

**DE ANZA COLLEGE
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 20, 2026

2:30pm - 4:00pm

Location: Staff Development Lab – MLC 243

This meeting was held in a hybrid modality, meaning anyone can participate in-person or online.

PRESENT:

Joshua McCluskey *(BH)*

Julie Hughes *(CA)*

Cynthia Brannvall *(CA)*

Sandra Li *(CB)*

Kayla Khangaldy *(DASG)*

Megumi Estrada Nakamatsu
(DASG)

Susana Ramirez *(IC)*

Katelyn Endow *(LA, LR)*

Vinh Nguyen *(PS)*

Danielle Vlahos *(SS)*

Betty Inoue *(ST)*

Christa Steiner *(Articulation Officer)*

Sam Bliss

(Administrative Co-Chair, tie vote)

Zack Judson

*(Faculty Vice Chair – nv,
Content Review Liaison)*

Sarah Wilker *(DEI Coordinator)*

Thomas Ray *(Division Dean Rep.)*

Sukhjit Singh *(Faculty Co-Chair, tie-
vote)*

Mary Clark-Tillman
(Curriculum Coordinator - nv)

Mi Chang *(Curriculum Secretary - nv)*

ABSENT:

James Tallent *(AT)*, Cathy Patel *(DS)*, Joe D’Agostino *(PE)*, Jayanti Roy *(CPL Coordinator)*, Derrick Felton *(FA Rep.)*

GUESTS:

1. **Approval of today’s agenda** – **APPROVED** – (M/S/C—Judson/Chang) – with the following addition:

a. Walk-in Other Business item d: Div Rep in the Curriculum Workflow – **APPROVED**.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

a. September 29, 2026, Minutes – **APPROVED** – (M/S/C—Ramirez/Khangaldy) – as presented.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4. **ACTION CALENDAR** – **APPROVED** – (M/S/C—Inoue/Khangaldy) – as presented.

If a course is passed by the Curriculum Committee, it is “**conditionally approved**” pending Curriculum Committee required and/or recommended changes and final submission of the course and all required forms to the curriculum office. Initiators have **ONE WEEK** from the date of the conditional approval to submit the final version.

a.	APPROVED, effective Winter 2027: ENGR 11 Initiator: Saied Rafati Title: Programming and Problem-Solving in MATLAB Hybrid <u>Approved Curriculum Consensus Vote Items: NONE.</u>
b.	APPROVED, effective Winter 2027: ENGR 45 Initiator: Saied Rafati Title: Properties of Materials Hybrid <u>Approved Curriculum Consensus Vote Items: NONE.</u>

5. **OTHER BUSINESS:**

	Topic	Time	Leader
a.	Coursedog Update	2:35 – 2:40	Curriculum Office
	Clark-Tillman – proactively moving through Coursedog. Creating the course/program templates and workflows. Looks very different from eLumen. The office will provide training. We will be sending emails to inquire about beta testers and some additional requests for some pre-testing. Please email curriculum@fhda.edu if you have any questions.		
b.	UC TCA Memo – Fall 2027	2:40 – 2:45	Steiner
	Steiner – all courses approved for UC approval for fall 2027.		
c.	DEI Training Presentation CC Equity Review Toolkit	2:45 – 3:40	Wilker
	Wilker – please see presentation.		
d.	Public Comments	3:40 – 3:40	All
	None.		

e.	Div Rep in the Curriculum Workflow	3:40 – 4:00	All
Voting on whether or not div rep reviews and approves a course. Judson – historically, they have been there and two years ago it was removed. Can set a certain a number of days to act. Can receive notifications as reminders. Judson – is in favor of adding back, setting a number of days and then re-discussing at the end of the academic year. APPROVED – (M/S/C—Huges/Brannvall) – motion to vote to adding the division rep back in the workflow. 8 votes = yes; 0 votes = no; 6 votes. = abstain (Steiner, Ray, Vlahos, Ramirez, Li and Judson).			

6. **MEETING ADJOURNED** – (M/S/C—Steiner/Wilker)

Curriculum Committee DEI Training

October 20, 2026

Dr. Sarah Wilker

Faculty Coordinator for Equity / Curriculum Committee DEI Coordinator

Today's path

Quick Review

- Title 5, equity, and the Course Outline of Record (COR)

Supporting Faculty

- General suggestions
- Common asks and answers

Our Equity Process and Working with CORs

- Review of the process
- Suggesting revisions on model CORs





Goals

I hope this training helps you...

- Feel comfortable as a first point of contact on equity/COR questions for your division
- Feel prepared to advise on how the equity process works
- Begin to think about how equity review might apply to tech review

I am always here to support!

Equity-focused updates to Title 5

- CORs shall 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
- Curriculum committees must guarantee accessibility in learning through course outlines of record that reflect universal design for learning strategies

Complete text of revised Title 5 is included in the **CC Equity Review Toolkit**

To access the toolkit, use the following [link](#) [link to external site]

Or scan the QR code [QR code to external site]





Supporting faculty

Strategies that helped last year...

- Lift up instances where faculty are already doing the work
- Encourage authenticity and support academic freedom
- Support preserving options for individual faculty
- Your enthusiasm can be powerful; if you have reservations, be candid about them



Support scenario 1

Concern around the amount of work

- Acknowledge this concern is valid
- Lift up COR elements that already support equity and universal design (fight the blank page phenomenon)
- Encourage focus on aspects that are most authentic to current classroom behavior
- Advocate for small steps (perfection is enemy of good)
- If you have capacity, offer to help them with one or two revisions



Support scenario 2

Interest in line-by-line support (partnered work or pre-review)

- Last year, it was helpful to do this for 1 member of a department
- Someone you train can become a trainer
- This takes significant time, and it is okay if you do not have capacity!
 - Offer to do 1-2 revisions with them
 - Offer to review once they've done a first draft



Support scenario 3

Feeling skeptical

- Your communication is powerful
 - If you believe in the process, it can help folks feel more comfortable
 - If you have discomfort, that's okay: Consider sharing reservations, but try not to shut others off from the process
- Respect academic freedom to engage as they wish (you are not an enforcer, but a supporter)

Questions about supporting faculty?



Our equity process

Developed, revised, and used last year

Spring 2026: Developed into a form and shared with Curriculum Committee

Looks at six sections:

1. Course Description
2. Examples of Primary Texts and References
3. Methods of Instruction
4. Assignments
5. Methods of Evaluation
6. Course Outline

Course description

Check ALL that apply.

- ☐ Course description uses welcoming, student-centered language and minimizes the use of impersonal, course-centered language.
- ☐ Course description defines all acronyms and explains all technical terms.
- ☐ Course description describes the knowledge, skills, and abilities students may gain upon the completion of the course

For each not selected, please explain why it was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Examples of primary texts and references (1/2)

Examples of representative textbooks (“Examples of Primary Texts and References”) include Open Educational Resources (OER). If this is not possible, Curriculum Committee strongly encourages consideration of zero textbook cost (ZTC) options or low-cost textbook options (LTC).

Check ONLY ONE, if applicable.

- ☐ Includes one or more Open Educational Resource (OER)
- ☐ No representative OER, but Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC)
- ☐ No representative OER or ZTC, but includes one or more low-cost textbook (LTC)

If none were selected, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Examples of primary texts and references (2/2)

Examples of Primary Texts and References meet universal design course standards.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Course materials reflect diverse authors, voices, and perspectives, and/or discuss current debates in the field that are relevant to students.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Methods of instruction

Methods of Instruction include representative descriptions of diverse instruction methods in keeping with best practices from universal design for learning (especially multiple means of representation). Together, these instructional practices may be used to engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Each type of instruction is clearly defined/explained.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Assignments (1/2)

Assignments include representative descriptions of diverse assignments in keeping with best practices from universal design for learning (especially multiple means of engagement and expression). Together, practices may be used to engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Assignments (2/2)

Do assignments do one or more of the following?

Check ALL that apply.

- ☒ Provide choices in how students demonstrate proficiency.
- ☒ Encourage students to connect course content to their own life, background, and experiences.
- ☒ One or more course assignments provide students the opportunity to revise their work based on instructor feedback, peer feedback, or self-reflection.

For each not selected, please explain why it was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Methods of evaluation

Methods of Evaluation include representative descriptions of diverse evaluation methods in keeping with best practices from universal design for learning (especially multiple means of engagement and expression). Together, practices may be used to engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Methods of Evaluation clearly explain assessments and objectives. Methods of Evaluation also state that the instructor will consider providing rubrics and/or models of strong and/or successful assignments to clarify expectations for all students when possible and appropriate.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Course outline

Course outline is written in clear, transparent, and accessible language, without unexplained acronyms or technical terms.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

Course outline provides space to reflect on diverse perspectives and/or experiences, inequities, racism, or other barriers to inclusion specific to the course subject if appropriate.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please explain why this was not possible or appropriate:

If you would like to provide additional comments, please do so here:

DEI statement

Please use this space to provide any additional comments on the ways in which your course is working to engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote the inclusion of all students:

Questions about our equity process?



Working with CORs

Choose a COR from the model CORs and work on it as a tech review group for 10-12 minutes.

Imagine a faculty colleague brought this COR to you and asked for your guidance.

- What strengths can you applaud?
- Where might you suggest development/revisions?
- What advice would you give if they have discomfort surrounding the process?
 - Common discomforts: Concern surrounding workload; Requesting line-by-line support; Feeling skeptical

Focus specifically on your tech review section.

If you have extra time, feel free to expand your review to other areas of the COR, or try another model COR!



Hearing from you

How was working with the model CORs?

What specific take aways came up for you and your tech review group?



How can I best support you / your faculty?

- What other trainings can I develop for Curriculum Committee to support you?
- I'll run **Cracking the COR Code** again this year. What else do you think might help your division's faculty?

Thank you!

Resources for you: **CC Equity Review Toolkit**

- Presentation, Equity Process, and Model CORs
- Additional resources: Title 5 text, UDL quick facts, intro to CORs, and more!

To access the toolkit, use the following [link](#) [link to external site]

Or scan the QR code [QR code to external site]



If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, I am here!

By email: wilkersarah@fhda.edu

In person: Office Hours, Tuesday 10:30 – 12:30 @ Physical Sciences and Technology Village (in S55)