

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Approved

Meeting of September 9, 2010
2:00 PM—District Office,
Room 245

Minutes

PRESENT:

Benard, Mary	Vice President, Instruction—City College
Cheung, Cecilia	Academic Senate Representative—City College (proxy for Libby Andersen)
Ellison, Brian	Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning— District Office
Igou, Daniel	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair —City College
McGrath, Tim	Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Parsons, Toni	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Werle, Kathy	Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer—City College
Matthew, Esther	Academic Senate Representative —Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
Van Houten, Laurie	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office

STAFF:

Ficken-Davis, Amanda	Senior Secretary, 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 2:02 p.m.

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Shelly Hess welcomed the Council to a new school year. Since there were new people, she asked that everyone go around the world and introduce themselves.

II. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: May 13, 2010 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended. M/S/P (Werle/Igou)

Mary Benard arrived at 2:06 p.m.

B. Approval of: September 9, 2010 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:

Architecture 226, Architectural Theory

Architecture 230, Sustainability in the Built Environment

Computer Information Science 150, Introduction to Computer and Information Sciences

Philosophy 102B, Introduction to Philosophy: Values

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

III. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

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

B. Approval of Program Changes

The programs were approved by consent. M/S/P (Benard/Igou)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Policy and Procedure Update (Information)

Shelly Hess gave the Council an update on the policies currently under review by the CIC Policies and Procedures Subcommittee. These policies will be brought to CIC for review and approval before being forwarded to the District Governance Council and the Board of Trustees.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Jan Lombardi inquired as to who is on the committee. Hess responded it is a representative from each college and Continuing Education; David Fierro from City, Shirley Flor from Mesa, Duane Short from Miramar and Roma Weaver from Continuing Education. She continued that the subcommittee brings the policies to CIC for recommendations and vetting. Upon approval it is forwarded to DGC and then the Board. At DGC it is given to the Academic Senate Presidents to take back to their campus constituents. Lombardi asked what the approval process is for procedures. Hess responded that it will be the subject of the first procedure.

B. Assigning Courses to Disciplines (Action)

Hess informed the Council of the need to formalize a process for assigning courses to disciplines. This issue was raised at the Curriculum Institute held over the summer and attended by many representatives of the District. According to Title 5, Section 53200, the faculty (via local Academic Senates) are responsible for placing courses in disciplines. Specifically, each course is required to be assigned to one or more disciplines that are identified in the Statewide Academic Senate/CCCCO approved "Disciplines List."

The District currently has no formal process. Hess urged the committee to develop a process for selecting and recording this information. There is a field for this information in CurricUNET; it will become a required field for all course proposals (except deactivations and distance education only) launched in Spring 2011 or later.

Lombardi noted that City is already running into this as the enter proposals in CurricUNET. Currently, the originator is the one selecting the disciplines. The faculty would like guidance.

Tim McGrath arrived at 2:14 p.m.

Hess recommended that the faculty pick one or more appropriate disciplines, which would then be vetted through the campus curriculum committees and CIC. She suggested involving the department chairs and deans in the decision.

Michelle "Toni" Parsons stated her understanding that this list will correlate with the minimum qualifications list. How will that be decided? Hess stated this is why this information is going on the course outline, to ensure that the discussion takes place at the beginning of the approval process.

Daniel Igou asked if aligned curriculum would require approval of faculty at all three colleges. Hess acknowledged that it would; this is why the process established will need to include a mechanism for resolving disagreements between the colleges.

Mary Benard asked where interdisciplinary courses fell. Duane Short acknowledged this issue was discussed at the Curriculum Institute. There are two different ways to assign disciplines to these courses. Both require selecting more than one discipline. The first is to state that meeting minimum qualifications in one listed discipline is sufficient to teach the course. The other is to state that

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

teacher must meet the minimum qualifications in all disciplines. Kathy Werle clarified that usually this meant meeting minimum qualifications in one discipline with some additional coursework in the others.

Hess stated this issue will be brought to the next CIC meeting for further discussion.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Catalog Errata (Information)

Hess updated the Council on several Catalog Erratum that had been recently sent out. Include the change to City because it was approved by CIC.

B. October 14 CIC Meeting (Action)

Hess reminded the Council that a meeting was scheduled for October 14th, a date that coincides with the campus accreditation visits. She asked the committee if they would like to change this to a virtual meeting. The committee agreed.

*Action: The October 14, 2010, CIC meeting will be a virtual vote on curriculum.
M/S/P (McGrath/Benard)*

C. SB 1440 (Information)

Hess gave the Council an update on Senate Bill 1440, currently on the governor's desk. It is expected we will know whether it will pass by September 30, 2010. Hess reviewed the highlights of the bill, which mandates that California Community Colleges create associate degrees for transfer to a local CSU with areas of emphasis. Completion of the degree guarantees students priority admission to his or her local CSU campus and to a program or area of emphasis, as determined by the CSU to which the student is admitted. Hess informed the Council that the California Community College Chancellor's Office is putting together an implementation task force in case of passage. They do not want colleges to do anything until the final is passed and they have created guidelines. Stephanie Low has indicated that most colleges will not have to do much to be in compliance with this law.

D. Technical Review Process (Action)

Hess reminded the Council that on April 22, 2010 CIC adopted the Action Plan which derived from the "Shared Governance Self Assessment" that CIC underwent in March 2010. It was determined at that time that there was a need to develop an improved process for the technical review process that works better within the shared governance framework. Hess would like to set up and schedule meetings between District Instructional Services and the technical review staff of each of the campuses. She will work with each campus to determine a process and schedule that works best for their individual needs.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

E. Walk-In Process (Information)

Hess informed the Council that during the 2009-2010 academic year, CIC reviewed 83 “walked-in” proposals including 43 course proposals and 40 awards—78 proposals were approved and 5 were pulled and reviewed at a later date. District Instructional Services is not looking to eliminate walked-in proposals, but to develop a formalized process for approving them. It seems that there has been an increase in the number of proposals, which has led to an increase in the number of errors. While there is a written procedure for emergency approval, there is no formal procedure for walked-in proposal approval. Hess feels that the Instructional Policies and Procedures Subcommittee should be tasked with developing a procedure; in the meantime, District Instructional Services is looking to implement a form (which was then presented).

Juliette Parker expressed her belief that process does not need to be more formalized than it already is. Courses are only walked in after a vote of approval by the campus curriculum review committee. There are a lot of types of reasons why this might occur, and the process is only used when it is needed. She questioned who would evaluate whether it is appropriate to walk in a proposal.

Hess responded the form has an “other” option to allow for the many different needs the campuses face. She conceded the process has been relaxed and made more informal since she started working for the District; however, it seems that walked-in courses are becoming more the rule than the exception.

Mary Benard pointed out that the form may not resolve all errors. She conceded that at the May 14, 2010, CIC meeting there were so many courses being reviewed that they did not receive the same level of scrutiny. She questioned whether the form would facilitate that. For example, will only a limited number of courses be allowed to be walked in to each meeting? She expressed her concern that the problem may be the deadlines for curriculum submission.

Otto Lee emphasized that the deadlines are set as late as possible. It seems the courses that miss the deadlines and are walked in are the difficult ones. District Instructional Services is undergoing a comprehensive review to avoid errors; in the meantime, this form is intended to make sure that due diligence takes place throughout the process.

Toni Parsons asked if there would be a deadline for the form. She stated that the form could be sent out immediately after curriculum committee meetings, leaving a week for Council members to review the proposals and ask any necessary questions.

Benard recommended revising the form to focus on the content of the proposals and the impact of circumventing the regular process versus the need for approval currently emphasized. This will force those walking in proposals to evaluate and assess the impact. Hess responded that the reason that the need for approval is emphasized is to help distinguish between why proposals must be approved at the present meeting as opposed to waiting for the next regular business meeting.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Brian Ellison noted that it seems the “other” box would be frequently checked. He questioned how many proposals are walked in due to unavoidable situations rather than a mere lack of planning. It seems that the volume of proposals being walked in is the issue; it has clearly had an impact.

Parker asked how many proposals have been walked in this year versus in previous years. With a District our size, she did not believe that any SDCCD college or continuing education had abused the walk-in process.

Duane Short reminded the Council that in walking in proposals, we are putting aside the Board-approved policy and process. This should only happen in extreme cases.

Lombardi reiterated Parker’s concern that the faculty members have many responsibilities and a lack of reassigned time to work on curriculum. She appreciates the flexibility that has been enjoyed and hopes that any new process would not make it too difficult to approve walked in proposals. Hess responded that District Instructional Services is only looking to formalize the process.

Parsons asserted the deadlines occur too close to times when the CurricUNET approval process is turned off, making it difficult to move curriculum through.

Short put forward that Miramar publishes a deadline sheet that shows key deadlines, including a recommended deadline for prelaunching courses; this has been helpful. He expressed his concern that whatever the Council decides to do, the criteria established needs to be clear and uniformly applied.

F. Walked-In Curriculum (Action)

Architecture 226, Architectural Theory; Architecture 230, Sustainability in the Built Environment

Parsons announced these course need to be approved so they can be submitted for UCTCA. There are no further changes to the outline.

Action: Architecture 226, Architectural Theory; Architecture 230, Sustainability in the Built Environment were approved for Mesa College pending technical review.
M/S/P (Werle/Lombardi)

Computer Information Science 150, Introduction to Computer and Information Sciences; Philosophy 102B, Introduction to Philosophy: Values

Parsons announced these proposals are for Distance Education only; they are being submitted now for inclusion in the Spring schedule.

Action: Computer Information Science 150, Introduction to Computer and Information Sciences; Philosophy 102B, Introduction to Philosophy: Values were approved for Distance Education at Mesa College pending technical review.
M/S/P (Benard/McGrath)

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

VI. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Hess stated the number of courses to be integrated has gone down.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Hess announced that she will be sending emails to the curriculum committee chairs to determine who will be on the Steering Committee. She met with Roma Weaver over the summer to submit some changes for Continuing Education's CurricUNET that will help align it better with what the colleges have.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. Joint Meeting Agenda Items

Hess read a list of previously suggested items. No new items were submitted.

E. State Academic Senate

The next meeting will be held in November.

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

Tim McGrath notified the Council of an issue with UCSD's History Department that impacts the Chief Instructional Officers and the Articulation Officers. The UCSD faculty are picking what courses to accept based on course syllabi and not the course outline. This needs to be dealt with by both the individual colleges and the District as a whole. He recommended working with UCSD to resolve the issue, while simultaneously creating a task force to collect information and determine a strategy for dealing with this at both a local and statewide level, as the UCs and CSUs continue to take similar actions.

Short added that articulation will not be lost until next academic year. This issue pertains to History major requirements, not general education. He echoed McGrath's proposal to develop a local and statewide District strategy for dealing with this issue. It will be discussed at the regional articulation officers meeting and at the state level. He suggested that it may be requested that the Academic Senate issue a resolution. In the meantime, he recommended refusing to submit syllabi.

McGrath suggested posting the issue to the CIO listserv to find out if this is happening elsewhere. Parker added that it already is. City has been told that articulation for Chicano Studies 110B will be removed this year. The first responsibility is to maintain articulation; the political issues will be worked on next.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

G. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Short described an emerging issue with SDSU. ARTF 125 was articulated for Miramar. Mesa activated the course and requested articulation; CSU instead removed articulation from both colleges. Usually the colleges are given a year but that has not happened this time. Parker added that faculty changes in the Art department are responsible for the issues. We have asked to meet with the faculty to see what changes can be made to the course but they have refused.

Short explained the broader issue is that the District has articulation officers who are faculty members who follow the process. At the UCs and CSUs have issues because their articulation officers are not faculty and have no authority to enforce articulation.

Hess concluded this is on the next DAC agenda; CIC will be kept updated.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The September 23rd meeting will be held at the District Office, Room 245.
- B. Certification of Stand Alone Credit Course is due to the State by September 30th. Reminder, the form requires Chancellor Carroll's approval. Submit signed forms to District Office of Instruction before **9/23/2010**.
- C. Reminder: It is encouraged that forms for New Business Items be turned into District Instructional Services one week prior to the meeting at which they will be discussed so that there is sufficient time for council members to review prior to discussion.
- D. Handouts:
 1. September 9, 2010 CIC Meeting Agenda
 2. Draft Minutes from the May 13, 2010 CIC meeting
 3. Curriculum Summary
 4. Policies Currently Under Review
 5. Assigning Courses to Disciplines New Business Form
 6. SB 1440 New Business Form
 7. Technical Review Process New Business Form
 8. Walk-In Process New Business Form
 9. Walk-In Curriculum Approval Form
 10. Curriculum Updating Project

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.