purpose of revising the position paper and ask the Academic Senate to expound what's needed in revising the paper.
    - Morgan asked the committee to share their thoughts on other sections of the PP, e.g. membership, which it was a suggestion to update it based on ASCCC language.

Brainstorming ideas by the committee members:
- Consider the role of GE in comparison to the curriculum tech review process
- Consider the role of the GE Chair, more so as ad hoc or voting member
    - Suggestion to add GE Chair as a voting member
- Consider adding representatives to the tech review process: transfer, CSLO/PSLO, TLC
- Consider representative with reassigned time that their membership could be written into their roles of responsibilities.
- Consider the relationship with guided pathways purpose and philosophies

There was a question about using reassigned time for membership work and it being a conflict of interest to one's faculty responsibilities to serve on committees. However, it was shared no conflict exists because RT is in lieu of their excused duties as a reassignment to

focus on other work, which equals to their regular work scheduled and not beyond (overtime).

The committee continued to discuss membership and the purpose of having a student and department representation. Additionally, how guided pathway plays a role in the curriculum processes in consideration to creating additions to the existing membership.

Natalie displayed the guided pathways workflow to help the committee think about how to align their membership and practices between the groups. In reviewing that there are faculty who will fall into more than one guided pathway category as it may complicate the process of revising the membership via guided pathways.

Examine utilizing the campus community voices to modify the membership for open dialogue, being that the conversation is suited for AS. Although, curriculum falls under 10+1 as noted in ASCCC and Title V such that voting members reflect faculty. Morgan expressed developing a draft to present to AS to begin the conversations.

In review of the brainstorming ideas of the committee, it was shared the ideas tie to what is the committee's purpose. Such that curriculum is a core piece of what faculty do; however, faculty should participate in developing curriculum and serving on the committee. Moreover, there are factors to consider when adding members to the group. Inasmuch, the volume of work and the effect of it on a larger membership.

As a result, the committee asked to present the concerns of the committee to AS regarding faculty participation and their thoughts of enhancing the membership. It was recommended to consider discipline pods, in which there is one representative for a group that takes information to and from regarding curriculum. This will help bring more people into the conversations without physically being present at the meetings, and it won't interfere with quorum.

Morgan shared she will draft a review of today's conversation and share via Google docs and ask that members add their ideas and feedback.

8. **COOR Template Review - tabled**

Governance Committees - Tabled

1. Shared Governance
2. Articulation
3. Teaching and Learning Committee
4. Academic Senate

Adjourned at: 4:30 pm