Marianne Tortorici called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: April 28, 2005 Minutes

The minutes were approved. M/S/P (Glow, Lombardi)
B. Approval of: May 12, 2005 Agenda

Items Added:
- Proposed Course Phot 141 (Lombardi)
- Tutoring Referral Process (Neault)

_The agenda was approved as amended._ M/S/P (Glow, Lombardi)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW / APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

Removed from the Consent Agenda:
- Disabled Student Program And Services 020, Introduction to Accessible Computers
- Computer And Information Sciences 182, Fluency with Information Technology

_All other items were approved by consent._ M/S/P (Andersen, Glow)

B. Approval of Program Changes

_Items approved by consent._ M/S/P (Neault, Glow)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

None

D. Curriculum Items Discussed

*Disabled Student Program And Services 020, Introduction to Accessible Computers*

Jan Lombardi requested activation of this course for City College. Laurie VanHouten announced the title change of the department to Disability Support Programs and Services and clarified that it will only change in the catalog and CurricUNET, not in the ISIS system.

_Motion to approve activation at City._ M/S/P (Glow, Andersen)

*Computer And Information Sciences 182, Fluency with Information Technology*

Elizabeth Armstrong reported that she met with Paula Liska and the faculty member who is teaching this course at UCSD to discuss the reason for proposing this course. She learned that CSE3, Computer Science & Engineering - Fluency in Information Technology, at UCSD is equivalent to this course and enrolls approximately 150 students, three-fourths of which are psychology majors. She explained that psychology majors at UCSD are required to take a Computer Science course. Armstrong reported that Mesa transfers about 300 students to UCSD each year, many of whom are
psychology majors. Mesa’s transferring psychology students may take this course as a Psychology General Education.

Armstrong also stated that the second reason for this course is that CSE3 is a major requirement for CSE program at UCSD and CISC 182 may fulfill that requirement. Armstrong also said SDSU is currently discussing revamping the CISC 181 course which would lose our ability to transfer our 181 articulation/transferability.

Libby Andersen mentioned the faculty’s concern that CISC 181 and CISC 182 are too similar. She noted the difference is that 181 emphasizes programming and 182 emphasizes application. Paula Gustin informed the Council that the articulation of CISC 181 with UCSD was rejected in the past. Armstrong mentioned that this is only proposed for Mesa. Lynn Neault suggested putting a note in the catalog for students who intend to take 181 or 182, to see a counselor before taking the course in order to take a measure in good faith to alert the students. Andersen requested adding a note in the course description mentioning the student’s major. She will consult with faculty for their approval. Lombardi, Gustin, and Andersen will come up with the catalog wording and will send it to VanHouten. Andersen reported that she will withdraw her transferability objection and have the UC system decide if they want to articulate it or not.

**Motion to approve with amended catalog description. M/S/P (Glow, Gustin)**

### E. Psychology 161

VanHouten reminded the Council that Mesa indicated disapproval, but they still allowed it to go forward although the concerns of Mesa had not been addressed. Lombardi and Gustin will meet to address several issues: integrate the course and broaden the course description to apply to City and Mesa’s perspectives.

### III. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. 2005-06 CIC Calendar

The Council reviewed the changes made to the calendar at the last CIC meeting. Glow mentioned that Miramar will have a campus meeting on February 2. Lombardi stated that City will have a meeting on May 18th and a January 25th meeting, but will schedule it around the CIC Retreat. VanHouten clarified that the deadline for curriculum review for May 26 has passed so everything else that arrives at Instructional Services later will be discussed at the August 17 CIC meeting. She reminded Council that May 28th is the last day for CurricUNET approval workflow.

**Motion to approve with amendments from City and Miramar for Spring 2006. M/S/P (Andersen, Glow)**

#### B. Calendar Committee (Neault)
Neaульт reported that this was explained at the last Joint CIC/SSC meeting. Jim Mahler had contacted the Chancellor about Miramar and City changing their summer start date without the approval of the Calendar Committee. Neaульт announced that deviations from the calendar are not to be made without going to the Calendar Committee. Through consultation, Neaульт will bring forward the idea of including Instructional VPs and the Academic Senates to participate on the Calendar Committee in a non-voting capacity. Neaульт clarified that each unit selects its own representative to attend the meetings and that the calendar is created in consultation.

C. Six-Year Review Criteria Draft
Myra Harada requested that the Council review the criteria mentioned at the Ad Hoc Committee. Harada mentioned that the Steering Committee will discuss operationalizing the review in CurricUNET. The Steering Committee will meet on the 24th of May.

Motion to approve the Six-Year Review Criteria. M/S/P (Glow, Lombardi)

D. Procedure & Timeline For State Approval Submissions Draft
Harada mentioned that she sent out an email asking if they wanted to shorten the timeline since it would take approximately thirty days for the Chancellor’s office to approve a program, but 60 days if it goes to the California Post–Secondary Commission for review. Andersen commented that it will be difficult for those people who are making program proposals to have the approval packets ready for prelaunch. Glow recommended putting a notation for the Dean in CurricUNET as a reminder at prelaunch. VanHouten stated that an email message to the Dean and Department Chair can be created as a reminder. Harada mentioned the importance of a reminder from the CRC to the originators at the early Tech Review. Andersen noted that a lot of the work such as Market Assessment and Job Labor require more involvement from Institutional Planning & Research in order get a direction from them. She also requested having a training for faculty as well as a provision for faculty reassigned time to do program development.

Motion to approve notation for Dean in CurricUNET M/S/P (Gustin, Glow)

E. Certificates of Completion on Transcript
Harada mentioned that this was discussed at the last Joint CIC/SSC meeting and there were people who did not think it was necessary to post all Certificates of Completion on transcripts. However, she reminded the Council that in a previous CIC meeting, the Council supported posting Certificates of Completion on transcripts and changed procedure 5300.2 to reflect that decision. Neaульт suggested that people who actually do the posting were not at that meeting and that evaluators keep bringing this concern forward. She suggested being sensitive to other people’s workload and recommended Certificates of Completion be posted on transcripts at the student’s request, especially at Miramar. Armstrong requested that Certificates of Completion be posted on transcripts for Mesa. Glow mentioned that she did not think this was a critical issue at
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Miramar but requested time to check on it. She also stated that each campus has unique needs and suggested getting additional staff to meet the needs of the campuses. Neault noted the importance of quarterly Joint CIC/SSC meetings and suggested to revisit this topic at the next Joint meeting. [This topic was discussed at the Joint CIC/SSC meeting May 15, 2003. CIC vote to change 5300.2 took place on May 22, 2003 as a result.]

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Certificates—Recency of Coursework
Harada mentioned Recency of Coursework was discussed at the last Joint CIC/SSC meeting. Harada presented the need for a policy determining how recent coursework should be in order to grant a certificate. She also asked who the decision-makers would be and advised that the topic be revisited at CRC meetings. Neault reported that currently there is no recency requirement for certificates. Armstrong supported having a limit and recommended this be discussed at the next CIC meeting.

B. Certificates of Completion—non-SDCCD coursework
The use of non-SDCCD coursework was also discussed at the Joint CIC/SSC meeting. She noted that currently all coursework for Certificates of Completion be completed in our District with no outside substitutions. She stated that procedure 5300.2 was changed to allow substitutions with courses within the SDCCD District. Accepting non-SDCCD coursework requires transcripts from institutions outside the district. Glow mentioned that reviewing these transcripts would present a Student Services workload issue. Armstrong recommended allowing outside substitutions by exception only through the petition process.

C. Units in Residency
Neault mentioned that this too was discussed at the Joint CIC/SSC meeting. She said evaluators are requesting to increase the required number of units completed in residence. Neault clarified that currently, a student could receive a Certificate of Achievement or an Associate Degree without having taken a single required course for the major in this district. Neault also noted that students can receive a degree without having taken one core course in the degree at this District. Andersen requested to get information regarding this from Student Services. Armstrong moved to establish an Ad Hoc Committee, including Curriculum and Instructional Council and Student Services members, to study the residency requirements for the Associate Degree and Certificate of Achievement.

Motion to approve to establish an Ad Hoc Committee. M/S/P (Armstrong, Glow)

D. Copyright & Captioning
Not Discussed

E. Integration of New Courses (Andersen)
Not Discussed
F. Proposed Course Phot 141
Lombardi noted that Phot 141 course was entered incorrectly. It was put in as an integration but is actually new course. She asked if it passes next week in CRC, can the new course be offered in the Fall? VanHouten noted that there are CIC meeting dates on May 26 and August 17 and that it depends on when it arrives and the particulars of the proposal. She reminded Council that there is a Tech Review on May 18 for the May 26 CIC meeting. Gustin also mentioned that there may be courses coming in at the last minute. Meanwhile, Glow announced that they will not be pursuing 054L for the Fall.

H. Tutorial Referral Process (Neault)
Neault stated that to claim apportionment for tutoring, the state has a legal advisory to ensure that every student has had a formal referral and documentation of who referred them and for what skill deficiency. She proposed two options: manual/paper process or emulating the add code process as a tutorial referral code. The instructors would receive a code and a tutorial roster with all the students’ names in that course listed. For students to receive tutorial service, the instructors must give their students a tutorial code to bring to the tutorial center. The code would be linked back to the Instructor. The instructor must also log the students given a code as well as the student’s skill deficiency on the tutorial roster. The purpose of this is to track the use of the tutorial center and indicate which departments need tutors. Students need a referral for each discipline. She anticipated making this effective in the fall.

Motion to approve. M/S/P (Glow, Webb)

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project
VanHouten mentioned that since there are only six courses that will not be approved by the next meeting, they will be moved to Version 2 and kept the same approval level. She will make hard copy of the approval flow and move the content over. The comments will not be in version 2. Tortorici requested an electronic copy.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee
Not Discussed

C. Information Technology Council
Not Discussed

D. Student Services Council
Not Discussed

E. State Academic Senate
Not Discussed
F. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)  
*Not Discussed*

G. GE reviewed 5/26  
VanHouten mentioned that the draft of the GE & transfer proposals for the next meeting was in the handouts.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The next CIC meeting is May 26, 2005 at 2:00 PM at the District Office Room 272.

B. The curriculum deadline for the May 26, 2005 meeting is Friday, April 29, 2005. This is the curriculum deadline for the Spring 2006 printed schedule.

F. Handouts:

1. Today’s CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summaries
4. Draft of 2005-06 Calendar
5. Draft of Six-Year Review Criteria
6. Procedure & Timeline for State Approval Submissions
7. Certificates of Completion 5300.2
8. Associate Degree Requirements: Units in Residency (Catalog)
9. Captioning Practice
10. Status of Version 1 proposals
11. Curriculum Updating Project
12. 5-05-05 Joint Meeting Agenda
13. CIC May 26, 2005 GE /Transferability Actions

III. ADJOURNMENT

*Tortorici adjourned the meeting at 3:57 pm*