

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Meeting of April 13, 2017
2:00 PM
Educational Cultural Complex
(ECC)
4343 Ocean View Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92113
Room 186

Minutes

PRESENT:

Ascione, Lou	(Proxy for Paulette Hopkins) Dean, School of Liberal Arts— Miramar College
Boots, Jennifer	Curriculum Co-Chair—City College
Bulger, Stephanie	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services—District Office
Gustin, Paula	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum Services—District Office
Kilmer, Renee*	Interim Vice President, Instructional Services—City College
Namdar, Donna	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office
Norvell, Elizabeth	Articulation Officer—City College
Palma-Sanft, Mara	Articulation Officer—Miramar College
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Alder, Kate	Vice President of Instruction—Continuing Education
Hopkins, Paulette	Interim Vice President, Instructional Services—Miramar College
Marrone, Erica	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum Services—District Office
McGrath, Tim	Vice President, Instructional Services — Mesa College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office
Shelton, Deanna	Curriculum Co-Chair—City College

STAFF:

Meredith, Jasmine	Senior Secretary, Curriculum Services—District Office
Radley, Michelle	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office
Scott, Carmen	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum Services—District Office

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Bulger called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: March 23, 2017 Minutes (*Action*)

The Council reviewed the March 23, 2017 minutes; No changes were made.

<i>Recommend Approval of the March 23, 2017 Meeting Minutes</i>
<i>Motion by Short</i>
<i>Second by Parker</i>
<i>Final Resolution: Motion carries</i>
<i>Aye: Gustin, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft</i>
<i>Abstain: Boots, Norvell</i>

B. Approval of the March 23, 2017, Meeting Agenda (*Action*)

Gustin walked-in FASH 168 and ARCH 112. Gustin requested that Course Activations be added to the agenda. Norvell and Boots walked-in HIST 109, HIST 110, ENGL 31, ENGL 21 and ENGL 47A. Norvell requested that the action items be moved to the beginning of the agenda.

<i>Recommend Approval of the April 13, 2017 Meeting Agenda as Amended</i>
<i>Motion by Norvell</i>
<i>Second by Boots</i>
<i>Final Resolution: Motion carries</i>
<i>Aye: Gustin, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Short</i>

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum (*Action*)

<i>Recommend Approval of Curriculum Review</i>
<i>Motion by Short</i>
<i>Second by Gustin</i>
<i>Final Resolution: Motion carries</i>
<i>Aye: Boots, Kilmer, Namdar, Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker</i>

B. Approval of Program Changes (*Action*)

<i>Recommend Approval of Program Changes</i>
<i>Motion by Short</i>
<i>Second by Palma-Sanft</i>
<i>Final Resolution: Motion carries</i>
<i>Aye: Boots, Kilmer, Namdar, Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker</i>

C. Approval of Upper Division Curriculum (*Action*)

No upper division curriculum

D. Approval of Upper Division Program Changes (*Action*)

No upper division programs

E. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum (*Action*)

No Continuing Education curriculum

F. Approval of Continuing Education Programs (*Action*)

No Continuing Education programs

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. District Requirements 4 and 5 (Action)

Short mentioned that City's and Mesa's Academic Senate were opposed to combining District Requirements 4 and 5. He requested of the council to vote on the proposal so that he can report back to Miramar's CRC.

<i>Recommend Approval of the Proposal to Combine District Requirements 4 and 5 in Accordance with the Action Item</i>

<i>Motion by Short</i>

<i>Second by Palma-Sanft</i>

<i>Final Resolution: Motion Denied</i>
--

<i>Aye:</i>

<i>Opposed: Boots, Gustin, Kilmer, Norvell, Parker</i>
--

<i>Abstained: Namdar</i>

B. Hidden Prerequisites (Action)

Short explained that there are courses where the prerequisites that are approved in CurricUNET and on the course outline, but are not coded in ISIS. He shared that in ISIS, there are additional prerequisite options students can use; however, they were not approved through the curriculum process and are not on the course outlines or in the catalogs. He explained Miramar's CRC has two issues:

1. Process Issue
 - a. To make requisites for courses, they have to go through the curriculum approval process; Miramar would like this to be enforced.
2. Outcome Issue
 - a. Requisites that are published versus requisites that are not published but are being enforced are causing issues.
 - i. Students and counselors do not know about the requisites that are not published in the course outlines and catalogs.
 - ii. Articulation partners may consider what is in the course outline is correct. However, the outlines may not be correct because there are additional requisites.

Vice Chancellor Neault reported that the topic of "hidden prerequisites" as brought to her attention by an accrediting team member. She provided the following information:

In the past, when requisites were implemented across curriculum, "or higher" and "or equivalent" were available for courses that would clear prerequisites. Students would go to the departments to get their equivalent courses approved. However, the method of approval caused issues at registration. As a solution, Instructional Services and Curriculum Services had the faculty chairs submit a signed, formal document of the higher level courses that will clear prerequisites. Those higher-level courses were approved.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Neault clarified that the decision to have the higher level courses approved was a means to facilitate registration and not to have hidden prerequisites. The decision was also made as a service to students at the time and to avoid overriding petitions. She explained that the approved courses were put into the system so students would not be blocked from registering for classes. Neault mentioned that documentation is available pertaining to the approval history and that she is open to recommendations about developing a different process.

Gustin shared that it would be cumbersome to have higher-level courses on the course outline. She recalled at a past meeting, she requested that the verbiage “hidden prerequisites” be changed to “requisites,” to reflect the discussion of the issue.

Short shared that he approves of any title of the discussion. He clarified that the discussion of the requisites took place only at Miramar’s CRC and not with anyone outside of SDCCD. He also mentioned that, to him, it does make sense to add higher-level courses in the catalog because some prerequisite courses are not clearly identified in the chain of prerequisites. He clarified that Miramar is asking to make the documentation of the requisites consistent. Neault assured the council that Student Services has a defined process—they do not publish anything that does not come through Instructional Services and the curriculum process.

Norvell shared that adding the higher level prerequisites to the course outlines would make the process more rigorous for faculty and expand the catalog in terms of volume. Short inquired about how a student or counselor would know if a course is worthy to satisfy a prerequisite? He requested that there be a way to identify and define a higher-level course to avoid unnecessary course work students if they already completed higher-level courses.

Palma-Sanft mentioned that the matter is of everyone not knowing of the approved courses mentioned earlier. Students may be advised by counselors who know of the approved courses to clear prerequisites or students may follow the catalogs where the information of the higher-level courses that clear prerequisites is not available. Also, many counselors at Miramar are new and may be unaware of the issue. Gustin suggested that it would be better to identify which prerequisites are perplexing rather than implementing a system-wide search of courses that may have higher-level course prerequisite clearance.

Neault mentioned that she will summarize higher-level course equivalencies into a crosswalk. She shared that a sample list of higher-level course equivalencies will be posted to the Student Web Services site and will share the issue with counselors at the next all counselors meeting. Once the final crosswalk is complete, she will bring it to CIC for review.

Neault strongly recommended the campuses to talk about corequisites. In the new system, if there is a corequisite on a course and one of the courses is dropped, students are dropped from both courses. She shared that corequisites are literal. Bulger summarized the following topics to add to the requisites discussion:

- Prerequisites
- Corequisites
- Training
- Crosswalk

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Boots added to Bulger’s list the issue of walk-ins. To ensure the campuses have the opportunity to review what is being walked-in, they could track when each campus’ CRC meetings are and send an email to council of what courses they plan to walk-in and add them to their CRC agenda before coming to CIC.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

C. Walk-Ins (Action)

Mesa: FASH 168 and ARCH 112

Gustin walked-in FASH 168 for a proposed action of Distance Education. She also walked-in ARCH 112 and explained that due to a miscommunication between the originator of the ARCH 112 proposal and Mesa’s Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), the Council approved ARCH 112 as a three-unit lab. However, the course was intended to be designed as a 1.5 lecture units and 1.5 lab units. She requested that the course be approved for 1.5 lecture units and 1.5 lab units.

Recommend Approval of FASH 168 for Distance Education; ARCH 112 for 1.5 lecture units and 1.5 lab units.

Motion by Boots

Second by Parker

Final Resolution: Motion carries

Aye: Gustin, Kilmer, Namdar, Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Short

City: HIST 109, HIST 110, ENGL 31, ENGL 21 and ENGL 47A

Norvell explained that she worked with Mesa and Miramar to edit the course proposals for HIST 109 and HIST 110 to meet the C-ID descriptor. She shared that the attempt to appeal the courses on conditional status was not approved. Therefore, edits were to be made.

Recommend Approval of Revisions on HIST 109 and HIST 110

Motion by Short

Second by Gustin

Final Resolution: Motion carries

Aye: Boots, Kilmer, Namdar, Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker

Boots explained the following concerning ENGL 21, ENGL 31 and ENGL 47A:

- ENGL 21 was proposed to be changed to ENGL 21A because 21 was used in the 1970’s. Boots mentioned that ENGL 21 is paired with ENGL 47A with an R2/W2 advisory.
- ENGL 31 was walked-in for approval of the outline of topics revisions.
- ENGL 47A was proposed for a name change from Accelerated Reading and Writing

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

to Integrated Reading and Writing. She reported that a recency statement was added for students who have taken ENGL 42 and ENGL 43 or ENGL 48 and ENGL 49 more than three years ago, so that they may enroll in ENGL 47A. Boots clarified that the recency statement is applicable Districtwide.

- Neault explained that when the course is activated at Mesa, to ensure that students cannot pass one and not the other because it will cause repetition issues. She mentioned that this was the agreement in the beginning and that drops by students will be managed by faculty.

Recommend Approval of ENGL 21A; Recommend Approval of Revisions of ENGL 31 and ENGL 47A

Motion by Norvell

Second by Gustin

Final Resolution: Motion carries

Aye: Boots, Kilmer, Namdar, Palma-Sanft, Parker, Short

Parker shared her reservations against ENGL 31 being on the ENGL 101 course outline because it does not meet the definition of a corequisite. She mentioned that she has been receiving calls from universities with questions about why a basic skills course is a prerequisite on a transfer-level course. She asked how the ENGL 31/101 learning community is different than any other learning community? And reported that she did not receive an answer to her question of how ENGL 31 is different from any course in a learning community and a one-way requisite?

Short explained that ENGL 31 is how to get to ENGL 101. He mentioned that in a Learning Community, a course can be taken by itself. In the ENGL 31/101 Learning Community, ENGL 101 cannot be taken by itself unless it meets a requisite. Parker suggested that Short is discussing an issue of access; that students are accessing ENGL 101 in a different manner. However, accessing the course differently does not mean ENGL 31 is a corequisite of ENGL 101. Parker shared that to her understanding, for a course to be a corequisite, it has to be dependent on the other course. She reasoned that ENGL 101 is not dependent on ENGL 31, but the opposite is true.

D. Curriculum Processes (Information/Discussion)

Gustin requested clarification of the process to activate courses. She and Parker suggested that one college submit a proposal and add the other colleges that plan to activate the same course. This way, when courses are being activated or deactivated, all campuses are aware of the changes.

Short mentioned that he agrees with the suggestion only if the curriculum chair and the articulation officer and those who are creating the proposals are aware of it. Hess shared her concern of the courses not being approved in time for catalog. Short suggested that the technical review committees can notify the Curriculum Chairs and Articulation Officers of identified issues.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

I. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Hess)

No report.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Hess)

No report.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

Plenary will be the week of April 17, 2017.

E. Chief Instructional Officers (CIO) (Bulger, Matthew, Hopkins, Kilmer, McGrath)

Kilmer reported that Dr. Nguyen, Interim President of ACCJC, and Susan Lamb, mentioned that the 18-month reaffirmation for accreditation will be eliminated beginning in June. She shared that the elimination applies to any colleges that went through accreditation in spring 2017. If colleges do receive reaffirmation, it will be for the full seven years. A report may be requested of the colleges, but the colleges will no longer have an 18-month follow-up.

Kilmer also mentioned that information regarding Guided Pathways will be shared at the next CIC meeting when all the Vice Presidents of Instruction are present.

F. Articulation Officers (Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Robertson)

The Articulation Officers will be at a meeting during the April 27, 2017 CIC meeting. They will send proxies in their place.

G. ADT/C-ID (Norvell, Palma-Sanft, Parker)

Parker shared an implementation update about C-ID: There must be evidence of submission and after 45 days without approval, submission of courses will be automatically approved.

H. Subcommittees (Bulger)

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Hess reported the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee met with Catherine Shafer and Tina Recalde to edit the policies related to nursing.

I. ERP Implementation (Bulger)

No Report.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting will be: Thursday, May 11, 2017 at the District Office in Conference Room 220.

All new courses, new programs, and program revisions must be approved by CIC, Board of Trustees, CCCCCO, new programs may be subject to WASC, before they may be published in the college catalog.

A. Handouts:

1. April 13, 2017, CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from the March 23, 2017 CIC Meeting
3. Curriculum Summaries
4. Curriculum Updating Project
5. TMC Tracker
6. SDCCD C-ID Project

III. ADJOURNMENT

Bulger adjourned the meeting at 3:13 p.m.