
Curriculum Committee Minutes

Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate

Spring 2022 Semester

Meeting Thursday, March 10th, 2022 2:15 pm via Zoom

<https://marin-edu.zoom.us/j/93434117360?from=addon>

Present: Gina Cullen, Bob McCoy, Sara McKinnon, Lori Michelangelo; Steve Newton, Kathleen Smyth, Grace Mengqi Yuan, Logan Wood, Luna Finlayson, Rachel Klein, Cari Torres, Holly Shafer, Ron Palmer, Meg Pasqual, Maria Coulson, Alina Varona, Alexander Jones.

Absent: Sheldon Carroll, Lisa Morse, Kevin Muller, Heather Rahman.

Standing Items

1. Call to Order at 2:17 pm via zoom
2. Approval of the agenda
 - Motion to approve: Logan Wood
 - Second the motion: Luna Finlayson
 - Vote: all approved
3. Approval of the minutes
 - Motion to approve the amended minutes: Logan Wood
 - Second the motion: Bob McCoy
 - Vote: all approved
 - Abstained: Luna Finlayson.

Discussion Items

1. WE Presentation – Alex Jones, Gina Cullen
Presentation attached as Exhibit A.
 - a. Kathleen commented that it was great that the work was getting done as it was over-due.
 - b. Grace asked about WE 297B which was listed as a required course in the Court Reporting certificates. Alex and Gina will look into WE 297B before deactivating the 297 series.
 - c. There were no more questions from the floor.
 - d. Kathleen moved to put this proposal to vote in the next meeting. Rachel seconded the motion.
2. Bus Coach Operator Apprenticeship Program Proposal – Ron Palmer, Alina
Discussion:
 - a. Gina asked about the Fall 2022 effective term and whether the curriculum would be ready by then. Ron answered that the program would start with a 139 Special Topic course.

- b. Bob asked about the cost to the students.
Alina answered that the students would pay COM's tuition and the union dues. Alina elaborated on the concept of "Earn and Learn".
- c. The teachers of the apprenticeship are working at the Golden Transit. Sara asked if COM would be responsible of paying the teachers.
Alina said the cost of instruction could be negotiated. The instructors can not be double represented, or by both UPM and their bus union. She further clarified that the teachers would be hired by COM and meet our minimum qual.
- d. Bob asked about funding sustainability.
Alina said that the cost of the apprenticeship to COM was minimum. The cost comes from providing the wrap-around support services. Funding cycle is every three years. She was confident that college could cover our cost in the future.
- e. There was a comment about step one was creating a new discipline to house the program. One asked why we are creating a new discipline.
Alina answered because the commitment of awarding 18 college-level credits, or a Chancellor's Office recognized Certificate of Achievement.
- f. What about the transferability?
Cari said that we have to do analysis to determine if any could be transferable. For example, a similar apprenticeship program at Mission college is degree applicable but not CSU transferable.
- g. Kathleen and Alina talked about parallel pathway; the likelihood that students in the apprenticeship would take other college-level courses. The program would increase student access to college education.
- h. Maria asked about the minimum qualification of the teachers as there was no such category and she asked about how to hire and ensure the bus driver teachers would meet our minimum qual.
Alina responded that CC could propose Transportation as a new discipline to add into our minimum qual list, the Joint Apprenticeship Committee could drive the composition of minimum qualification.
- i. Maria asked what COM came to play other than providing the wrap-around support services; whether the program fit into our mission since the teachers were not ours and the students were not taught in our classrooms.
Sara commented the type of training for students that directly leads to employment fits in our mission. She thought the Certificate would be terminal, not leading to any Associate Degree; and the minimum qual for the instructors would be an AA.
- j. Meg asked who would write the curriculum.
Ron responded that the first step was to go to Golden Gate Transit teachers, figure out what they have.
Alina said it would likely be Ron since he has subject-matter expertise. Ron shared his concern over the updates and maintenance of the curriculum.
Meg and Gina talked about the need of curriculum maintenance on a regular basis. Lori suggested a coordinator position for this program.
Ron commented that a coordinator would be a solution as the person could be in regular contact with the Golden Gate Transit teachers and make the curriculum revisions.
Ron talked about research other Community Colleges with existing apprenticeships.
- k. Gina asked why the curriculum could not be housed in Auto.
Ron said that apprenticeship was a stand-alone program. Alina added that bus operator teachers' minimum qual was distinct from Auto instructors.
- l. Bob asked about liability.
Alina said that the Golden Gate Transit would take full responsibility as the employer.
- m. Meg commented that the proposal felt like "the tail is wagging the dog" because COM already got the funding, so it seemed like the CC would be forced to approve it. She voiced her disappointment in the creation of this apprenticeship as it looked like administratively-driven. Giving out college credits and curriculum development are 100% under faculty purview.

Cari talked about the lesson learned from the process and improvements that could be made to ensure that it is clearer in the future. She suggested it would be better to bring the new concepts to Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, UPM first before going external or submitting an application.

Alina responded with information from her perspective and stated that she did her due diligence by talking to all players and talking to DART before presenting to CC.

Gina reflected on the process and also added that CC should look at the role of DART, re-look at the process for new programs, particularly for the ones that are new to the College.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Exhibit A

COURSE SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSAL

A PRESENTATION TO THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Instructions to Presenters:

- All presentations should be vetted and approved at the Department level before requesting to schedule a date to attend the Curriculum Committee
- Materials must be sent to CC Chair the Friday before the scheduled presentation
- Department Chairs will be encouraged to attend
- Departments should select one or two faculty to present to the CC
- Academic Deans will be invited as resource
- Faculty can request that DART (ad hoc committee of the CC) review presentation materials for feedback
- Presentations should be about 10 minutes in length, not including question and answer period

BASIC INFO

Course Information

- Occupational Work Experience (WE) 298 A, B, C and General Work Experience (WE) 299 A, B,C
- 1, 2 and 3 student units
- (CSU transferable)

Proposed Changes

- Drop the co-requisites, change number of student work/volunteer hours needed for credit to align with Title 5
- Fix the teaching units to reflect the delivery mode of the course from lecture to practicum
- Courses: WE 298 A, B, C and WE 299 A, B,C
- Summer 2022

REMOVE CO-REQUISITE

- ❑ Drop Corequisite and embed into WEXP course
- ❑ Reduce student unit load, registration fees and allow course to be more accessible

SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

- Adjust the number of work and volunteer hours required by student to earn WE unit
- Align with Ed Code, Title 5, and other CCCCO-approved WEXP courses

RATIONALE

- § 55256.5. Work Experience Credit.
- (a) One student contact hour is counted for each unit of work experience credit in which a student is enrolled during any census period. In no case shall duplicate student contact hours be counted for any classroom instruction and Cooperative Work Experience Education. The maximum contact hours counted for a student shall not exceed the maximum number of Cooperative Work Experience Education units for which the student may be granted credit as described in section 55253.
- (b) The learning experience and the identified on-the-job learning objectives shall be sufficient to support the units to be awarded.
- (c) The following formula will be used to determine the number of units to be awarded:
 - (1) Each 75 hours of paid work equals one semester credit or 50 hours equals one quarter credit.
 - (2) Each 60 hours of non-paid work equals one semester credit or 40 hours equals one quarter credit.

WORK/VOLUNTEER HOURS CHANGE

- Current: 80 hours= 1 unit, 160 hours= 2 units and 240 = 3 units
- Proposed: 75 hours (paid)= 1 unit, 150 hours (paid) = 2 units and 225 hours (paid) = 3 units
- Proposed: 60hours (unpaid) = 1 unit, 120 hours (unpaid) = 2 units and 180 hours (unpaid) = 3 units
- Reason for change: align with Ed Code and Title 5

TEACHING UNIT CHANGES

- Current units are inconsistent across the WE courses
- The presentation and content of the course do not meet the UPM contract definition for a Lecture course
- WE course most closely aligns with UPM contract workload definition for Practicum:
 - “The presentation of course content in a practicum or clinical setting, under direct supervision of the instructor of record. Students may be directed to the use of media, computer technology or patient experience. Students may proceed at the direction of the instructor or preceptor at his/her/their own pace for advancement to a higher level within the course content. Students not involved in independent activity may be involved in direct one on one communication with the instructor of record. Practicum is where students require a high amount of practice with instructor supervision to reach the level of skill required for specific courses within the discipline.”
- Practicum teaching units for WE courses would be:
 - WE 298A and 299A: .7 TU
 - WE 298B and 299B: 1.4 TUs
 - WE 298C and 299C: 2.1 TUs

TEACHING UNIT CHANGES

Q
&
A