



**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Facilitator: Sean Moore—Curriculum Committee Chair**

**Recorder: Noemi Monterroso**

**Date: May 9, 2023 / Time: 2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.**

**Location: VT-124**

**Vision:**

Compton College will be the leading institution of student learning and success in higher education.

**Mission Statement:**

Compton College is a welcoming and inclusive community where diverse students are supported to pursue and attain student success. Compton College provides solutions to challenges, utilizes the latest techniques for preparing the workforce and provides clear pathways for completion of programs of study, transition to a university, and securing living-wage employment.

**Attendees:** Sean Moore, David McPatchell, Shay Brown, Charles Hobbs, Susan Johnson, Bradfield Conn, Nathan Lopez, Noemi Monterroso, Michael VanOverbeck, Andree Valdry, Hoa Pham, Jose Martinez, Paul Flor, Alejandra Pham, Maya Medina, Sheri Berger, Melain McIntosh

**AGENDA:**

1. **Approval of Agenda:** May 9, 2023.
  - **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to approve agenda. David McPatchell seconded. Approved**
  
2. **Approval of Minutes:** March 28, 2023 and April 25, 2023.
  - **Shay Brown motioned to approve minutes for March 28, 2023 meeting. Susan Johnson seconded. Approved**
  - **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to approve minutes for April 25, 2023 meeting. Bradfield Conn seconded. Approved**
  
3. **Reports and attendee follow up questions during the reports:**
  - **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to open agenda items 3a-3e. Shay Brown seconded**
    - a) Vice President, Academic Affairs – Sheri Berger
      - No updates
    - b) Curriculum Analyst – Maya medina
      - There are three locations that Minutes and Agendas are posted on website. All three locations are up to date
      - 20 new courses have been submitted and have approved by the Chancellor’s Office
      - Sociology program revision has not been reviewed by Chancellor’s Office yet; still waiting for updates
    - c) Articulation Officer – Melain McIntosh
      - Science courses and science labs; reminder that colleges and universities are looking at modality. Before COVID, assumption was that lab was taken in person and it was never

checked. Since COVID, there is more scrutiny on how the lab courses are being taken. Some universities have been communicating regarding their policies. Remind division that labs need to be taken in person (physically, on campus, in lab)

- Ex: UCR has posted their expectations on assist.org (major agreement)
- Course report update: there are still outstanding courses that need to be updated; we still have 10% of courses that have not had COR updated. Need to get those done as soon as possible. 2024 is our Accreditation visit and should not be out of compliance for that. Will send another email to remind divisions/departments of courses that need to be updated. Divisions/departments should analyze and consider inactivation for courses that need it.
  - Inactivation process should be started ASAP, if needed
  - Reminder that inactivation needs to be approved by division. Keep in mind that course that are inactivated automatically lose their transferability; can take 1-2 years to get transferability back
- Sheri B.: With science labs, this relates to major prep only?
  - Melain: As long as student it is taking science lab just to meet their general education or transfer units, then online should be fine. However, if the course is a major preparation course for the university, they may not accept it and students may have to retake. Also, if student is taking science course to meet prerequisites for specific programs, they may not accept online labs (i.e., RN/PA program pre-reqs). If they are taking the course for their major, then they should take it in person. Universities are concerned with lack of rigor in online labs
  - Sheri B.: Can they do a hybrid, where it is online lecture, in-person lab?
    - Melain: Yes
- d) SLOC – Jose Martinez
  - Dr. Sosenko created SLO template in elumen. SLO coordinators will test over summer and will implement in Fall
  - Juan Tavarez will facilitate a SLO analysis workshop today at 3pm. Workshop is available for PD
- e) DEFC
  - No report
- **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to close agenda items 3a-3e. Susan Johnson seconded**

#### 4. Consent Agenda Items:

- **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to approve Consent Agenda Items 4a-4c. David McPatchell seconded. Approved**
- a) Course Inactivation: ATEC 145 - Automotive Machining.
- b) Course Review; Course Title Update; DE Addendum: CSCI 102 - Introduction to Data Structures.
- c) 6-Year Standard Course Review- No Changes: HDEV 101 - Orientation to College and Educational Planning; HDEV 105 - Career and Life Planning; HDEV 107 - Navigating the Transfer Process; HDEV 110 - Strategies for Creating Success in College and in Life; and HDEV 115 - Career Development Across the Lifespan.

#### 5. Action Items:

- a) First Read—New Courses: ESTU 101H - Honors Introduction to Ethnic Studies; ESTU 150 - African American Psychology; FILM 130 - LGBTQ+ Film; PE 110A - Body

Conditioning and Physical Fitness-A (Beginners); PE 110B - Body Conditioning and Physical Fitness-B (Intermediate); PE 110C - Body Conditioning and Physical Fitness-C (Advanced); PE 125A - Weight Training A (Beginners); PE 125B - Weight Training - B (Intermediate); PE 125C - Weight Training - C (Advanced); SOCI 207 - Introduction to Human Services and Social Work; SOCI 208A – Social Work and Human Services Seminar; and SOCI 208B – Fieldwork in Social Work and Human Services.

- **Nathan Lopez motioned to open discussion on item 5a. Shay Brown seconded**
- Sheri B.: ESTU 150 created to try to meet new CSUGE Area F requirement. New CSUGE Area F needs to meet core competencies and objectives. This is a course that is mirroring PSYC 110. Will create course and will submit for articulation. If it gets approved we can start offering course to meet CSUGE Area F
- PE courses are levels of the course. Currently PE 110 is not repeatable. If we add levels, then students can retake course. After articulation, we can add it to ADT.
- SOCI courses are for new Human Services program
  - Hoa P.: Why is Social Work courses/program in SSCI vs HEPS?
    - Social work is subset of Sociology. Sociology faculty developed the program. Other schools have separate programs but it doesn't make sense at Compton College
    - Subject doesn't determine who can teach the course. We need to use minimum qualifications identified in COR
    - Title of course doesn't determine the subject. Sociology faculty brought idea to senate, created curriculum, assigned minimum qualifications, etc. which is why it is currently in SSCI
- FLM 130 is the last LGBTQ+ course that needed approval. Will be 5<sup>th</sup> course for social justice degree
- **Hoa Pham motioned to close item 5a. David McPatchell seconded**

b) *First Read*: CurriQunet Course Outline of Record DEI Template Draft.

- **Shay Brown motioned to open item 5b. Michael VanOverbeck seconded**
- Reviewed the DEI Template Draft. Proposing template be housed in a new field/area in CNET. After Curriculum Committee feedback and approval, it will go to COR committee, then Academic Senate. All approvals will be included in template so everyone knows who provided feedback
  - Template is on a Likert scale. If they select strongly agree or agree, explanation portion would be optional. If they select disagree or strongly disagree then explanation portion will be required
  - Nathan L.: Do we need to include accessibility in the first question (DEIA)?
  - Maya M.: Where would template go?
    - Template would be included in a new additional tab
    - Maya M.: Why would faculty select disagree or strongly disagree?
  - Nathan L.: Who is filling out this section? Would it be faculty or the reviewer?
    - Sean M.: Faculty member who is revising course would fill out this form
  - Sean M.: Are there any courses that faculty would select disagree to any questions?
  - Michael V.: Should we add a 'not applicable' option on Likert scale?

- Not applicable sounds better (no negative connotation) and it would make sense for some of the courses
- Nathan L.: When looking at DEI we can't just check mark. Explanation portion should be required in all questions/responses
  - Sean M.: The difficulty comes with How much do we want it vs How much pushback will we most likely receive. We want to streamline a process but not add too much work
- Nathan L.: Can we do 'yes' or 'no' or 'not applicable'? We should not have a middle ground because it would not address DEI issues and help us move forward in that regard. Likert scale allows for interpretation and if we keep Likert scale then explanation should be required
  - Sean M.: We should provide questions and responses where all faculty can answer (for all subjects)
    - Nathan L: A 'not applicable' option is a good idea to be inclusive to all subjects
- Susan Johnson: If we included accessibility, then all courses would need to ensure that everything in their course is accessible
- Melain: Who is filling this out... might need to be both the originator and reviewer. Is there going to be a process to make sure we institutionalize DEIA on our campus? The originator just checking off a question might not help in that regard.
  - Sean M.: Maybe we can have a person that specialized in DEIA
- Hoa P.: Some examples of courses that might answer 'strongly disagree' to some of the questions: CDEV courses have to follow the same course description as state regulations/definitions, they can't make changes to be more DEIA. Also, an issue that might come up is that some language approved previously might not be DEIA anymore and it would make the course no longer inclusive
  - Sean M.: Likert scale would allow leeway, especially for these situations
- Melain: Accessibility: Does this mean that accessibility should be its own question/section? If we keep them all together, then all courses might have 'disagree' since they don't meet all DEIA but accessibility is required
- Jose M.: Can we write the questions 'how does this course take into consideration DEI' and maybe provide check boxes?
  - Hoa P.: Check boxes might be a good idea. Explanation required might be too much work for faculty that already did everything else in COR
  - Susan J.: We might need to have all of them require explanation
- Maya M.: This is a great starting point to start thinking of changes to CurriQunet. Will need a DEIA faculty/coordinator to be put in place before implementing so they can review. Currently, no one will be able to review everything
- Nathan L.: Why or How did this start? Why was this a need?
  - Hoa P.: Minodora mentioned in a union that we should be doing DEI before it was required (it will be required soon)
  - Sean M.: COR taskforce created a rubric and current template draft came out from rubric and information from ASCCC DEI Toolkit
- David McP.: How will Fire Science/EMS look at this?

- ‘Not applicable’ will be useful
- Melain M.: ‘yes’, ‘no’, ‘not applicable’ might be better
- Michael V.: How do we get people involved in DEIA? If we can agree to all of this and explain why, maybe faculty can get a badge like OER/Zero-cost badge so it’s notated on schedule of classes and might help with enrollment if students are looking for these types of courses
  - Melain M.: How would this affect faculty that can’t do fully DEI?
  - Michael V.: Might motivate faculty to try to do this even more
- Sean M.: We are the first college to start working on this so early. This process can serve as an example of what other colleges can do/use if ASCCC approves
- Paul F.: Does ASCCC have some language or guidelines?
  - Sean M.: ASCCC already provided DEI toolkit overview/training in April
- Nathan L.: Can we focus on question 5 or 8?
  - Question 5 feels loaded - Too much in one question
  - Maya M.: How can we know some of the items like “prior knowledge”
    - Sean M.: Would bring in to review rubric. We also want to be careful on infringing on faculty academic freedom
  - Hoa: Prior Knowledge refers more to personal narrative/background/experience
    - Recommendation to rewrite “prior knowledge” since faculty might assume it refers to previous coursework
- Sean M.: Susan will make changes based on recommendations
  - Nathan L.: Can we have a shared document where we can include all our feedback and comments to bring back to next meeting?
    - Yes, document will be shared with committee to share feedback/comments
- **Nathan Lopez motioned to close discussion on item 5b. Charles Hobbs seconded**

## 6. Information Items:

- a) ASCCC representatives, LaTonya Parker and Manuel Velez, presenting DEI in Curriculum Toolkit and IDEAA training during our April 25, 2023 College Curriculum Committee meeting.
  - b) Professional Development Spring 2023 Curriculum Open Labs will be held from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 June 5, 2023 via Zoom—Meeting ID: 882 2218 6850.
- **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to close Information Items. David McPatchell seconded**

## 7. Discussion Items:

- a) Public Comment—Any discussion item(s) may be presented by any person in attendance.
  - **Shay Brown motioned to open Discussion Items. Nathan Lopez seconded**
  - Sean M.: Welcome Back to Susan Johnson and Hoa Pham
  - Nathan L.: Is it possible to get someone from the state to talk more about ESTU Title 5 - cross listing courses?
    - Sean M.: Will reach out to ASCCC to have someone talk to us
  - **Michael VanOverbeck motioned to close Discussion Items. Nathan Lopez seconded**

**Meeting adjourned at 3:09pm**