



Curriculum Committee

Minutes

Date: January 28, 2025

Meeting Room: L113 (Zoom for Guests)

1:00 pm

1. **Call to Order** | Erin Duane called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.
2. **Roll Call** | Please see change in membership and welcome new committee members. Sarah Barsness is on sabbatical leave and Jim DeKloe is Chairperson for Spring term. Jim was unable to attend today. Roll call is as follows:

Committee Officials (Non-voting)

- ☐ Jim DeKloeChairperson
- ☒ David Williams.....VP of Academic Affairs
- ☒ Lisa Abbott.....Curriculum Analyst
- ☒ Claire Gover.....Meeting Secretary
- ☒ Laura Maghoney.....DE Coordinator

Additional Expertise

- ☐ Andrew Wesley..... Assessment Coordinator
- ☐ Cody VigPrincipal Research & Data Analyst

Guests

Committee Members (Voting)

- ☒ Luis Angel-Campos.....Career & Technical Ed
- ☐ Alison Bolton...1:42* Social & Behavioral Sciences
- ☐ Guy Brookshire.....Liberal Arts
- ☐ Saki CabreraSocial & Behavioral Sciences
- ☒ Ginger Cain.....Health Sciences
- ☒ Kow-weng "Kelvin" CheahCounseling
- ☒ Jose CortesDean
- ☒ Erin Duane.....Library
- ☐ Orion LamMath & Science
- ☒ Ashlie Lawson.....Articulation Officer
- ☒ Freeman Lo..... Career & Technical Ed
- ☒ Maire Morinec.....Health Sciences
- ☒ Joe Ryan.....Dean
- ☐ James WordMath & Science
- ☒ Teri Yumae.....Liberal Arts

*Attend via Zoom

3. Approval of Minutes

Approval of Minutes from: December 3, 2024. <i>Item was tabled until we had quorum.</i>					
Motion:	Ginger Cain				
Seconded by:	Ashlie Lawson				
Comments/Discussion/ Revisions:	Since our meeting on December 3 rd , Dean Ryan, GEOG faculty and VP Williams met to discuss GEOG006 (California Geography) and decided not to deactivate this course. We want to ensure that we offer courses that help students along their degree path. We will have a clear record on Governing Board action that GEOG006 is reactivated/modified.				
Final Resolution:	Yeses:	6	Noes:		Abstentions: 3
Motion Passed:	Yes: ☒		No: ☐		

4. Agenda Approval

<i>Approval of the agenda will enact all matters listed under the Consent Items which are considered routine unless removed from the Consent Items by a Committee member.</i>					
Motion:					
Seconded by:					
Comments/Discussion/Revisions:	<i>Quorum had not yet been reached at the time of agenda approval. There are no action items other than approval of 12/3/24 minutes.</i>				
Final Resolution:	Yeses:		Noes:		Abstentions:
Motion Passed:	Yes: ☐		No: ☐		

5. Consent Items

<i>(No vote – moving on to Curriculum Committee)</i>			
6a. General			
There were no items in this section.			
6b. Workload/Class Max			
Course	Rationale	Workload Committee Decision	Change

6. Comments from the Public

<i>Three minutes are allotted per person **</i>	
Name	Comments
There were no public comments	

7. Information Items

<i>No Action Required</i>

8. Action Items

		Motion:			Seconded by:	
Comments/Discussion/Revisions:						
Final Resolution:	Yeses:	0	Noes:	0	Abstentions:	0
Motion Passed:	Yes: ☐		No: ☐			

9. Discussion on tentative Items for review this semester

Lisa Abbott reviewed the tentative schedule. Here are the topics for upcoming meetings:

<u>Tech Rev</u>	<u>Curriculum</u>	Topics
Feb 18	Feb 25	NURS (revising program requirements) WELD140 (Doug Green has been working w/WELD faculty to update) ADVM150 ARTH
Mar 4	Mar 11	Artificial Intelligence AS/Cert – New AI course and certificate has not come to curriculum ENGR GEOG
May 6	May 13	PHOT Liberal Studies Interdisciplinary Studies Wellness COUN062 (Curriculum Review, need to update their two programs and COUN062) KINE ADT

Topics for Curriculum Workshops are scheduled for March and April are TBD, most likely related to common course numbering.

Erin Duane- Workload Committee will provide Curriculum with outcomes from their last meeting.

10. Discussion on CTE Curriculum Review preparation

Tech Review and Curriculum have no agenda items for Feb 4 and 11, the meeting time will be used for CTE curriculum review, held on zoom. This will be coordinated with Dean Cortes.

I. Report from Assessment Coordinator, Andrew Wesley

There were no items in this section.

II. Report from Distance Education Coordinator, Laura Maghoney

Laura explained that Peer Online Course Review (POCR) is a special review process for high standards of online classes. It is very intensive and requires a significant amount of changes on the course, including accessibility. We are trying to get a good sampling of classes through POCR, and currently have 8 faculty certified as POCR reviewers. Priority would be transfer courses, and those that are part of the GE degree or a certificate. Courses are offered in the California Virtual Campus (CVC) exchange. Courses that are POCR certified will be displayed first in the Exchange and include a POCR badge.

Per Dean Ryan ENGR 7 & 8 are ready to be reviewed.

Laura is working on a DE Handbook which should be ready in the next few weeks.

III. Report from Curriculum Analyst, Lisa Abbott

There were no items in this section.

IV. Report from Articulation Officer, Ashlie Lawson	There were no items in this section.
V. Report from VP of Academic Affairs, David Williams	Our Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the ACCJC Peer Review Team Report, and the Accreditation Reaffirmation Letter are posted on our website under Accreditation. We received a Reaffirmation Letter this month through which we were notified of our 18-month Accreditation. (Full accreditation is 7yrs.) We will meet with our Accreditation Liaison to get clarity on their findings (what they found or what lacked evidence). By March 2026, we will have to demonstrate compliance in two areas. 1) Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI): (The review team based their findings on random online course samplings.) What is the ACCJC looking for? What does RSI mean? What is in the syllabus? Is it clear enough? Have a blueprint in the syllabus – “This is how I will be contacting you....” Instructor initiated communication. RSI is included with the DE addendum. Interaction needs to be measurable and regular, and we must pay more attention to this moving forward by reviewing Canvas shells and syllabi. 2) Using assessments to make decisions for improvement: How do we evaluate courses and academic and non-academic programs and use the assessment to make improvements? How does academic program review drive curriculum review? Example- if a faculty wants to change SLOs, what made them decide to do so? In program review meetings the deans are given feedback on what the programs need (resources) or want to modify. Direct SLOs to expenditures, hiring prioritizations, and document (have evidence) of the process. Institutionalize that this will be part of the regular process.
VI. Report from Curriculum Committee Chair, Jim DeKloe	There were no items in this section.
VII. Other	There were no items in this section.
VIII. Open Discussion	There were no items in this section.
IX. Adjournment	1:47 PM

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD STARTING AT 1:00 PM ON THE FAIRFIELD CAMPUS AND ON ZOOM (FOR GUESTS) UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

***Under the Bagley-Keene Act, a body does not have to listen to comments on matters that are not on the agenda or that were already considered in a public meeting where there was an opportunity to comment. Cal. Gov't Code § 11125.7(a).*

Under the Brown Act, the public is entitled to comment on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body, as well as any agenda item. Cal. Gov't Code § 54954.3(a). See Galbiso v. Orosi Pub. Util. Dist., 167 Cal. App. 4th 1063, 1080, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 788 (2008). Under the Brown Act, the legislative body does not have to listen to comments on items that are not within its subject matter jurisdiction. 78 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 224 (1995). And, as under the Bagley-Keene Act, a legislative body under the Brown Act does not have to listen to comments on items that were already considered in a public meeting where there was an opportunity to comment. Cal. Gov't Code § 54954.3(a).

An agency may limit public comment on items described in the agenda to the time when those items are being considered. Olson v. Hornbrook Cmty. Servs. Dist., 33 Cal. App. 5th 502, 528, 245 Cal. Rptr. 3d 236 (March 26, 2019).

In addition, under both Acts, the body may adopt reasonable regulations to ensure that the above provisions are carried out, including but not limited to regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated to each individual speaker for public testimony or comment on particular issues. Cal. Gov't Code §§ 11125.7(b) (Bagley-Keene Act); 54954.3(b) (Brown Act). A legislative body of a local agency may regulate the time, place and manner for speech to ensure orderly discussion. Baca v. Moreno Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 936 F. Supp. 719 (C.D. Cal. 1996) (Brown Act); see, e.g., Ribakoff v. City of Long Beach, 27 Cal. App. 5th 150, 177, 238 Cal. Rptr. 3d 81 (2018) (rejecting plaintiff's First Amendment facial and as applied challenge to board's rule limiting public comment to three minutes); Olson, 33 Cal. App. 5th at 528 (holding limitation on public comment on agenda items to when those items are being considered was not an unreasonable regulation).