

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate

Fall 2022 Semester

Meeting Thursday, October 27th, 2022 2:15 pm via Zoom

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

Present: Gina Cullen, Bob McCoy, Sheldon Carroll, Luna Finlayson, Lisa Morse, Sara McKinnon, Kathleen Smyth, Alex Jones, Beth Sheofsky, Scott Serafin, Sara Malmquist-West, Grace Mengqi Yuan, Cari Torres, David King, Maria Coulson, Patrick Kelly.

Standing Items

1. Call to Order at 2:15 pm via zoom
2. Approval of the amended agenda
 - Motion to approve: Lisa Morse
 - Second the motion: Bob McCoy
 - Vote: all approved
3. Approval of the minutes
 - Motion to approve: Sara Malmquist-West
 - Second the motion: Lisa Morse
 - Vote: all approved
 - Abstained: Scott Serafin

Discussion

1. Curriculum Training: Credit Hour and Noncredit – Gina Cullen
 - 1) Credit Hour calculation
 - 2) Credit vs. Noncredit
 - 3) Sara added that our district uses “Pass” and “Satisfactory Progress” indicators for noncredit courses.
2. BOAP Discussion -the Committee had a follow-up discussion on the Bus Operator Apprenticeship program (BOAP); the key points are below:
 - 1) Noncredit option
 - Noncredit would eliminate the concern of students not being able to fulfill the

- out-of-class time after the long in-class time each day.
- CC was concerned about the intensity of long learning hours each day. Students may not retain anything for such long learning hours.
- Noncredit would cut out homework and the course hour during the day stay the same.

2) Revision to the Apprenticeship Program

- Alex Jones talked about the State's direction on creating more apprenticeship programs by 2029 and the opportunity to create Apprenticeship programs in noncredit and not-for-credit settings in addition to the for-credit option.
- Any revision would need to be signed off by the Program Sponsor. In our case, the Program Sponsor was the bus company's union, who would need to support any revisions, such as changing to a noncredit option, and revise the program and meet the standards they set up originally for the program. Alex knew apprenticeship programs from other colleges had submitted and revised their programs successfully.

3) How to meet the original standards set in the program

- The changed version that Ron discussed to the CC in the last meeting aimed at a Certificate of Achievement with a minimum of 8 units (4 units of BOAP and 4 units of Work Experience). It was a major cut back from the original proposal of a Certificate of Achievement for 18 units (12 units of new BOAP curriculum and 6 units of existing Work Experience).
- GGT is in need to train bus drivers for the company quickly. Gina understood that the development narrowed down the scope, shortened the completion time, and made it more specific to GGT, which would still be sufficient to prepare the bus drivers.
- Patrick asked the Committee about what they thought of having the program narrowed down to the minimum to pass the tests. Would it be realistic to do 10 -12 hours of learning a day and be successful? He further commented that part of the grant was the credit-course proposal; he did not think noncredit could be viable under the same grant proposal. He could help the Committee to find out whether the grant would allow the program to be changed to noncredit.

○

4) Curriculum content

- Gina clarified that Ron favored the 6-week structure over the 12-week structure because he had cut out content. Work Experience comes after the content courses.
- There was a discussion on how much curriculum had been chopped out from the course content to reduce to 4 units.
 - There was a concern that the narrowed scope, which was specific to GGT, would miss one of the apprenticeship program's biggest values, which was to train bus drivers for bus companies in general. Would the apprentices

- be able to pursue options besides GGT?
- Sara asked whether apprentices could do WE for noncredit. CC did not know the answer. There was no existing noncredit WE at COM. Mirrored noncredit WE courses could be a way to add the noncredit quickly.
- Minimal qualification and faculty evaluation questions came up. Gina asked the CC to stay within the purview of the Curriculum Committee and focus on the BOAP courses, although we did not have the content specialist since bus driving was not a subject established at COM.
- Maria thanked the CC for vetting the changes in the curriculum. She said that the apprenticeship was a good idea but Academic Senate and the faculty Union were still in the process of figuring out how to make it work.
- Patrick added that UPM and the Senate were both paying attention to those things that were in their purview and the overlap between the two bodies. Things such as evaluation, minimum qualifications, discipline are all discussions ongoing.

5) Next Steps:

CC did not approve the 8 units as-is; Gina would provide feedback to the department/GGT:

- Research the noncredit option and find out if it could be a viable option for the grant.
- Find out whether the large reduction in units could be approved for the same grant.
- Since CC approved the original 12 units/12 weeks and CC stand behind that curriculum, it was suggested to require more weeks to add to the four-week model.

3. 150C and 150NC – Blaze

- 1) 150C/NC - Reduce to 1 hour to draw more students to the companion courses. Student units and teaching units would reduce from 2.0 to 1.0 Units.
- 2) ENGL 150 - Require four visits over a semester to the Tutoring Services. Tutors would help students with their essay assignments. Add the requirement in the course description and course outline.
- 3) The majority of instructors already do it; the proposal would formalize the requirement at a department level.
- 4) Discussion:
 - Lisa asked whether the proposal would change the unit allocation. Blaze answered that the unit allocation would stay the same. Teaching units turned out from 150C would be used to offer more sections.
 - Bob asked whether the Tutoring Center could handle the demand. Beth and Blaze answered that WRL has many open hours that can bring more students in. The surge in demand would not be that drastic because more

than half of the 150 instructors already require visits to the tutoring services.

- Kathleen asked how the four visits be tracked. Visits in person would be tracked in the RWL. Virtual visits could be tracked by SARS. Blaze added that the requirement is non-punitive. It would be an honor system to submit a paper of proof.
- Projected start term: Fall 2023.

5) Next Step:

- Beth Sheofsky moved to put the ENGL proposal to vote at the next meeting.
- Sara McKinnon seconded the motion. Vote: all approved. No objection. No abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.