

# College of San Mateo

## Curriculum Committee

October 23, 2025 (2:15 p.m.)

Building 10, Room 10-468

Zoom Meeting: <https://smccd.zoom.us/j/89148507277>

Meeting ID: 891 4850 7277

Call in using: +1 669 444 9171 US

### MINUTES

#### Members Present

Chair	Malathi Iyengar
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	David Laderman, Lia Thomas (Zoom)
Business/Technology	Hellen Pacheco
Counseling/Student Services	Leonardo Cruz, Trang Luong (Zoom)
Creative Arts & Social Science	Jeremy Ball, Michelle Mullane
Instructional Design	Julieth Benitez
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Tamara Perkins, Keira Travis
Math/Science Division	Beth LaRoche

#### Non-Voting Members

Deborah Laulusa, Chris Walker (sub for Danni Redding Lapuz), Niki Castello

#### Absent/Excused

ASCSM Student Representative	Finola Miqailla
Business/Technology	Lale Yurtseven
Counseling/Articulation Officer	Marsha Ramezane
Math/Science Division	Chris Smith

#### Other Attendees

Madeline Wiest, Tamara Porras, Kamran Eftkhari, Michelle Beatty, Dave

Chair, Malathi Iyengar, called the meeting to order at 2:21 p.m. Motion by Michelle to approve the agenda, seconded by Leonardo, all members voting "Aye."

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

---

Motion by Julieth to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Michelle, all members voting "Aye."

- **Approval of minutes from the October 9, 2025 meeting**

- **Course Modifications**

- |      |     |   |
|------|-----|---|
| FILM | 145 | Watching Quality Television (4.0)<br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in SLOs, objectives, texts.)                       |
| HIST | 261 | Women in American History I (3.0)<br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in description, SLOs, objectives, content, texts.) |
| VARS | 342 | Beach Volleyball (3.0)<br>(DE update; 6-year update)  |

- **Program Deactivation**

- Social Justice Studies – AA-T Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (18.0 – 19.0)

### **SUBSTANTIVE AGENDA**

---

*Courses listed on the substantive agenda have been reviewed for listed changes. Though courses on the substantive agenda may have changes in prerequisites and/or recommended preparations, the full committee is expected to review prerequisites and recommended preparations statements for all proposals to ensure compliance with Title V regulations.*

- **New Course**

- |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|--|
| CIS | 403 | Introduction to Deep Learning (4.0) – <b>approved.</b> <i>Motion by Helen, seconded by David, all members voting “Aye.”</i><br>(New DE Supplement)<br>Malathi asked if all comments had been addressed. The author Kamran confirmed that all comments were addressed, also noted in the Course Comments. |
|-----|-----|--|

- **Course Modifications**

- |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|--|
| ART | 391 | Experimental Photography 1 (3.0) – <b>approved.</b> <i>Motion by Julieth to approve ART 391, ART 392, ART 393 and ART 394, seconded by Leo, all members voting “Aye.”</i><br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in hours, description, SLOs, objectives, content, instruction, assignments, evaluation, texts.)<br>Malathi asked if all comments had been addressed for ART 391-394. The author Tamara P. confirmed that all comments were addressed. |
| ART | 392 | Experimental Photography 2 (3.0) – <b>approved.</b> <i>(included in ART 391 vote above)</i><br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in hours, description, SLOs, objectives, content, instruction, assignments, evaluation, texts. )  |
| ART | 393 | Experimental Photography 3 (3.0) – <b>approved.</b> <i>(included in ART 391 vote above)</i><br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in hours, prerequisite, description, SLOs, objectives, content, instruction, assignments, evaluation, texts. )  |
| ART | 394 | Experimental Photography 4 (3.0) – <b>approved.</b> <i>(included in ART 391 vote above)</i><br>(DE update; 6-year update; change in hours, prerequisite, description, SLOs, objectives, content, instruction, assignments, evaluation, texts. )  |

- MATH C2210 Calculus I: Early Transcendentals (5.0) *formerly MATH 251 – **approved.** Motion by Michelle, seconded by Julieth, all members voting “Aye.”*  
(DE update; 6-year update; change in course ID, title, prerequisite, description, objectives, content, evaluation, texts.)  
Malathi informed everyone that the two Math courses, MATH C2210 and MATH C2220, are AB 1111 courses and reminded everyone that they have a specific format they have to follow. Malathi asked if all comments had been addressed. Beth and the author, Michelle B., confirmed that all comments were addressed.
- MATH C2220 Calculus II: Early Transcendentals (5.0) *formerly MATH 252 – **approved.** Motion by Julieth, seconded by Shana, all members voting “Aye.”*  
(DE update; 6-year update; change in course ID, title, prerequisite, description, objectives, content, instruction, evaluation, texts.)  
Malathi asked if all comments had been addressed. Beth and Michelle B. again confirmed that all comments were addressed.

- **Program Modifications**

- International Business – Certificate of Achievement (changes in required courses) – **Postponed.**  
This will move to the next meeting as the representative, Lale, is absent and the committee would like to hear more about the program changes.
- International Business – Certificate of Specialization (changes in required courses) – **Postponed.**  
This will move to the next meeting as the representative, Lale, is absent and the committee would like to hear more about the program changes.

## **OPEN AGENDA**

---

- **Policy for Use of Upper Division Coursework**

Postponed to next meeting due to Marsha’s absence.

- **ASCCC Memo on New Title V Language**

Malathi provided a handout to all committee members and posted a link in Zoom; this handout is included with the minutes.

Malathi summarized the ASCCC memo: Under regulatory provisions and key changes, the curriculum committee at each of the CCCs now has to adopt written procedures ensuring that every course outline describes approaches that will engage diverse student populations and advance equitable outcomes. Also, the committee ensures there is a process that reflects the principles of universal design for learning, UDL, providing multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression, which is important, yet vague. The DCC seemed to indicate that it would be the same policy for all of the colleges.

Malathi then opened the floor for discussion and ideas that she can bring back to a special meeting with the other chairs. Julieth said this framework was used to revise multiples sections of the handbook. Malathi offered that one direction the committee could proceed would be to say that the statements in the handbook constitute the written procedures and so we already have it.

Malathi also suggested an idea that was brought up at the DCC by Rick Hough, which is having a collection of resources, of which the handbook could be one, along with a whole UDL resource, that we would could direct faculty. Then, there would be a field in CurricuNet that faculty would have to fill in when they do their two-year or six-year updates, saying what they have changed about their course from

the last iteration, based on something from these resources. She added that this seemed like a fairly flexible idea in the sense that each course author could look through these materials and come up with what they think the best improvement would be for their course and let the committee know, rather than the committee creating a one-size-fits-all prescription for every course.

Jeremy asked whether it make sense to have this requirement for course outlines when it is something that the college should be doing universally. Malathi said the the language of the legislation is that we must adopt written procedures ensuring that every course outline describes approaches that will engage diverse student populations, etc. So according to the legislation, it does refers to every course outline. Chris added that, like a lot of things in the course outlines, it needs to be in writing that we are actually following the regulation.

Tamara suggested that it would be nice to do this in community and have a mechanism for sharing out ideas to the larger community that could be supportive to others.

Jeremy suggested a multiple choice option where you can select what works best for your course to create a moment of reflection. Malathi asked it would be more reflective and flexible for a course author to go to a list of resources rather than select from a checklist of options. Julieth said the Academic Senate at the state level put out guidelines for the COR Curricunet system that recommends against having checklist options.

The discussion veered into the specifics of making checkbox changes in Curricunet and the staff labor involved versus faculty labor. Chris W. steered the conversation away from labor and back to checkboxes, providing some context on why the committee has moved away from checkboxes, with the purpose primarily being to encourage faculty to be thoughtful about their course outlines.

Jeremy asked if there is a strong reason for thinking that making the person who works on the course outline think through these things is actually going to translate into how the course is taught by any particular teacher. He continued that the process of writing curriculum and the process of being a good teacher are different tasks and, of the two, he would like the make the process of writing curriculum the easier one to get through. Julieth countered that the course outline is the document of reference to onboard new instructors to the institution. In her experience with onboarding faculty sometimes the course outline is not particularly helpful, especially adjunct faculty can get lost in the process. She thinks there is value to the course outline as a reference document and as an onboarding document. Malathi added that a lot of effort goes into the details of the course outline yet people can completely ignore it so she is unsure how much of it actually translates to the classroom.

Helen brought up that the list of checkboxes could take effort to maintain if they are prone to change. Jeremy said the list of options should come from the committee and should only change when the committee chooses to change them. Chris W. explained that revisions to our version of Curricunet is only allowed once a year. Helen suggested a reference to an outside document so the actual software doesn't have to be changed.

Beth offered that for CTE classes that are revised every two years the COR is the foundation that that class has to be taught by. She supports the idea of making it more thoughtful but also keeping it open and flexible because not everyone thinks the same way. She also added that this seems like a big conversation that is more than what can be agreed upon or resolved today.

Jeremy asked if the other two colleges have a preference on how to handle it. Malathi said they haven't met yet, but the meeting has been scheduled. Also, she said that no one has said that all the colleges

have to have the same policy, but the understanding among the chairs was that we would. Of course, if they end up vigorously disagreeing, then the three colleges could have three different written policies to comply with the regulatory change.

Malathi summarized again that we “must adopt written procedures ensuring that every course outline describes approaches that will engage diverse student populations and advance equitable outcomes,” which could be simply gesturing to the procedures we already have in the curriculum handbook, or it could be any combination of the ideas presented today. She reiterated that she heard from the group that equity is important, that things can differ greatly between classes and the composition/turnover of faculty, and that we have different relationships with the course outline. She also stated that this written policy is not going to solve everything.

Jeremy made one last comment that he wants to be careful that virtue signaling doesn't get in the way of being virtuous. For example, we can do a lot of work in the course outline with equity and then feel like we've met the needs of equity, but the “rubber meets the road” in the classroom, in the ways in which our classes are taught and how accessible they are. Based on that, Malathi and Jeremy both suggested a good idea would be to handle the Title V change as efficiently as possible and then put our institutional effort into finding more ways to meet students where they are in the classroom.

Julieth made a last comment that compliance and efficiency are important, but perhaps the conversation should not be about the easiest way to do this or how individual people are using the COR, but about the purpose of the COR and the spirit behind the regulation. Chris W. agreed that the COR is an important tool and we should be able to instruct faculty on how the COR should be used. Also, it is not academic freedom to choose to ignore the course outline of record and teach topics that aren't there, and ignore topics that are there.

- **Presentation: AB 1111 Format**

Beth shared the ENGL 100 and ENGL C1001 course outlines. She discussed the format and content of course outlines for English courses, focusing on state-mandated versus local curriculum requirements. She explained that faculty have flexibility in incorporating local content, but state-mandated content must remain consistent across all courses. The group agreed to wait for Beth's review before making comments on course outlines to avoid redundancy and ensure compliance with transfer requirements. It was noted that using the provided templates does not guarantee course approval for transfer, and local additions should be added to meet transfer standards.

- **Teach-outs**

Chris W. shared his presentation on Program of Study (POS) Inactivations Teachouts on how degree program changes will trigger inactivation and the subsequent two-year teach-out period for students. He described the process in detail along with the groups of people and decisions involved. He shared an example from his division of an Engineering degree, why they decided to make a program change, and the actions the division took to inform, guide and provide options to students. He emphasized that the college can move students to an “Undecided” major but it is illegal to move them into a different degree program due to financial aid and other implications. The discussion highlighted the need to improve communication about teach-outs to academic counselors, with suggestions to also make documentation more accessible to counselors.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.**