APPROVED

Joint CIC/SSC Meeting of September 25, 2008 1:00 PM–District Office 245

MINUTES

PRESENT: Andersen, Libby E

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer—City College
Benard, Mary	Acting Vice President, Instruction—City College
Bergland, Yvonne	Dean, Instructional—Mesa College
Craft, William	Acting Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Flor, Shirley	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Fong, Peter	Vice President, Student Services—Miramar College
Ellison, Brian	Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Hiel, Edwin	Academic Senate Representative—City College
Hosley, Ticey	Academic Senate Representative—Miramar College
Kavalier, Barbara	Vice President, Student Services—Mesa College
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning— District Office
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair—City College
Murphy, Carol	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar
	College
Vincent, Bill	Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
White, Peter	Vice President, Student Services—City College
ABSENT:	
Marrujo, Guillermo	Academic Senate Representative — Mesa College
Matthew, Esther	Academic Senate Representative — Continuing Education
<u>STAFF</u> :	
Ficken, Amanda	Acting Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District
	Office
VanHouten, Laurie	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
GUEST .	

GUEST:

Elizabeth Castaneda

Curriculum Support—City College and Mesa College

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 1:03p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: February 21, 2008 Minutes *The minutes were approved.*

M/S/P (Ellison/White)

B. Approval of: September 25, 2008 Agenda *The agenda was approved.* M/S

M/S/P (*Craft/Bergland*)

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Approval of Curriculum (CBTE 143/152)

William Craft announced that Mesa had withdrawn its objection to the passage of these courses upon realizing that Mesa did not have to deactivate any courses at this time.

The courses were approved by consent.

M/S/P (Short/Craft)

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Title 5 Revisions

Lynn Neault announced to the Council that there were recent permissive changes to Title 5 language regarding repetition and withdrawal. She stressed that the District is currently in compliance with Title 5 standards, but wanted to get a sense of whether the Council supported changing policy to take advantage of these changes. Neault gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Council highlighting how the interaction between withdrawal Ws and repetitions could change under the new provisions. The presentation included information about specific revisions in regards to repetition to alleviate substandard work, repetition in repeatable courses, repetition for significant lapse of time, repetition for extenuating circumstances, and withdrawal limitations (including military withdrawal and withdrawal due to discrimination or retaliation). There were numerous examples highlighting what the effect of each policy change would be on students, and a list of the pros and cons of each change. There was also a summary of each policy decision that Neault was asking the Council to make. Neault clarified that the Council did not need to worry about the various funding implications that any change in current policy would bring, but rather focus on whether they feel that the changes would help students.

The Council reviewed the examples, and discussed the implications of changing each policy.

Neault stated that she fought several of these changes at the state level, but it was too late in the process. The people who created these changes believe that the negative impacts do not occur that frequently; those of us who work with students know otherwise.

Following the presentation, the Council reviewed each of the 6 policy decisions that need to be made. Neault stressed that many of the changes would require extensive coding and testing and would not be available until at least Spring 2010.

The first decision made was regarding repetition to alleviate substandard work and repetition in repeatable courses. The Council discussed the District's current policy, which is to allow one repetition to alleviate substandard work. It was resolved that the District would maintain its current policy while monitoring other Districts that do implement changes. At a later date, the Council will review the results other Districts have seen and reevaluate whether to change our policies.

Action: The Council resolved not to change District policies at this time, but to monitor other colleges' results and reevaluate at a later date. M/S/P (White/Short)

The Council then discussed the Title 5 changes regarding withdrawal due to discrimination. Neault thinks that the college vice presidents should know about this provision so that they can deal with it if it starts becoming an issue. The Council discussed their concern that these grievances could build up against specific teachers and that certain subjects might see a disproportionate number of complaints filed. The district's policy is published in all three catalogs. She clarified that though the new language was not intended to be read as it is written, it still must be followed. She clarified that to be a valid challenge, the student file a formal complaint and must have withdrawn from the class (grade grievances are not covered under this change). She hopes to see these very infrequently, but wants the administration to be aware that this issue might come up.

The next decision made was regarding a Significant Lapse of Time policy. Duane Short stated that there was an interest in creating a recency prerequisite for certain courses. White stated recency on prerequisites is already permissible according to District policy. Neault pointed out that repetition due to recency is currently handled by petition; if students feel that they need to retake a course to move on to the next course or to improve their skills and knowledge, they talk to a counselor. We have not claimed funding for these students in the past. Now, Title 5 has changed to allow us to claim funding; however, we can no longer do it student by student as we have in the past, we must have a defined process and publish it in the catalog. The policy, including the recency of the prerequisite, must be the same for all students. For example, we cannot require students to retake a course as a prerequisite for other courses, but allow the original course satisfy the degree requirements if they don't meet that same time criteria. Peter White clarified that in the absence of a District policy and in light of the Title 5 changes, he cannot currently approve any petitions to retake prerequisites based on time. Neault confirmed this.

The Council discussed the urgency of creating a policy through official means. Neault stated that she would consider this issue, and bring back a written policy for the Council's review. In the meantime, the colleges can continue with their current policy, as we do not request funding from the state. In the meantime, she wants to encourage the Curriculum Instructional Council to consider the issue as soon as possible.

After discussion, the Council decided not to create a withdrawal due to extenuating circumstances or withdrawal limitation policy at this time (including military withdrawal), as they feel there are other options available to students.