Curriculum Committee Minutes

Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate

Fall 2025 Semester

Meeting Thursday, October 02 2025 2:15 pm

AC 303

Emergency Zoom: https://marin-edu.zoom.us/j/84713722571?from=addon

Present Voting Membership: Gina Cullen, Wende Bolke, ~~Shaylah Anderson~~, Rebecca Beal, Ingrid Kelly, Alex Jones, Sara Malmquist-West, Jeff Yates, Alex Jones~~, Lisa Morse~~, Patty France.
Present Non-Voting Membership: Maria Coulson, Cari Torres, Grace Mengqi Yuan, Sheldon Carroll.

Standing Items

1. Call to Order at 2:17 pm via zoom
   - Approval of the agenda
   - Motion: Alex Jones
   - Second: Sara Malmquist-West
   - Vote: Approved

2. Approval of the minutes
   - Motion: Alex Jones
   - Second: Rebecca Beal
   - Vote: Approved

3. Public requests: None

4. Chair Announcement:
   - Gina explained that the meeting was rescheduled due to an inquiry from the District regarding the Senate units assigned to the Curriculum Chair role.
   - She clarified that the current practice has remained unchanged for the past 10 years.
   - In response to the inquiry, a call for faculty interested in serving as Curriculum Chair was issued campus-wide. Gina applied and was selected for the position.

Discussion Items

1. Comprehensive Program Review – Alex Jones
   (1**) Background:**
   - Alex shared the Program Review webpage outlining the current process.
   - Maria provided a brief history and the goals of the Program Review Workgroup. She noted that departments have faced challenges with the current instructional program review template.
   - Since program review falls under faculty purview, the Academic Senate formed a workgroup to revise and improve the template and process.

- The workgroup is seeking input from the Curriculum Committee to identify what data would be most useful in the review process.
- Much of the work aligns with the new ACCJC accreditation standards, which are being integrated into the process.
- The current process involves departments completing their program review and submitting their reports to SLOAC and GRIT for feedback. Following that, the idea is to invite the departments to discuss with the Curriculum Committee as well.
- A document outlining several proposed discussion points has been shared with CC members to help guide these discussions. The workgroup welcomes any suggestions or recommendations to enhance the process.
    - Gina shared that GRIT's review focused solely on equity, without examining curriculum.
    - Sara emphasized that the CC could determine its level of involvement and what aspects of curriculum and student impact should be analyzed.
    - Sara also walked the CC through the document's proposed areas. Sections 5A and 5B can be submitted or presented by departments, with the CC determining the preferred format.

(2) Discussion:
Ingrid suggested:
- Rebranding Program Review to make it more inviting.
- Framing presentations to the CC as opportunities to share departmental journeys—"where we've been" and "where we want to go"—rather than formal presentations.
- Wende and Jeff expressed enthusiasm about highlighting the strengths of various departments. For example, Wende shared that she would be excited to present the successes of the Dental Program to the Curriculum Committee and welcomed the opportunity to seek additional support and resources for completing the Program Review Process.
- Several members emphasized that the part involving the CC should be conversational, not punitive or task-oriented.

There was a discussion about data reporting for program review.
- PRIE will provide data for requested areas.
- Members suggested including specific guiding questions in the template to help departments prepare and engage in meaningful discussions.
- Ingrid stressed the importance of explaining why certain data is needed.
- Rebecca reinforced that the ultimate goal is student success.
- Sara provided examples of how course offerings affect articulation and transferability. Jeff asked about the role of deans in ensuring departments offer courses that support student success. Currently, this is addressed during the "Refine" phase, where deans review data, refine goals, and discuss resources with departments.
- Wende shared that while she received support for mandatory revisions, she felt isolated during the program review process. She advocated for more guidance and clarity.
- Members agreed on the importance of providing:
    - Clear data
    - Guiding questions
    - Supportive personnel
    - A clear explanation of purpose ("the why")

There was a discussion about deactivation/reactivation process:
- Ingrid raised the issue of course deactivation and the potential for an institutional policy. Gina noted this is a topic of discussion on the Curriculum Chair listserv.
- Reactivating a course can take up to two years due to articulation and transferability timelines.
- Jeff recommended having Holley present program data contextually. Ingrid suggested using raw

numbers instead of percentages due to the college's small size.

Other points:
- There was a brief discussion on the value of noncredit offerings, particularly given that we have a large population of noncredit students in the college.
- Alex also announced that a Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) presentation/training is forthcoming.

Next step**:** CC members will review the guiding document and begin drafting a set of guided questions.

Action Items

Motion to approve: Alex Jones moved to approve all items on the consent agenda.

Second: Rebecca Beal seconded the motion.

Vote: approved with consensus.

Meeting adjourned at 3:17 pm.