

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of March 22, 2007  
2:00 PM – Miramar W-248

## MINUTES

### **PRESENT:**

Bergland, Yvonne	Dean, Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research – Mesa College (substitute for Elizabeth Armstrong)
Edinger, Valerie	Vice President Instruction – Continuing Education
Gustin, Paula	Curriculum Chair – Mesa College
Harada, Myra	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office
Ingle, Henry T.	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning & Technology – District Office
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair – City College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Miramar College
Murphy, Carol	Curriculum Chair – Miramar College
Teegarden, Terrie	Academic Senate Representative – Mesa College
Weaver, Roma	Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education

### **ABSENT:**

Armstrong, Elizabeth	Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College
Castaneda, Elizabeth	Academic Senate Representative, Interim Articulation Officer – City
Foster, Kit	Interim Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College
Manzoni, Ron	Vice President, Instruction – City College
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services – District Office ( <i>Ex Officio</i> )
Shimazaki, Leslie	Faculty Representative – Continuing Education

### **STAFF:**

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

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

*Myra Harada called the meeting to order at 2:03pm.*

## **I. MINUTES AND AGENDA**

- A. Approval of: March 08, 2007 Minutes

*The minutes were approved.*

*M/S/P (Murphy/Edinger)*

- B. Approval of: March 22, 2007 Agenda

Added to the agenda:

Recency of Coursework

*The agenda was approved as amended.*

*M/S/P (Teegarden/Lombardi)*

## **II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL**

- A. Approval of Curriculum

None.

- B. Approval of Program Changes

*All programs were approved.*

*M/S/P (Lombardi/Short)*

- C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

None.

## **III. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Certificates of Completion – Clarification of the modifications to course requirements statement specifically related to waiver of courses

Terrie Teegarden stated that the Mesa Academic Senate approved the changes to procedure regarding Certificates of Completion. Jan Lombardi stated that the City College Academic Senate approved the changes as well. Carol Murphy stated that the Miramar Academic Senate has not reviewed the changes and that it is on their agenda.

- B. CIC/SSC Joint Meeting

Henry Ingle stated that Lynn Neault had alerted him that she thought the proposed date of May 10, 2007, for a joint meeting would work. Myra Harada proposed that the May 10<sup>th</sup> date be accepted as the joint meeting date and the time period would coincide with the regular afternoon block of time when CIC meets.

Harada mentioned that agenda items would need to be solicited to shape an agenda for the meeting. Duane Short stated that a possible agenda item would be LDTP. Ingle stated that basic skills and reclassification of pre-collegiate should also be added to the agenda items.

- C. Recency of Coursework Statement

Short clarified that the approved Recency of Coursework statement pertained to graduation requirements and the courses required to obtain a Certificate of

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Achievement or a degree. He explained that the statement did not pertain to prerequisites for other courses. Teegarden stated that students often want to repeat a class because they took it a long time ago, but it takes them a semester to get the current petition through the Academic Review Committee before they can take it, which is a problem. Short stated that his hope and expectation is that students would not have to petition. Harada observed that there is need for such a statement to inform the students of the requirements. Teegarden stated that the students would be denied enrollment if they tried to enroll in the course because the system shows that they have taken it already and the counselors and faculty are not willing to let the students repeat the courses. Harada stated that evaluations come late in the student's careers, which is where the problems occur. She stated that students submit petitions and then they have a considerable wait time for a response. Teegarden agreed with Harada and said the students delay graduation or receiving a certificate and wait 6 months and then give up and don't get the certificate and move on. Harada stated that early in a student's matriculation, we would have to review their transcripts.

Short suggested that in order to make sure that students and counselors are notified of the requirements, that the Miramar counselors will be suggesting that notification be inserted in the catalog where the courses are listed for the major. He also suggested that there would be no need for a petition if the District has already agreed that this statement is policy. Then, the Counselors or Admissions staff could be given permission to let the student enroll in the course. Short said he thought Title 5 states that colleges can authorize students to retake a course for credit for apportionment if a significant amount of time has passed. Harada explained that the District has been using the petition process and there were certain kinds of courses that would qualify, most of which the District does not receive funding on the second go-around. Harada did not think there would be too many courses falling into this category and that the departments could determine which of the courses would not be useful after a certain number of years, such as computer science courses. Harada stated that she would review apportionment rules and regulations on this concern and report back to CIC.

Yvonne Bergland suggested that CIC check with the campus committees to see how many petitions for course repetition are being submitted. Bergland thinks that the District needs to look into this before placing it into policy and to be cautious. Short stated that he understood Berglands point, but CIC has voted and brought it to the Academic Senates who voted and approved it. He stated that the District would never tell a student that they could not receive a degree because they have to retake a course and then the college tells them that they are unable to retake it. Bergland still thinks that the petition process should stay in effect.

Ingle suggested as a resolution the identification of a category called "refresher courses" through the upcoming funding for basic skills and maybe the District could find an innovative way of creating those courses. Harada suggested that Continuing Education teach the "refresher courses". Valerie Edinger stated that Continuing Education would be happy to teach them. Ingle said that perhaps the strategy would be one of not offering a course for credit. Lombardi stated that the concern is that the district is stating that the students may have to meet the

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

recency requirement and that it is not being mandated and enforced. She went on to state that there is nothing in place stating that the departments have to review their program and decide whether they want to limit students or not. She recommended asking the departments what they will be doing. Harada stated that the Academic Review Committee would suggest that they take the course at another District when a decision is made to not allow the student to retake the course. Ingle suggested that perhaps the most prudent course of action would be the revamping our practices and policies. Harada stated that when we send a student to another college District we are not paying for that student without reimbursement. She said that if we allow the student to retake the course then the district loses money. She stated that each college may want to review the situation and have their own procedure. Bergland agreed with Ingle; she thinks that each college should have options. Edinger asked the Council why the students find out so late that a course is too old to meet a requirement. Short explained that if the requirements are not published in the catalog then the student would never find out until they petition to graduate. This usually does not take place until the semester before they graduate. Short stated that the best advice that a counselor could give to a student is to wait and take certain courses during their last semester and then if the student graduated two years after that, they would be fine in terms of the requirements. Short thinks that when the topic was first discussed, it was recommended that a list of such courses be on file in the evaluator's office for checking that requirements are met against. He said that courses with a recency requirement should be listed in the catalog for each program. Lombardi thinks that during the joint CIC/SSC meeting, this topic should be discussed. She said that a lot of the students do not go and see a counselor and there is no requirement for them to do so. As a result, this may aggravate the problem.

### D. Special Topics Courses

Short explained that the Council talked about how the District combines Experimental Courses and Special Topics Courses into one category. He stated that last year he was going to write up what changes were needed in procedure for CurricUNET in order to clearly delineate the difference between Experimental Courses and Special Topics Courses. Short gave the Council a handout detailing the changes. He stated that Experimental category represents courses that the District wants to try out, see if they work and if they meet state requirements before making them permanent. He explained that a Special Topics course is a course with a consistent disciplinary framework each time it is offered that might facilitate a different instructional focus. Short gave the example of analyzing a different author's work in an English class.

He suggested reserving a set of district-wide course numbers that would be used for Special Topics Courses. He worked with Laurie VanHouten to find the numbers 392-399. He stated that he and VanHouten picked those numbers because the three hundred level courses could be degree applicable, non-degree applicable, transfer level courses, etc. He stated that the catalog would have to be modified to indicate the difference between these courses. He stated that there needs to be a process for creating and activating a focus course under the Special

## San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

Topic category. Short gave the example of creating a Special Topics Course for Occupational Spanish that is approved by CIC and is named Spanish 392 Occupational Spanish. He explained that when and if a college wants to offer a Special Topics Course in Occupational Spanish for Nurses then the college could use the number of 392A for that focus, followed by another identifier letter for another focus. He stated that those particular focus areas do not need to go through the curriculum approval process because the framework course has already been approved. He said that there would only be one small change to CurricUNET with the title change each time a new focus course is created under the Special Topics category.

Lombardi asked how Special Topics Courses differ from perspectives. She stated for instance that English 101 is offered from a Chicano perspective and a variety of perspectives, but the course and title do not change. She stated that what is being called special topics through the use of different perspectives without going through a curriculum change as is implied by offering the regular course through another focus. Harada stated that she thought the difference was articulation. Paula Gustin thinks the faculty were not being encouraged to do Special Topics Courses because they may not transfer. Gustin was not sure that Mesa College would use the Special Topics category.

Short explained that Miramar College would benefit because they have a lot of courses, from Fire Technology and the Police Academy that have a special focus in the fields. He stated that the State of California requires that classes be taught, and a lot of times it is on short notice. Because it takes so long in the curriculum process to gain this approval, they have been calling these courses “Experimental”. Short stated that it would be good to make a course called “Current Issues in State Fire Fighting Procedures” and then each time a course needs to be adapted, they can more quickly offer it. He said that the reason they do not want to use the changing perspectives approach is because students might need to take a different topic every semester for five years, and the students need the topics to show up on their transcripts under the specific Special Topics heading.

Bergland asked if the course would only be offered once. Short explained that the courses would be given their own unique number and then three or four years down the road, the course may need to be taught again. He stated that if the courses were offered on a regular basis, then the courses would need to be shaped into a regular, permanent course. Lombardi stated that she supports the Special Topics Courses but she does not want faculty to think they can teach anything they want. Short stated that the vocational programs want the Special Topics Courses. Carol Murphy stated that the numbers chosen to give Special Topics Courses would warrant that. Harada stated that the Council seemed to agree that there needs to be two separate processes and that a separate workgroup is required. Short stated that if the Council gives their permission to redoing the catalog, we could rework the statement in CurricUNET and the procedure for how a focus area would be assigned to a Special Topics Course. We can begin to

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

develop the Special Topics Courses and create the process in CurricUNET over the next months. VanHouten stated that there maybe something more that can be done in CurricUNET to create the framework for the course. Short asked CIC to give permission to authorize the framework in CurricUNET. Bergland stated that a “pilot” course would be more prudent. Harada stated that maybe the syllabus could be attached to the record in CurricUNET. She stated that the Curriculum Steering Committee will be the workgroup to review special topics and work on this proposed project.

*Action: The Curriculum Steering Committee will be the workgroup to review Special Topics Courses.*

## IV. NEW BUSINESS

None.

## V. STANDING REPORTS

### A. Curriculum Updating Project

No report.

### B. CurricUNET Steering Committee

VanHouten gave a handout to the Council on the “Other Hours” field in CurricUNET. She stated that the student hours needed to complete the course. This field is for courses that are not typical lecture or lab courses.

### C. Student Services Council

No report.

### D. State Academic Senate

No Report.

### E. CIO (Chief Instructional Officers)

No Report.

### F. Articulation Officers

Short gave an update on LDTP. The Regional Articulation Officers met. They talked with the Articulation Officer at SDSU. The Region will be developing a statement in early April. Some colleges reported that they would try to remove their proposals from the second review cycle.

## VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The April 12th CIC meeting will be held at Muir in room Z-602. We were unable to reserve a room at City College. We will try to adjourn the meeting by 3:30pm because the Board Meeting will be held at City College at 4:00pm.

B. Board Dockets will no longer be sent out by hard copy but rather via email attachment. Also please note that all approved curriculum board dockets are available on the I.S. Website <http://instsrv.sdccd.edu/>

# San Diego Community College District Curriculum & Instructional Council

## C. Handouts:

1. Today's CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from last CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summary
4. Curriculum Updating Project
5. Certificate of Completion – Course Substitution
6. CIC Action Lists

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

*Harada adjourned the meeting at 3:20pm.*

*At the closing, Vice Chancellor Ingle expressed his appreciation to her for a record of exemplary service to this District as she moves to retirement later this year. This meeting represents the final chairing responsibilities for Dean Harada.*