

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of October 22, 2009
2:00 PM—District Office, Room 245

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer—City College
Bergland, Yvonne	Dean, Instructional—Mesa College (proxy for Tim McGrath)
Ellison, Brian	Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Erreca, Lori	Dean, Behavioral & Social Sciences and Consumer & Family Studies, City (proxy for Mary Benard)
Flor, Shirley	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Igou, Daniel	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning— District Office
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

ABSENT:

Benard, Mary	Vice President, Instruction—City College
Matthew, Esther	Academic Senate Representative —Continuing Education
McGrath, Tim	Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
Werle, Kathy	Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

STAFF:

Ficken-Davis, Amanda	Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Van Houten, Laurie	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office

GUESTS:

Henne, Andrea	Dean, Online and Distributed Learning—District Office
---------------	-------------------------------------------------------

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:04p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: October 8, 2009 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended. M/S/P (Short/Andersen)

Brian Ellison arrived at 2:05p.m.

B. Approval of: October 22, 2009 Agenda

The agenda was approved. M/S/P (Andersen/Erreca)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

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

B. Approval of Program Changes

No Programs.

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discipline Deans List Update

Shelly Hess informed the Council that the District Office of Instructional Services is working to finalize the updated list of discipline deans. It will need to go back to the Vice Presidents of Instruction one last time; it should be ready for the next CIC meeting.

Amanda Ficken-Davis added that the list now includes all subject areas that have at least one active course.

Libby Andersen asked how City's new interdisciplinary subjects were assigned, as they often fell under multiple subject areas and they are difficult to designate in CurricUNET. Ficken-Davis responded that the college organization chart was consulted to determine who the subject area deans were; they were then assigned as discipline dean.

Hess added the issue of designating interdisciplinary subjects in CurricUNET has been brought to her attention. Otto Lee will be discussing with the CPIs how to add them to CurricUNET.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Course Description

Hess referred the Council to handout 4, Course Description Clarification. She stated the issue at hand involves clarification within the course description of the target audience of the course. As the handout indicated, in 2004, CIC developed the *“San Diego Community College District Associate Degree Credit Course Outline Guide”* which includes requirements for the catalog course description. She has received several questions about the target audience statement and the need to make it clearer.

Andersen clarified the history; in 1997, the college curriculum chairs met to establish the integrated outline standard; in 2004, the State Academic Senate came out with its recommendations, which were integrated into our current guide.

Hess stated the ultimate recommendation is to clarify the “target audience” in the course description and update the aforementioned guide.

Andersen added this issue has been discussed in DAC; while reviewing the course description, the articulation officers have noticed some target audience statements reflect the status and intention of the course at its origination college. Once a course has been activated by all three colleges, the statement is not always applicable. The statement should be generic and broad enough to define the student who should take the course. If it is too specific (for example, course descriptions that include statements about the American Institutions requirement), it should be removed to make sure that students are looking at the accurate, updated chart to determine this information.

Shirley Flor noticed many course proposals include target audience statements that imply the course is for specific majors, although it may actually be a general education course.

Duane Short added he has seen the same thing. Some courses are in fact intended solely for major students (i.e. FIPT), but many are intended to be general education.

Hess referred the Council to the examples on the handout. These are intended to be broader to clarify for students whether they should take this course. What she is asking for is clarification on the target audience requirement.

Short voiced his concern that many courses that state they are “intended for majors” can be deceptive. For example, UCSD does not articulate any of our Psychology courses. A psychology major who reads in the course description the course is intended for majors and feels compelled to take it may be taking more courses than necessary, and would likely get upset when they transfer and find the course does not transfer. He asked if a target audience statement is needed.

Laurie Van Houten reiterated the integrated outline recommendation of the State Academic Senate to include target audience statements.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Short pointed out this District is unique; unlike most colleges, our curriculum is completely aligned, which complicates target statements. He referred the Council to the transfer statements that appear at the end of each course description. He stated this information is consistent across colleges, and should stay.

Andersen pointed out the difference in “majors” between the associate and baccalaureate level. Associate students should be focusing on general education. As it is often written in the catalog, if a course is designed for a specific major and a student is not pursuing that major he or she may not take the course, even if in reality the course is a general education subject in which the student is interested. A target audience statement for American Politics 102 might be reference “a student with an interest in American politics” rather than “a political science major.” She feels for most courses, the target audience should be a broad statement.

Yvonne Bergland pointed out this broad statement may be difficult for some specialty disciplines such as Allied Health. Andersen responded those disciplines can be more specific.

Parker recommended changing the terminology; for example, using “transfer students” or students who “may” major instead of “major students”. There is a certain core of courses that will transfer everywhere, such as introductory history courses.

Hess stated she had heard several recommendations discussed by the Council. Specifically, eliminating the target audience statement completely or broadening the statement.

Bergland argued to keep the statement in some cases; there are areas where students need the guidance it provides.

Short recommended leaving it to the technical and curriculum committees to establish which courses need the clarification. Currently, all courses require it, sometimes leading to hastily created statements that are not necessarily accurate. He asked that the requirement for the statement be changed to be more permissive.

Hess vowed to integrate the discussion into the form, to be brought back to the Council for future discussion; in the meantime, she asked the Council to bring this discussion to their curriculum committees.

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Van Houten informed the Council that the number of courses left to be integrated is at 149.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Van Houten stated she had received an email about a representative from Mesa College joining the committee. Andersen added she is expecting a volunteer from City to be added soon.

Roma Weaver stated she would attend the committee meetings on behalf of Continuing Education.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

Andersen reported the plenary session will be held November 11-13. Of particular note is Assembly Bill 440, which was passed and then had its approval pulled when it was pointed out that it would be the first time something having to do with an educational degree would be legislated.

E. Chief Instructional Officers (Benard, Ellison, Lee, McGrath, Werle)

No report.

F. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Short reported the articulation officers had received word they would be allowed to submit the Economics courses at the last LDTP submission, due by December 11, 2009.

Andersen asked Flor why the courses were on hold at Mesa. Flor responded there were some formatting changes that needed to be made. Andersen responded she would have City start to review the courses, as the deadline was approaching.

Hess reminded the Council there would only be one meeting in November, so they should bring these courses soon.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Lee complimented the colleges on fast tracking the new ARRA grant courses.

B. Handouts:

1. October 22, 2009 CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from the October 8, 2009 CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summary
4. Course Description Handout
5. Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.