

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of October 28, 2010
2:00 PM—Mesa College, Room S-305

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
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Igou, Daniel	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair —City College
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Parsons, Toni	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Schwarz, Susan	Dean of Library & Technology—Miramar College (proxy for Kathy Werle)
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

ABSENT:

Benard, Mary	Vice President, Instruction—City College
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning— District Office
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
----------------------	---

GUESTS:

Faulkner, Kim	SDICCCA Intern, Grossmont College
Henne, Andrea	Dean, Online and Distributed Learning—District Office
Jeffcoat, Kendra	SDICCCA Coordinator

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Shelly Hess welcomed the Council and its guests and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: September 9, 2010 Minutes

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

B. Approval of: October 28, 2010 Agenda

The agenda was approved. M/S/P (Igou/Weaver)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

Removed from the consent agenda:

Diesel Technology 101, Heavy Duty Truck, Advanced Transportation, Equipment Preventive Maintenance and Inspections

Diesel Technology 131, Alternative-Fueled Engine Overhaul

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

Jan Lombardi arrived at 2:03 p.m.

B. Approval of Program Changes

The program was approved by consent. M/S/P (Andersen/Parker)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

E. Curriculum Items Discussed

Diesel Technology 101, Heavy Duty Truck, Advanced Transportation, Equipment Preventive Maintenance and Inspections

Diesel Technology 131, Alternative-Fueled Engine Overhaul

Daniel Igou requested that the effective date of these courses be changed from fall 2011 to summer 2011.

Action: Diesel Technology 101, Heavy Duty Truck, Advanced Transportation, Equipment Preventive Maintenance and Inspections and Diesel Technology 131,

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Alternative-Fueled Engine Overhaul, were approved for activation at Miramar College effective summer 2011. M/S/P (Andersen/Parsons)

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. SB1440 (Information) (Short)

Duane Short gave the Council two presentations regarding the recently passed Senate Bill 1440. He gave a summary of SB 1440 and its requirements, implications, and potential problems. There will likely be a conflict between how the State Academic Senate and the CSUs (particularly SDSU) will each interpret and implement the law. The bill requires CSUs to give students priority admission and allow the associate degree to satisfy all major preparation requirements.

The Academic Senate believes there are two ways to develop these degrees. The first is for each college to develop their own degree for each major. The second (preferred) method is for the Academic Senate to develop model curriculum designed by intersegmental faculty that local colleges can adopt. This method would already be worked out with the CSUs, hopefully reducing conflict. This would also provide a path to expedited approval by the State Chancellor's Office.

The Senate has created a template for how these programs will be structured. For each degree area there will be a core group of courses that are required major prep for most CSUs, and a list of restricted electives that each college can select based on their campus course offerings and local CSU requirements. Even if the student selects courses that are not required major prep at their transfer university, the CSU must still accept the student as if they have completed all preparation for the major. Meetings are already taking place to create possible drafts and will continue in the winter and spring. There is an upcoming joint task force meeting that will include representatives from the CSUs.

Susan Schwarz arrived at 2:18 p.m.

Brian Ellison asked what would happen to currently approved degrees that won't carry the same priority admission status. Short responded that nothing is required to happen to those degrees, but it would probably make sense to replace these with the transfer degrees. Short reiterated that this is an area where it is particularly important to work with SDSU; their interpretation may be different than the state Academic Senate's. This can lead to a number of dangerous scenarios, including students who don't have all of the required major preparation gaining priority admission, and those who complete the major prep but don't have a degree being denied.

Parker expressed concern with the Academic Senate's promotion of statewide patterns of statewide patterns and degrees. Our region is different; our impactation criteria presents an additional challenge that most of the state does not have to face. LDTP did not have the intended results in our district; the same thing could happen with this. Parker feels this could work, but that we must work with SDSU to find something that works for everyone in order to best serve the students and help SDSU manage their enrollment. She would like to know what SDSU intends

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

to do so that we can act appropriately. She is also concerned that the State Chancellor's task force does not have an articulation officer, despite the fact that the people in those positions will likely lead the charge in developing the degrees and making sure that the system works.

Short then gave his second presentation, a decision matrix to help guide our region. We may not want to adopt a statewide template if SDSU indicates that they won't accept it. The matrix presented the different decisions that the community colleges could make, the decisions that the CSUs might make, and the potential result of each decision combination. Short discussed which decisions were most unlikely, and what the best and worst options were of those left.

Short recommended waiting to see what course of action the CSUs will take. If the CSUs agree with the Academic Senate and SDSU agrees, we should move forward with the statewide degrees. If SDSU indicates that they will take an action other than what the State Academic Senate thinks they should, we should then modify the state decision to meet our local needs.

Hess asked Short if we should wait for the state to come out with a decision before we start having conversations with SDSU. She reminded the Council that in the case of LDTP, a decision was made but SDSU disagreed and were allowed to pursue a different course.

Short recommended implementing the parts of the degree that we know (those specified by the legislation). We can start drafting language for that; what we are unsure of is how the major will work. The meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday. What we need to know is whether SDSU will accept the degree as major prep without any further requirements.

Andersen added that there is an additional issue of CID. We are in a holding pattern to see if the common course descriptors are accepted by CSU before we can move forward with the broad transfer degrees.

Short recommends waiting at least until after the meeting scheduled for November 2. Another area articulation officer has asked SDSU's articulation officer whether they intend to accept these programs. At this time their answer is no, but that may change. Since SDSU gets to select which majors are "similar" it would be prudent to make an agreement as to which of our degrees match which SDSU major codes so that we can agree what is and isn't similar.

Hess asked if there was anything specific that the curriculum chairs could take back to their CRCs at this time. Short recommended presenting at least the first presentation to the committees at this time in order to begin the discussion. Whatever happens statewide will inform our next decisions; we should hopefully know more soon so that we can start moving forward.

Ellison pointed out that students in pursuit of this degree who are not following our District GE patterns may have an impact on the future enrollment of some course sections.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

B. Assigning Courses to Disciplines (Action)

Hess reminded the Council that in September they discussed the fact that currently there are no disciplines listed on the course outline of record for our courses. She referred the committee to Handout 6, the Assigning Courses to Disciplines New Business Form. Updates to the form have been made based on the Council's recommendations.

Toni Parsons explained her understanding that the assigning disciplines is not necessarily faculty driven, but rather curriculum committee approved. She asked if the assignment could be done by the committee outside of the CurricUNET process. Her understanding is that the course subject indicators are already attached to disciplines. Hess responded that this is not the case for all subject indicators, particularly interdisciplinary ones.

Parsons stated her concern that adding the extra step of assigning the discipline(s) might be too much for originating faculty. Is this something that can be done at the curriculum committee level? Hess responded that CurricUNET can be programmed to indicate who must fill this out. Currently TOP, SAM, and other codes are entered by the Dean. We can modify the process so that it is entered elsewhere as long as it is faculty driven (which the curriculum committee would be).

Juliette Parker would like to see each college determine who should select the discipline(s) for their own courses. Not all colleges may think the curriculum committee should be the one to choose, or think that it should be entered on the course outline. Hess responded that each college is free to choose their own process so long as it is a faculty decision. CurricUNET is the logical place as it is where all other curriculum information is stored.

Brian Ellison expressed his concerns with Governet following his interactions with them regarding Continuing Education's CurricUNET. His understanding is that the State Chancellor's Office shares his concerns. There are issues with accuracy that he feels must be resolved if Continuing Education is to continue using CurricUNET. *[Hess will meet with Ellison and Roma Weaver to make sure these concerns are addressed.]*

Libby Andersen stated wherever the information is stored it should be in the same sport for all three colleges so that the information can be accessed by whoever might need it. Short added the form for the information is currently in CurricUNET and can be filled in at any point in the process. He recommends that it stays that way. Hess added that CurricUNET is the logical place to keep the information because that is where all other curriculum data is stored.

Hess concluded that she will make any recommended changes to the New Business form. She asked that the curriculum chairs take the issue to their respective CRCs for their recommendations.

San Diego Community College District

Curriculum and Instructional Council

C. Technical Review Process (Action)

Hess reminded the Council of the previous discussion of the Technical Review Process, which stemmed from last spring's shared governance self assessment. Since the September 9 meeting, Hess discussed the updates to Handout 7, the Technical Review Process New Business Form. Hess asked the committee to vote to establish a process that will ensure that there is more collaboration between District technical review and the colleges and Continuing Education technical review. This will include at least one meeting a year; the environment and number of meetings will be established by each curriculum committee.

Action: The recommendation to establish process that will ensure that there is more collaboration between District technical review and the colleges and Continuing Education technical review was approved. M/S/P (Short/Lombardi)

D. Walk-In Process (Information)

Hess reminded the Council of the need to formalize the walk-in process for curriculum, previously discussed at the September 9 meeting. She presented the Council with the data they had requested at that meeting. The data showed that most proposals are walked-in to the catalog deadline meeting and the final meeting of the academic year. Based on this information, she recommended the previously introduced form be implemented for those two dates. For other meetings, walk-ins will still be allowed following the current process.

Parker asked who would determine whether a course can be walked in. Currently that decision is made by the campus curriculum committees. Hess stated that walked-in curriculum would still be accepted; the intention of this form is not to limit the curriculum but to make sure that procedure is being followed and to manage the proposals that are walked in. Lombardi requested dates be added to the business form and the Walked-In Curriculum form. Hess said she would make the change.

E. District Subject Assignment List (Information)

Hess discussed Handout 11, the District Subject Assignment List (previously the Discipline Dean List). The list now includes all subjects currently offered by the colleges (including those that are interdisciplinary). Hess recommended adding a list of the roles and responsibilities of the Discipline Deans to the upcoming procedure revisions. A draft list of the responsibilities will be brought to the next CIC meeting before the Subject Assignment List is made available to the rest of the District.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Experimental Courses (Action)

Hess informed the Council that the current procedure 5300.2 states that an experimental course can only be offered three times. There is currently an issue of interpretation as to whether the number of times refers to sections or semesters.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Mesa is currently offering three course sections of experimental course English 265B, and would like to schedule more sections for spring 2011 and fall 2011 in order to continue to gather data and to have time to review and revise the course. Hess is asking the Council to make an exception and allow Mesa to offer additional course sections. Additionally, she would like to recommend that the policies and procedures subcommittee revise the current procedure to clarify the language.

Lombardi asked to have City, who also offers course section of English 265B, to be included in the exception.

Short expressed his concern regarding the extension and the number of students enrolled. He feels that the Council was not properly informed of these intentions at the time the course was approved.

Hess responded that a discipline meeting took place earlier that week with Lou Ascione, discipline dean, and faculty from all three colleges to discuss all the concerns surrounding this course, including how to implement the transition of students to English 101. Currently, the recommendation of the faculty is for students to follow the current student challenge procedure. Further meetings will take place with student services to clarify the next steps. The Council can wait to vote on the extension until after the issues have been addressed.

The Council continued discussion. It was decided that the issue would be brought back for a vote at a future date following consultation with the campus CRCs.

Brian Ellison and Susan Schwarz left at 3:43 p.m.

B. Six-Year Review (Action) (Parsons)

Parsons gave the Council background on the issue. She is concerned by the number of course listed as out of compliance on the six-year review report in CurricUNET. She believes that this number may include courses that have been reviewed but failed to check a box on the proposal, courses that have been deactivated, and courses that have been updated and approved but are not yet active. There also is no mechanism for two year review of vocational education courses.

Ultimately, Parsons is wondering what the process is for six year review of courses. Are the deans aware of their responsibility? Do meetings need to happen to get everyone on the same page? Does a process need to be developed?

Hess clarified that Parsons's recommendation is for the District Instructional Services Office to investigate issues with the six year review list, and refer the process to the policies and procedures subcommittee. Hess will also clarify whether vocational education courses and programs must undergo two year review.

Andersen also added that there are courses that have not been integrated.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

C. CIC Subcommittees (Information)

Hess reminded the Council that several CIC subcommittees are meeting or in the process of being formed. Policies and procedures has met and will continue to meet. Steering will be meeting October 29. There are also two more committees to be formed, the Catalog Committee and the GE Committee. Hess's research has turned up documentation establishing the membership and responsibility of these committees, but would like to bring it to the Council for their review. Representatives will then be solicited.

D. Course Outline/Course Report Transferability (Action) (Parker)

Parker presented a proposal to revise the transfer applicability are of the course outline. She is requesting that pending transfer applicability be removed because it is not always accurate or clear, leading to issues for students and with articulation. She gave the example of Chinese 202, which had been approved along with the rest of the curriculum earlier in the meeting. The course is being proposed for UCTCA and CSUGE, but will not be submitted until next year; however, the transfer applicability section of the course outline lists the information now as if it were already approved.

Parker would like to recommend that the information be removed from the course outline. She would also like to revise the curriculum report to indicate when things are proposed versus approved, including a distinction between baccalaureate credit and general education credit.

Short gave his support to the proposal. He added that because of our aligned curriculum, there are cases where a course's transferability is approved at one college, but is activated at another where there is no articulation in place. Currently, there is no distinction between colleges in the system. Parker recommended having different sections, as the curriculum report currently has for distance education.

Andersen asked how this would affect the articulation assistant's ability to enter Oscar submissions. Hess said that she will research it.

Parker asked if the articulation officers could meet and then bring back clarified recommendations.

E. Instructional Policies (Action)

Hess presented a new round of draft policies to the Council for their review, including *Community Service Programs; Military Services and Education Coordination; Health Occupation Instruction—Selection of Off-Campus Facilities; District Catalogs and Related Information Publications; and Delineation of Functions*. Hess reviewed each policy with the Council, and took note of their suggestions and concerns. She promised the Council the revisions would be brought back to the next meeting for further review.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

No report.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

No report.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. Joint Meeting Agenda Items

No report.

E. State Academic Senate

No report.

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

No report.

G. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

No report.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The November 11th meeting will be held at the District Service Center, 1st Floor Conference Room.

B. Handouts:

1. October 28, 2010 CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from the September 9, 2010 CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summary
4. SB 1440 Presentation 1
5. SB 1440 Presentation 2
6. Assigning Courses to Disciplines New Business Form
7. Technical Review Process New Business Form
8. Walk-In Process New Business Form
9. Walk-In Curriculum Approval Form
10. Walk-In Curriculum Totals 2006-2010
11. District Subject Assignment List
12. Six-Year Review New Business Form
13. Course Outline/Course Report Transferability New Business Form
14. Community Service Programs
15. Military Services and Education Coordination

**San Diego Community College District
Curriculum and Instructional Council**

16. Health Occupation Instruction—Selection of Off-Campus Facilities
17. District Catalogs and Related Information Publications
18. Delineation of Functions
19. Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Hess adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m.