Meeting of March 23, 2017 2:00 PM District Office Conference Room 220

Minutes

PRESENT:

Gustin, Paula Curriculum Chair—Mesa College

Hess, Shelly Dean, Curriculum Services—District Office

Hopkins, Paulette Interim Vice President, Instructional Services—Miramar College Kilmer, Renee Interim Vice President, Instructional Services—City College

Namdar, Donna

Palma-Sanft, Mara

Parker, Juliette

Shelton, Deanna

Short, Duane

Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

Articulation Officer—Miramar College

Curriculum Co-Chair—City College

Curriculum Chair—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Alder, Kate Vice President of Instruction—Continuing Education

Boots, Jennifer Curriculum Co-Chair—City College

Bulger, Stephanie
Marrone, Erica
McGrath, Tim
Neault, Lynn
Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services—District Office
Vice President, Instructional Services—Mesa College
Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office

Norvell, Elizabeth Articulation Officer—City College

STAFF:

Meredith, Jasmine
Radley, Michelle
Scott, Carmen
Senior Secretary, Curriculum Services—District Office
Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office
Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office

Hess called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: March 9, 2017 Minutes (Action)

The Council reviewed the March 9, 2017 minutes. No changes were made.

Recommend Approval of the March 9, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Motion by Short
Second by Gustin
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Hopkins, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Shelton

B. Approval of the March 23, 2017, Meeting Agenda (Action)

Hopkins requested to add English Pathways as a New Business item. From her understanding, English courses were pulled from the proposed curriculum summary. However, Hess clarified that English (ENGL) 29 is not at District Curriculum Services' level and that the other English courses were not added to the summary at all. Short mentioned that Miramar is waiting for their Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) to review the revisions to ENGL 101 and ENGL 105 before ENGL 29 is moved forward for review.

Recommend Approval of the March 23, 2017 Meeting Agenda as Amended
Motion by Short
Second by Kilmer
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Gustin, Hopkins, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Shelton

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum (Action)

Shelton requested to pull LIBS 101 from the proposed curriculum summary for discussion.

Recommend Approval of Curriculum Review
Motion by Short
Second by Gustin
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Hopkins, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Shelton

Shelton reported that at City College's CRC meeting, City's librarian asked if LIBS 101 needed to include the advisory of ENGL 037A and ENGL 037B on the course proposal. She explained that the English courses are only offered to San Diego State University (SDSU) fast-track students. Hess suggested tabling the course and the discussion for the next CIC meeting because she does not feel comfortable removing the advisory without faculty input.

Scott explained that if LIBS 101 is pulled from the curriculum summary, ENGL 64 and a program would also have to be pulled since they are impacted by LIBS 101. Kilmer explained that ENGL 037A and ENGL 037B are equivalent to basic skills courses and that they are only offered to students who are in the SDSU Joint Program. She suggested that maybe ENGL 037A and ENGL 037B are advisories for students who are conditionally admitted to SDSU and have to take the remediation courses at City College.

The council voted to approve LIBS 101 as it was on the proposed curriculum summary.

Recommend Approval of LIBS 101 as Proposed
Motion by Gustin
Second by Parker
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Hopkins, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Shelton, Short

B. Approval of Program Changes (Action)

Recommend Approval of Program Changes				
Motion by Short				
Second by Palma-Sanft				
Final Resolution: Motion carries				
Aye: Gustin, Hopkins, Kilmer, Namdar, Parker, Shelton				

C. Approval of Upper Division Curriculum (Action)

No upper division curriculum

D. Approval of Upper Division Program Changes (Action)

No upper division programs

E. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum (Action)

No Continuing Education curriculum

F. Approval of Continuing Education Programs (Action)

No Continuing Education programs

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. OCEA Subject Area (Information)

Gustin reported that she spoke to Don Barrie about the OCEA subject area change and that he approves of the change. She also reported that the subject area will be added to Mesa's next CRC agenda. Gustin mentioned that Barrie asked that if the change is approved, will the course still be housed under physical sciences? Hess agreed, clarifying that if the discipline changes, the course would no longer be under physical sciences. Hess informed Gustin that if there are any additional changes to the course, to add them as 'or' in the course proposal.

Short explained that once OCEA is available as a subject area, Miramar will make the change from PHYN 120 to OCEA 101. He assured the council that he discipline will not change and that the approval flow will still be the same in CurricUNET. Kilmer reported

that Erin Rempala, Chair of Life Sciences at City College, was notified of the subject area change and approved of it. However, since the course is under biological science and not physical science, City will leave the course subject area as is; they have the option to change to OCEA. Hess confirmed that Curriculum Services will add the subject area to CurricUNET.

B. Hidden Prerequisites (Action)

Short reported that Miramar proposed the following concerning hidden prerequisites:

- a) Discontinue hiding prerequisites; inform everyone that all prerequisites are to be enforced.
- b) Identify all prerequisites
 - i) Compare what is in ISIS to what is in CurricUNET
 - (1) Hess mentioned that the comparison is challenging due to the coding language. However, the comparison can be done now as Curriculum Services is converting to the new system.
- 2) Short clarified that Miramar is not opposed to evaluating prerequisites the way they have always been evaluated; The issue is adding a prerequisite that was not approved.
- 3) Parker mentioned that she met with evaluators and that they will take the issue through the chain of command to Vice Chancellor Lynn Neault. She reasoned that not having access to information in ISIS is the issue. Parker emphasized the importance of understand the evaluation process more from evaluators in Student Services.
 Short and Hess discussed that historically, there may have been a way to approve prerequisites outside of CurricUNET. The council will bring the item back and will invite Vice Chancellor Neault and an evaluator.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. English Pathways (Information)

Hopkins reported that she attended a meeting with Vice Chancellor Bulger, Hess and the VPIs from City and Mesa where she learned that there are nine pathways to English 101. Afterwards, she met with Miramar's counselors and Palma-Sanft to inform them of the different pathways. Hopkins mentioned that she heard from her campus that at Chancellor's Cabinet, curriculum was instructed to work better alignment with the courses. Hopkins explained that she brought the discussion to CIC because CIC is where curriculum is approved.

Hopkins reasoned that maybe the misalignment is a result of the proposed pilots of City's ENGL 21 and Miramar's ENGL 29. She mentioned that Miramar's ENGL 29 is accelerated, but students must score an R4/W4 to enroll concurrently with ENGL 101. Gustin asked why Miramar does not adopt the ENGL 31/ENGL 101 combination? Short explained that Miramar's English faculty believe acceleration should only be offered to their students with higher skill levels (R4/W4). Palma-Sanft explained that when the ENGL 31/ENGL 101 learning community was created, Miramar chose not to activate it. Gustin reasoned that since the learning community has been through the pilot phase, and

if there is data on the learning community's success, why not adopt the learning community? Parker suggested that the English faculty discuss the pathways and to inform them of the concern brought to CIC.

Hess presented a chart that explained all the proposed changes for English:

		Ct all the proposed C	I	
R10/W10		Students are		
		encouraged to		
		take the ESOL		
		Assessment		
R20/W20	*ENGL 21	ENGL 47A (due	ENGL 101	
		to the revision of		
		ENGL 47A)		
R3/W3		ENGL 31/ENGL		
		101		
		ENGL 42/ENGL	*ENGL	
		43	29/ENGL 101	
			25721102 101	
		ENGL 42/ENGL	ENGL 48/ENGL	ENGL 101
		43	49	LIVEL 101
R4/W4		ENGL 31/ENGL	17	
137/ 77		101		
		101		
		ENGL 42/ENGL	*ENGL	
		43	29/ENGL 101	
		ENGL 40/ENGL	ENGL 40/ENGL	ENGL 101
		ENGL 42/ENGL	ENGL 48/ENGL	ENGL 101
		43	49	
R5/W5		ENGL 101	ENGL 105	

Kilmer inquired about the issues that called for the review of the curriculum. Hess mentioned that there was concern from Student Services that the English curriculum was unaligned and that Miramar students are being held to a different standard for acceleration compared to students at City and Mesa.

Kilmer shared that ENGL 21 is being held up and that the pairing with ENGL 47A is no different than ENGL 31 with ENGL 101. Hess shared that she was instructed to bring the accelerated English curriculum as a package. Hopkins reported that McGrath mentioned that Mesa will not be adopting ENGL 21 or ENGL 29. Kilmer mentioned that although Mesa will not be adopting the courses, they approve of the curriculum.

Kilmer explained that ENGL 21 does not change the pathway and that it is an extra attachment to

take with ENGL 47A for students who score on the lower end of the assessment and need additional assistance. She shared some of the success rates of City's accelerated curriculum versus traditional pathways.

Hess mentioned that the next steps are:

- Meeting with Student Services, VPIs, and faculty before the 4/13/2017 CIC meeting
- English Curriculum will be added as an addendum to the catalog (Hess notified Jennifer Boots)

Kilmer shared that it is important for those concerned to know that this is an important pilot initiative for City's ENGL 21 and Miramar's ENGL 29 and that she would like to move forward with the curriculum to avoid not being added to the catalog. The council discussed that each campus offers different curriculum to address the diverse learning needs of their student.

As a general response from the Curriculum and Instructional Council, they are in favor of moving forward with the pilot of ENGL 21 at City College and ENGL 29 at Miramar College.

I. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Hess)

No report.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Hess)

No report.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

No Report.

E. Chief Instructional Officers (CIO) (Bulger, Matthew, Hopkins, Kilmer, McGrath)

The CIO Conference is during the week of the 4/13/17 CIC meeting in San Francisco. Hess requested that the VPIs send a proxy in their place. Kilmer will request that Trudy Gerald attend as her proxy.

F. Articulation Officers (Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Robertson)

The Articulation Officers will be at a meeting during the April 27, 2017 CIC meeting. They will send proxies in their place.

G. ADT/C-ID (Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker)

Parker shared an implementation update about C-ID: There must be evidence of submission and after 45 days without approval, submission of courses will be automatically approved.

H. Subcommittees (Bulger)

Hess reported the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee are continuing their efforts in editing Phase II policies and procedures.

I. ERP Implementation (Bulger)

No Report.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting will be: Thursday, April 13, 2017 at ECC in Room 186.

All new courses, new programs, and program revisions must be approved by CIC, Board of Trustees, CCCCO, new programs may be subject to WASC, before they may be published in the college catalog.

A. Handouts:

- 1. March 23, 2017, CIC Meeting Agenda
- 2. Draft Minutes from the March 9, 2017 CIC Meeting
- 3. Curriculum Summaries
- 4. Curriculum Updating Project
- 5. TMC Tracker
- 6. SDCCD C-ID Project

III. ADJOURNMENT

Bulger adjourned the meeting at 3:14 p.m.