

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of October 9, 2008
2:00 PM—District Office Room 210

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer—City College
Benard, Mary	Acting Vice President, Instruction—City College
Bergland, Yvonne	Dean, Instructional—Mesa College
Flor, Shirley	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning— District Office
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair—City College
Murphy, Carol	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Vincent, Bill	Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

ABSENT:

Craft, William	Acting Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Ellison, Brian	Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Matthew, Esther	Academic Senate Representative —Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College

STAFF:

Ficken, Amanda	Acting Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
VanHouten, Laurie	Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office

GUESTS:

Chacon, Mario	Associate Dean, Tech Prep
Signorelli-Brown, Lydia	Work Experience Program Coordinator—Mesa College

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: September 11, 2008 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended. M/S/P (Bergland/Bernard)

B. Approval of: October 09, 2008 Agenda

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

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

The courses were approved by consent. M/S/P (Flor/Lombardi)

B. Approval of Program Changes

No Program changes.

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. LDTP: SDSU and Accounting Courses

Libby Andersen explained to the Council that following approval at the September 11, 2008, CIC meeting, Accounting 116A and 116B had been submitted for LDTP review. Having been assisted by SDSU in their submission for early review, both courses had been accepted for LDTP.

She continued that Otto Lee had joined the October District Articulation Council (DAC) meeting to discuss LDTP with Shelly Hess and the articulation officers. At the meeting, Lee was provided with a historical background of LDTP, including its development and change from a transfer pattern to an articulation vehicle. The articulation officers shared their concerns about the possible impacts on students, including possible scenarios where students may be negatively affected by District LDTP participation including: LDTP provides incorrect/harmful guidance for course selection to some major/campus combinations (e.g., Criminal Justice at SDSU); may prompt cancellation of existing campus-to-campus articulation; may result in "misaligned" coursework to some campuses; may result in loss of articulation to other systems (e.g., UC; private); and the numerous reports of flaws/inconsistencies in LDTP review process.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Andersen stated Lee wanted to identify a way to approach the issue with the Chancellor's Cabinet so as to not overwhelm them with the details, but still explain the possible impact on students, admissions offices and evaluations (all of which will be affected by the changes).

Lee stated he would like to thank the articulation officers for their work on this issue. He elaborated he is working with the articulation officers to come up with scenarios (such as the disadvantages listed above) that will easily explain to Cabinet the possible consequences a majority of students may endure while transferring under LDTP, including the specific majors impacted. He stressed the importance of having solutions the Cabinet can enact, and said that he and the articulation officers are still brainstorming to come up with them.

Andersen said with the approval of the Accounting courses for LDTP, we are ensuring that students will have no break in their ability to transfer to SDSU; while the immediate issue is resolved, there is a concern that LDTP will replace course-to-course articulation. We don't know how that will impact other articulation agreements. She summarized that the articulation officers' hope is the District administration will talk with CSU administration about the impact of their actions, showing them the bigger picture of how this will affect students.

B. Math 95/English Title 5

Hess informed the Council that she and Dean Lynne Ornelas had met with the CTE deans to discuss their concerns about the recent Title 5 changes to Math and English requirements. She will be meeting with English faculty and the English Discipline Dean on Wednesday, October 15 to begin working to create a definition for English competency.

Hess continued Math Discipline Dean Saeid Eidgahy was working to form a group to discuss the changes to Math 95. Andersen added that she had spoken with Carlos de la Lama, who had confirmed that City's Math department would be submitting a proposal in CurricUNET to renumber Math 95 for basic skills applicability, though the proposal is still being discussed by Math faculty at the three colleges.

C. Fashion 120

Hess reminded the Council that Mesa course Fashion 120 had been approved the previous spring. She explained that articulation officer Juliette Parker had researched the course and recommended removing its UCTCA and IGETC transferability. She further recommended amending the CSUGE to remove areas D6 and C2 and replace it with C1, as well as to amend District GE to remove it from area D-Social/Behavioral Sciences but keep it for area C.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Work Experience District Plan

Hess invited the Council's guests to present the District's Work Experience plan. Mario Chacon informed the Council the recent Title 5 revisions had led to changes to several District documents pertaining to Work Experience. He continued that

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

most of the changes to the documents involved updating the Title 5 language, and had been made in collaboration with campus Work Experience representatives and Deans.

Chacon explained there are two significant Title 5 changes that are to be discussed today: first, the elimination of the parallel and alternative plan formats, and second, the change in language regarding mandatory in person counseling at the site students are performing their work experience. He informed the Council that in addition to the meeting today, they will also be meeting with the Student Services Council to update them on the changes.

Lydia Signorelli-Brown explained that prior to the Title 5 changes, work experience had two formats. The first required that students be enrolled in at least 7 units (including work experience) to be able to take work experience courses. The second (alternate) format would only allow students to enroll in work experience and one other course. These have been eliminated in favor of General and Occupational work experience. Chacon continued that there also have been changes in the courses' repeatability; now students can take a maximum of 16 units of work experience (though only up to 6 units of that can be general work experience).

Chacon informed the Council that the language requiring in person site visits to observe students' work experience has been modified. A form has been created by the work experience faculty to take advantage of this change; in lieu of faculty having to visit every site (which can be difficult, as in the recent case of a student enrolled in work experience in Paris), this form can be filled out by a work experience advisor to explain the circumstances that might limit the ability to perform onsite visits, and the requested alternative. It is then reviewed by the campus site coordinator to determine if the request and alternatives suggested are appropriate. This will encourage the use of new technologies to monitor students' experiences, and will increasingly become useful as students take on work experience in areas such as Los Angeles where the cost to visit the site can be prohibitive to faculty, but the experience is invaluable for students.

Signorelli-Brown explained they are also working to address the language change regarding the elimination of the alternative and parallel plans. Under the new language, students may take up to 8 units of occupational work experience courses. Signorelli-Brown continued the work experience coordinators feel this is an issue for the District, as most Occupational work experience courses are only 1-4 units; this means students could conceivably enroll in multiple work experience courses in the same semester. This practice has implications for instructor pay, financial aid, and the question of whether students are meeting the intended educational effectiveness of the work experience units.

The work experience coordinators would like to create a limitation on enrollment, limiting students to only one work experience course per semester, whether it be Occupational, General, or subject specific. This would not disallow students taking an 8-unit internship, assuming that the experience that they are receiving is proportionate to the unit load. As an example, she listed a student that had taken classes in Automotive Technology working 40 hours a week at a dealership

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

servicing vehicles. Generally, the work experience coordinators feel that the work site experience is best take over a period of time and not all at once, though the current Title 5 language seems to allow this.

The Council discussed the implications of the Title 5 changes, and the steps that had already been taken to update District publications.

Lee stated that he felt that in light of the limitation that is being proposed, it is good that Chacon and Signorelli-Brown would also be meeting with the Student Services Council, as students will often add work experience during a shortened session late in the semester to make up units lost to dropping classes, etc. These changes need to be understood by counseling, who will be advising those students.

B. Significant Lapse of Time Policy

Hess reminded the Council the need for a significant lapse of time policy had been raised at the Joint CIC-SSC meeting. She continued that Lynn Neault would present further information to the Council about the decisions that needed to be made, but as she was not present, the issue will be raised at a later CIC meeting.

C. Accreditation/Student Learning Outcomes

Hess explained to the Council during a recent accreditation presentation, WASC announced that colleges would be required to present degree, general education, and program levels of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in their catalogs. Lynn Neault, the District Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), asked Hess to help facilitate this requirement. During the most recent District Accreditation meeting Hess i provided representatives from each college with sample Student Learning Outcomes to help guide their effort. The degree-level student learning outcomes samples were based on Mesa College (who had completed many of the SLO requirements), the language for the goals for the general education level student learning outcomes were was taken directly from Title 5, and the general education level student learning outcomes were modified from samples of other California community colleges which have already incorporated outcomes into their catalogs. These samples, without full context, have spread to faculty members on the college who are concerned that the District is enforcing SLOs on the colleges. Hess reiterated that these samples were just ideas, and in no way was the District attempting to dictate to the colleges what they should do. Hess is coordinating meetings with the college SLO coordinators who are coordinating discussions and gathering feedback from the appropriate college constituents, i.e., Academic Senate, CRC, and discipline faculty. She wanted to give the Council this context so individuals could respond to any concerns that might be brought to them. She offered to send the samples that she had created to the Council for their review.

Hess explained the several levels required: 1) Associate Degree level; 2) General Education level and; 3) Program/Department level. She continued while the Associate Degree SLOs would vary by college (but would likely be similar), since the three colleges have the same general education requirements those SLOs should be the same; to that end, all three colleges would be collaborating and

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

working toward concurrence. The coordinators have met and have returned to their Academic Senates to start presenting the Associate Degree and general education level outcomes for feedback and development at the college level. Hess explained that SLOs would not be presented to the Council for their approval, as they were college-level, department-level decisions.

The Council continued to discuss the status of the SLO effort at the individual colleges.

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Laurie Van Houten announced that there were less than 200 courses left on the list to be integrated; she expected that number to decline further due to several course integrations being included in the meeting's Curriculum.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Van Houten announced the Steering Committee may have found a new date to meet, and would do so beginning at the end of October. She continued that making Total Hours changes mandated by Title 5 were currently on the CurricUNET test site, and that she hoped to move to the live site soon.

Roma Weaver announced that Continuing Education had made 2 big steps. First, they were working on an approval process for distance education courses. Second, because they have moved their accreditation date to match the rest of the colleges, there are many courses to change.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

Jan Lombardi announced that the State Academic Senate would be meeting in November.

E. Chief Instructional Officers (Benard, Bergland/Craft, Ellison, Vincent)

Mary Benard announced that the CIOs would be meeting at the end of October.

F. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Andersen reported that the articulation officers had just received their lists from SDSU for 2008-2009, and would be working on the prep for the major.

Andersen informed the Council that in order to submit Economics 120 and 121 to LDTP, SDSU was requiring a prerequisite of Math 96 (Intermediate Algebra). At present, we have course-to-course articulation with SDSU, so our students will not be impacted at this time, but this could change if they choose to follow the same path as the Accounting department. She continued that in order to transfer,

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

our students have to have Intermediate Algebra; what we are unclear of is if students will be required to retake Economics if they take it prior to passing Math 96. She will keep the Council updated.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The October 23, 2008, meeting will be held at Mesa College, LRC room 208.

B. Handouts:

1. October 9, 2008 CIC Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from the September 11, 2008 CIC meeting
3. Curriculum Summary
4. Math/English Title 5 Handout
5. Draft Work Experience Policy
6. Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

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