

San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of February 9, 2006
2:00 PM – District,
Room 272

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer – City College
Armstrong, Elizabeth	Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College
Deegan, Pam	Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College
Edinger, Valerie	Vice President, Instructional Services – Continuing Education
Gustin, Paula	Curriculum Chair – Mesa College
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 (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer – Mesa College
Shaffer, Sandra	Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education
Short, Duane	Articulation Officer – Miramar College

ABSENT:

Ingle, Henry	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning and Technology – District Office
--------------	---

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

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council**

Myra Harada called the meeting to order at 2:06 pm.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: December 08, 2005 Minutes

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

B. Approval of: February 09, 2005 Agenda

Laurie VanHouten reported that the curriculum deadline for the March 9th CIC meeting is February 16th. Paula Gustin requested that the three colleges communicate more effectively in determining which courses need to be approved.

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

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW / APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

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

B. Approval of Program Changes

None

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

Sandra Shaffer will confirm with Continuing Education whether or not they will have curriculum to present at the end of the semester. She said Continuing Education usually provides hardcopies of the curriculum. Myra Harada said there has been Cabinet discussion about articulation agreements between Continuing Education and the colleges and that members should review Continuing Education curriculum in light of transfer students.

No Curriculum

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Class Schedule Task Force Update

Harada reported that the Class Schedule Task Force will be provided a mock-up of a reformatted schedule with two-columns and the removal of repetitive comments. The timeline for schedules has been moved-up three weeks as requested. The Schedule Task Force will meet on March 13, 2006 to finalize efforts and create a report that will be forwarded to the Chancellor.

B. Repeatability – MFET 220

Harada reported that Manufacturing Engineering Technology 220 allows three repeats without specifying the enhanced skills or the change in content with each repeat. Council reviewed Title V, Section 58161 State Apportionment of Course Repetition. Harada expressed the difficulty of identifying the skill level of each student in a course that is repeatable. In the past, the district identified repeatable courses with levels of A, B, and C to determine the skill level and clarify the content change. MFET does not specify a change in course content with each repetition. Elizabeth Armstrong said Section 58161 does not state that the system has to track the changes in content with regard to students and each repetition. The Course Outline should specify that there is

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council**

different content and state that the skills and proficiency are enhanced by repetition or practice. The tracking is separate from the statements in the Course Outline. Harada said the tracking was easier with the A, B, C course designation system. Lynn Neault said there is no tracking to distinguish first-time students of a course from repeat students. After a student has exceeded the number of allowable repeats, FTES can not be collected. The challenge occurs when vocational courses have an update in the software or hardware, especially with computer software courses.

Neault said that the new W (withdrawal) Policy will be enforced in Fall 2006.

Libby Andersen suggested the Course Outline indicate how many times the course may be repeated. Armstrong suggested using similar language stated already in the Physical Education Courses for other courses.

“When this course is offered for three hours, additional time is used for the practice of advanced skills and techniques. Additionally, all students must demonstrate increased skill proficiency and command of course objectives with each repetition of the course.”

Ron Manzoni believed that this statement would suffice because the reason MFET requested repeatability was software changes. Paula Gustin said this statement gives students the impression that they can repeat the course because they can get better at it each time, not because of software change. She suggested stating that there has been an upgrade in software in the course outline. Jan Lombardi suggested stating that the course can be taken four times for skill development or with a change in software or hardware. Andersen said that in the past the Curriculum Committee had decided that when new software is implemented, it was a new course and had to have the repeatability statement.

Armstrong said she had created language for the Course Outlines to address repeatability in the past, but CIC had not made a decision. VanHouten said repeatability has become an issue again because there are vocational courses being marked as repeatable but the outlines do not state how the skills will be enhanced with each repetition of the course. According to section 58161 of Title V, each time a course is repeated, the content must be different and students are expected to gain expanded educational experience based on skills or proficiency, or active participation. Pam Deegan said for example in a tennis course that the content is different each time the course is repeated because the perspective of the student changes with each repetition. Harada said the Tennis Course Outline specifies Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced skill levels while the MFET course has no defined levels. Gustin requested consistency.

Neault said that Student Services did not implement monitoring repetition by subject because the guidelines were not established. Armstrong suggested allowing repetition within the same level of a course. Neault said if you have a course that is part of a transfer program, you can have repeats at different levels. Council reviewed Section 58162 (c).

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council**

Council also reviewed the January 2001 letter from Victoria Marrow, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services and Economic Development from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, which gave further clarification on the repeatability of vocational courses.

ACTION: Harada will put together model language from current outlines. Neault will verify that Datatel has capabilities.

C. Educational Review Update

Harada reported that the Educational Review Sub-Committee has discussed Units in Residence and Recency of Coursework. City has made recommendations. The Sub-Committee is waiting for recommendations from Mesa and Miramar. The four-year universities' requirement for recency of coursework is seven-years from the date that the textbook was written. The CSU Title V allows restriction of courses to seven years old, but it also states the campus has discretion. Gustin reported that these issues are at the Senates.

D. CIC Action List

Council reviewed and updated the CIC Action List. Carol Murphy explained that the parents of a student had complained about the icons on the online class schedule not being accurate. A course was indicated as being fully-online, but the class had to meet on campus four times. Neault suggested that the problem may be in WebCT. Neault said that currently the web and online designations indicate if a course is fully-online or meets on campus. The code to designate a course as hybrid in ISIS has been created but not implemented yet because the campuses must designate the courses once the definitions are approved. Armstrong said that usually the meeting dates for the courses are listed in the comment field in ISIS.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. ISPT Campus Visits

Harada said Henry Ingle is planning Instructional Services, Planning, and Technology visits to the colleges. He is scheduling the visits through the college presidents' offices.

B. CIC Quorum

The January 25th CIC meeting was canceled because of a lack of a quorum by one person. We want to avoid wasting the time of Council members who attend the meeting expecting to do business. Harada expressed the importance of notifying Instructional Services when the Council members cannot attend the meetings. Manzoni suggested not scheduling meetings during winter-break.

C. Guidelines to Common Pitfalls in Course Revision (VanHouten/Gustin)

VanHouten distributed the Guidelines to Common Pitfalls in Course Revision handout that sets standard procedures for creating proposals with different scenarios of curriculum changes and problems in CurricUNET. The guidelines were initiated by Paula Gustin and presented at the CurricUNET Steering Committee. The Council reviewed and edited the handout. Andersen said that faculty were creating proposals without understanding the effect of the changes they were inputting.

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council**

D. Review of Courses Based on TOP Codes as well as Course Prefix (Manzoni)

Manzoni said that there is a course proposal with a discipline prefix of Drama and a TOP Code of Media Mass Communication/Television Production. That course was not reviewed by City's Radio/Television Department, which has a duplicate course. Also, Miramar has 0612 TOP Code for Digital Film Production 101. He requested clarification on the review process for proposals with a TOP Code that is not in the discipline of the course prefix. Manzoni said duplication of a course is the concern when the college disciplines are non-aligned and a proposal is being made for a course that may already exist in different discipline at the other colleges.

VanHouten stated that the TOP Code is selected by the School Dean when the School Dean reviews the course. Faculty is limited to creating a proposal in the discipline in which they teach and the approval process is set-up by discipline. VanHouten said for this Drama course, there is no selected TOP Code because the course was defaulted at the Mesa Dean level. Gustin recommended the originator and the discipline dean at City discuss this issue.

Gustin said this will not be fixed in CurricUNET: it should be caught at the CRC level. Short suggesting giving a list of the TOP Codes to the Deans. Neault suggested Instructional Services do a final review of the proposal if the TOP Code is inconsistent with the discipline. VanHouten said it should be caught before because it will have gone through the whole approval process. Armstrong believed that this issue may not be resolved with a technical fix. She suggested the VPIs discuss the issue with the Deans to determine where there is potential of overlap in discipline. She believes there will be more interdisciplinary courses. She will discuss this with the Mesa Deans. Andersen expressed the importance of discussing this issue in order to avoid offering similar courses that may take the space needed for a course that does need more sections.

E. Schedule a Joint Meeting Date

Instructional Services will email Council with suggested dates for a Joint SSC/CIC meeting.

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project

The Curriculum Updating Project was distributed.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (not reported)

C. Student Services Council (not reported)

D. State Academic Senate (not reported)

E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)

Deegan reported that there are many of legal changes. Previously, the Computer Labs had a problem with their non-credit designation. The CIOs may now bring current written curriculum and send them to the state for approval. The state will use the approved curriculum at the March 13th meeting to provide different iterations of the credit/non-credit types of courses that can be offered. Interested faculty may contact their CIO.

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum Instructional Council**

Deegan reported that at the end of February apportionment collection is going to change effective Spring, 2006. Currently, one-unit labs taught online do not receive full apportionment, but this will change this semester. The state is confirming that there is a relationship between units and hours.

Deegan stated that there has also been a change in determining apportionment for open entry/open exit courses. The curriculum committees are to determine a reasonable number of hours needed to complete the course. Deegan recommended that in order to continue to collect double the hours for apportionment that CIC vote that double the hours is the agreed number of hours needed to complete the course. She suggested CIC take action on the Open Entry/Open Exit policy first and then the Curriculum Committees will be able to collect double apportionment.

Effective Fall 2007, stand-alone course approval will become a local approval.

Any faculty with an issue/problem with any part of the Educational Code may consult his CIO because changes can be presented to the Consultation Council. The changes will be presented in October.

There is a State-wide Academic Senate request to increase the minimum standard for the Math/English graduation requirement. The State is waiting for CIO and CSSO feedback on that matter.

F. Articulation Officers (not reported)

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The next CIC meeting is February 23, 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
- Repeatability
- Program and Course Approval Handbook pg. 37
- Curriculum Updating Project
- Guidelines to Common Pitfalls in Course Revisions
- Action List

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Harada adjourned the meeting at 4:02 pm.