

Present: Morgan Lynn, Chair, Josh Bearden (Distance Education), Sepideh Daroogheha (Mathematics), Dann Gesink (CTE Representative), Paula Gunder (Liberal Arts and Sciences), George Olgin (English), Tess Shideler (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Penny Wilkins (Computer Science), Trinidad Zavala (Counseling); Rikki Hall (Director of A&R), Nikki Moultrie (Dean of CTE and Social Sciences), Natalie Hannum (Vice President of Instruction) Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Math and Sciences), Eileen Valenzuela (Articulation Officer), and Grace Villegas (Academic Scheduling), and Shondra West (Note-taker)

Absent: Christina Goff (Librarian), Aprill Nogarr (Non-Departmentalized Faculty Group - Brtwd), and Liz McLaurin (LMCAS Representative)

Guest: None

Meeting called to order: 2:34 pm Location: Zoom Meeting

CURRENT ITEMS

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

Nikki gave a COOP update and shared a list containing COORs cross-listed with COOP 160/170/180 will be provided at the next curriculum meeting.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved (M/S: Gunder/Olgin) approved with changes; unanimous
Remove AA-T History

Approval of the Minutes: April 21, 2021

Action: Approved (M/S: Gunder/Goff); abstain J. Bearden

3. Standing Item: Articulation Update

Eileen's articulation update consisted of

- Updates regarding the last meeting items; 1 and 2
- CSU/IGETC course approval
- Ethnic studies approved for area F
- CSU course competency list requirement for area F
- LMC potential courses that can be submitted for area F
- Governing Board results; approval and submitted courses and programs
- CID submission for approval

4. Meeting Schedule

The committee spoke about scheduling an additional curriculum meeting for Spring on May 19th to finalize the approval of curriculum programs; History, African American Studies, and Social Justice. Morgan asked the members if they were available to meet on the additional date. The committee agreed to meet.

The committee discussed the meeting schedule for 2021-22 to include department eLumen deadline dates; plus, the integrated curriculum calendar with the local, district, state, articulation, and scheduling deadline dates. Clarification questions were asked about

submission of documents via eLumen and it being approved by the Department Chair and Dean; including the Academic Senate review of new course and programs. It was shared that the eLumen dates will help streamline the process of getting items approved in meeting other entity deadlines, especially for schedule and catalog deadlines to publicize items. A meeting with AS is recommended to explore their approval process related to eLumen submission dates for new programs/courses. Considering that timeline takes into consideration regulation deadlines mandated by the State/District in which departments adhere to, e.g., Office of Instruction. Recommendation to develop a comprehensive timeline that includes AS in the integrated calendar dates and a timeframe for submitting new courses/programs and 900 courses. The curriculum calendar allows for flexibility to approve courses through December 8th for curriculum items that are submitted no later than October. The 2021-22 curriculum meeting schedule will include an additional meeting in September. **Action:** Approved (M/S Gunder/Gesink) 2021-22 meeting schedule and the additional 5/19 meeting; abstain T. Zavala

A question was asked about departments receiving notification whenever other disciplines make modification to a course that impacts that department's program. Eileen shared an example of how departments are impacted whenever another course discipline is used for that major, which sometimes limits communication about changes or deletions. Inasmuch, Nikki shared with the eLumen system it will alert departments whenever there is a change to a course that impacts other programs, more so the author becomes aware how the inactivation and revisions impact other majors.

5. Programs

- **AA-T Anthropology Action:** Approved (M/S: Gunder/Shideler); unanimous
- **AA-T English, Action:** Approved (M/S: Gunder/Shideler); abstain J. Bearden

6. Position Paper

Morgan gave an update about the responses received from AS with making suggested changes to the draft position paper. Such that it should include adding a curriculum representative to the GE meetings, and clarifying whether adjunct faculty can serve on the curriculum committee.

The committee discussed adjunct attendance on meetings, which there has been so in the past. Also, shared with the committee was DGC's discussion about the topic of adjuncts attending meetings in particular about receiving payment, because their attendance is not required compared to full-time faculty as being part of their professional obligation. This topic is a 10+1 concern, and there was a recommendation to have a broader conversation at the academic senate level.

With regards to having a representative serve on GE, it may pose a problem with the meeting date because GE and SGC meet on the same day, and it may become challenging for a rep to attend both meetings. The GE committee is currently having discussions about the best date and times to meet, which doesn't conflict with everyone's meeting schedules.

Morgan shared with the committee that she will share AS vote to approve the final draft of the curriculum position paper scheduled for 5/17.

7. Units and Theory Policy

The committee received an update about the State Chancellor's units and policy change. Nikki shared a document that explains the curriculum policy definitions and descriptions derived from the Program and Course Approval Handbook PACAH, district policy 4001, and the units/policy change with regards to using activity as a method of instruction was replaced with lab. For example, KINES courses are now lab which were activity. Being that there are different types labs, e.g. science lab type 1 vs math lab type 2, and physical activity type 3. These types are outlined in the UF contract.

A question was asked about faculty compensation teaching non-credit courses being that they are mirrored with a credit course. It was shared that non-credit faculty are paid by hours and not units, and mirrored non-credit courses are compensated at the same rate as the credit course. Also, with non-credit course, there are no units associated with them. However, there is a concern that colleges are not receiving the appropriate apportionment for the non-credit courses being that the college reports non-credit courses by the hours only. Overall, the CDPC non-credit courses receive higher pay, essentially the same pay as the mirrored credit course, yet a regular non-credit course that is not CDPC and mirrored receives less, paid by the hours submitted.

A question was asked about change from activity to lab impacting transfer; however, it was stated that the change is associated with pay and has no bearing on IGETC/transfer.

8. ISLO Core Group

Paula gave an ISLO Core Group update. The group completed several activities, one being the review of other college's ISLO descriptions, which they voted on Santa Rosa, Chaffey, and CSU San Diego as the best language for the group to begin developing language for LMC'S ISLO descriptions.

9. Syllabus Policy

Morgan and Nikki shared a document and provided information about the syllabus policy that's found in the faculty handbook. The document outlines required and recommended syllabus elements. The syllabus is a 10+1 issue. The document also has detailed descriptions of the elements. It's essential for faculty to review the required elements to ensure it's provided in the syllabus, especially in the event of a grade appeal the syllabus becomes a reference document of what's required by the student when taking a course. Furthermore, the committee discussed having a conversation with AS about making suggested changes to the syllabus policy.

10. COOR Template and Forms

Morgan gave context about the COOR how-to-guide in relation to updating the COOR eLumen template. Nikki shared ideas of creating a step-template via the specification tab to include a textbox that captures additional information about the COOR that would have been essentially an attachment, e.g. online addendum. Another thought when revising the eLumen templates is credit for higher learning as a process. Morgan concluded by asking the committee for feedback about what type of information to provide faculty with how to use eLumen, particularly the assignment section. There was a recommendation to change the following statement:

Provide a sample assignment in each appropriate category that demonstrates the level and rigor of the course and link that sample assignment to one or more CSLOs.

Bold the statement and make it bigger, and change the word “link” to “connect”

It was recommended that the members review the document via SharePoint and bring back feedback, ideas, and concerns to the next meeting.

There was a recommendation to address the following statement:

These assignments should read like actual in class assignments.

The committee discussed what’s required to develop an appropriate assignment. One idea was to create bullet items followed by examples tailored to different disciplines.

Questioned asked about two college reading and writing assignments are required, being that it should read two college assignments. More so in the past, it identified four assignments.

There was a concern about the writing assignment as it implies all courses should meet the requirement, not considering that CTE courses have different parameters. One thought is that degree-applicable courses must identify reading, writing, and critical thinking assignments. One method to demonstrate this action should not require a writing assignment to consider CTE.

Governance Committees - Tabled

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

Adjourned at: 4:34 pm