
Curriculum Committee Minutes

Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate

Fall 2023 Semester

Meeting Thursday, September 28th, 2023, 2:15 pm

Emergency Zoom link: <https://marin-edu.zoom.us/j/82951617913>

Present in AC 303: Gina Cullen, Luna Finlayson, Bob McCoy, Jason Dunn, Mengqi Yuan, Sara Malmquist-West, Sara McKinnon, Peggy Dodge, Cari Torres, Maria Coulson.

Present in Zoom room:

Beth Sheofsky – faculty office, KTD

Kathleen Smyth – faculty office, KTD

Alex Jones – faculty office, IVC

Sheldon Carroll – ES office, KTD

Erik Dunmire – faculty office, KTD

Colleen Mihal – faculty office, KTD

Dan Zaffran – faculty office, KTD

Standing Items

1. Call to Order at 2:17 pm in AC 303
2. Approval of the agenda
 - Motion to approve the agenda: Bob McCoy
 - Second the motion: Jason Dunn
 - Vote: approved
3. Approval of the minutes
 - Motion to approve: Sara Malmquist-West
 - Second the motion: Sara McKinnon
 - Vote: approved.
4. Public Announcement – none
5. Chair's Announcements:
 - none

Discussion

1. ECE mandatory revision current status and plan – Peggy Dodge
 - CC reviewed the pending workflow status in eLumen
 - ECE courses also need to satisfy CAP alignment (Curriculum Alignment Project)
 - Significant courses will be done by Fall 2023

- Elective courses will be revised by Spring 2024
- The ECE 261ABCD Conference courses vary each time. Repeatability might be updated through legislature AB 811. Before repeatability is changed, it was recommended that ECE 261ABCD have distinct course outlines.
- Peggy asked about the content review process on English competency. There was a discussion about language challenges for English learning students in the courses. The group discussed the benefits of prerequisites versus advisories. They also considered the potential barrier of implementing prerequisites, as they would be enforced for every student regardless of their readiness. It was recommended to list advisories on the course outline to describe the necessary language skills students need to succeed in the course.

2. COMM Updates – Colleen Mihal

(1) Reactivation request: COMM 162 (see extra information in Exhibit I)

- Place in the curriculum:
COMM 161 is the introductory level of screenwriting and COMM 162 will be the advanced level. COMM 161 was offered this semester with good enrollment. Students were surveyed that they would be interested in taking the advanced level.
- Appropriate level for offer
There were a number of similar courses at neighboring community colleges. It would be a lower-division transfer level course.
- Resource and course rotation
Two faculty are available to teach the screenwriting series. Including COMM 161 and 162 would add course availabilities to the current degrees (Film ADT and AA COMM Screenwriting).
- Discussion:
Kathleen asked about the enrollment of COMM 161. Colleen replied that there were 16 students in the course. Additionally, faculty spoke with students majoring in Film Studies and they expressed interests in taking the advanced screenwriting course.

(2) Course size maximum; request to reduce Film production courses from 20 to 15 students.

- The rationale for reducing the course size is primarily because of the limited, expensive film equipment available for students to share. This reduction would allow more hands-on experience for students during class time. Both faculty members who taught the courses believed that 15 would be the appropriate class size.
- Discussion:
Kathleen asked if the courses were lecture-type or lab-type. The response was lecture-type. Colleen added that students need to learn how to use the equipment in these courses.

Bob McCoy asked about class sizes for comparable courses at other community colleges. A similar course at SRJC has a class size of 20.

Sara McKinnon inquired about the cost of equipment and the cost analysis for purchasing more equipment versus reducing class size.

Colleen further noted that the lack of studio facilities puts students at a disadvantage.

CC recommended not letting the class size hinder the revision process, especially since recent enrollment has not reached the maximum. Colleen said she would discuss the matter further with her department and revisit the topic if necessary.

- (3) Math 121C new option at 0.5 student units, 1.5 weekly hours. – Dan Zaffran
- Current Math 121C, the companion/support course for Math 121, is at 1 student unit, 3 hours per week. Dan proposed a reduced version at 0.5 student unit, meaning 1.5 hours per week. The rationale behind this is that Math 121 serves as one of the entry points to math courses. When only one section of in-person Math 121/121C is scheduled, 3 hours of Math 121C per week might be too much for some students. A 1.5-hour weekly session of Math 121C would be a more appropriate fit for students who require a certain level of support.
 - Discussion:
Jason asked for clarification on how the principal course and companion course function. He was particularly interested in knowing if the companion course was mandatory for all students. The response was that the companion section would be mandatory for all students when Math 121/121C was the only scheduled section available.

Cari asked how the support class would be effective for the students. Dan answered that it depends on the students, as they come in with different skills and levels.

The group asked for the offerings of Math 121 and companion in Spring 2024.

Dan responded with the SP24 schedule:

One Math 121 (3 units) online

One Math 121 (3 units) and companion (1.5 units) in-person;

They shifted one offering from Math 121 to Math 114, which meets the same requirement for the Business degree as a result of course rotation.

Maria commented that since we cannot determine the exact needs of the students, wouldn't it be better to offer all companion courses at 1.5 hours if the support course works effectively at that duration?

Erik asked about the current enrollment in Math 121 and companion sections in Fall 2023.

Math 121, online – 30

Math 121 with companion, in person – 17

Math 121 with companion, in person -21

Cari asked how the content and description would be adjusted to reduce the course to 1.5 hours in the outline. Sara McKinnon and Bob further discussed this perspective, expressing concern that adjustments should be made to the content and course outline before considering scheduling changes.

Beth discussed ENGL and its recent reduction of the companion course from 2 hours to 1 hour. The reduction took effect this semester, so there were no conclusions to draw from it yet. She further added that they couldn't predict the outcome of such a reduction.

Gina, Sara MW, and Luna shared their opinion from a counselor's perspective. Students might be confused about signing up for companions, and in general, they often don't understand what the companions are. Dan responded that having three courses (121 and two different companions) could potentially be confusing. However, the inclination to try the shorter companion might be beneficial.

Bob mentioned that 1.5 hours could disadvantage students who need 3 hours. Dan responded that the key was to strike a balance. After discussing with instructors who teach Math 121, it was noted that not every student needed 3 hours of support. Dan suggested that those in need of more

support could utilize resources like the Math lab. Following this idea, Bob suggested making 121C a permanent 1.5-hour course and directing those in need to the Math Lab as a long-term solution.

Erik asked how the companion courses were taught. Dan responded that some instructors integrate remedial concepts into the principal course, while others review concepts during the companion time. There wasn't a consistent approach.

CC recommended that Math instructors review the current content of MATH 121C, and create a new course outline for the shorter version, which would be 1.5 hours per week.

Action:

Meeting was adjourned at 3: 30pm.

Exhibit I

Retrieved from Presentation prepared by Colleen Mihal 09.28.2023

DEMONSTRABLE NEED

- Student surveyed in the classroom, increased demand for screenwriting, could be offered as FILM161/FILM162
- Other factors: Alignment with educational master plan, required class for degree program, prep for film transfer students
- Reactivating this course is part of the program review of the Communication Department, we plan to build on and expand our film offerings, allows students to complete the A.A. in Screenwriting degree we currently offer
- Demonstrate how this course or program compares to what other local community colleges are offering. List similarities and differences. The key difference is these classes are listed as "Intermediate" not "Advanced." We could change the course title.

CINE 75B Intermediate Screenwriting (CCSF)

MEDIA 123 Intermediate Screenwriting (SRJC)

English 88 Intermediate Playwriting and Screenwriting (Berkeley CC)

English 89 Intensive Playwriting and Screenwriting (Berkeley CC)

CURRICULUM STANDARDS

- Program design: Adding this course and teaching as cross-listed with FILM 161 would allow students to attain an A.A. in Screenwriting in two years, we hope to offer it every semester or once a year
- This course would also support lifelong learning and allow community members to develop screenplays even if they are not degree seeking
- "Programs and courses are integrated, with courses designed to effectively meet their objectives and the goals and objectives of the programs for which they are required." PCAH pg27

RESOURCES

- Adequate resources: We have the available faculty (Frank Crosby, Gauri Adelkar) to teach the course, we have the facilities needed, we have the units available, we have support from our Dean, we plan to offer once a semester or once a year depending on interest
- "The college must commit to offering all required courses for the program at least once every two years, unless the program goals and rationale for the particular program justify or support a longer time frame" PCAH pg28