Present: **Morgan Lynn, Chair**, Josh Bearden (Distance Education), Christina Goff (Librarian), 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: Sepideh Daroogheha (Mathematics) and Dann Gesink (CTE Representative)
Guest: Rachel Anicetti (Transfer & Career Services Manager); Sally Montemayor Lenz (*LMC Guide Pathways Consultant*), Girlie Sison (*Physical Science*),

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

1. **Announcements & Public Comment:**
    - Concerns about the curriculum committee upholding the Brown Act (BA) include file sharing and communication outside the meeting. A recommendation was made to consult with ASCCC who offers BA training. The training is meant to ensure members are aware of BA policies and procedures. The committee discussed
        o Examples of file sharing and how making comments
        o COOR comments discussed due to file sharing via eLumen should be agenized for everyone to participate in the conversation, including the public
        o Provide online resources for members to complete a self-pace BA training
        o COVID adjustments to BA made by the Governor as an Executive Order specifically converting committee discussion online, i.e., Zoom.
        o The purpose of the BA is meant for the college to conduct business in a public fashion whereby constituents of the college and the community can participate. Additionally, providing the general public with information that occurs during the meetings.
    - Speaker event April 15th from 4-5pm; Beth Piatote, Native American Studies to discuss and read from her book *Beadworkers*.

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

    Approval of the Minutes: March 17, 2021
    Action: Approved with changes; Ryan's name (M/S: Gunder/Shideler); abstain J. Bearden

3. **Standing Item: Articulation Update**
    Eileen shared with the committee:
    - Departments were notified that modifications are needed due to course inactivation
    - Submitted the AA-T to the State Chancellor's Office: Law, Public, Policy and Society
    - Submitted KNDAN-056 and certificate and degree information for the 4/28 GB approval
Question about academic senate (AS) receiving program revisions for review and approval. It was shared that new programs are sent to AS for approval, and changes to programs go to the State because the original program request as a new program was approved by AS. Eileen

notifies the community via email whenever the state approves new and revised courses and programs.

4. <u>**Programs**</u>
   - **AA Journalism, Action**: Tabled
     The program was modified; classes were removed (deactivated Journal 161), updated the elective list, and replaced courses with available options.
     Feedback: the program template outlining the degree requirements is needed.

5. <u>**LMC GE Courses**</u>
   - Cindy provided an update about the new GE model passed May 2020. A redesign of the requirement list was completed to include LMC courses that meet GE CSU/IGETC transfer and placed in specific requirement areas. Developing a new GE format will help students to understand how courses meet different transfer category requirements. The redesign includes removing area letters (A, B, C, etc.) and replaced with area requirement abbreviations. For example, Area D language and rationality become LR with specific breakouts LR1, LR2; Area B Natural Science become NS, and so on. This format follows the CSU area model. Further, courses that meet local GE requirements that do not transfer are marked with an asterisk. Also, a list is provided at the end of the document to include courses that are not part of LMC's GE pattern but transfer as GE units are noted as elective units for GE transfer.
   - Cindy furthered shared a few courses were added to the list but does not meet the new model, yet they met the previous existing GE model. Cindy will work with the departments to make the adjustments to meet at least one new GESLO requirement.
   - Cindy shared that the work of evaluating GE courses in eLumen as the sole person was overwhelming, and the recommendation is to grant the GE members to have access to eLumen as future GE evaluators. Past practice, all GE members were responsible for evaluating courses. Another concern was whether the notes and comments provided by Cindy were forwarded and seen by the originator to make modifications to their courses vie eLumen.
   - A question was asked about aligning GE courses to META majors' pathways; some say the model is restrictive while others support aligning specific key courses. Cindy followed up that the GE model was written to integrate into all the GE courses which they fall into the majors, programs, and transfer. With the pathways majors there are GE courses listed; however, assigning specific GE courses to the pathways poses difficulties, since GE courses need to meet Title V requirements. Further, Sally shared as a future conversation, consider reviewing how research shows that there are majors that align to specific GE courses to help students see how courses map to transfer institutions. The discussion continued with how to contextualize the requirements.
     - GE courses are embedded in the disciplines connected to pathways and transfer
     - Consider when developing new GE courses, they should meet both GE and are contextualized for specific majors
     - The META major list consists of LMC learning major and career pathways.
   - Question about courses meeting CSU/IGETC and why they don't automatically satisfy LMC GE.

- o Cindy provided the background about the integration of GE criteria into LMC courses based on the philosophy paper, in which there were nine requirements reduced to six. Whereas, the transfer courses require different expectations compared to LMC. However, with the new model, it includes transfer GE courses as meeting LMC's local GE provided that courses must meet at least one GESLO. Further, there are universal outcomes to include reading, writing, and critical thinking required of by all LMC courses. In the past math and science did not meet the GE model, however with the new model they do.

The committee agreed to act in support of the GE redesign area requirements; to include the six courses that are pending integration of the new LMC GESLO requirements.

- There six pending courses that has no impact on students. They previously met GE based on the older model and require an update to include adding the new GESLO requirement.
- Applauded Cindy and the GE committee for making inclusive changes whereby students can meet local GE transfer requirements, considering those that are in CTE programs.
- The new model will become active during the 2021-22 catalog; therefore, courses counted toward degree/transfer are for students using the latest catalog.

Action: Move to support GE redesign of the local degree and transfer requirements; (M/S: Goff/Olgin) Approved; unanimous

6. **Position Paper**

Morgan shared the position paper document that included revisions and ideas shared from the previous meeting

- Language was added about the ASCCC curriculum approval process: membership, committee purview to review and approved recommended courses, relationship with AS, and composition of the committee. ASCCC refers to 1996 paper, which there were no updates since.

The committee discussed the position paper:

- Membership – who should serve on the committee
- Quorum requirements
- Non-voting vs. voting members

The committee was given time to review the position paper revisions before the discussion. New ideas about the position paper included:

- Membership – consider the four learning, major and career (LMC) pathways to include 1) Health, Behavioral Science, & Social Science; 2) Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM); 3) Business and Management;) Arts, Humanities and Communication
  - o Sally shared more information about the four META majors and the listing. The information was in support of realigning the curriculum membership based on the META categories, in which the programs reside under the pathways. For example, a member from Liberal Arts would consist of Liberal Arts & Communication.
  - o Considering that the adoption of the four pathways provides an opportunity for additional people from the specific areas to diversify the committee.
- Adding a transfer representative as a member would serve better on the Tech Review process and sit on the committee as a standing (non-voting) member

Brown Act – a question was asked with regards to the eLumen Tech Review process and commenting about COORs via eLumen chat

- Nikki shared the infrastructure of the Tech Review committee and how reviewers provide their expertise reviewing the COORS independently and provide comments to the Curriculum Chair. Whereby the chair contacts the originator to make the changes. This process is designed to help streamline the efficiency of the curriculum committee discussion and approval processes at the meeting. However, suppose comments were made about pedagogy or content of the COOR during the Tech Review process. In that case, those discussions and decisions should be approved at the meeting, not via eLumen.
   - o In light of BA and deciding how best to utilized transfer representative as the expert, the information helps determine if they should be a voting vs. non-voting member.
   - o Josh shared as long as the Tech Review is not a sub-committee there is no Brown Act violation, granted that the vast majority of the reviewers do not have discussion nor do they meet to have discussion. However, tech review did have meetings, but were meeting for logisticals requirements.
   - o Non-voting members are not subjected to Brown Act. The voting members are the ones that should not meet as group to discuss policy, which is done publicly.
- Maintain a balance of discipline with voting members in which there is not predominance of one subject expertise from a single department on the committee. Granted that members are not reviewing and voting as representatives of their department, but based on their disciplinary expertise.
   - o Recommendation to state that no more than two reps from a department. However, the committee must consider Brentwood and LMC Math department may have one than one rep.
- Clarity is needed regarding the META majors and where disciplines resides on the list, e.g., social science as one not listed.
   - o The idea was brainstorming how to connect existing members with the META major pathways to provide opportunities for different expertise to participate in the meetings, e.g., GE member to review specific components of the COOR.
   - o Consider the amount of workload when including members; particularly those that chair other committees.
- Student representation – ASCCC paper states voting members do not have to include faculty. Such that encouraging and supporting student participation is needed, in which in the past they were non-voting members.
   - o Liz LMCAS shared participation as a non-voting member is viable, but overall student representation is important
   - o One concern with student participation is that the topics of discussion is complex due to the usage of curriculum language/acronyms whereby the committee would need to support student involvement with understanding the processes
- A question was asked about DE, GE, CSLO/PSLO Coordinator as voting members and how many voting members the committee should have?

- o Quorum – consider the number of people on the committee and how historically there has been issues with quorum in the past. A recommendation was made to not count vacant positions toward quorum. In comparison, the structure of counting members' seats as meeting quorum has been a struggle when there're vacancies
  - o Consider reassign time position may have a greater obligation to attend meetings making it easier to meet quorum. Due to the college financial obligations being at a standstill, there may not be support with providing more funding for reassign time
  - o Consider the committee's charge to grow curriculum by establishing goals and missions, more so in developing a diverse committee structure. This is in support of ASCC in developing efficient process to approve curriculum.
  - o The committee expressed that DE, GE, CSLO/PSLO Coordinator serve best as Tech Reviewers. Also, modifying the job descriptions of these positions require having a discussion with AS.
  - o Recommendation to draft a letter to senate and ask about their thoughts concerning curriculum membership to include the META major pathways or include members of other committees, or maintain the current structure.
    - ▪ The members discussed the language of GEs role on the committee, being that the person is part of the tech review and not as a voting member
- Morgan asked the committee about developing a process around AS feedback and recommendation. Which the committee was in support of this recommendation as it relates to revising membership and meeting quorum. Topics to consider asking AS feedback:
  - o Envision aligning membership to the pathways, quorum as majority of the members, changes to the membership, and general feedback overall. Use the current membership model as the comparison.
  - o Considering the structure of voting, non-voting, and tech-review individuals are listed separately in the position paper. It was shared when listening the people that one GE rep would be listed because all members of the GE committee will serve on the tech review process.
- Due to time, the decision from the previous meeting about philosophy as it relates to creating a voting member structure was not discus today.

Governance Committees - Tabled

1. Shared Governance
2. Articulation

3. Teaching and Learning Committee
4. Academic Senate

Adjourned at: 4:30 pm