San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council

APPROVED

```
Meeting of February 23, 2006
2:00 PM – District,
Room 272
```

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – City College
Bergland, Yvonne	Instructional Service and Economic Development, Dean – Mesa College – Proxy for Elizabeth Armstrong
Deegan, Pam	Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College
Edinger, Valerie	Vice President, Instructional Services – Continuing Education
Gustin, Paula	Curriculum Chair – Mesa College
Ingle, Henry	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning and Technology – District Office
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair – City College
Manzoni, Ron	Vice President, Instruction – City College
Murphy, Carol	Curriculum Chair – Miramar College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services – District Office *(Ex Officio)*
Parker, Juliette	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Mesa College
Shaffer, Sandra	Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Miramar College

ABSENT:

Armstrong, Elizabeth	Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College

STAFF:

Harada, Myra	Director, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office
VanHouten, Laurie	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office
Yousofy, Ghazal	Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office

Myra Harada called the meeting to order at 2:08 pm.

I. **MINUTES AND AGENDA**

   A. **Approval of: February 09, 2006 Minutes**

   The minutes were approved.   **M/S/P** *(Shaffer, Andersen)*

   B. **Approval of: February 23, 2006 Agenda**

   The agenda was approved.   **M/S/P** *(Deegan ,Shaffer)*

II. **CURRICULUM REVIEW / APPROVAL**

   A. **Approval of Curriculum**

   Removed from the consent agenda:
   American Sign Language/Interpreting 104, Introduction to Deaf Culture
   English 249, Introduction to Creative Writing
   English 253, Fundamentals of Fiction Writing
   English 254, Intermediate Fiction Writing

   The curriculum was approved by consent.   **M/S/P** *(Andersen, Deegan)*

   B. **Approval of Program Changes**
      None

   C. **Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum**
      None

   D. **Curriculum Items Discussed**
   American Sign Language/Interpreting 104, Introduction to Deaf Culture
   The course proposal indicates activation for City and Miramar, although Duane Short
   requested Miramar activation be removed from the AMSL proposal. Libby Andersen
   said City's Foreign Language Department and the DSPS Office are not interested in
   activating this course at City and it defaulted in CurricUNET at the City level. She
   requested removing City from the proposal.

   Motion to remove City and Miramar from the proposal and approve at Mesa only.
   M/S/P *(Short, Andersen)*

   English 249, Introduction to Creative Writing
   English 253, Fundamentals of Fiction Writing
   English 254, Intermediate Fiction Writing
   Jan Lombardi said that the proposals defaulted in CurricUNET at City's Curriculum
   Chair level, but the City English department wished to review them. They believed
   there were only prerequisite changes for articulation reasons, but more complete
   revisions were done and a six-year review was indicated. VanHouten said the next CIC

meeting is the curriculum deadline for the courses to make the 2006-2007 catalog. Andersen said the courses will be proposed for UC transfer for City in August. She had proposed English 253 and 254 for UC transfer in Fall 2004 but they were denied. UC advised changing English 101 from an advisory to a prerequisite.

> *Motion to table approval until City reviews proposals. The proposals will be presented at the next CIC meeting.*   **M/S/P** *(Lombardi, Andersen)*

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. State Approval Procedure

Harada presented the revised state approval procedure. The Academic Senate Representatives were waiting for CIC to revise the state approval procedure draft before presenting it to the colleges. Short clarified that the State Approval Procedure is parallel to the District Curriculum Approval procedure.

Andersen said she had worked with faculty who were preparing state approval applications and they were frustrated with the lack of support for them to work through the State Chancellor's Approval Program Handbook. Procedure 5300.2 Section 5 District Instructional Services, indicates that there should be support from the Instructional Services office at the District. This procedure is not being implemented. Harada stated that the actual submission of the applications are made by the Vice Presidents of Instruction at the colleges. Instructional Services is not prepared to assist in a hands-on manner with preparing state approval applications. In order to provide this assistance, Instructional Services must be trained. Furthermore, Instructional Services and Institutional Research and Planning need to communicate more effectively if Instructional Services is the liaison to preparing state applications. Neault reported there was a proposal for placing a researcher on each campus and reconvening the District Research Council to include a member of the Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology department. The research office currently spends most of its time on enrollment management and Board support. Deegan believed the problem of a lack of support in preparing state applications will be eliminated when each campus has its own researcher.

Deegan recalled that a solution was presented by an outside company from Utah in the past. The company had created a package for the District which included the economic impact and economic information in San Diego. Henry Ingle clarified that the District decided not to follow through with that company. He said the Strategic Planning Committee will be funding activities that will enhance enrollment and requested that members discuss their ideas with their Strategic Planning Committee representatives. The Strategic Planning Committee will meet in March. Deegan said that preparing applications includes compiling demographic information and that Institutional Research had denied assistance to Miramar in the past. Neault will follow-up to determine why Miramar was denied assistance as she believed that the Institutional Research and Planning department provides assistance to all the colleges in the District when requested. She reported that the Institutional Research and Planning department assists Mesa on a regular basis. She expressed the importance of how questions are asked and agreed with Deegan that the problem may be solved with an on-campus researcher. Ingle suggested having a consultant come to help until the colleges hire their researcher.

Andersen requested having an example of an acceptable state application. Deegan agreed that a standard for preparing applications must be established. Andersen is a member of the State Chancellor's Curriculum Committee who are identifying ways to make the Program and Course Approval Handbook more user-friendly. At the State Chancellor's meeting, Ralph Black discussed the legal aspects of revising the State Program Handbook and said the committee members do not have the right/authority to revise the handbook. Andersen will follow-up to determine who will revise the Program and Course Approval Handbook.

Manzoni proposed that the chairs and the deans at each college take the responsibility for assisting with the preparation of the application. Each college will establish its own process to facilitate submission of state applications. He recommended omitting Step two from the program application procedure and omitting step 3 from the occupational program procedure. Lombardi agreed that each campus should review the procedure and make it more useful for their college. Andersen stated the importance of observing the timelines as suggested by the draft of the State Approval procedure.

Manzoni said the current process at City is that program approval by CIC initiates the process for the state approval application. He suggested the procedure note that once a program has been approved by CIC, it becomes the college's responsibility. The Vice President of Instruction's Office will forward a copy of the state approval letters to Instructional Services as they are received. Harada noted that Instructional Services will scan the approval letters to allow electronic storage.

> *Council decided that this procedure will be taken to the campuses and each college will create its own procedure. Manzoni suggested that the Deans and Chairs be responsible to make sure their programs are sent to the state.*

B. Hybrid Definitions
Harada asked if the hybrid definitions were presented to the academic senates. Juliette Parker said she was waiting for revisions. Ingle said there were no further revisions after Andrea Henne presented the definitions at a previous meeting. Neault added "as described below" to the last sentence of the first paragraph. Council approved the wording of the definitions with using different icons for each definition.

> *The wording for the hybrid definitions was approved with different icons to be used for each definition in the Summer 2006 schedules.* **M/S/P** *(Andersen, Deegan)*

C. Open Entry/Open Exit
Harada reported that the City's Curriculum Committee voted on the number of optimal hours to complete a course offered as open entry/open exit. Miramar's and Mesa's CRC will vote as soon as possible on the courses offered as open entry/open exit for their college. They will inform Instructional Services with their vote and the number of optimal hours for completing those courses. The purpose of this is to record for the State that the college curriculum committees voted and approved it. Neault said ISIS will automatically allow the colleges to claim double hours.

D. Repeatability Models

Harada presented three repeatability models: Hardware/Software; Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced; and the A,B,C model. Microsoft 134 was used as the Hardware/Software model; Physical Education 159 was used as the Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced model; and Art-Fine 165A, B, C was used as the A, B, C model. Council reviewed handouts on each of the models for use in courses that require repeatability.

Hardware/Software model
The Vice President of Instruction must inform Instructional Services when the Hardware/Software of a course is being updated. Manzoni clarified that the number of completions would be indicated by the department.

Manzoni stated that there are courses that have changes other than Hardware/Software. For instance, City has a labor studies program that periodically undergoes regulation changes. Since the course is vocational, it would be appropriate to allow repeatability. Harada said there are also real estate or legal assistant courses that have regulation changes. Neault recommended creating a recency model that would handle course repetition depending on a recency time-limit . Those that do not fall within that recency range would have to petition. She said the recency model would not address hardware/software changes, but the issue that a significant amount of time has passed since the student has taken the course and the content of the course has changed as a result. She said Title 5 states that courses can be repeated based on recency. This District has not defined recency yet. Gustin suggested clarifying that the Hardware/Software model is for vocational courses only. There was discussion as to which courses are vocational and which are academic. Harada said the state had written communication in the past of what constitutes a vocational course. Ingle recommended not limiting the Hardware/Software model to just vocational courses, but Harada stated its application is limited by Title 5.

Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced model
Andersen noted that the last sentence in the course description and the 18th SLO reflects the variation to units in addition to repeatability. The outline must reflect the difference in content with the difference in units. Deegan clarified that physical education classes often have variable units because of the variation in the number of hours the course is offered each semester. Harada recalled that there was previous discussion to eliminate variable units because some courses had variable units but no change in the content. Andersen recalled the previous decision of having the Student Learning Outcomes reflect the content change for the variable units.

A,B,C model
Harada said she believes the A,B,C model is the clearest in indicating the difference in content and identifying the level of the students.

Deegan said R1, R2, R3 has been used at other Districts to indicate repeatability and suggested using it to indicate repeatability at the District.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
     A. Distance Education Approvals

VanHouten stated that the CurricUNET Steering Committee discussed distance education approval and when to activate the ISIS screens. The committee decided to activate the ISIS screens on the curriculum deadline date, making the screens available two weeks earlier than the current process. The screens would be created in a batch, instead of creating them one by one as they come in. Manzoni said that would be helpful. City recently activated a new course that was posted online without any publicity and students were enrolling for that course two days later.

B. CurricUNET Demonstration (VanHouten)
VanHouten said she had demonstrated the six-year review training module added to CurricUNET at the January 25th CIC meeting that was cut short because of a lack of quorum.

C. New Disciplines: CurricUNET Assignments
VanHouten said when a college plans to offer a course in a discipline new to the college (but not new to the other colleges), Instructional Services must be informed of the school and department assigned to that discipline so CurricUNET can be set-up appropriately to give the proposals the appropriate approval flows. VanHouten stated that Instructional Services needs this information before the proposal is created. Manzoni said City activated Administration of Justice 101 and 102 and Miramar integrated the course. The reason for the activation was that City has offered these courses for a number of years at Miramar as the off-campus site.

D. Removal of Preparation for the Major from Catalog
Harada said removal of preparation for the major from the catalogs was discussed at the last District Articulation Council meeting. Parker said this issue has been taken to the colleges and will be brought back to CIC with feedback. There is a proposal to remove Preparation for the Major information for four-year colleges and universities from the District's catalogs. Parker believes that the reason this information was placed in the catalogs was that it may have been used as a tool for students to get to the four-year colleges before ASSIST was established. She said currently it takes more coursework to transfer than the prep for the major because of impaction criteria and other issues. She also noted that the information in the catalogs is a year old as the information available at the press time of the catalogs would be the previous year. This information confuses students. Deegan said Miramar's prep for majors are different and the colleges should not have to concur. Andersen said the three articulation officers are approaching their own colleges and explaining their reasons for their proposal.

V. STANDING REPORTS
    A. Curriculum Updating Project
The Curriculum Updating Project was distributed and reviewed.

    B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (not reported)
    C. Student Services Council (not reported)
    D. State Academic Senate (not reported)
    E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers) (not reported)
    F. Articulation Officers (not reported)

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The next CIC meeting is March 9, 2005 at 2:00 PM at the District, Room 272.

B. Handouts:
Today's CIC Meeting Agenda
Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
Curriculum Summaries
State Approval Procedure
Hybrid Definitions
Repeatability Models
Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Harada adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.