San Diego Community College District
Curriculum and Instructional Council

Meeting of February 28, 2019
2:00 P.M.
North City Center
Multipurpose Room (101-102)
8355 Aero Dr., San Diego, CA 92123

Approved Minutes

PRESENT:
Beitey, George	Dean, School of Public Safety, Proxy for Paulette Hopkins—Miramar College
Boots, Jennifer	Curriculum Chair—City College
Bulger, Stephanie	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services—District Office
Chavez, Matilda	Vice President, Instructional Services—City College
Gholson, Richard	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Gray, Michelle	Dean, Business, Information & Technology, Distance Ed., Proxy for Michelle Fischthal—Continuing Education
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum Services—District Office
Hoffman, Andrew	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Norvell, Elizabeth	Articulation Officer—City College
O'Connor, Isabel	Vice President, Instructional Services—Mesa College
Palma-Sanft, Mara	Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College

ABSENT:
Fischthal, Michelle	Vice President, Instructional Services—Continuing Education
Hopkins, Paulette	Vice President, Instructional Services—Miramar College
Marrone, Erica	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum Services—District Office
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office

STAFF:
Clark, Jacqueline	Senior Secretary, Curriculum Services—District Office
Gil, Patricia	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office
Radley, Michelle	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office
Scott, Carmen	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office

Vice Chancellor Bulger called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

I.   **MINUTES AND AGENDA**
      A. **Approval of: February 14, 2019, Minutes (Action)**

          The council reviewed and made edits to the minutes.

San Diego Community College District
Curriculum and Instructional Council

Recommend Approval of the February 14, 2019 Minutes as Amended
Motion by Boots
Second by Hoffman
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Norvell, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Short
Abstain: Parker

B. **Approval of: February 28, 2019, Meeting Agenda (Action)**

The council reviewed the agenda and made the following revisions:
1. Removed item III.D. It will be added to the agenda at a future date.
2. City walk-in: CHIL 151—Course Revision
3. Mesa walk-ins:
   a. CHIL 275—Course Activation
   b. RADT Associate of Science—Revision
   c. RADT Certificate of Achievement—Revision
4. Added the following to III.A AB 705
   1. Changes of course outlines

Recommend Approval of the February 28, 2019 Agenda as Amended
Motion by Short
Second by Hoffman
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Boots, Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Norvell, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker

II. **CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL**
   A. **Approval of Curriculum (Action)**

   Hoffman questioned why certain curriculum have the comment *to be reviewed at the May 9, 2019 CIC meeting*. Hess explained that the curriculum is first approved at CIC. It is then added to a list of the general education courses to be reviewed and approved at the May and November CIC meetings.

Recommend Approval of Curriculum Review
Motion by Short
Second by Boots
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Hoffman, Norvell, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker

   B. Approval of Program Changes (Action)
   C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum (Action)
   D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes (Action)

III. OLD BUSINESS
A. **AB 705**
1. **Addressing Math and English Curriculum Impacts (Discussion)**

Hess shared that Curriculum Services is working on a timeline for the implementation of the AB 705 impacts on the catalog and other systems such as ISIS and Campus Solutions.

2. **Math and English Skill Levels (Information)**

The council reviewed the handout - Conversion of Existing Skill Levels which defines the conversion for both English and Math skill levels. Hess explained the different guidance that students will receive:

- Hess reported Math faculty clarified that students with a M30 will be strongly recommended to take a support course with the transfer-level math course; students with a M40 skill level will be recommended to enroll in a support course with transfer-level math course; and students with a M50 skill level will be recommended to enroll directly into a transfer-level math course. Regardless of the skill level, it will be the student's choice to take the co-requisite or support course or enroll directly into the math course.

Hess is waiting for a decision from the English faculty if an R30/W30 will be strongly recommended or required for a co-requisite support course.

Bulger asked the council if these conversations are taking place at the colleges. Hoffman stated that it was shared at their last English meeting; however there are concerns regarding the specific language - *required* versus *recommended*. Hoffman continued that it was discussed at a department meeting that students who have a R30/W30 are being recommended to take LCOM 101 and not being directed to take 47A. Hoffman stated that he would like to see 47A as a recommended course for R30/W30. As an option students can take an LCOM.

Boots explained, that during the last District Assessment meeting, it was determined that students get placed in a R30/W30, R40/W40, etc. The student receives an email stating where they placed in their skill level along with options of courses to take and hyperlinks explaining the course description. Boots reported ENGL 47A may not be as apparent for students who are placed in R40/W40 or R50/W50. If a student is placed into R30/W30, ENGL 47A presents as one of the options, but not the first one. The first option is LCOM 101. One of the issues is that all of the colleges do not have the same recommended courses which may be confusing. Boots further stated that there has to be a balance in ensuring that students understand what they are rolling in especially with regards to ELAC. There has to be collaboration with assessment and counseling to create these types of additional systems for clarification.

Bulger asked how much more does this group need to know to make decisions about what the discipline meetings cover. She recommended that these discussions continue in the discipline meetings in a more focused way with that

information brought back to CIC for further discussion. She asked if there is something more that CIC can do to assist.

Boots asked the following questions:

1. Can we require a support course or can we not?

2. Is every student going to be placed in a skill level? If they state that they are comfortable with writing and English, they are directed to take an assessment. Since it's not placing them in a skill level, does that block them from being able to take an English class? What will be the process? Will paperwork need to be filled out and given to the student?

Bulger stated that these types of class issues and questions can be discussed at the Discipline and Assessment Subcommittee meetings. Boots asked what kind of support the district can provide with resources and time that it will take to create these systems.

O'Connor commented that there should also be an analysis of the effect that it is already having on students, and how the discussions regarding the placement and information is guiding the students.

Bulger thanked the council for their questions and will confer and provide feedback.

Palma-Sanft agreed with Boots statements and added that there needs to be clarification on informing students of their rights especially regarding transfer.

Boots shared the following comments and questions that were discussed at a recent meeting at City College:

The courses being recommended may actually affect the class that needs to be created. For example, if a student is only given recommended courses in Math but is unable to view the other courses in the discipline, will the faculty then have to create co-requisite classes or support classes specific to each of the discipline? Or is there a generic co-requisite that works for multiple disciplines? Should the recommendation be for faculty to create co-requisite classes to support them so that students are receiving them as an option?

3. Changes of Course Outlines

Short stated that with all of the discussions and decisions regarding the changes to pre-requisites, co-requisites, skill levels, he is concerned the options are correctly reflected in the course outlines when this process is complete. He provided the example if students are given an additional option to get into English 101 and that option is to take a support course, this information must be placed in the course outline. If the requisites are not enforced they should be listed as advisories. His concern is how this is going to be implemented with the deadline approaching and it being placed in the catalog.

Short asked the following questions on how this legal requirement will be implemented:

1. Are the curriculum changes going to be done administratively?

2. After the Math and English faculty make their decision of what the prerequisites and advisories will be, will they be reviewed through CIC?

3. Will individual faculty members be asked to make a CurricUNET proposal for each one of these courses to make it through the process in time for the fall catalog?

There was discussion regarding the policy for making changes in CurricUNET which is approved through the CurricUNET Steering Committee and CIC. Gholson recommended that given the timeline, it should be processed administratively.

Parker made a recommendation to standardize the information as much as possible so that there is the appropriate language supportive of articulation efforts. Also so that they have a repository of what the UC system is saying is acceptable.

O'Connor noted that there are discussions occurring among the UC, CSU and community colleges systems.

Hess noted that after reviewing the requisite impacts, it was her understanding that the pre-requisites were required to stay because of articulation with the understanding that the pre-requisite is not to be enforced.

Short agreed that it's important to keep the prerequisite for a course that is required for articulation. However, if it's been chosen not to do so, you cannot falsely represent on a course outline what is not required. If there are no students that will ever be required to take a course for entering a class, then it's not a requisite, it's an advisory. If there are some students that get assessed at a level where they have to take a specific course, then it is a requisite and most students will assess out of it. If every student assesses out of it then there is no such thing as a requisite. Short suggested to determine what the course outline is going to look like and then send it to the English and Math workgroups to show the intent of what will be published in the fall.

Bulger recommended Short's suggestion to take the course outline to the English and Math faculty for revisions and bring it back to CIC for discussion.

B. **Math Competency/Course List to Satisfy Competence in Mathematics (Discussion)**

- A correction was made to change POLI 202 to POLI 201.
- Mesa voted to add POLI 201 to the list.
- Miramar recommended adding BANK 103 and CISC 246 to the list of courses.

Shelly noted that she will send the revised list to the council with the added courses highlighted.

Short shared the following topics discussed at Miramar's CRC meeting regarding the evaluation of these courses:
  ▪ What courses should or should not be on the list and why?

- Are we are looking at computation skills (i.e. the ability to solve equations) versus courses that teach quantitative reasoning?
- How much quantitative reasoning must be in the course before you consider it legitimate to clear the math competency requirement?
- The level of quantitative reasoning. Per title 5 the course has to be at a level of intermediate algebra or higher. A math faculty on the committee screened the courses at Miramar to determine whether the concepts that are covered in the course are conceptually at the level of intermediate algebra or higher even if they are not solving intermediate equations but just the way that you have to think.
- In the Policy & Procedures meeting, there was discussion to have a language or definition explaining what quantitative reasoning is. Short had volunteered to create this language to share with Policy & Procedures and CIC. He made reference to the language in the CSU GE standards requirement for quantitative reasoning that can be followed as an example.

Bulger recommended finding out what the math faculty used as criteria to create this list so that this information can be shared with the council. Short commented that when the math faculty met regarding this subject, they were thinking of quantitative reasoning as to computation. They were thinking about the level however, did not consider how much quantitative reasoning supports it not the quantity.

Bulger noted that this will be an action item after all of the questions have been answered and the information is brought back to CIC for further review.

C. **Additional College Degree (Discussion)**

Short reported the following items discussed at the Miramar Curriculum Committee meeting:

1. The committee agreed that if a student has met the requirements of the ADT, they should receive it regardless of whether it overlaps with another degree. This decision was based on the fact that the CSU system decided that the ADT is an admission priority.

2. The committee discussed how to establish a separation between degrees and what is required of earning a second degree that is not an ADT. With regard to the unit separation and requirement of an additional 18 units in the new major, the committee agreed that it should be less restrictive and the range should be changed from 0 units (if the student completed all of the requirements) to 12 units.

3. The committee discussed other ways to distinguish what is a separate degree such as titles, etc.

Boots reported that this topic is on the agenda for discussion at City College. Bulger noted that this will be a continued item on the agenda.

San Diego Community College District
Curriculum and Instructional Council

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**
A. **Walk-Ins (*Action*)**

City College walked-in the following curriculum:
- CHIL 151—Course Revision

Recommend Approval of City College Curriculum: • **CHIL 151—Course Revision**
Motion by Short
Second by Norvell
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Boots. Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Hoffman, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker

Mesa College walked-in the following curriculum:
- CHIL 275—Course Activation
- RADT Associate of Science—Revision
- RADT Certificate of Achievement—Revision

Recommend Approval of Mesa Curriculum: • **CHIL 275—Course Activation**   • **RADT Associate of Science—Revision**   • **RADT Certificate of Achievement—Revision**
Motion by Short
Second by Norvell
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Boots. Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Hoffman, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker

V. **CIC Subcommittee Reports**

Bulger explained that the CIC Subcommittee Reports, which are the subcommittees that report to the Curriculum Instructional Council, has been added as a new section on the agenda. Hess shared a list of the CIC functions and responsibilities that includes information of the subcommittees.

A. **District Articulation Council (DAC)**

Palma-Sanft requested that the purpose of the District Articulation Council be updated. Bulger recommended that she include her recommendation on the DAC agenda. After approved, it will be brought back to CIC for review.

B. **CurricUNET Steering Committee**

Boots asked if the Academic Senate can solicit faculty membership for the CurricUNET Steering Committee. Hess confirmed that she will follow up with

her request. Short recommended that the membership lists Curriculum Chairs, Representatives, or Tech Writers of each college.

C. **Educational Review Committee**

No Report

D. **CIC Catalog Subcommittee**

Hess reported that the subcommittee is working on a date to meet. She suggested that the subcommittee review and revise the overall catalog production timeline. The curriculum dates will not change but the issue with the time period that the colleges are receiving the copies of the catalogs for review needs to be addressed. Currently it's when the faculty are unavailable and the turnaround time is too short. Hess asked the committee to send her any items they would like added to the agenda or anything they would like to have changed. No changes will be made for the 2019/2020 catalog but looking to make changes for the 2020/2021 catalog year. There will also be a discussion regarding any changes to the colleges that need to provide pathways in the catalogs. Bulger asked the council to provide examples of how guided pathway is presented at other colleges.

Short requested that faculty representation be added to the list of attendees for this committee. The council voted to add a faculty member from each college and Continuing Education.

Recommend Approval to add a faculty member from each college and Continuing Education to the CIC Catalog Subcommittee
Motion by Norvell
Second by Hoffman
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Boots, Chavez, Gholson, Gray, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Short

Bulger communicated that the suggested changes will be noted and brought back to CIC for final approval. She recommended that this list be reviewed annually.

Bulger stated that there have been numerous discussions in multiple places on the option of having an electronic catalog. She asked Hess to look at examples of electronic catalogs. The council can discuss the cost and ideas on how they are to be defined. There are a lot of conversations regarding the production timeline especially given campus solutions and the power that it can give the district. There are many reasons for the catalog subcommittee to share this information especially in regards to Guided Pathways, changing the catalog, and how we do registration.

Chavez asked if there could be consideration to transition out of using a paper catalog. Bulger said that she will seek feedback from the Vice Presidents regarding the usage at the colleges.

E. **Discipline Deans**

Hess shared that she is working on systemizing the discipline deans with a goal for them to meet annually. She will bring a list to the next CIC meeting. Short asked if the title can be changed to "Subject Deans".

F. **Policies and Procedures Subcommittee**

The subcommittee met today and the changes they are working on are not ready to be brought to CIC. They are waiting for the finalized title 5 changes which should be approved within the next couple of weeks. We are in Phase IIIB of three phases.

Hess reported that the subcommittee will be reviewing a masters list received from the District Chancellor's Office.

VI. **STANDING REPORTS**
   A. **Local and State—Curriculum Streamlining Process (Bulger/Hess)**
   No Report

   B. **Legislative Update (Bulger)**

Bulger noted that an email was sent today regarding Title 5 changes related to distance education. She asked the council to review the email that includes student to student contact and other information.

   C. **Curriculum Updating Project (Hess)**

COCI now allows the colleges to submit for the low unit degrees.

   D. **CurricUNET Steering Committee (Hess)**
   No Report

   E. **Student Services Council (Neault)**
   No Report

   F. **State Academic Senate**

There is a Curriculum Regional Meeting occurring on March 16, 2019 at Irvine Valley College.

The Curriculum Institute meeting will take place on the second weekend in July 2019.

   G. **Chief Instructional Officers (Bulger, Chavez, Fischthal, Hopkins, O'Connor)**
   No Report

   H. **Articulation Officers (ADT/C-ID) (Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker)**

San Diego Community College District
Curriculum and Instructional Council

Palma-Sanft shared the following:
- The Articulation Officers had their Southern Regional meeting on Monday.
- The second review cycle is going to be the first ten days of October.
- Assist will hopefully have a release date in May.

I. **Subcommittees (Bulger)**
No Report

J. **Campus Solutions Implementation (Neault/Bulger)**
No Report

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. *The next meeting will be Thursday, March 14, at 2:00 p.m. at North City Center, Multipurpose Room 101-102, 8355 Aero Drive, San Diego, CA 92123.*

B. *Reminder, the 2019-2020 Catalog Deadline was Thursday, December 13, 2018.* **All new programs and program revisions must be approved by CIC, Board of Trustees, CCCCO, new programs may be subject to WASC/ACCJC, before they may be published in the college catalog.**

C. *Reminder the 2019-2020 subject indicator changes (new indicators and revisions) and academic organization changes are due, Thursday, December 13, 2018.*

D. Academic Senate of California Community Colleges
2019 Spring Curriculum Regional Meeting - South,
March 16, 2019 at Irvine Valley College. Click here to register

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.
Motion by Boots
Second by Hoffman
Final Resolution: Motion carries
Aye: Beitey, Chavez, Gholson, Gray, Norvell, O'Connor, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Short