

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of April 12, 2007
2:00 PM – Muir Z-602

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Armstrong, Elizabeth Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College
Castaneda, Elizabeth Academic Senate Representative, Interim Articulation Officer – City
Foster, Kit Interim Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College

Gustin, Paula Curriculum Chair – Mesa College
Ingle, Henry T. Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning & Technology –
District Office

Lombardi, Jan Curriculum Chair – City College
Manzoni, Ron Vice President, Instruction – City College
Short, Duane Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Miramar
College

Murphy, Carol Curriculum Chair – Miramar College
Parker, Juliette Articulation Officer – Mesa (substitute for Terrie Teegarden)
Weaver, Roma Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education

ABSENT:

Edinger, Valerie Vice President Instruction – Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn Vice Chancellor, Student Services – District Office (*Ex Officio*)
Shimazaki, Leslie Faculty Representative – Continuing Education
Teegarden, Terrie Academic Senate Representative – Mesa College

STAFF:

VanHouten, Laurie Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office
Nasca, Shannon Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Henry Ingle called the meeting to order at 2:05pm.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

- A. Approval of: March 22, 2007 Minutes
Duane Short recommended a change to the third sentence of the Articulation Officer's report. The word "district" was changed to "region".

The minutes were approved with the noted change. M/S/P (Short/Murphy)

- B. Approval of: April 12, 2007 Agenda

The agenda was approved. M/S/P (Short/Murphy)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

- A. Approval of Curriculum
Removed from the consent agenda: Photography 265G.

The curriculum was approved by consent. M/S/P (Lombardi/Manzoni)

- B. Approval of Program Changes

All programs were approved. M/S/P (Lombardi/Castaneda)

- C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

None.

- D. Curriculum items discussed: Photography 265G.

Short stated that he thinks Photography 265G is a perfect course for the Special Topics category. Ron Manzoni stated that the course should be degree applicable and transferable. Short commented that Manufacturing 270 should also be degree applicable and transferable. Laurie VanHouten stated that Instructional Services will make the changes.

Photography 265G was approved with the change to transfer applicability for CSU. M/S/P (Short/Lombardi)

Manzoni commented that Manufacturing 270 should be a generic course. He made the assumption that it is a generic course. VanHouten stated that Short is working on creating a generic outline for work experience (270).

III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. CIC/SSC Joint Meeting

Henry Ingle stated that the joint meeting would be held during a CIC meeting. He stated that the earlier May 10th proposed date is posing some calendar difficulties for Student Services and conflicting with some other back-to-back meetings scheduled for that same day. Among these calendar commitments are the scheduled Thursday Board of Trustees meetings. Ingle suggested holding the meeting earlier from 1:30pm to 3:30pm to ensure that those attending the Board Meeting at 4:00pm have sufficient travel time. He requested that we work up

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

some optional meeting dates and times to present to Student Services along with the idea of having an earlier meeting. Pending their response, we could better finalize a meeting date and time.

Among other possible meeting dates to be explored for a joint CIC/SSC session, is the May 24, 2007, CIC meeting. Otherwise, we may have to wait until the fall semester to hold the joint meeting.

Liz Armstrong suggested that the proposed changes in Title 5 be a topic to discuss at the joint meeting. She stated that some of the changes are clear and significant, such as, not being able to use the term “Certificates of Completion for Credit”, while some changes are not as clear.

VanHouten stated that the May 24th CIC meeting is the date that the Council reviews the General Education requirements. She suggested moving the review of GE requirements to the May 10th CIC meeting. VanHouten stated that she would send out the proposed submissions before the next CIC meeting so that the materials could be reviewed prior to the meeting.

Action: The Council will review the General Education requirements at the May 10, 2007, CIC meeting instead of the May 24, 2007, CIC meeting.

B. Recency of Coursework Statement

Short stated at the last CIC meeting the Council discussed the concern; if the District allows students to repeat courses then perhaps the district would not be able to claim apportionment for those courses; therefore, the District would not let the students repeat them. He researched this concern in Title 5 and found that the District is allowed to let students repeat courses and still claim apportionment for them.

Armstrong stated that Title 5 states that a student may repeat a course up to three times; on the fourth time the student must take a “W”. Armstrong stated that some districts have more liberal “W” policies than the district. Ingle asked Armstrong if she found reference to apportionment in the revised Title 5 policy. Armstrong said that she had and that there may be more to it.

Short restated that if indeed the District allows students to repeat courses that were taken too far in the past, based on the District’s new policy, the District would be able to claim apportionment.

Manzoni noted that the apportionment for one student is not a significant amount. He said that the District can let a student repeat a course as many times as they want if it is not claiming apportionment. We need to keep in mind the idea is to benefit the students. Manzoni stated that he does not think apportionment should be an issue. Short agreed, but he said that it did seem like an issue based on the Council’s last discussion. Manzoni said that if you had 10,000 students repeating courses it would be an issue because of the significance of the revenue amount. Paula Gustin was not certain as to the exact number of students we have that are repeating courses. Armstrong thinks that at Mesa College, there is a fair number

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

of requests from students seeking to repeat courses, but she has not seen the actual numbers from the Academic Review Committee. Gustin agreed that if the District tells students that it will not accept a course completed years ago, there has to be a way for them to repeat it. Manzoni thinks that even for apportionment, unless the class is full, it is not proper to tell a student they cannot repeat a course. Ingle asked if some informal data could be brought to the committee by the Vice Presidents of Instruction for review. The three VPIs will be requested to provide that information, as best available, at our next meeting.

VanHouten asked the committee if they wanted to move ahead with placing the Recency of Coursework Statement in the catalog since the deadline was coming up. The Committee agreed to insert the Recency of Coursework Statement in the catalog. Armstrong stated that she did not oppose the repeat policy, but she thinks that there is some number of students who petition to repeat courses, if it is determined that it is appropriate for the students.

C. Courses Developed with Grant Funding

VanHouten stated that last spring semester the State Chancellor's office informed the community colleges that they must report whether or not a course was developed using grant funding. She stated that it seems that several courses at City, possibly in Manufacturing, were developed with grant funding. VanHouten stated that she needs confirmation from each Vice President of Instruction of any course developed in the last year where economic development funds were used. She informed the Council that there are three categories as follows: (1) primarily developed using economic funds; (2) partially developed using economic funds; or (3) not applicable (economic development funds exceed 40% of the total development costs). Armstrong asked if this could be added to the SLO document the Vice Presidents of Instruction are preparing for the commission.

Manzoni suggested adding a section for this in CurricUNET, under the course originator, because that is the person who knows who is funding the course and the VPI's would be hard-pressed to accurately provide this information. Elizabeth Castaneda further examined the funding request indicating that she knows she is being funded for courses, but does not always know where the funding is coming from. VanHouten stated that she would review the request from the State again. Ingle offered VanHouten assistance to finalize the issue if VanHouten can provide him with details. Manzoni stated that the District has Military and outside agencies funding course development along with staff development funds that are used for funding course development. Manzoni stated that the people who manage the grants know they are paying for course development and maybe they should be the ones to make that information available. That is, it might be best to have the grant manager responsible, not the course originator, provide the information. Ingle stated that receiving information from the grant managers can often be equally as difficult based on the grant award docket the ISPT office produces each year for the Trustees.

D. Certificate of Completion Course Substitution Statement

Short stated that he just wanted to make clear that the Miramar Academic Senate voted to approve the Certificates of Completion change.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

E. Units in Residency in the Major Statement

Short stated that Miramar College wanted to suggest a slight modification to the written statement on the Units Required for the Major. He indicated that the wording suggested proved to be “too wordy and long” as one sentence and they are suggesting breaking the sentence down into two sentences. VanHouten stated that the revised wording was already submitted for approval to the Chancellor and that she had already approved it. Short said that his observation was not a substantial change and we should let it stand as presented.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2007-2008 CIC Calendar

Laurie VanHouten informed the Council of the proposed CIC calendar for the 2007-2008 academic year. A tentative working copy of the calendar was distributed at the meeting. She stated that Instructional Services tentatively placed the campuses curriculum committee meeting dates on the proposed calendar by working with the calendar from last year. She asked the Council to bring a list of their campus curriculum committee meetings to the April 26th CIC meeting so those dates can be added to the new calendar. VanHouten explained that August 23, 2007, and January 24, 2008, are suggested dates to hold virtual CIC meetings.

VanHouten noted that the catalog deadline for March 13th is tentative because next year’s catalog production timeline is still fluid and not final. Jan Lombardi asked if there was anything that could be done to schedule more time for “walked-in” curriculum, and it seems that we are short a meeting as she reviews the calendar. VanHouten stated that there are not any meetings scheduled for the entire month of January due to the holidays. She stated that the Instructional Services office could frequently send deadline reminders in November. Also, February 22nd is the deadline for curriculum to be at the Instructional Services level for the March 13th CIC meeting. Liz Armstrong stated that there are community college districts that require their catalogs to be done before the fall semester. The Council talked about doing something similar for SDCCD in the past but had agreed not to do that. She was not optimistic about moving the catalog deadline forward. She stated that the schedule deadline may need to change, as opposed to the catalog completion date.

Lombardi pointed out that there is only one meeting in November and December and that the Council should consider its timelines based on meeting dates. Carol Murphy stated that there are five Thursdays in November. She suggested that the Council meet on Thursday November 29, 2007, as well as the November 8, 2007, scheduled meeting. VanHouten informed the Council that the curriculum deadline for November 29, 2007, would be November 9, 2007.

Ingle recommended that the calendar be reviewed and discussed again at the April 26th CIC meeting. VanHouten asked the Council to email her the dates of their campus curriculum committee meetings so they can be added to the calendar for the next CIC meeting.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project

VanHouten stated that the integration report is down to 230 courses. Armstrong stated that there is a different part of updating the curriculum which is the CRCC project. She stated that the VPIs are in phase three, which is very complex and lengthy. Armstrong said that the VPIs are working with Lynn Neault, who thinks that the data can be downloaded into the database fields directly. Otherwise, the data will have to be entered individually when there is already a great deal of it in the database.

Ingle asked Armstrong to briefly describe phase three of the CRCC project. Armstrong stated that the project is looking at the entire database for each of the colleges and the deactivated courses, which may have been deactivated some years ago. She said that the project also profiles the general education and “stand alone” courses. She stated that the process, in essence, has us sending to the State Chancellor’s office the data that they already have. Armstrong stated that the State Chancellor’s office may have five or six different versions of the same course. Manzoni stated the project was simple at the beginning and now is becoming an onerous task. He stated that VanHouten has provided the VPIs with a roster of the deactivated courses and each college has about 2,000 courses. Armstrong also indicated that the colleges are mandated by legislation to locally approve “stand alone” courses. She stated that they should be completed by May 2007.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee

VanHouten informed the Council that the “tech review liaisons” at each of the campuses are on the Steering Committee. She said they requested that the position in CurricUNET at their level be made “required” for five days only. She stated that the liaisons said the courses were arriving in their queue and then moving on faster than they could respond to them. She stated that the modification has been made in CurricUNET to give the tech review liaisons time to review and act on courses in their queue.

VanHouten stated that the committee had a large discussion about creating Learning Communities (LCOM) and streamlining that process. She gave the Council a handout on the procedure the committee made to create new LCOM’s and activate current LCOM groupings on a campus.

C. Student Services Council

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

No Report.

E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)

Manzoni informed the Council of the State Academic Senate group’s position on associate degree requirements in the major. He stated that the focus is on the transfer studies degree title. Manzoni said that all three colleges need to have the

San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

same format for the transfer studies degree, which does specify that students complete the units for the major. He stated that the title needs to change, because students do not major in transfer studies, but rather in an academic discipline. The description is fine, but the label is not. He stated the Liberal Arts Degree, which is offered at all three colleges, also requires some changes. He stated that there are no courses in the major and that is what the State Academic Senate has critiqued.

Manzoni said that either the Liberal Arts Major needs to be deleted or the title needs to change. And of course, he understands that once you change the title, it becomes the same as the transfer studies degree. He also stated that the colleges could have transfer studies certificates or possible a Liberal Arts Certificate and forget the degree. Short stated that other colleges refer to the title as university studies. He said that he spoke with Professor Mark Lieu, Chair of the Academic Senate for California Community College Curriculum Committee at Ohlone College, who said that the way the district has it structured, even if the prep for major units were mandated, it would not be acceptable. Manzoni stated that SDCCD is okay with the description, but the three Academic Senates may want to discuss a new title that is more descriptive of the program.

Ingle shared with the CIC Committee members the new San Diego State University TAG Table, which was introduced at the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting and given to the VPIs. He asked Instructional Services staff to duplicate it and hand it out to all Committee members for more widespread sharing at each campus.

F. Articulation Officers

Short informed the Council that Region 10 Community Colleges discussed the LDTP. They voted on the statement which he will be sending out by email.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The April 26th CIC meeting will be held at Muir in room Z-405.
- B. The curriculum deadline for the May 10th meeting is Friday, April 20th at 5pm.
- C. Handouts:
 - 1. Today's CIC Meeting Agenda
 - 2. Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
 - 3. Curriculum Summary
 - 4. Curriculum Updating Project
 - 5. Certificate of Completion – Course Substitution
 - 6. CIC Action Lists
 - 7. Learning Communities Proposal Procedure
 - 8. Miramar Academic Senate Votes
 - 9. CIC Calendar for 2007-2008

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Ingle adjourned the meeting at 3:04pm once all agenda business had been handled.