APPROVED

Meeting of October 26, 2006 2:00 PM – District, Room 272

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Armstrong, Elizabeth Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College

Castaneda, Elizabeth Academic Senate Representative, Interim Articulation Officer – City

Edinger, Valerie Vice President Instruction – Continuing Education Foster, Kit Interim Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College

Gustin, Paula Curriculum Chair – Mesa College

Ingle, Henry T. Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning & Technology –

District Office

Lombardi, Jan Curriculum Chair – City College

Manzoni, Ron Vice President, Instruction – City College Murphy, Carol Curriculum Chair – Miramar College

Neault, Lynn Vice Chancellor, Student Services – District Office (Ex Officio)

Shimizaki, Leslie Faculty Representative – Continuing Education

Short, Duane Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Miramar

College

Teegarden, Terrie Academic Senate Representative – Mesa College

STAFF:

Harada, Myra Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office

VanHouten, Laurie Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office Nasca, Shannon Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office

ABSENT:

Weaver, Roma Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education

Myra Harada called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: October 12, 2006 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

M/S/P (Armstrong, Lombardi)

B. Approval of: October 26, 2006 Agenda

The agenda was approved.

M/S/P (Armstrong, Foster)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

Curriculum was approved by consent.

M/S/P (Foster, Lombardi)

B. Approval of Program Changes

Program changes were approved by consent.

M/S/P (Foster, Lombardi)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum None.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Curriculum Reporting for the California Community Colleges (CRCC) Project

Ron Manzoni stated that the District is being asked by the State to review all of the courses for each college and to identify which courses are the current courses. The Vice Presidents of Instruction have the lists for their respective colleges. Manzoni gave an example of his list to the Council and explained the procedure he is using at City College. One of the items that the State wants reviewed is the TOP Code for each course. After the colleges have updated their list of courses, including the TOP Codes, District Instructional Services will coordinate implementing the TOP Code changes. The vice presidents of instruction will work together to agree on the appropriate TOP Code for aligned courses.

Lynn Neault asked if the TOP Code changes would be implemented before the MIS submission. Manzoni stated that the MIS report would not reflect the changes until next year.

Manzoni asked who is responsible for selecting TOP Codes. Myra Harada clarified that the deans are responsible for selecting the TOP Codes.

Liz Armstrong said that along with the deans, the vice presidents of instruction should be looking more closely at the TOP Codes.

Action: The vice presidents of instruction will designate the TOP Code changes and will submit them to Instructional Services by January, 2007.

B. General Education (GE) Review Dates

Duane Short recommended the committee change how it approves UCTCA submissions. Short suggested that those courses be screened for UC transferability at the same time they are screened CSU transferability. The criteria are similar and it seems appropriate to screen them at the same time. Courses will be approved for UCTCA.

However, Short recommended two dates for approval of General Education, including CSUGE, IGETC and District General Education. He recommended the second CIC meeting in November and the first CIC meeting in May.

Action: Approve submission for the UCTCA list when a course is approved at CIC, approve submission of the District CSUGE and IGETC submission of General Education requirements, at the second CIC meeting in November and the first CIC meeting in May. M/S/P (Armstrong, Foster)

C. Student Learning Outcomes to Course Objectives on Course Outline

Carol Murphy asked if the other colleges went to their Academic Senates regarding the wording of Student Learning Outcomes on the course outlines. Murphy stated that Miramar is suggesting that the wording be changed back to Course Objectives. Jan Lombardi stated that City discussed it at both their Curriculum Committee meeting and their Academic Senate meeting. City's Academic Senate decided the wording should remain as it is. Liz Armstrong informed the Council that the consensus is that the current wording is confusing. Mesa does not want to rewrite courses to make a change to the wording. Terrie Teegarden moved to change the wording back to Course Objectives. Paula Gustin suggested waiting a year while the colleges are working on making Student Learning Outcomes more prevalent and more documented on campus. Armstrong agreed with Gustin and suggested "Student Learning Objectives" as a compromise.

Action: To change "Student Learning Outcomes" to "Student Learning Objectives" in the course outlines.

M/S/P (Foster, Short) 7for, 3 against, 1 abstained.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Basic Skills Criteria

Teegarden asked what constitutes basic skills. Lynn Neault explained that TOP Code 4930 courses was recommended by the State as the permissible TOP Code for basic skills. Neault said that she doesn't know if all of the courses with 4930 TOP Codes are basic skills. Harada read the basic skills definitions from Title 5, Section 55002. Manzoni said that the Title 5 definition does not explain that basic skills courses are pre-collegiate. Another section of Title 5 explains that courses that are appropriate to the Associate Degree and pre-collegiate could be considered basic skills. Instructional Services will send out a PDF version of Title 5, Sections 55002 and 55502 to the Council.

Neault stated that the District is not picking up basic skills funding from the TOP Code for basic skills. It is being picked up from another code on the catalog screen in ISIS. Manzoni stated that for future knowledge we need to know which field to look for to code a class as basic skills. Laurie VanHouten explained that there is a list on CurricUNET that helps with basic skills. Harada said that Instructional Services would provide assistance with the correct selection of basic skills. Jan Lombardi stated that there should be guidance as to what should be noted and what the criteria are.

V. STANDING REPORTS

- A. Curriculum Updating Project
- B. CurricUNET Steering Committee
- C. Student Services Council
- D. State Academic Senate
- E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)

F. Articulation Officers

Short mentioned the Articulation Officers will start submitting courses against the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP). He wanted to make sure that the courses stay aligned at all of the campuses. A list will be given to the District Articulation Council (DAC) in December. The Articulation Officer's think it would not be to our advantage to change our courses to match an LDTP descriptor because the change could jeopardize other articulation agreements. Kit Foster stated that the LDTP is essentially the same thing as CAN.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The next CIC meeting is November 9, 2006.
- B. The deadline date for curriculum to be reviewed for the November 30, 2006 CIC meeting is Friday, November 3, 2006 at 5 pm.

- C. CurricUNET Users Group Conference is scheduled for Friday, October 27, 2006 and will be held at City College, Room B103.
- D. The November & December CIC meeting rooms have been changed; November 09, 2006 will be held in room 272 at the District Offices, November 30, 2006, will be held in room 245 at the District Offices & December 21, 2006, TBA

E. Handouts:

- 1. Today's CIC Meeting Agenda
- 2. Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
- 3. Curriculum Summary
- 4. Curriculum Updating Project
- 5. CIC Actions List
- 6. SDCCD Courses with 4930 TOP Codes

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Harada adjourned the meeting at 3:36 pm.