APPROVED Meeting of November 12, 2009

2:00 PM-District Service Center,

1st Floor Conference Room

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Benard, Mary Vice President, Instruction—City College Crispen, Nancy Academic Senate Representative—City College

Ellison, Brian Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education Fiero, David Academic Senate Representative—City College (proxy for Libby

Andersen)

Flor, Shirley Curriculum Chair—Mesa College

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

Lee, Otto Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning—District Office

Parker, Juliette Articulation Officer—Mesa College

Short, Duane Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar

College

Weaver, Roma Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Werle, Kathy Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Andersen, Libby Articulation Officer—City College Igou, Daniel Curriculum Chair—Miramar College

Matthew, Esther Academic Senate Representative —Continuing Education

McGrath, Tim Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College

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

STAFF:

Ficken-Davis, Amanda Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office Van Houten, Laurie Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office

GUESTS:

Jeffcoat, Kendra Observer from San Diego State University
Lopez, Michelle Observer from San Diego State University
McMahon, Marie Department Chair, Miramar College Biology

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:03p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: October 22, 2009 Minutes

The minutes were approved. 7 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

M/S/P (Short/Benard)

B. Approval of: November 12, 2009 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:

Economics 120, Principles of Macroeconomics Economics 121, Principles of Microeconomics Medical Laboratory Technician Program

The agenda was approved as amended.

M/S/P (Werle/Flor)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

The curriculum was approved by consent.

M/S/P (Benard/Werle)

B. Approval of Program Changes

Removed from the consent agenda:

Certificate of Performance-E-Commerce

Associate of Science-Administrative Assistant

Certificate of Achievement-Administrative Assistant

Certificate of Performance-Administrative Assistant

Certificate of Performance-Typist/Word Processor

Certificate of Performance-Website Designer

Duane Short asked to table these programs until a future CIC meeting as Miramar was not yet ready to vote on them.

The remaining program was approved by consent.

M/S/P (Flor/Parker)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

E. General Education Course Approval

All curriculum on the District and Transfer General Education Patterns list was approved.

M/S/P (Short/Werle)

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Course Description

Shelly Hess informed the Council about an error in the New Business Item form that had been sent to them; the originator should have been listed as Hess, not Juliette Parker.

Hess continued that this was the second reading of the form. It had been brought back for discussion because the Vice Presidents of Instruction were at a conference and not in attendance at the 10/22/09 meeting. She reminded the Council that in 2004, CIC had developed an outline guide for curriculum, including a requirement that course descriptions include a target audience statement. Unfortunately, the phrasing for this requirement is a little vague and has resulted in a lot of inconsistencies in the statements currently found in course descriptions. Hess has received a request to modify that statement in the outline guide. Based on the discussion at the last CIC meeting, there is a new proposed statement that says, "Include general statement that identifies the target audience, e.g. students who would benefit from taking this course."

Mary Benard asked if this meant that we were removing the information regarding where the course transfers to. Hess clarified that the transferability information is a separate section of the course description that Juliette Parker will discuss later; this pertains to the information within the actual course description. There are some course descriptions that identify courses as transferring to a specific institution or being part of a specific major; because our courses are aligned, this information is not always the same across our colleges. Hess referred the Council to look at an example statement in the Course Description handout.

Parker explained the current practice regarding target audience statements is not always what was intended. Hess continued that by clarifying the language in the outline guide, it will be easier for curriculum chairs and others to explain what is meant by "target audience" so that faculty have a clearer understanding.

Hess concluded that this would be brought back for a vote.

B. Math 46

Hess reminded the Council there had been confusion regarding Math 46 in relation to its degree applicability and catalog rights. The evaluators are concerned that some local colleges still offer elementary algebra as degree applicable. Because Math 46 is a non-degree applicable basic skills class for our district effective Fall 2009, if a student did not successfully complete Math 95 or its equivalent prior to Fall 2009, it will not be applicable to a degree or to satisfy a competency regardless of where it was taken.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Catalog Revision Proposal (Parker)

On behalf of the Mesa Catalog Committee, Parker presented a proposal to revise the District's catalog and course outlines for all the District's colleges. There are several changes that she is recommending. The first change is to remove the phrase "and/or private colleges and universities" from the transferability section of the course description. The reason for this is because the articulation officers are not able to ensure that each course will articulate to those colleges and universities; this has led to confusion by counselors and students.

The second change is to the course description and explanation of terms. Parker said the Mesa Catalog Committee would like to revise the credit and applicability information in the catalog course descriptions to abbreviations. Currently, information about transferability to UCs and CSU runs into the same sentence. Parker referred the committee to her New Business form, which shows the proposed change. 82 college catalogs have been reviewed and most have some sort of abbreviation; we would like to update the catalog to follow what other institutions are doing. There will be a legend indicating what the abbreviations mean: "A" will mean associate degree applicable, "CSU" will indicate that it transfers to a CSU and "UC" will mean that it transfers to a UC. The proposed effective date for this change is the 2011-2012 catalog.

Kathy Werle asked why we are waiting so long for this change. Hess responded that this proposal will need to go through consultation with all the colleges and then return to CIC for approval. Making the actual changes in the catalogs takes time and likely will not be possible for the 2010-2011 catalog. Benard asked if this will require a programming change in CurricUNET. Hess responded that it would not, rather a manual change in each catalog.

Parker continued the third change the Mesa Catalog Committee is recommending is an explanation of terms that will identify more accurately what takes place when a student transfers. The fourth and final change is to revise the course numbering description information in the catalog, specifically changing the language to make it more clear and accurate.

Hess asked Parker what action she would like to see from CIC at this point. Parker responded that she is asking for input from the colleges to make revisions to the plans.

Hess told Parker that she does not need CIC approval to take this proposal to the other colleges for consultation, but will need approval from CIC before any revisions go into effect.

Short commended Parker and the Mesa Catalog Committee for their hard work.

B. Walked-In Curriculum

Economics 120, Principles of Macroeconomics; Economics 121, Principles of Microeconomics

Shirley Flor announced that these courses were being walked in so they could be submitted for LDTP articulation; as discussed in previous CIC meetings, SDSU is requiring the classes be revised to include a prerequisite of MATH 96, Intermediate Algebra.

Hess announces that she received a request from Lynn Neault to share with the Council some statistics regarding current student success rates. Of the students who took these classes in Fall 2008, 571 students had not completed MATH 96 but most passed.

Short clarified what these statistics show is that the classes will probably see a drop of enrollment of 1/3 to $\frac{1}{2}$ by adding this prerequisite. Hess agreed.

Parker reminded the council that while LDTP has been suspended and the Council had previously decided not to submit courses unless necessary for course to course articulation with CSU. SDSU, CSU Long Beach and possibly Fullerton have stated that they will not accept these courses without this prerequisite. These are our top transfer institutions, so if we don't approve these revisions, we will lose course-to-course articulation with these schools.

Economics 120, Principles of Macroeconomics and Economics 121, Principles of Microeconomics were approved by consent.

M/S/P (Short/Parker)

Medical Laboratory Technician Program

Short announced this is a new program funded by the ARRA grant. The faculty have worked very hard to get this program through quickly. The program was not submitted to the Instruction Services office in time to meet the deadline for this meeting; however, the courses have all been approved and there is a need for urgency to continue to move this through the state approval process.

Lee complimented the Miramar faculty for fast tracking this program, and getting it through so quickly.

The Medical Laboratory Technician Program was approved by consent. M/S/P (Werle/Benard)

V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Laurie Van Houten announced that only 148 courses were left on the list.

Short asked if issues were created if an originator wrongly indicated that an already integrated course was going through integration (when really it was going

through 6 year review). Van Houten responded that the list was kept manually outside of CurricUNET, so this would not be a factor.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Van Houten announced that the Steering Committee had not met, as they were waiting for a faculty representative from City College.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

No report.

D. State Academic Senate

No report.

E. Chief Instructional Officers (Benard, Ellison, Lee, McGrath, Werle)

No report.

F. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Short announced that the community colleges have received a mandate to create a common course numbering system to facilitate articulation. The issue that this does not address is that just because courses share a number does not mean that they are used the same. As such, CID has been created as a community college-sponsored/driven program that will create and use course descriptors. Similar to what LDTP was originally supposed to be, a committee will review each course and determine whether it has the minimum requirements to satisfy the descriptor. Universities can then articulate the descriptor to their requirements, rather than maintaining separate articulation for each course with each college. This will significantly reduce the number of individual articulation decisions that need to be made. At this time, there is no system in place, but the intention is to create one in the future.

Van Houten asked if this committee was intersegmental; does it involve community college faculty, or just those from the UCs and the CSUs? Short responded at this time it is mostly community college faculty, with fewer UC and CSU reps. The committee is trying to be inclusive. The push has been to ask community college faculty to work on descriptors to allow more control. When the system is up and running, there will be review panels consisting of 1 community college rep, 1 UC rep, and 1 CSU rep. In the past, LDTP consisted only of CSU reps. This new format is a big improvement.

Parker encouraged addressing the program as being voluntary, since it is community college driven. There is a concern about involvement among faculty regarding whether this system will stay in place (LDTP didn't). Faculty want assurance this system will be around for awhile, making it worth their time and effort to get involved. With LDTP, 1 person at 1 school made a decision that has affected the whole state.

Lee asked if this scenario could cause the same thing to happen; 3 people deciding if a course fits into a category. While it's efficient, it could be biased. Short agreed that one of the issues going forward will definitely be if this 3 person body is legitimate enough to be trusted.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Reminder—Due to mandatory furloughs, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office may take longer than it traditionally has to approve programs. It is strongly recommended that you submit all new programs for the 2010-2011 catalog to CIC for approval as soon as possible.

B. Handouts:

- 1. November 12, 2009 CIC Meeting Agenda
- 2. Draft Minutes from the October 22, 2009 CIC meeting
- 3. Curriculum Summary
- 4. Review and Approval of G.E./Transferability Actions
- 5. Course Description Handout
- 6. Catalog Revision Proposal Handout
- 7. Curriculum Updating Project

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.