

Curriculum

Curriculum Committee **MINUTES**

Wednesday, March 4, 2026 1:30 - 4:30pm

Building 200 Room 224

I. **Call to Order:**

Voting Members:	Present	Role:
John Ison	Y	Curriculum Committee Chair
Abraham Romero Hernandez	Y	MATH/CSCI Division Rep
Allen Menton	N	Fine Arts Division Rep
Gary Graves	Y	BUS/CIS Division Rep
George Bonnand	Y	Technology and Engineering Division Rep
Guy Dadson	Y	Tech Review Chair, Natural Sciences Div. Rep
Thydan Huynh	Y	COUN Division Rep
Kelly Nelson-Wright	Y	Social Sciences Division Rep
Amber Gonzalez	Y	Ethnic Studies and Student Equity Division Rep
Yolanda Duron	Y	PE Division Rep
Lugene Rosen	Y	LIB Division Rep
Geoff Smith	Y	Humanities Division Rep
Resource Members:	Present	Role:
Carlos Ayon	Y	Dean, Business & CIS
Kevin Tran	Y	Articulation, Counseling
José Ramón Núñez	Y	Vice President of Instruction
Kenneth Starkman	Y	Dean, Technology & Engineering
Nicol Tushla	Y	Admissions & Records
Scott Lee	Y	Articulation Officer
David Soto	Y	Education Services & Technology Coordinator
Sofia Trujillo	N	Student Rep

II. **Roll Call:** 1:30pm

III. **Public Comments:** *Maximum 10 minutes, 3 minutes per person or group*

IV. **Approval of Agendas ACTION ITEM (VOTE) MSU**

- A. March 4, 2026, Discussion Agenda
- B. March 4, 2026, Proposal Agenda

V. **Approval of Minutes ACTION ITEM (VOTE) TABLED**

- A. February 18, 2026, Discussion Minutes
- B. February 18, 2026, Proposal Minutes

VI. **Curriculum Corrections / Fast-Track Approvals: ACTION ITEMS (VOTE)**

- A. PSLO approvals:

Curriculum.Fullcoll.edu

Meetings: [See CurricUNET Homepage](#)

- B. Distance Education Addenda (DEA) approvals:
- C. FSA approvals:
- D. Curriculum Corrections:
- E. Prefix additions:
- F. Fast-track approvals:

VII. Proposal Agenda (attachment): ACTION ITEM (VOTE) [MSU](#)

VIII. Announcements: (John Ison, Chair)

- A. First Week in February: "Target Date" for pre-launching Fall 2027 curriculum
- B. Wednesday, March 18 is the last CC meeting to have UC TCA (UC transfer) curriculum approved.
 - In order to be sent to UC TCA on June 1 (the once-a-year deadline), curriculum must be Board approved by May 2026 at the very latest.
 - Please keep me posted if there is a chance that curriculum will not make the 3/18/26 CC proposal agenda, which requires reaching level 6 by Thursday, March 12.
- C. Curriculum Committee Three-Year Terms Ending in Spring 2026: Please let me know ASAP if you wish to serve another term, or if your division has chosen someone else. Once I have names, I will send them to Faculty Senate for elections.
 - Curriculum Chair
 - Rep, Business/CIS
 - Rep, Counseling
 - Rep, Tech/Engineering
- D. Courshedog Transition Status Update
 - Reminder: Please save all attached documents (narratives/advisory minutes/recommendations/LMI data) from curriculum. Let's not expect Courshedog to migrate attachments...only CNET data. (It's better to be safe than sorry.)

The Courshedog migration is in progress, but the data transfer from Banner is incomplete. Faculty originators should save all attachments from course and program proposals and consider backups of all pending and launched proposals.
- E. Other announcements

IX. Tech Review Clarification/Updates: (Guy Dadson, Technical Review Chair)

X. Brown Act Updates as of 2026

- A. Effective January 2026, the state implemented numerous changes. Some changes are effective July 2026.
- B. Here are key changes:
 - Brown Act bodies (such as the curriculum committee and Faculty Senate) may no longer meet strictly in person. There must be a remote option for the public.
 - We must have a remote option for those allowed accommodations (ADA, etc).
 - As long as a meeting has an in-person quorum, members may attend remotely (via Zoom, for example) up to 5 times per year (a total of 2 semesters), but "just cause" must be mentioned in the minutes.
 1. A quorum for a Curriculum Committee meeting: 6 out of 11 curriculum reps in attendance
 - Meetings, agendas, and attachments must be accessible to the public, which includes translation into non-English languages upon request.

- Please consult the attachments for further information.

Recent revisions to the Brown Act now require the committee to hold hybrid meetings with a remote attendance option for the public, potentially necessitating a change in meeting location. Committee members are limited to five remote attendances per year (excluding those with ADA accommodations), and all meeting materials must be accessible, including translations. Concerns were raised about other colleges potentially violating the Brown Act by holding fully-online meetings.

XI. 2026 TOP/CIP Code Transition

- A. By the end of the year, we must update the CIP codes in our curriculum management system. We will use a new TOP/CIP crosswalk to determine codes.
- B. By summer 2027, TOP will no longer be used.
- C. Curriculum reps, chairs and deans should work closely with faculty in revising curriculum to reflect the updated CIP codes.
- D. Reps should work with department/discipline faculty and deans to go through all of their courses and programs in CurricUNET by the end of March 2026.
 - Compare the listed TOP/CIP with the revised TOP/CIP crosswalk.
 - If there are changes in TOP/CIP to be made, keep a record of the course and/or program, the current TOP/CIP and the new TOP/CIP to be updated.
 - It would be best for each division compile a spreadsheet listing courses/programs, whether there is a change in either/or TOP and CIP, and what the new codes should be.
 - If Coursedog is implemented in fall 2026, it would be possible to create a fast-track approval process to enter the new TOP and CIP crosswalk codes before the 2027 cut off date.
 - The new/updated CIP code would be entered into COCI as a “non-substantial change,” and not requiring a new control number.
 - It’s important to note that the new TOP/CIP crosswalk (see link below) specifies whether a TOP and CIP code is “CTE” or “Not CTE.” In some situations, a non-CTE CIP is paired with a CTE TOP code, based on the “old” crosswalk found in curriculum.fullcoll.edu. If CIP is centered, and it is non-CTE, it could make a big difference in whether a program would require OCRC recommendation and LMI data.
- E. Website from the National Center for Education Statistics: CIP Codes
<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/browse.aspx?y=55>
- F. The revised “crosswalk” (you must have a Google account in order to access it):
<https://lookerstudio.google.com/u/0/reporting/62925aaa-3c91-48ab-941b-2473c0e17cb7/page/iCRIF>

The transition to CIP codes for 2026 is underway, with a revised TOP to CIP crosswalk available to aid in the process, though it may be temporarily unavailable for updates. The state chancellor’s office recommends that we ensure that TOP and CIP codes matches are either both CTE or both non-CTE. Next year, the focus will shift to CIP codes, and representatives, particularly in CTE, should consult with faculty about aligning with the new crosswalk in a way that accurately reflects their curriculum and is in compliance with state regulations.

XII. Revising the Curriculum Approval Process for Coursedog

- A. I recommend keeping the same “workflow” for new course/program proposals. For revised courses and program proposals, we should reduce the steps and facilitate timely approvals.

- B. I recommend separate, short “workflows” for CCN revisions, Program Revisions for Course Impacts, textbook/SLO updates, Distance Education revisions, FSA additions/subtractions, and possibly others. These require Board and State approval.
- C. Since a “minor revision” proposal stops at Curriculum Committee approval and implementation, a general “Minor Revision” workflow may not help us.
- D. We need to be very specific to make things clearer and easier for faculty originators.
- E. A more streamlined approval process and allowing faculty originators to edit proposals until they are approved by the curriculum committee and moved forward, will reduce workload and confusion.
- F. Coursedog allows us to program a “kill” (end) proposal step before it reaches the curriculum committee. I suggest we exercise caution with this power.

The discussion centered on revising curriculum approval process, aiming for a more streamlined and user-friendly workflow within Coursedog and reducing the need for using the discussion agenda for “fast-track” items that are not scrutinized in workflow/approval process. The goal is to maintain a rigorous approval process for all courses and programs, including tech review, while shortening the overall process by making some stakeholders’ approval steps optional until originator changes are needed. There's also a desire to automate checks for common errors and formatting issues within Coursedog to reduce unnecessary revisions.

XIII. Class Size Planning and Resource Document Revision (INFORMATION ITEM: DISCUSSION ONLY)

- A. DCCC has tasked curriculum committees with creating class size document language (and numbers) for the following categories:
 - Honors courses
 - Performance Activity
 - Courses with Safety Requirements
 - Upper division (baccalaureate degree) courses
- B. Question to consider: are we willing to raise class sizes in current categories to establish categories with lower class sizes?
- C. Please remember that the addition of categories with lower class sizes requires careful consideration of enrollment needs and challenges.
- D. Please rest assured that discussion and approval will involve each district campus’s curriculum committees, Faculty Senates, United Faculty, DCCC and the Board of Trustees, and possibly others. Your input is valuable.

The discussion on class size planning revolves around a potential revision of the current resource document, prompted by the vice chancellor's concerns about discrepancies between Fullerton and Cypress colleges and a perceived overuse of class sizes below 35. The possibility of adding class size categories, including lower sizes for specific courses like performance activities, is being considered, but this might require raising the standard class sizes. There are also concerns about the motivations behind these potential changes, the impact of course offerings, and the need for alignment between the two colleges.

XIV. Should Certificates Require a Minimum Number of Fullerton College Courses?

The committee discussed certificate programs and residency requirements, prompted by inconsistencies in current practices. Some certificates have residency requirements (a certain number of units must be completed at the college), while others do not. The discussion explored the pros and cons of residency requirements, including attracting students and generating FTES (full-time equivalent students) versus recognizing prior learning and attracting students who may only need a few courses to complete a certificate. There was also a discussion about ensuring faculty expertise and awarding certificates based on prior learning.

XV. Mission and Collegiality Workgroup: (Allen Menton, Fine Arts) **TABLED**

XVI. Curricular Overlap Workgroup: (Kelly Nelson-Wright, Social Sciences)

XVII. Common Course Numbering (CCN) Timeline and Related Topics:

- A. Status of Phase 2B proposals, as of February 11, 2026:
 - COMM C1004: Faculty Originator (Level 2.75)
 - The rest are at level 6 or higher.
- B. The State Chancellor's Office and ASCCC have agreed to pause the distribution of Phase 3 CCN templates.
 - The primary goal is to "pre-approve" articulation of templates so that there won't be disparities between community colleges in their CCN revisions and their GE and transferability qualification.
 - The timeline of the "pause" is indeterminate but considered "temporary."
 1. The State Chancellor's Office expects community colleges to process Phase 3 CCN course revisions for an effective catalog date no earlier than Fall 2028.
 - Phase 2 (both A and B) will continue, as planned.
- C. The state chancellor's office will allow us to update ADTs for CCN Phase 2A and 2B without COCI submission. We will need to complete a form, just as we did for Phase 1 in May 2025.

The CCN timeline is progressing, with Phase III being paused, but Phases II A and B are expected to move forward as scheduled. The goal is to achieve 100% approval for Phase IIB CCN proposals in order to maintain funding.

XVIII. Integrating Title 5 Changes into the Course Outline of Record

- A. § 55001.5. (a) (3) "Course Outlines of Record":
 - "Course outlines of record shall also include representative descriptions of approaches faculty may use to accommodate and engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students."

The discussion focused on integrating Title 5 changes, particularly those related to accessibility and equitable student outcomes, into the COR. The idea of creating a template with specific language for accessibility and DEI was explored, with the suggestion of embedding these elements into existing categories and templates within Coursedog. The goal is to ensure these changes are meaningful and not just a "check mark" exercise, with suggestions to establish clear methods of instruction and evaluation that promote equity and inclusion.

XIX. Spring 2026 Curriculum Committee Meetings

- A. March 18th
- B. April 15th & 29th
- C. May 6th & 20th

XX. Ongoing Agenda Items

- A. To be determined

XXI. Future Agenda Items:

- A. To be determined

XXII. Adjournment: **3:35pm**

Next meeting:

March 18, 2026 Building 200 Room 224