

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee Meeting Roll Call

Date: 3/03/2025

Time: 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Location: NH 215

Call to Order: 2:02 p.m.

Adjournment: 4:00 p.m.

Quorum: 13

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anthony Ababat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Samuel Addington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Banola (Mary Lawler Proxy)	<input type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Banuelos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Berry (Faculty Chair)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melita Caldwell-Betties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mary Copeland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Todd Heibel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leticia Hector (Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Kristina Heilgeist*
<input type="checkbox"/> Denise Knight	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Keith Lee	<input type="checkbox"/> Steven C. Lee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessy Lemieux	<input type="checkbox"/> Breanna Lopez
<input type="checkbox"/> Kevin Lyons	<input type="checkbox"/> Micah Martin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Martin	<input type="checkbox"/> Jesus Navarro	<input type="checkbox"/> Maria Notarangelo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Robles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jamie (Herrera) Salyer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rutina Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janice Wilkins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vinnie Wu*
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kay Dee Yarbrough	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Reps. (2)			
Guests:	Amy Avelar (CHEM)	Michael Torrez (CHEM)	Daihim Fozouni (ENGL)	Nori Sogomonian (DE)
	Ken Lawler (KINX/KINCO)			

Co-chair - In the event of a tie vote, discussion will be re-opened, followed by a second vote. If the tie still persists, the Curriculum Chair shall cast the deciding vote.

*non-voting members

Agenda Items

Approval of Minutes	Tabled.
VPI Report	Tabled.
New Business	<p>A. Information Items</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HUMSV 198C – C-ID recommendations: (see item F) Common Course Numbering (CCN) Task Force Information: The CCN taskforce met on Thursday last week and have put together an initial budget to present to the next Faculty Chair's meeting that 6 hours of work will go towards every course that needs a template addition to the COR (completed in Meta), two hours in Technical Review and any changes that need to be made and 1 hours at the Curriculum Committee meeting. This will be approximately \$350 per class. Program modifications to align with CCN and CalGETC for 2025/2026 College Catalog: Kay Dee Yarbrough informed the Curriculum Committee about the program modifications scheduled for approval at the 04/10/2025 board meeting. These modifications include updates to CalGETC and CCN and must be approved for implementation in Fall 2025. Administrative update to ENGL C1001 & ENGL C1001H: We noticed that there was an issue with ENGL C1001 and ENGL 1001H, the units were set to 3 and we have to update to 4.

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.

Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.

Curriculum Committee Minutes

- i. **Administrative processing of articulation related items:** Janice Wilkins provided an update on HUMSV 198C, noting that necessary revisions were requested by four-year institutions. Several administrative adjustments are required, and she assured the committee that these changes have been coordinated with the department to expedite submission for review. While updates will be processed to ensure compliance, the priority is to secure timely approval. These revisions will be presented to the Curriculum Committee as information items and are typically annual updates to the Liberal Arts degree and Cal-GETC Certificate and compliance modifications for C-ID and TMCs.
- e. **Modifying SBVC Graduation Catalog Rights policy:** Janice Wilkins and Jamie Salyer informed the committee about updates to catalog rights, aimed at expanding and making them more inclusive. These updates will be presented to the Academic Senate. Currently, the policy lacks detail, specifying only the year a student started and completed their program. The revisions address questions regarding continuous enrollment, including whether summer terms count and how the policy applies to CHC students, dual enrollment, and Middle College students. The goal is to make catalog rights more student-centered by allowing any catalog year during which a student maintains continuous enrollment to remain valid. The language has been clarified to define catalog rights and reference all symbols that count toward continuous enrollment. The policy has been adjusted to require attendance at least once per academic year to maintain catalog rights.

B. Action Items

Motion to move the Course and Program Approvals to the front of the action items. Move c before a.

1st: K. Yarbrough

2nd: J. Lemieux

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

- a. Suggestion guide for Justification for Course Enrollment Maximum in Meta
 - i. Revisions to “Data and Documentation to Justify Maximum Course Enrollment/Course Caps” based on faculty feedback.
 - ii. References:
 - 1. [Setting Course Enrollment Maximums: Process, Roles, and Principles](#) (ASCCC – Adopted Spring 2012).

Curriculum Committee Minutes

2. [Curriculum Process for Class Caps](#) (SBVC Academic Senate Minutes – [First read Jan 31, 2024, passed Feb 7, 2024](#))
3. Class Caps Resolution Endorsement (SBVC Curriculum Committee Minutes – [supported Dec. 4, 2023](#))
4. Academic Senate Resolution for Class Caps (SBVC Curriculum Committee Minutes – [supported Oct. 30, 2023](#))

Thomas Berry originally presented the document titled *Data and Documentation to Justify Maximum Course Enrollment/Course Caps* at the February 3, 2025, Curriculum Committee Meeting. He recommended that the committee review the document line by line, provide feedback, and move to approve the proposed changes.

During the discussion, M. Robles inquired about the next steps following the committee's review. Specifically, he asked whether the document would be forwarded to the Academic Senate or remain within the Curriculum Committee. T. Berry clarified that class caps have already been reviewed by the Academic Senate, but this document would be housed within the Curriculum Committee as a reference guide when evaluating changes to maximum course enrollment/course caps.

Motion to go through the document line by line:

1st: M. Robles

2nd: T. Heibel

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

T. Berry began the discussion by asking the committee whether we would like to refer to it as *Course Caps* or *Class Caps*.

Motion for course caps to be used:

1st: J. Salyer

2nd: M. Caldwell-Betties

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

Discussion: J. Salyer asked whether we should be consistent with Academic Senate and say Class Caps instead? Per T. Berry it's used interchangeably, J. Salyer recommended that they can use them interchangeably. J. Lemieux said that in the definition it should say "Course or Class Caps".

Amended Motion: J. Salyer amended the motion to use course caps but put a note in the document where course caps or class caps can be used interchangeably.

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

T. Berry asked the committee to review and vote on the title of the document - Title: Data and Documentation to Justify Maximum Enrollment/Course Caps

Motion to accept T1:

1st: Jessy Lemieux

2nd: J. Salyer

Discussion: None

15 Responses

Aye: 87% (13 votes)

Nay: 13% (2 votes – T. Heibel and M. Caldwell-Betties)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section B to discuss whether they preferred P.1 or P.2

Motion to approve P2:

1st: M. Caldwell-Betties

2nd: J. Lemieux

Discussion: None

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee to reviewed Section C and whether they approved or denied of the wording.

Motion to approve all of C:

1st: M. Lawler (for John Banola)

2nd: T. Heibel

Discussion: J. Lemieux mentioned that if all of this will be in the curriculum committee handbook, it is not necessary to say this.

T. Berry asked whether it should be edited out. If the committee decides to keep the wording, there should be a motion to change the word “presented” to “approved”.

M. Lawler amended motion to approve all of C changing the word “presented” to “approved”.

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

J. Salyer asked if the committee would update if there’s a newer version of the ASCCC paper that comes out. Per T. Berry, we haven’t voted on citations yet.

The committee reviewed Section D (Definitions), to discuss whether they approved of P1 or P2.

Motion to accept P2:

1st: J. Lemieux

2nd: M. Robles

M. Robles was confused with the statement “because the course cap may be higher than classroom size”, T. Berry said it was to explain the definition and what’s happening. J. Salyer mentioned that in the definition.

J. Salyer requested to amend the motion to put course caps and include a statement that says class caps can be used interchangeable, “something to that fact”.

15 Responses

Aye: 100% (15 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed E3 (Stacked Courses) and discussed whether it should be added to the document:

A. Avelar initiated the discussion by highlighting that in the science department, certain courses, such as CHEM 101, are scheduled with two stacked sections, typically enrolling 28+28 students in a single classroom. This results in an actual lecture size that is double the enrollment cap, raising pedagogical concerns. Similar practices occur in Welding and Art, where different course numbers are assigned, but classes meet simultaneously.

In the sciences, stacking sections is used to accommodate scheduling needs, akin to the accepted practice in disciplines like Music, Welding, and Art, where instructors intentionally combine different levels within a single class to meet minimum enrollment requirements. However, in science courses, this leads to significantly larger class sizes—such as 56 students in a CHEM 101 lecture—raising concerns about instructional quality.

T. Heibel clarified that the discussion revolves around defining what constitutes a stacked class. A. Avelar noted that the previous understanding—that classes could be scheduled together—was no longer permitted. For example, physics courses were explicitly instructed to discontinue this practice because it was determined that students were not receiving their required instructional hours. Given that similar practices continue in other disciplines, A. Avelar questioned the inconsistency across the district and the need for a uniform definition.

The group discussed whether the definition of stacked courses should remain strictly aligned with its intended purpose. Some noted that in Art, for instance, the total enrollment across stacked courses never exceeds the individual course cap, whereas in CHEM, that is not the case.

A. Avelar suggested revising the language to clarify that stacked courses should not exceed the enrollment cap of a single course. T. Berry asked whether there is an existing policy addressing stacked classes, to which J. Lemieux responded that no such policy currently exists.

Curriculum Committee Minutes

M. Copeland emphasized that while stacking is primarily a scheduling issue, it has pedagogical implications. Stacking two CHEM 101 sections effectively creates a larger lecture, which falls outside the Curriculum Committee's purview. L. Hector supported maintaining the current definition but without additional qualifications. M. Robles stated that this issue would be addressed separately.

J. Salyer pointed out that the definition should clearly state that the combined enrollment should not exceed the cap of an individual section, as the current wording suggests the opposite. They recommended clarifying whether this policy is meant to regulate or justify stacking.

A. Avelar advocated for retaining language that allows faculty within disciplines to make their own determinations about combining courses, particularly in fields like Art, where stacking multiple sections is pedagogically appropriate.

J. Lemieux recommended amending the language to specify that stacked courses meet simultaneously as a single class and must not exceed the course cap.

L. Hector raised concerns about the impact on larger lecture-based courses and referenced contractual language that limits class sizes.

J. Lemieux mentioned that some courses, particularly in BIOL and CHEM, currently exceed class caps, indicating an ongoing issue.

J. Salyer concluded that the policy should explicitly state that combined enrollment "should not exceed the cap for an individual section" and suggested using "should not" rather than "must not" to reflect a recommendation rather than an absolute mandate.

Motion: E3 instance where two or more sections where the same course either online or in person. Enrollment in stacked courses should not exceed the course cap.

1st: J. Lemieux

Discussion: M. Copeland questioned the definition of a stacked class. If you want to put something somewhere else about pedagogy, then it should go somewhere else other than the definition.

T. Heibel commented that if this is purely definitional then yes, anything that we negotiate will supersede this. This is, as it exists currently, informational. Are we okay with voting on this if contractual language is what it is.

Curriculum Committee Minutes

J. Lemieux withdrew the motion.

M. Torrez says meets simultaneously for a single class. They are separate classes but still considered stacked if they are hybrid. Another current practice that is not in line with this. The stacking of Hybrid lab meets in person. Lecture are in two different shells but are only getting load for the one shell. You can combine classes for stacked classes.

L. Hector stated that stacked typically means that they happen at the same time.

Motion: Motion to accept the sentence with a period ending at single class and then strike the rest.

1st: J. Lemieux

2nd: M. Lawler (for J. Banola)

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section F (Data and Documentation).

Motion to accept S2:

1st: M. Robles

2nd: M. Calwell-Betties

Discussion: T. Berry inquired about local fire and safety codes that remain unclear. M. Robles clarified that the suggestion originated from faculty and that the Curriculum Committee's role is to ensure alignment with local practices. He emphasized that faculty are the ones proposing these changes and have justification for them. A. Avelar added that national organizations consider local, state, and other regulatory factors when establishing guidelines.

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section G (Criteria for the Modification of Course Caps). This area is changing the word “must” to “should”.

Motion to approve P2:

Curriculum Committee Minutes

1st: M. Lawler (for J. Banola)

2nd: J. Lemieux

Discussion: None

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section H (Health and Safety) and whether this should be added to the document.

Discussion: T. Berry asked whether fire code is a curricular matter and if we can this align more pedagogically.

M. Copeland commented that if faculty are coming to the Curriculum Committee to fix a fire code or OSHA issue, then this is an Office of Instruction matter.

A. Avelar mentioned that it is pedagogical in the sciences. They have to cover safety. It's hard to tell students about safety protocols when the student number inside the classroom does not make sense. Have to teach students how to light fires, they have to learn to light fires on Bunsen burners and can potentially light each other on fire. You have to talk about fire code and OSHA in the class for safety for the students. There have been many leaders' changes and adding this will ensure safety and compliance all the way through.

T. Berry asked who monitors fire code and OSHA

A. Avelar answered that we are supposed to have a safety person who just resigned. The Chemical Hygiene person is the contact person for the campus. Currently we have the Dean of Science and the Dean of Arts and Humanities. Any time you handle chemical you are supposed to have a chemical hygiene plan, but we do not. The classes need to follow the compliances.

J. Salyer mentioned that criteria are options.

T. Berry asked if we can make them pedagogically stronger.

J. Lemieux quoted the *Setting Course Enrollment Maximums: Process, Roles, and Principles* paper by The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), "Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that discipline faculty at local colleges determine class caps for each of their courses based on pedagogical and health and safety factors, such as but not limited to

Curriculum Committee Minutes

the methods of instruction, course modality, objectives and outcomes of the course, the assessment methods as established on the Course outline of record (Cor), and fire codes;

T. Berry commented that the committee needs to tie it stronger to pedagogical concerns.

A. Avelar stated that if you're not in a STEM or CTE field you assume that administration looks at this.

J. Lemieux commented that lab classes were raised to a very unsafe level. They wrote a resolution that passed. Nearly 3 years in the making that centers around this and the stacked classes and asked how do we strengthen this?

M. Copeland stated that this need to be tied to pedagogical concerns in order for them to take notice. Fire codes and OSHA are not our purview.

T. Berry commented that trying to align with curriculum to it aligns with our purview.

T. Heibel asked per the conversation does it better belong under section 2?

Motion: Move H portion starting with "based on" to the section under the phrase "availability of seats, desks or workstations" and accept it there.

1st: J. Lemieux

J. Lemieux withdrew the motion.

M. Robles commented that this is a health and safety issue.

L. Hector asked the committee if they could add something to the affect at the end of the sentence referencing pedagogy.

M. Copeland stated that the rules above [in the document] say need two of health and safety one through four whatever. If health and safety were the only justification that the faculty gave it is not enough for the Curriculum Committee to approve if only one is chosen. Safety is important, but it is not the main concern of the Curriculum Committee.

Motion: Move to accept H with "in connection with pedagogical concerns"

1st: J. Lemieux

2nd: J. Salyer

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section I – adding stacked courses:

J. Salyer asked if stacked is a modality.

Curriculum Committee Minutes

T. Berry stated it is a sub-modality.
J. Salyer stated when I think modality I don't think stacked.
L. Hector commented that she doesn't know that this belongs in this area and assumes that classes are always stacked which is not the case.
T. Berry commented that this is not how the process works.

Motions to take this out and reference stacked somewhere else.

1st: J. Salyer

2nd: M. Copeland

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Sections J, K, and L for feedback, or to decide whether to remove these sections.

Motion: J. K. L. Feedback to get rid of the whole paragraph and substitute.

1st: M. Lawler

Discussion: M. Copeland likes the wording that references the ASCCC information. It's useful as a guide to the Curriculum Committee and believes it could be helpful.

J. Lemieux mentioned that when it comes to dangerous classes, fire code comes into factors. Per T. Berry, paragraph L shows fire code.

A. Avelar noted that for those outside the sciences, it may be difficult to see how space limitations relate to curriculum. An outsider might assume that a classroom has room to fit more students, but in science courses, proper use of lab spaces is an essential part of instruction. Safety concerns, including exposure to volatile substances, are integral to every lab session.

A. Avelar also pointed out that there seems to be a disconnect with non-STEM areas regarding these considerations. Unlike other disciplines, science labs must account for safety in every session, making it a continuous and ongoing effort. While some may view space as a scheduling issue, for chemists and other lab-based disciplines, it is fundamentally tied to curriculum and student safety. Avelar suggested that Section L provides a reasonable framework for administration to consider, ensuring that every safety component affecting students is adequately addressed.

L. Hector asked if we could provide clarification for the last sentence in Section L.

Curriculum Committee Minutes

J. Lemieux counted that referencing if there is a safety argument based on the physical side of the classroom, that is important and should be considered. We cannot have 30 students in a CHEM 101 lab, this is a serious problem.

M. Copeland stated that the Curriculum Committee is bound by state and local and accreditation guidelines.

T. Berry stated that references are in the original document. Sections K and L were feedback that came in after.

Motion amended to take out K which would automatically take out J.

1st: M. Lawler (for J. Banola)

2nd: A. Ababat

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section L:

Motion to remove the last paragraph sentence.

1st: M. Lawler (for J. Banola)

2nd: J. Lemieux

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

Section L (cont.)

Motion to Accept L:

1st: J. Lemieux

2nd: M. Robles

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section M - Balancing Pedagogy Safety and Compliance:

J. Salyer motioned to add stacked classes after legal and safety requirements stacked courses should not exceed maximum enrollment for a course.

J. Salyer adjusted the motion to faculty must balance student learning opportunities with safety and legal compliance. While faculty determine appropriate course caps based on pedagogy, enforcement of regulations, including fire codes and space limits, remains the responsibility of administration. Thus, course caps must align with the legal and safety requirements, and stacked course enrollment should not exceed the maximum enrollment for a single course. Pedagogy should remain the guiding principle in curriculum committee decisions, but safety and legal compliance must also be prioritized.

1st: J. Salyer

2nd: J. Lemieux

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

The committee reviewed Section N (Citations) and discussed whether they want to keep the citations or remove them.

Motion to keep:

1st: J. Salyer

2nd: M. Lawler (for J. Banola)

14 Responses

Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstentions: 0% (0 votes)

Motion Passes

Motion to approve document as edited:

1st: M. Caldwell-Betties

2nd: Rutina Taylor

Curriculum Committee Minutes

	<p>14 Responses Aye: 100% (14 votes – J. Wilkins Absent) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstentions: 0% (0 votes) Motion Passes</p> <p>b. Work Experience & Independent Study Course Template updates – possible work groups - Tabled c. Course & Program Approval Action Items i. Course Approvals</p>
Announcements and Public Comments	

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
KINX 110Bx3	Intercollegiate Cross Country-Men Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		Batch approvals: KINX 110BX3 KINX 110CX3 KINX 111BX3 KINX 111CX3 KINX 112BX3 KINX 112CX3 KINX 113BX3 KINX 113CX3 KINX 114BX3 KINX 114CX3 KINX 115BX3 KINX 115CX3 KINX 116BX3 KINX 116CX3 KINX 120BX3 KINX 120CX3 KINX 120DX4
KINX 110Cx3	Intercollegiate Cross Country-Men Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 111Bx3	Intercollegiate Cross Country Women Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 111Cx3	Intercollegiate Cross Country-Women Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 112Bx3	Intercollegiate Football-Offense Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 112Cx3	Intercollegiate Football-Offense Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 113Bx3	Intercollegiate Football-Defense Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 113Cx3	Intercollegiate Football-Defense Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 114Bx3	Intercollegiate Soccer-Men Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
KINX 114Cx3	Intercollegiate Soccer-Men Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		KINX 121BX3 KINX 121CX3 KINX 121DX4 KINX 130BX3 KINX 130CX3 KINX 131BX3 KINX 131CX3 KINX 132BX3 KINX 132CX3 KINX 133BX3 KINX 133CX3 Motion to approve all KINX course inactivations: 1 st : M. Caldwell-Betties 2 nd : J. Salyer Discussion: J. Lemieux asked about the justification for the class. M. Lawler stated that with the creation of the KINX 090x4 course, students would be able to take this class four times instead of taking individual classes for their
KINX 115Bx3	Intercollegiate Soccer-Women Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 115Cx3	Intercollegiate Soccer-Women Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 116Bx3	Intercollegiate Volleyball-Women Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 116Cx3	Intercollegiate Volleyball-Women Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 120Bx3	Intercollegiate Basketball-Men, Spring	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 120Cx3	Intercollegiate Basketball-Men Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 120Dx4	Intercollegiate Basketball-Men Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 121Bx3	Intercollegiate Basketball-Women, Spring	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 121Cx3	Intercollegiate Basketball-Women Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 121Dx4	Intercollegiate Basketball-Women Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 130Bx3	Intercollegiate Baseball Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 130Cx3	Intercollegiate Baseball Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 131Bx3	Intercollegiate Softball Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 131Cx3	Intercollegiate Softball Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
 Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
KINX 132Bx3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Men Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		sport. This will streamline the athletics courses while still meeting NCAA guidelines that's required for student athletes. T. Heibel asked about the x4 for basketball. Students will be able to take the 090 up to four times and the department is planning on creating an 091X4 course for those who need the extra class. M. Caldwell-Betties asked whether they are collapsing the courses. Per the department, since the B and C are no longer active because of the KINX 090x4 class, it's partially collapsed. The KINX 090x4 will be credit, non-transferrable. The 100-level classes will
KINX 132Cx3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Men Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 133Bx3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Women Pre-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		
KINX 133Cx3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Women Off-Season Athletics	Mary Lawler	Inactivation		

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
					<p>still be transferable, but it won't be effective until Fall 2026. For in-state students, this should not affect transferability. The in-season section will still be transferable.</p> <p>15 Responses Aye: 100% (15 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes)</p> <p>Motion Passes</p>
KINX 110x3	Intercollegiate Cross-Country -Men	Mary Lawler	Modification		<p>Motion to approve KINX 110x3:</p> <p>1st: T. Heibel 2nd: M. Robles Discussion: None 15 Responses Aye: 100% (15 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes)</p> <p>Motion Passes</p>
KINX 111x3	Intercollegiate Cross-Country -Women	Mary Lawler	Modification		<p>Motion to approve KINX 111x3:</p> <p>1st: M. Caldwell-Betties 2nd: A. Ababat Discussion: None 15 Responses</p>

*The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.*

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
					Aye: 100% (15 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes) Motion Passes
KINX 112x3	Intercollegiate Football - Offense	Mary Lawler	Modification		Motion to approve KINX modifications: 1 st : M. Copeland 2 nd : M. Caldwell-Betties 15 Responses Aye: 100% (15 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes) Motion Passes
KINX 113x3	Intercollegiate Football - Defense	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 114x3	Intercollegiate Soccer - Men	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 115x3	Intercollegiate Soccer - Women	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 116x3	Intercollegiate Volleyball - Women	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 120x4	Intercollegiate Basketball - Men	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 121x4	Intercollegiate Basketball - Women	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 130x3	Intercollegiate Baseball	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 131x3	Intercollegiate Softball	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINX 132x3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Men	Kenneth Lawler	Modification		
KINX 133x3	Intercollegiate Track and Field-Women	Mary Lawler	Modification		
KINCO 601	Fundamentals of Coaching	Mary Lawler	New		Motion to approve KINCO 601: 1 st : T. Heibel 2 nd : A. Ababat Discussion: T. Heibel asked for confirmation that

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
 Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.

Course Approval Action Items					
Course ID:	Course Title:	Originator:	Proposal Type:	Notes/Comments:	Voting:
					<p>this is a noncredit course. Per M. Lawler, they are launching this noncredit course so they can do their due diligence to research coaching. M. Copeland asked for clarification as to whether this is going to go under the coaching discipline for ASCCC, which it is.</p> <p>15 Responses Aye: 100% (15 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes)</p> <p>Motion Passes</p>

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the pre-requisites and co-requisites approved be re-evaluated in the next 2-3 years by the appropriate departments/programs to ensure student success.
Note: Committee members are voting on all Proposals, Requisites, Advisories, and Distance Education.