APPROVED CIC/SSC Joint

Meeting of September 27, 2007 2:00 PM-Muir, Z-405

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby Articulation Officer – City College

Armstrong, Elizabeth Vice President, Instruction – Mesa College

Bromma, John Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education
Cassar, Rick Academic Senate Representative – Miramar College
Conrad, Gail Interim Vice President, Student Service – Mesa College
Ellison, Brian Vice President, Instruction and Student Services – Continuing

Education

Gustin, Paula Curriculum Chair – Mesa College

Hess, Shelly Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services – District Office

Hiel, Edwin Academic Senate Representative – City 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)

Ramsey, Gerald Interim Vice President, Student Services – City College

Vincent, Bill Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College

Weaver, Roma Academic Senate Representative – Continuing Education White, Peter Vice President, Student Services – Miramar College

ABSENT:

Crakes, Ailene Academic Senate Representative – Mesa College
Matthew, Esther Representative, Academic Senate – Miramar College

Parker, Juliette Articulation Officer – Mesa College

Short, Duane Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer – Miramar

College

STAFF:

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

GUEST:

Schlichtman, Monique Director of Grants and Resource Development – District Office

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: March 23, 2006 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

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

B. Approval of: September 27, 2007 Agenda

The agenda was approved.

M/S/P (Andersen/Conrad)

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Title 5 Changes
 - 1. Certificates of Completion

Shelly Hess informed the Council the Board of Governors adopted a new set of revisions to Title 5. She announced that a taskforce would need to be formed to implement the curriculum changes. Section 55070 of Title 5 concerns Certificates of Completion. The process the District currently follows is for programs that consist of 18 units or more have been sent to the State Chancellor's office for approval and have been called Certificates of Achievement or they have been put forth toward an Associate Degree. Title 5 now states the shorter credit programs under 18 units such as Certificates of Completion or Certificate of Competency can no longer hold those titles. The shorter credit programs can be called Certificate of Achievement, if they are submitted to the State Chancellor's Office and approved. Hess continued the joint group needed to decide how to proceed with certificate naming and approval submissions.

Peter White asked if the Title 5 change allowed the District to invent new names for Certificates, to which Hess answered yes. White stated it is in the interest of the District to continue to recognize the smaller unit programs in some manner. Lynn Neault explained the certificates cannot be on transcripts unless they are approved by the State Chancellor's Office. As of now, the Certificates are on transcripts although there are not many. Ron Manzoni does not think this will be a big deal right now. He recommended submitting certificates with names and seeing what the State Chancellor's Office does. Neault confirmed this has to be in effect by the Fall 2008 term and the catalogs can catch up. She stated that according to section 52010 of Title 5, the regulation and revision of districts' policies and publications to address the issue, the District cannot give students an award internally that does not go on the transcript. Neault stressed the District needs to be in compliance. Henry Ingle asked Neault if she had received more guidance on the issue at consultation, to which she answered no. Neault continued the guidance from consultation is effective dates have been placed in the new changes and section 52010 was added to Title 5 due to publications and many of the changes affecting policies.

Libby Andersen recalled in the past the District made a decision to add certificates of completion to the transcripts in response to requests from the senate and employers on a requested basis. Neault affirmed Andersen is correct. Andersen added in order to continue to do that for awards with less than 17 units, we would have to have state approval. Many have been updated with the State Chancellor's Office.

There was considerable discussion in regards to the Councils' concerns about the Title 5 revisions and how they will address and implement the changes.

2. Cooperative Work Experience Education

Hess stated Cooperative Work Experience Education is described by section 55250 of Title 5. Many of the changes to this section are minor and are mostly changes in language. The big change is in the types of cooperative work experience. The parallel plan and the alternative plan were removed from Title 5. The remaining plans are General Work Experience (GWE) and Occupational Work Experience (OWE). GWE is supervised employment intended to assist students in acquiring desirable work habits and attitude and career awareness. OWE is education supervised employment extending classroom time based on occupational on the job learning stations. Students can earn up to 16 credit hours of cooperative education, however they can only earn a maximum of 6 semester credit hours in GWE and a maximum of 8 credit hours in OWE during one enrollment period (one semester) for a total of 16 combined credit hours. Neault explained the new regulation is completely different from how the District tracks it now. She stated the District only monitors 16 units not GWE versus OWE. Armstrong asked how the new regulations would pertain to the students who may have completed some work experience so far. For example, Armstrong asked how does the regulation effect a student who in prior semesters has completed 6 units of GWE, starting this semester are they limited to eight units in OWE or does their time begin now for the total of 16 units. Neault replied the 16 unit total has always been in place. She continued in regards to the other two requirements, a report is being produced to see what the District has. Neault explained the District will be lenient on this since it is happening mid-fall.

3. Mathematics and English Requirements for Associate Degree

Hess announced on October 19, 2007, there will be a symposium for the Mathematics and English Requirement for the Associate Degree. Neault expanded the Vice Presidents of Instruction, Vice Presidents of Student Services, Vice Chancellor Ingle, Dean Hess, as well as other important individuals on the campuses are invited. The purpose of the symposium is to gather everyone together and address some of the issues such as 1.) Assessment; 2.) Challenge Exam; 3.) New Math Requirements; and 4.) How to initiate articulation discussions with Continuing Education and K-12 faculty.

4. New Degree Requirements (Transfer Studies Degree)

Hess presented the New Degree Requirements, section 55063, and the impact they will have on the Transfer Studies Degree. In 2005 a legal advisory was issued that confirmed the language in Title 5 does not allow a degree to consist only of transfer coursework required by the CSU or UC systems. New Title 5 regulations states a degree must be 18 semester units of General Education (GE) and 18 semester units in a major or an area of emphasis based on the Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) therefore it needs a TOP code. This will impact our Transfer Studies Degrees. Manzoni believed our Transfer Studies Degree already satisfies the new requirements. He suggested changing the name of the degree.

Hess reiterated that a taskforce should be formed to address and implement all of the new Title 5 regulations. Ingle asked Hess if members for the Title 5 taskforce could be identified before the end of the joint meeting. Andersen stated the senate representatives would need to go back to their senates. Neault thinks either the Student Services Council (SSC) or Curriculum Instructional Council (CIC) should be able to address the new Title 5 regulations. She continued the new Title 5 regulations were brought up at the joint meeting because a lot of the changes cross both areas.

5. Credit/No Credit changed to Pass/No Pass

The grading option of Credit/No Credit has been changed to Pass/No Pass. Neault explained the change is effective Fall 2009. This change has a huge impact on the District in terms of forms and policies. The change affects 29 programs and the Education plan. The plan is to retroactively change our records so we do not have two different grading symbols. Andersen asked how far back the retroactive change would take effect. Neault answered all of the live records would be changed. White asked if the terminology was the only change or is there a change in content. Neault answered it was the terminology only.

6. Withdrawal

Neault stated there are two components to a withdrawal. The limits on withdrawals have been redefined in the regulations. The first piece being proposed is that a third withdrawal needs to be referred to a counselor for approval. Before a student can repeat a course for the third time they must receive counseling. When the student takes the course for the fourth time following 3 "W's" the Vice President of Instruction and the Vice President of Student Services has to approve the withdrawal prior to the student withdrawing. Neault stated the change is a redefinition of the number of withdrawals that are permissible. The second piece is required counseling and approval for the third and fourth withdrawal, which is still being debated. The District has asked for clarification on this proposal because they have also added regulations that a district may allow an extra substandard grade. What

has not been defined is the relationship between the "W's" and the substandard grades and the total allowable times a course is taken. The Council had further discussion regarding their concerns.

7. Course Repetition

Neault explained course repetition is permissive. This permits the District to allow a substandard grade for extenuating circumstances, such as illness, circumstances beyond the student's control, etc. The District can allow an extra repetition. What this means to the student is they can have two "F's" or "D's" removed instead of one if it is determined the student had an extenuating circumstance. Course repetition also affects education plans and academic standing. Neault thinks this will take one year to incorporate and test into the District's student system. She stated the District is already planning for the change.

Andersen asked the Counselors how the course repetition would impact transfer. Rick Cassar answered most institutions accept the policy of the school the student is transferring from.

Neault explained there are two options to implement the change; 1.)Implement the petition process and manually code it out. There will be implications or 2.)We wait until the program has been tested and the process can be done correctly. Neault continued course repetitions will have the biggest impact on the education plans. Andersen asked Neault if this was retroactive. Neault answered no, the date to enforce the change is May.

Hess stated the topics previously addressed by the Council are the initial Title 5 changes, but there are many more which is why a taskforce needs to be formed. The taskforce will review all of the implications and interpretations. Neault added there are big changes in the second part of the Title 5 changes for Noncredit; 1.) Acceptance of Noncredit courses for credit; 2.) Course repetition for Noncredit; and 3.) High School diploma.

Hess asked the Council if they wanted to discuss the composition of the taskforce. Neault recommended Certificates of Completion should be handled by the Curriculum Instructional Council (CIC). She continued Work Experience just needs the mechanism in place in the student system to track General Work Experience versus Occupational Work Experience. The Mathematics and English requirements are being dealt with. Neault is taking care of the grade option change from Credit/No Credit to Pass/No Pass. Neault stated Withdrawals should be placed on hold until further clarification. She stated the taskforce should be looking at the Certificates of Completion and the Transfer Studies Degree. Neault recommended some Counselors be on the taskforce for reviewing the Transfer Studies Degree. Hess confirmed both CIC and Student Services Council (SSC) will identify groups.

B. Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP)

Hess updated the Council on the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP). LDTP was designed to replace CAN numbers. Last year the colleges started submitting courses through LDTP. 45% of the courses submitted through LDTP were accepted and 55% were rejected. These courses were accepted under CAN but when SDSU went to the new LDTP pattern the courses were rejected. Based on this, the Region X Articulation group put together a resolution that has been submitted. Region X will not move forward with LDTP until there is discussion or resolution between the community colleges and the CSU system, and it is more in alignment with the CAN numbers. Hess explained after talking with the Articulation Officers the CAN numbers will be left in the college catalogs until there is further resolution with LDTP. Neault added there was conflict with SDSU taking the first position that LDTP would be the articulation for Accounting and Economics.

Andersen explained initially LDTP was only another way to transfer. Course to course articulation that was already in place would not be touched. Andersen continued now the faculty at SDSU, in Accounting and Economics, have decided our course outlines for Accounting 116A and Economics 120 & 121 must match the LDTP description. One reason all of these courses were rejected was for instance Economics 120 & 120 have a Mathematics prerequisite, where as a CAN course, clearly articulated across all CSU's and UC's, there are no prerequisites for mathematics. This has caused concern as to the interpretation of LDTP and why it has changed and it has led to a great drop for courses that have been proposed for LDTP. Andersen explained the resolution that Hess referred to has been sent to the State Academic Senate, who in their Spring 2007 plenary session, adopted a resolution against LDTP and what has been the reinterpretation by the CSU's. Ingle added Duane Short sent out a very thorough memo explaining the issues with LDTP. He offered to resend the memo to those who may not have received it but would like a copy.

Neault stated her understating is the State Chancellor's office has a taskforce that is working with CSU. White confirmed CSU is engaged. Neault explained at consultation Carol Bogue-Feinour, who is leading the taskforce, was unaware of the issue. Leslie Smith at San Francisco volunteered to help get CSU into the taskforce and get moving on it. Carole Bogue-Feinour was supposed to be expanding the taskforce. Neault will confirm the status at the CSSO board meeting.

Andersen explained the LDTP descriptors are not real courses. They are a skeleton agreed to by the CSU's. The CSU's do not teach the courses, however they have come to an agreement on the course descriptor with content and objectives. Andersen stated we are not articulating to LDTP. Paula Gustin thinks there will be huge implementations later on if we do have to articulate. She thinks this will overturn our curriculum writing and faculty will have to make sure they have all of the objectives, all of the language the CSUs are looking for in the LDTP descriptors. Gustin explained that faculty have been trying to minimize the objectives to eight and including all of the objectives from the LDTP descriptors

will double our course objectives. She continued all of the courses that have been integrated will need to be reviewed again. Gustin thinks in terms of our course outlines there will be a lot of work to be done and it will be a strain on CurricUNET. Neault added that is why we have to push the State Chancellor's office to stop it.

The Council had further discussion regarding their concerns of LDTP and the issues it has brought up.

C. Basic Skills and Reclassification of Pre-Collegiate

Hess informed the Council there has been a change in Title 5 regarding basic skills and funding. Now the only way the district can receive funding for a basic skills course is if it is not degree applicable. In the catalog there are some courses that we have been coding as basic skills but also stating they are degree applicable. Hess stated the next step is to review the courses, specifically in Mathematics and English, to determine whether they should be degree applicable or basic skills.

Hess stated the discussion will continue at the Mathematics and English Requirements symposium on October 19, 2007.

D. Combo Class Schedule

Hess stated most of the Council is aware the class schedule is moving to a combined class schedule versus individual class schedules. The direction has been to have a combined class schedule beginning Summer 2008. A wrinkle in the summer production timeline is a movement to have the printed schedule available one month earlier than previously distributed. The Combo Class Schedule Taskforce has been reviewing prototypes and how to move forward. One of the suggestions is to have a short course description for each course. Hess explained that 2/3 of our courses have a short course description in CurricUNET. There has been some discussion to modify those short course descriptions and create ones for the other courses.

Hess stated the printed schedule will be used more as a marketing tool and less as a registration tool and students will use the web to register. She continued there is also discussion for other delivery methods and other distributors.

Hess stated in the combined class schedule there will be a few pages for Continuing Education (CE). Edwin Heil asked Hess if there would be some reference to CE courses. He thinks that can be very positive. Brian Ellison explained at his former institution Credit and Noncredit was integrated. The idea was to have curriculum pathways available where students who take noncredit courses can eventually transfer to credit programs. Ellison stated half of the students attending the community college were coming from noncredit. Neault added 7,500 students in the 2006-2007 academic year started at CE. Neault asked Ellison if he felt that two pages for CE were not enough. Ellison replied yes, he would like more than two pages. Cassar thinks as time goes on the printed schedule will be used more as a marketing tool than as a registration tool. Neault

responded that is the idea. Andersen commented many times students from CE, when they first come onto the college campus need to remember, they can go back to CE for support. They can take open entry Mathematics, English, ESOL classes at CE while taking courses at the colleges. Andersen added sometimes making the transition from CE to college does not work so maybe there is someway to advertise that as well. Armstrong reinforced Andersen's comments at Mesa College they have the bridging lab, which is a noncredit lab for students in the credit program who need extra help. Neault asked Ellison to talk to Linda Mayfield regarding the pages for CE in the combined combo schedule.

Hess asked the Council to review the Abbreviated Summer 2008 Class Schedule Production Timeline handout. She asked them to review the dates and deadlines. Armstrong thinks the February 1, 2008, input deadline is a little late. Neault stated the schedule will be available on the web on April 1, 2008, and delivery/mailing will be April 15, 2008.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. 2nd Annual CurricUNET Users Group

Hess announced that the District Instructional Services Office (IS) would sponsor one faculty member from each college, including Continuing Education, to attend the 2nd Annual CurricUNET Users Group Conference. The conference is October 26, 2007, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The conference is being hosted by the North Orange County Community College District. Hess informed the Council the District IS office would be showcasing the automated tech review process, agenda's and online Camtasia training.

B. Handouts:

- 1. Draft minutes from the March 23, 2006, joint SSC/CIC meeting
- 2. Approved Changes to Chapter 6
- 3. Abbreviated Summer 2008 Class Schedule Production Timeline
- 4. 2nd Annual CurricUNET Conference Flyer/Registration

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Hess adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.