

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of May 10, 2007  
2:00 PM – ECC, RM 146A

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

### **ABSENT:**

Edinger, Valerie	Vice President Instruction – Continuing Education
Manzoni, Ron	Vice President, Instruction – City College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services – District Office ( <i>Ex Officio</i> )
Shimazaki, Leslie	Faculty Representative – Continuing Education
Teegarden, Terrie	Academic Senate Representative – Mesa College

### **GUEST:**

Flor, Shirley	Counselor, Mesa College
Schommer, Steve	Counseling Chair of Counseling, City 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 2:10 p.m.*

## **I. MINUTES AND AGENDA**

- A. Approval of: April 26, 2007 Minutes

*The minutes were approved as amended.* M/S/P (Murphy/Lombardi)

- B. Approval of: May 10, 2007 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:

Administration of Justice 167, Report Writing

Anthropology 265B, Introduction to Medical Anthropology

Biology 130, Human Heredity

New Business: Hybrids

*The agenda was approved as amended.* M/S/P (Murphy/Lombardi)

## **II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL**

- A. Approval of Curriculum

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

- B. Approval of Program Changes

None.

- C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

None.

- D. Approval of District and Transfer General Education Patterns

Henry Ingle referred the Council to the handout for Review and Approval of General Education Transferability Actions and asked the Council if they wanted to pull or discuss any courses on the list. Duane Short wanted to discuss Biology 111 and Geographic Information Systems 104.

Jan Lombardi reminded the Council that Sociology 223 (SOCO) does have a request for District Multicultural Requirements and it needs to be added to the front of the handout. She also inquired what the asterisk next to the course meant. Short believed that the asterisk is there for City. He recalled that Miramar College had Sociology 223 approved for District GE last year along with District Multicultural Requirements. Short explained that there should be an asterisk next to it for City. He checked the catalog for confirmation and found it was not listed as meeting the multicultural requirement. Therefore, SOCO 223 should be considered for the multicultural requirement for Miramar and City.

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Laurie Van Houten explained that the asterisk next to the listed courses means that the course was approved for GE submission at the meeting in which the proposal was originally approved. Because it met one of the conditions, the Council decided not to wait to review it. She explained that the conditions in which separate approval is not required for submission include UC Transfer and any of the other GE patterns already approved at on college where another college is activating the approved course. She added that the CSU system understands that if one of our colleges has already approved a course, it would be an automatic submission for approval by the other colleges in the District.

Armstrong asked why Manufacturing Engineering Technology (MFET) courses were being proposed for UC Transfer. She explained that she had never seen courses of this nature accepted for UC Transfer and she inquired about the rationale for submission. Elizabeth Castaneda informed Armstrong that the instructor insisted on submitting them and feels very strongly that they would be accepted for UC Transfer. Castaneda claimed that she did not mind pulling the courses and she has advised the instructor that the courses more than likely would not be accepted. Armstrong stated that typically in the UC system, the Engineering courses that transfer are those that are part of the Baccalaureate Degree Program, not Engineering Technology. She continued saying that these are high school entry-level student courses, and they look like application courses. Lombardi interjected that UC is very clear that application courses are not transferable. Armstrong feels that the District's reputation would be damaged if we submit courses that are clearly not likely to be accepted. She affirmed that if there have been changes to the UC Transfer criteria she would discontinue her disagreement, but the courses appear to be more job related and career technical. For example, Armstrong pointed out that MFET 115 Properties and Materials is an application and the District already has an Engineering course articulating UC Properties and Materials, if you look at the prerequisites in the areas of chemistry, physics and mechanics.

Ingle asked if the group would like to pull the MFET courses, review them and bring them back for discussion. Armstrong wanted to hear from the Articulation Officers because they are the experts in this area and she may be wrong in her analysis. Castaneda agreed with Armstrong and stated that she had added the courses to the list because the instructor was very insistent. Short also agreed the courses did not look like they met UC Transfer criteria. He stated that he did not think the MFET courses would be approved for UC Transferability. Short feels that if a faculty member believes that the courses are written at the UC level and they are eager to submit them, there is nothing to prevent the college from attempting to submit them for UC TCA approval. It is ultimately up to the UC to determine whether or not they will be accepted for credit. It is up to the campus to make the submission decision. Kit Foster interjected that the UC system is very clear about the types of courses that they want to see and they do exclude the application and vocational types of courses. Juliette Parker stated that they do not accept courses that they do not teach. Foster thinks that we need to show that we really know the curriculum; we cannot rely on one faculty member's opinion who may not know the whole curriculum and as a result might have a focused perspective.

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Ingle asked the Council to provide some recommendations on how best to proceed. Lombardi suggested removing the MFET courses from the list. Armstrong expressed concern that Ron Manzoni had given her his proxy for the meeting and she asked Lombardi what she thought his vote would be. Lombardi conveyed that Manzoni had not talked to her about his proxy and he did not express any issues with the MFET courses. Armstrong recommended approval of all courses on the review and approval list for General Education Transferability Actions, with the exception of the Manufacturing Engineering Technology courses. Therefore, pending discussion at City College, and a possible recommendation from City to include them, she would recommend them for submission.

*Motion to approve all courses for General Education/Transferability with the exception of the Manufacturing Engineering Technology courses at this time, pending their approval at City College. The MFET courses will be submitted if City College recommends them for submission.*

*M/S/P (Armstrong/Lombardi)*

Short added that researching the UC system for any courses similar to MFET taught there would be beneficial. Ingle asked the Council who should do the research, and Castaneda volunteered. Armstrong interjected that she wants Vice President of Instruction, Ron Manzoni to be involved in the research as well.

*Action: Short suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to approve all courses for General Education/Transferability with the exception of the Manufacturing Engineering Technology courses at this time, pending their approval at City College. The MFET courses will be submitted if City College recommends them for submission. Short's suggestion was to submit the MFET courses for UC Transfer once the courses are researched and recommended by City College for submission. Armstrong accepted Short's friendly amendment.*

*M/S/P (Armstrong/Lombardi)*

Short had a few questions regarding Biology 111 and Geographic Information Systems 104. He stated that he is not necessarily opposed to including these courses on the list. However, he is concerned that Biology 111 may be too narrow in scope to qualify for a GE course and for CSU and IGETC. He researched other community colleges that have Biology of Cancer as a course that they teach, and none of them have it certified for CSU GE or for IGETC in the category that BIOL 111 is proposed for. He did concur, however, that it is possible that the courses were certified but the other colleges never submitted them for approval, but he is concerned of the outcomes if the District becomes the first to submit in that area. He restated that the course seemed very narrow in scope to him, rather than what we usually look for in a GE pattern course. If he were to propose an action, it would be to propose that City College submit it for CSU GE and IGETC if the Council feels that it meets the criteria. Therefore, if it is denied by the CSU system for GE, then the District should not include it in the District GE pattern. If CSU or IGETC accept it then he thinks the District should accept it for the District GE pattern.

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Lombardi informed the Council that there had been a rather lengthy discussion regarding this course the day before. She noted that the department defended its view that this course is a science course and that strictly because it is using cancer as an example the faculty did not feel there was a problem. She further stated that the department feels strongly about the decision and is committed to its listing as a GE course. Also, City would like to proceed with the submission. Short asked Lombardi if she was comfortable with the recommendation that if the course is not approved for the CSU GE or IGETC, then it would not be approved for the District either. Lombardi was comfortable with that and thought Short's suggestion was reasonable.

Short expressed the same concerns with Geographic Information Systems 104 (GISG) as he did with Biology 111. He proposed that City College submit it for CSU GE and IGETC, but if it is denied by the CSU system for GE, then the District should not include it in the District GE pattern. Lombardi verified that SDSU has a course that is similar in scope to this course. They have approved it for GE. Short pointed out that the course is proposed for life science as well as mathematics, but he thinks it should be for mathematics only. Lombardi and Castaneda agreed that it should only be for mathematics.

Ingle asked if the District has been working with the UC system and SDSU on commonality for GISG tracking courses that have been funded by the National Science Foundation. Armstrong replied that Mesa College has a three year NSF grant. She continued that GISG has been Mesa's curriculum for a number of years and it has been only during this cycle that City College activated the GISG course. Parker stated that there has been significant communication between the faculty at Mesa College and SDSU to make sure that all of the requirements were met, including prerequisites for GISG 104. She feels comfortable that the course will be accepted. Short withdrew his recommended proposal. Armstrong voiced the concern that enrollment is very important and that Mesa College struggles to meet enrollment. She is concerned that activation of similar courses will dilute Mesa's offerings and impact important enrollment expectations. She thinks those are considerations for the CIC task force that Ingle has asked to create a concept paper regarding course activation and enrollment issues as a summer project.

Ingle stated that GISG is beginning to be viewed as interdisciplinary in many fields and the GISG arena represents some strategic opportunities for new course offerings. He continued that up until this point in time, the District has not done anything with it. Armstrong wanted to emphasize that the equipment and software programs for the GISG courses are very expensive, and Mesa has provided all of the funding. She stated that the National Science Foundation provides the funding for salaries, development and a portion of the money goes to SDSU and San Diego City Schools. Lombardi stated that City College needs to continue the discussion on GISG and would welcome further discussions with Mesa College.

Lombardi asked the Articulation Officers why Psychology 245 (PSYC) and Sociology 201 (SOCO) are listed under District GE but not under the CSU GE. Short recalled that those courses had been approved some time ago for CSU GE

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

and they just noticed that they had not been submitted for District GE. Lombardi asked if the same was true for Child Development 103 (CHIL). Short confirmed that PSYC 245, SOCO 201 and CHIL 103 were approved for CSU GE and now needed to be approved for District GE.

Van Houten stated that she did not believe that Psychology 245 was selected for CSU GE, only for District GE and IGETC. Short suggested if the Council was happy with PSYC 245 as a GE course, would they also give the Articulation Officers permission to submit for anything they forgot to include in the past. They will check on it and then submit it with the next cycle.

*Motion: Short requested a second friendly amendment that Sociology 223 be added to the multicultural column, and if Biology 111 does not get approved for CSU GE and IGETC then we would not list it for District GE. Further more, Psychology 245 can be proposed for CSU GE. The Council accepted Short's second friendly amendment to the motion to approve all courses for General Education/Transferability with the exception of the Manufacturing Engineering Technology courses at this time. Here again, pending this recommendation is approved at City College. That is, the MFET courses will be submitted if City College recommends them for submission. Short's first friendly amendment was to submit the MFET courses for UC Transfer once the courses are researched and recommended by City College for submission.*

### III. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. 2007-2008 CIC Calendar

Short stated that the February 22, 2008, Miramar CRC meeting was not correct and should be removed from the calendar.

*Motion to approve the Curriculum Approval Calendar for 2007-2008 Academic Year as amended. M/S/P (Gustin/Foster)*

#### B. Labels for Online Courses

Short asked for clarification regarding hybrid courses and inquired about a rumor that they are being discontinued. Ingle clarified that the use of the label "hybrid" will no longer be applicable in the schedule and catalog, but that the hybrid modality will still be used by faculty in developing courses.

Van Houten underscored the fact that at the April 26<sup>th</sup> CIC meeting, language terminology for web-based courses would be taken to the Academic Senates for approval before an official change was made. Lombardi stated that the City College Academic Senate had yet to meet. Armstrong affirmed that she could not see the need for full consultation from the Academic Senates and she does not think it is a shared governance matter. Short asked for clarification that the labels being used are "fully online" and "partially online" to which the Council responded yes. Paula Gustin conveyed that she has stressed to faculty and people in general that instructors are paid to be in class and if they are not in their classroom, then they need to have approval for that. Van Houten explained that the hybrid courses now considered partially online. She stated that in the class

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

schedule, the courses will be designated as partially online, but in ISIS the courses would be marked appropriately as hybrid.

Ingle informed Gustin that the issue she raised is being discussed nationally. He explained that people want to make use of the physical brick and mortar building facilities in a more cost effective manner, and if a course is going to be partially online at a whim, as opposed to structured during pre-determined time there are many “tradeoffs” in classroom utilization practices. This can result in more creative ways to use building facilities when courses are not meeting in a building, but online.

Lombardi asked for further clarification from the April 26<sup>th</sup> CIC minutes stating that the Council decided that “fully online” and “partially online” be the labels for online courses. On page 5 of the April 26, 2007 meeting, the minutes stated that Andrea Henne recommended that the label “fully online” not be used and to use “online” and “partially online”. She asked which labels have been agreed upon so she can accurately inform the Academic Senate. Ingle confirmed that the labels agreed upon at the last CIC meeting are “fully online” and “partially online” and asked that the minutes be consistent as well as the communication going out to the Academic Senates as they review the recommendation.

### IV. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) and Course Outlines

Gustin wanted to discuss how the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) will affect curriculum writing. She explained that LDTP uses descriptors to identify if a course being submitted meets all of the criteria for the LDTP. Mesa has used the LDTP descriptors in the revision of two accounting courses in order to keep them in line with SDSU’s accounting courses (SDSU is revising their accounting courses to match the LDTP descriptors).

Gustin explained that using the descriptors can result in 18 to 20 Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) in the course which is a departure from how faculty have been trained to write SLOs (no more than 5 to 10) for the past 10 years. She is concerned that if more courses are to be revised to meet the LDTP descriptors, then there is going to be a major shift in curriculum development and a growth in course SLOs that might become unwieldy.

Another concern that was raised was how revising curriculum to meet LDTP standards effect other articulation procedures for the course.

Murphy also pointed out that the outline of topics, based on LDTP standards is very minimal and does not reflect the integrated outline format adopted by the District. She stated that the outline of topics content is very vague and asked the Council if they knew why. Short explained that they were copied word for word from the CSU descriptor.

Ingle asked Gustin if she had any recommendations for the Council to take action. Gustin thinks the accounting courses should be addressed and the outline of topics

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

be reinstated. Armstrong stated that the business major is the largest major in the District that transfers to SDSU. She continued there are not many students taking business courses, but they do take accounting, and as a result maintaining articulation is absolutely imperative. Armstrong is concerned with the LDTP way of writing a course and is afraid it may counter what the accreditation commission is now telling the District about accountability. Ingle volunteered to raise the issue with Dr. Nancy Marlin, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at SDSU, as an evolving area of concern in the LDTP process.

Lombardi informed the Council that City's Radio and Television Department has been working closely with SDSU's to revise their program so it will meet the requirements. She said that their SLOs are being matched more closely to the descriptors. Castaneda thinks that is partly because City faculty were on the committee that made the CSU descriptors for LDTP.

As Articulation Officers, Short explained that they raised all of these concerns at the statewide conference, and they had a representative from the UC system there as well. He continued that at the latest plenary session a resolution was passed by the statewide Academic Senate expressing all of these concerns about LDTP and asking the CSU system to partner with the CCC system to help work out the details. Short confirmed that the concerns the District has raised are also statewide concerns. Short predicted that many colleges will pull back the courses they have already proposed for LDTP or not propose them in the future.

Lombardi is concerned that these changes may endanger the ability of students to more routinely transfer to four year institutions and the District needs to be warned ahead of time if curriculum changes. Short clarified that the CSU system is telling the District that it is a completely different method of articulation that will not affect any local articulation. He stated that the District will not be submitting the accounting courses for LDTP right now, but SDSU told the District that they are in the process of changing their courses. Therefore, the District would have to change the accounting courses to match SDSU's. The District would not lose articulation, unless other colleges start changing their courses to meet LDTP. Parker did not think that SDSU has changed any courses as of yet. Ingle restated that he would raise the issues with Nancy Marlin when he next meets with her in June.

Parker mentioned to the Council that this summer there is supposed to be discussion between community colleges and the CSU faculty. She stated that as soon as there is more information on who is supposed to participate, she will inform the Council.

Murphy stated that she was looking at the CIC Resolved Actions List and noticed that in October 26, 2006, the Council voted to change the phrase "Student Learning Outcomes" to "Student Learning Objectives" in the course outline. She asked if that could be completed. Van Houten stated that it would be completed.

*Action: Update course outline to read "Student Learning Objectives".*

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

### B. Curriculum Walked In

Ingle invited Murphy to present Miramar College's walked-in curriculum to the Council.

#### *Administration of Justice 167, Report Writing*

Murphy informed the Council that the course is a revision with distance education delivery modality now being added. Miramar would like to offer the course via distance education in the fall 2007 semester and is seeking approval.

Ingle asked Murphy if the course was fully online or partially online. She replied that it seemed to be fully online.

Armstrong interjected that the Mesa Curriculum Committee had an extensive discussion regarding distance education approval at their last meeting. She informed the Council that the committee mostly agreed that when distance education is approved, it is for any mode of distance education, because the course is being approved, not a particular section. She explained that she and Gustin will be reviewing the CurricUNET requirements for distance education and bring forward suggestions for revised wording because it is not clear. Armstrong advised that the Council was not approving the course as hybrid, online or fully online, but approving it to be taught online. She stated that once the Council approves the course to be taught online, it could be taught in any mode online. Armstrong explained that the district has to have an approval that is specific enough to meet Title 5 requirements, but not so specific that the approval is tied to an individual offering.

*Motion to approve Administration of Justice 167 for Miramar College.*

M/S/P (Short/Gustin)

Ingle invited Gustin to present Mesa College's walked-in curriculum to the Council.

#### *Anthropology 265B, Introduction to Medical Anthropology*

Gustin explained that she wanted to bring this course to the Council's attention and that it did not have to be approved at this meeting. She stated that the course is an experimental course for fall 2007.

Gustin clarified that the course is an introduction to medical anthropology that covers different cultures, their approach to disease and the implications of disease in their specific culture. She stated that the proposal for the permanent course has been submitted in CurricUNET, which will be Anthropology 205. Gustin continued saying that they would like to see the enrollment numbers for fall and continue with placement of the permanent course in the catalog.

Gustin explained that the permanent Anthropology 205 course would not be active until fall 2008, because they would like to have the articulation in place once it is finally offered and in the printed schedule. Gustin asked Parker if she had any comments on the course and articulation. Parker stated that several

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

universities we articulate with already offer the course. Lombardi asked Gustin if the course would have a prerequisite and Gustin replied that it only has an advisory. Armstrong affirmed this is a good course to further global awareness as well as the allied health programs.

Gustin affirmed the course has gone through tech review and has been passed by Mesa's CRC and they are in the process of launching it. Armstrong interjected that the course is needed for the fall semester schedule. Ingle stated that the course would need to be approved at this meeting if the intention is indeed to add it to the fall semester schedule. Gustin conveyed that the course has been in development for about a year. She continued that there is an urgency to move the course along because originally there was a miscommunication that it was being offered as an honors course. As a result, the originator did not know that the course had to be submitted into CurricUNET. She said that it was just recently that the originators realized that the course had to be submitted to CurricUNET.

Murphy added that if the course is to be numbered 205, there should be a prerequisite for science on the course. Parker will check on the prerequisites at the university level and report her findings to the CIC at the next meeting.

*Motion to approve Anthropology 265B pending research of the prerequisite requirements for Mesa College. M/S/P (Lombardi/ Murphy)*

### *Biology 130, Human Heredity*

Gustin explained to the Council that the course is also being proposed for distance education for the fall semester, 2007.

*Motion to approve Biology 130 for Mesa College. M/S/P (Foster/Lombardi)*

- C. Hybrid Courses  
Topic was covered under Old Business.

## V. STANDING REPORTS

- A. Curriculum Updating Project  
No report.

- B. CurricUNET Steering Committee  
Van Houten explained that the Steering Committee is revising the procedure to split apart the experimental and special topics courses and is close to completing the revision. She thinks it should be complete by the end of next week's meeting. Short expressed his appreciation for the committee's work on revising the procedure. Van Houten conveyed that the program changes are on the test site for review and are moving forward to implement that change for the fall semester. She stated the committee is also revising the curriculum report to clearly reflect these changes.

- C. Student Services Council  
No report.

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

## D. State Academic Senate

Roma Weaver gave the Council handouts for information on the 2007 ASCCC Curriculum Institute Program. She informed the Council that there were about 90 people registered so far. Weaver explained that the District would not pay for employees to attend the program if they were not presenting.

## E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)

No report.

## F. Articulation Officers

Short gave the Council a handout on the definitions and processes for inter-institutional agreements. He explained about two months ago at a District Articulation Council (DAC) meeting the question of MOU proposal procedures was raised. The example given was a proposal that stated it was a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), but it really was just information about transferring. He stated that DAC just wanted to provide the correct definitions to the Council for anyone who may be interested in the distinctions between these two practices and how everyone in the District has agreed to handle them. Armstrong added that under the definition for MOU it should state that it culminates in the signature of the College President or the Chancellor.

## VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The May 24th CIC meeting will be held at City in room B-104.

B. Handouts:

1. Today's CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summary
4. District and Transfer General Education Pattern List
5. CIC Calendar for 2007-2008
6. Curriculum Updating Project
7. Definition and Process for Inter-Instructional Agreements
8. CIC Action Lists

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

*Ingle adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m. in time for individuals to attend the Board of Trustees meeting.*