

San Diego Community College District

Curriculum and Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of December 10, 2009
2:00 PM—District Office, Room 110

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby
Benard, Mary
Ellison, Brian
Flor, Shirley
Hess, Shelly
Igou, Daniel
Neault, Lynn
Parker, Juliette
Short, Duane

Weaver, Roma
Werle, Kathy

Articulation Officer—City College
Vice President, Instruction—City College
Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (*Ex Officio*)
Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Crispen, Nancy
Lee, Otto
Matthew, Esther
McGrath, Tim

Academic Senate Representative—City College
Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning—District Office
Academic Senate Representative—Continuing Education
Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College

STAFF:

Ficken-Davis, Amanda
Van Houten, Laurie

Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
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 2:06p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

- A. Approval of: November 12, 2009 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

M/S/P (*Andersen/Werle*)

- B. Approval of: December 10, 2009 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:

Old Business, Item CHIL 133

Old Business, Item AMSL 276

The agenda was approved as amended.

M/S/P (*Werle/Benard*)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

- A. Approval of Curriculum

The curriculum was approved by consent.

M/S/P (*Andersen/Werle*)

- B. Approval of Program Changes

The programs were approved by consent.

M/S/P (*Andersen/Werle*)

- 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. Course Description

Shelly Hess reminded that Council that at the last meeting, the recommendation to the Council was to revise the outline guide for curriculum to read “Include general statement that identifies the target audience, e.g. students who would benefit from taking this course.”

Libby Andersen asked how this statement is different from what is currently in place. Hess replied that the outline currently lists recommends listing a target audience such as UC, CSU, etc. This statement is more general so it will apply to curriculum active at all 3 colleges.

Andersen asked if this would take care of the issues discussed by the articulation officers, specifically the language in the Political Science 102 course description; will this change remove that language? Hess responded that would be the next step; this action item is to clarify the guidelines to assist the faculty and the curriculum chairs.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Duane Short remarked that this will allow the curriculum committees more discretion in deciding what kinds of statements are appropriate. Hess clarified this step is just to clean up the outline guide; further steps will be discussed later. Juliette Parker added this cleans up the definition of target audience to coincide with current practice.

Action: The San Diego Community College District Associate Degree Credit Course Outline Guide will be revised to include a more general statement about the target audience, "Include general statement that identifies the target audience, e.g. students who would benefit from taking this course."

M/S/P (Short/Benard)

Andersen asked if the next steps should be discussed now. Hess responded that they will require another new business item and should be discussed later.

B. CB 21 Recoding

Hess gave the Council an update on the CB21 recoding. The state Chancellor's Office recently held 3 webinars on the issue, and will be sending out their final changes and further clarification soon. As soon as Instructional Services receives this, we will be able to work with the faculty and school deans to finalize the recoding, as well as any TOP code changes that may be required.

C. FUTR 101

Andersen reminded the Council that at the 11/12/09 CIC they had approved the District and Transfer General Education Patterns list. At the time, they approved Futures Studies 101 for CSUGE area C2 and IGETC area 3B. These areas are under Humanities; after discussion with the faculty, it was determined that the course should be under the interdisciplinary requirement. These courses have not yet been submitted; the deadline to do so is 12/11/09 (the day after the current CIC meeting). Andersen moved to change the approval of FUTR 101 from CSUGE area C2 to area D7 and IGETC area 3B to area 4G.

Action: The District and Transfer General Education Patterns list was amended to approve Futures Studies 101 for CSUGE area D7 and IGETC area 4G.

M/S/P (Andersen/Short)

Juliette Parker moved to amend the agenda to include Old Business Item PHIL 105.

The agenda was approved as amended.

M/S/P (Benard/Short)

D. CHIL 133

Shirley Flor reminded the Council that as part of the curriculum at the 11/12/09 CIC meeting they had approved CHIL 133 for all 3 colleges. Following this meeting, Flor learned from the faculty at Mesa College that they do not want to activate the course at this time, as it is intended to replace CHIL 131.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Action: The proposal for Child Development 133 was revised to remove Mesa from course activation.
M/S/P (Andersen/Parker)

E. PHIL 105

Parker stated the District and Transfer General Education Patterns list approved at the 11/12/09, included submission of Philosophy 105 to IGETC for approval under area 3B by City College. Mesa would like to revise the list to allow submission of this course by Mesa College as well to ensure alignment.

Action: The District and Transfer General Education Patterns list was amended to approve submitting Philosophy 105 for IGETC area 3B by Mesa College.

M/S/P (Short/ Andersen)

F. AMSL 276

Lynn Neault informed the Council that she had received a request from a faculty member to override the prerequisite of AMSL 108 for course AMSL 276. AMSL 108 has not been offered since 2002, making it impossible for most students to have completed the prerequisite. The department plans to offer the course in 2010 or 2011, but in the mean time the current process requires manually overriding the prerequisite for each student taking the course. Neault feels that there should be a process in place to allow Student Services to administratively remove a prerequisite requirement from a course if the prerequisite has not been offered in several years. It should not be legal to require students to take the prerequisite, and it certainly isn't right to block enrollment for a class that is not available to students. Neault asked if, rather than waiting for this to go to the curriculum revision process, if there can be an administrative process put in place to deal with courses that include prerequisites that haven't been offered in several years. Neault added that as a business practice, it does not seem legal to include the restriction of a course that essentially doesn't exist.

Short stated the only reason a prerequisite can be required is if students cannot succeed without it; if they can't take the prerequisite because it's not available, then that demonstrates the prerequisite is invalid.

Kathleen Werle agreed that Short's presumption is correct; and questioned what can be done about it.

Neault clarified that she is bringing this issue to the Council because she respects that prerequisites are the purview of the faculty; however, when they become an administrative problem, she feels there should be an administrative prerogative to do something about it to help students enroll.

Hess summarized what she believes are two separate discussions; first, Neault's question of what can be done about the situation at hand and second, Short's point that faculty should reevaluate whether this prerequisite meets the criteria.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Andersen asked if there are numbers showing whether students without the prerequisite are passing the class.

Neault explained that because the class has not been offered in six years, the faculty are asking for a blanket override; rather than manually overriding each student, or requiring each student to petition the prerequisite, Neault is arguing the administratively, there should be a way to remove this prerequisite. She is talking about the registration issue, not the instructional issue. Whether they are passing or not is irrelevant, as the prerequisite doesn't exist.

Andersen feels this could set a dangerous precedent; if students are petitioning to override the prerequisite, that's one thing. She does not like that we are discussing a process to set aside a prerequisite without a proper review.

Brian Ellison reiterated that there are two separate issues; from his perspective, by not offering the prerequisite the department has by default set it aside and deemed it irrelevant from a curricular perspective. Further, there is a potential legal liability. What he feels Neault is asking for is the blessing of the Council to move forward; from a managerial perspective, this makes sense. The curricular issue will need to be decided at some point in the future, but the current issue is one of access.

Werle stated that her understanding that the request to enroll students is coming from the department chair; if that does not happen, that means no students can be enrolled in the class.

Neault restated that she is simply asking to take the registration block off. She is not making a judgment about the value of the prerequisite and is not trying to get rid of it entirely, simply that there should not be a block to students of a prerequisite they cannot get.

Benard asked if a prerequisite block is removed when the course is not offered, will it be put back in class when the department resumes offering the course. Hess responded that it would.

Parker recommended creating a process so that if a course is not offered within a certain number of semesters, it can be removed from prerequisite status for enrollment purposes. Hess agreed that it is a great idea, but should be discussed later as part of the procedures subcommittee.

The Council continued to discuss the curricular issue of the prerequisite. Hess responded that this is a separate issue from the matter at hand, and should be discussed outside of this meeting and brought back for resolution at a later date.

Andersen recommended requiring a test of all students waiving the prerequisite, possibly given the first day of class. Hess reiterated that any change to the procedure would need to be discussed at a procedure subcommittee meeting; these kinds of changes cannot just be added by the Council.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Short summarized that the issue at hand is not about prerequisites, but rather enforcement of them within the registration procedure. As such, it is not a decision that should be made by CIC, but rather one that should be referred to the Student Services Council. While it disturbs him that there is a process in place to subvert the curriculum process, he understands it is too late to do anything about it now, and so Neault should decide.

Neault responded that she is happy to make a decision. What she is trying to say is that she respects the curriculum process and the role of the Council; she just wants to make sure that she is able to act in the best interest of the students while the curriculum issues are being addressed.

After further discussion, Ellison offered a motion to remand the matter at hand (AMSL 276) back to the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Services for consideration and resolution, with the curricular piece to be discussed further by the faculty. This is a one time, non precedent setting case. Andersen amended the motion to include that we encourage the AMSL coordinator at Mesa to get on this a.s.a.p.

Action: The matter at hand (AMSL 276) was remanded back to the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Services for consideration and resolution). The AMSL department chair is encouraged to follow up as soon as possible.

M/S/P (Ellison/Benard)

7 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

Neault stated the prerequisite will temporarily be changed to an advisory.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Joint SSC Meeting/Retreat

Hess asked the Council if anyone had agenda items for a joint Student Services Council/Curriculum and Instructional Council meeting. When no one presented items, she recommended that the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services get together and create an agenda for a joint retreat to be held later in the spring. She informed the Council there would be no joint meeting as scheduled in February, but one would be scheduled later on if necessary.

B. Spring Board of Trustee Meetings

Hess gave this update as part of the curriculum planning process. She referred the Council to handout # 5, the Spring 2010 Curriculum Approval Calendar. This is an update of the calendar that is on the Instructional Services website. Hess called attention to the fact that curriculum items approved by CIC at the March 11, March 25, and April 8 meetings that require Board of Trustees approval will not go until the April 29 Board meeting.

C. Student Services Policies

Hess informed the Council that the Student Services Council will be sending policies to the Board for approval in January. Instructional Services will send them to the Council so they are aware of the policy changes. Neault added that

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

the big change will be the repetition and withdrawal policy, as discussed at previous joint meetings. Hess concluded that a subcommittee will be meeting in the Spring to review our policy and procedures changes.

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

No report.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Laurie Van Houten reported that the Steering Committee will be meeting on 12/11/09 to discuss issues and training materials.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

Neault reported that at the last Student Services Council meeting, their revised policies were reviewed. They are in the process of planning a counseling retreat. Additionally, they are dealing with the impact of the budget cuts on support services.

Parker asked if it was true that there is a discussion about not having assessment. Neault responded there is a new law that allows us to use EAP results; we are currently working to incorporate that into the process. It has also been proposed that the district use UC and CSU SAT levels to clear prerequisites for English 101 and Math 96. Overall, we are look to expand the numbers of ways we have available to place people, not get rid of assessment. These are not placement tests; they can only clear all prerequisites or not.

Neault continued that the district will be asking for SAT results and will be entering them into the system in a similar way to transcripts. The policy still must be written, but is planned for Fall. She will be bringing it to the Council for their review.

D. State Academic Senate

No report.

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

Werle informed the Council that there are several big threats looming that the District will need to take a stance on. The first is funding for physical education. State Chancellor Jack Scott has stated that community colleges are competing with local fitness centers. The colleges are being told that they need to fix the situation, but with little guidance; we do not know what the legislature will do. We are currently trying to get a list of the kinds of changes they would like us to make so that we know what direction to go in. In the last budget cycle, there was a threat to fund PE at the noncredit rate, but at the time the PE faculty protested; their argument was that they had to have the same credentials as other professors. They won that battle, but fear that there will be more down the road as the budget

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

situation deteriorates. There is a lot of tension at Miramar, where a brand new fitness center has just been opened.

Hess added that when the noncredit discussion first came up, she asked the state to define physical education. They do not have one, which will cause further issues.

Andersen told the Council that during previous rounds of cuts, the district had eliminated borderline courses (such as surfing and SCUBA diving), and worked to revise the course outlines to include things like “cardiovascular” “physical strength” and “testing and assessment” to make sure the courses gave students lifelong skills. Werle is perfectly confident that meet all current standards; unfortunately that does not mitigate the theory that this is a looming threat.

Werle is also concerned about accreditation and the SLOAC cycle. She would like to create a “limbo” category for courses that the colleges don’t want to deactivate, but that they don’t want to show as current courses in the catalog. She is concerned about the low percentage of courses that are being assessed, and so wants to eliminate the total number of courses, but is concerned about the effect it could have on articulation.

Hess invited Short to share the discussion the articulation officers had about this at DAC. Short feels a limbo category could help the SLO issue, and could help when reactivating the courses to not have to go through the whole CurricUNET process, but once courses are out of the catalog they are eliminated for articulation purposes anyway.

Ellison feels that while this is essentially a binary issue of active or not, many colleges have a middle ground. What he is concerned about is the broader issue that Werle addressed. Continuing Education is following the issue closely. The arguments that have been brought up here are ones that have previously held weight with this same legislature, but the tenor has shifted from an academic realm to a political realm. With that shift, the state legislature is looking at these classes in a very different way that puts us at risk. He feels this is an opportunity for all four district institutions to work together to find ways to leverage curriculum and think about how things mesh. By working together, we can find ways to get through this crisis without having to decimate programs.

Benard suggested looking at the courses not being offered at the campus level to identify what courses are not likely to be offered at this time and find ways to keep them out of the SLO assessment cycle.

F. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Andersen announced that the articulation officers will be submitting courses for CSUGE and IGETC approval this week.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Reminder—Due to mandatory furloughs, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office may take longer than it traditionally has to approve

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

- programs. It is strongly recommended that you submit all new programs for the 2010-2011 catalog to CIC for approval as soon as possible.
- B. Summer 2010 class schedules will not be mailed to the local community; printed schedules will be available on campus.
- C. Handouts:
1. December 10, 2009 CIC Meeting Agenda
 2. Draft Minutes from the November 12, 2009 CIC meeting
 3. Curriculum Summary
 4. Course Description Handout
 5. Spring 2010 Curriculum Approval Calendar
 6. Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.