APROVED

Meeting of March 12, 2009 2:00 PM–District Office, Room 110

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby Articulation Officer—City College

Armstrong, Elizabeth Interim Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

Benard, Mary Vice President, Instruction—City College

Bergland, Yvonne Dean, Instructional—Mesa College

Ellison, Brian Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education

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

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

Parker, Juliette Articulation Officer—Mesa College

Short, Duane Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar

College

Weaver, Roma Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

ABSENT:

Craft, William Acting Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College

Matthew, Esther Academic Senate Representative —Continuing Education

STAFF:

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

Shelly Hess called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: February 12, 2009 Minutes

The minutes were approved. 10 for, 0 against, 1 abstained

M/S/P (Short/Andersen)

B. Approval of: March 12, 2009 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:

Physics 181A, General Physics Lab

Physics 181B, General Physics Lab

Applied Biology Program

Liberal Arts and Sciences (all emphases)-City

Legal Assistant 100A, Introduction to Paralegalism

Legal Assistant 100B, Introduction to Law

Legal Assistant 105, Legal Research

Legal Assistant 110, Legal Writing and Communications

Legal Assistant 115, Civil Litigation-Procedures

Legal Assistant 120, Tort Law

The agenda was approved as amended.

M/S/P (Bergland/Benard)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

Removed from the consent agenda: Journalism 206. Online Journalism

All other items were approved by consent. M/S/P (Lombardi/Bergland)

B. Approval of Program Changes

The program was approved by consent.

M/S/P (Short/Lombardi)

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

No Continuing Education curriculum.

D. Approval of Continuing Education Program Changes

No Continuing Education program changes.

E. Curriculum Items Discussed: Journalism 206, Online Journalism

Duane Short informed the Council that Miramar had two concerns with this proposal; first, Miramar was listed as activating the course when they had no

intention of doing so, and second, they were concerned that the course content was too similar to Journalism 202, Introduction to Mass Communication.

Laurie Van Houten responded 2 of the 7 course objectives were similar, but the focus of the course and its content were very different.

Libby Andersen stated that the originator had attended City's Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) and discussed the differences; while 202 was a survey course, 206 was an application course.

Jan Lombardi moved that the course be amended to remove Miramar from the proposal.

Action: Journalism 206, Online Journalism, was approved as amended.

M/S/P (Lombardi/Benard)

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Significant Lapse of Time Policy

Hess reminded the Council that at the February 26 joint meeting with Student Services Council, they had received a copy of the new significant lapse of time procedure. Recommendations to change some language were discussed, and those changes were now being presented to the Council.

The Council discussed the specifics of the procedure as written and expressed concerns about unclear/awkward language in section XX.1, Course Prerequisites. Hess agreed to revise the language for that section and bring back a new draft for the Council's review.

The Council went on to discuss section XX.3, Program Prerequisites. Short asked if this section only applied to programs that require applications for admission, or for all programs. The Council discussed the issue further, and resolved that the section needed to be split in two; one for addressing recency in program prerequisites, and the other for addressing recency requirements for program completion. Hess agreed to revise this section of the procedure as well and bring a new draft for the Council's review.

Lombardi expressed concern about the language in section XX.2.2, "...complete the subsequent level of a course sequence" as not all prerequisites are part of a sequence. Hess agreed to change the language to "...complete the course."

Elizabeth Armstrong asked if the colleges would need to document how they determined the amount of time for each recency prerequisite. Hess responded that they would have to go through the same scrutiny process as any other prerequisite. The Council expressed concern about having to do a statistical validation study on each prerequisite. Hess explained that validation was not always going to be necessary. She agreed to review the current District procedure and Title 5 to make sure the scrutiny process was the same for significant lapse of time as for course prerequisites, and announced that she would bring in a copy of

the current procedure for establishing prerequisites and corequisites to a future meeting to help the Council understand the process.

B. Catalog Redesign

Hess reminded the Council they had been sent a sample of the proposed font changes to the catalog. She asked if there were any objections to proceeding with the changes; there were no responses.

C. ARTF 260-Studio Art

Hess reminded the Council that at the February 12 meeting Art-Fine Art 260, Studio Art, had been approved with an amendment to remove some questionable language from the course description. The originating faculty objected to the change, and submitted new language for the Council's consideration.

Short stated his belief that the language seems intended to get around the limitations on course repeatability. He asked if the course had content different from the other art courses. Van Houten responded that in talking to the originator, this course is intended for students preparing their portfolios for transfer, or to prepare for an art exhibit. As such, students would already need to have works to use necessitating that the course be limited to advanced students. The originator did not want to put prerequisites on the course, so the course description was written to make the course's purpose clear.

Juliette Parker informed the Council the issue of prerequisites had been brought up at Mesa's CRC. There were simply too many courses for each of them to be listed as prerequisites. The course description was written with the intention of letting students know that it is an additional semester for a student nearing the end of the program.

Armstrong suggested using the term "capstone course" in the description. While saying the same thing, the phrase conveys more merit.

Lombardi pointed out the "capstone" courses always have perquisites, and this course does not. Short suggested adding even one course as a prerequisite, so that not just anyone could take it.

Hess announced the Council's suggestions of new language and a prerequisite would be taken back to the originating faculty for their consideration.

IV. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Van Houten announced there were fewer courses left to be integrated. She informed the Council there would be several course deactivations on the next agenda, hopefully further reducing the number of integrations remaining.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Van Houten informed the Council that at the last Steering meeting, the Committee determined it should be simple to change CurricUNET to allow revisions of distance education information. She is hoping to initiate this change as soon as Spring Break.

Roma Weaver announced the CE is still in the process of switching from ESLRs to SLOs. At this time, they are creating a report in CurricUNET, and will determine how to integrate SLOs into the course outlines at a later time.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

Hess announced that Student Services Council had not met since the joint meeting, and as Lynn Neault was not yet present, there would be no report.

D. State Academic Senate

Andersen announced that 2 articulation-related things had recently come from the State Academic Senate. The first is an interest in developing a statewide list of AP exams accepted for general education. The second is an interest in developing a paper on transfer, geared towards the unsophisticated readier. The goal is to help faculty members understand the transfer process, its benefits, and how it affects students.

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

Brian Ellison welcomed Elizabeth Armstrong back. He informed the Council that in the CE basic skills action plan, there is an emphasis to build bridges between CE and the colleges. He asked the Council to think about ways to build bridges when the colleges are developing curriculum.

F. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Short announced the information about the impacts of LDTP on transfer previously presented to the Council has now been presented to the State Chancellor's Office, and disseminated to community colleges throughout the state. Andersen thanked and commended Short for all of his hard work, stating he had helped to open the eyes of many to the limitations of LDTP.

Parker announced that Mesa had approved a catalog committee.

Lynn Neault arrived at 2:48 p.m.

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

Hess asked Lynn Neault to share any updates. Neault informed the Council that there were some issues with students attempting to transfer to SDSU. As of this morning, the district received a list from SDSU of Mesa students that had been rejected for admission. According to SDSU, the vast majority of these students were missing coursework. Student Services is currently trying to determine what course work is missing, and if the supplemental application is confusing for the

students. While Neault conceded that there are some students who legitimately did not qualify, she wants to find out about many others who the district feels should. She is working with SDSU to determine if mistakes were made; if SDSU made any errors, they will fix them. However, if the students were rejected because they failed to fill out the supplemental correctly, the will not be admitted at this time because there are too few available seats.

Short asked if the criteria SDSU is using includes the major preparation coursework. Some of SDSU's major preparation coursework is not in ASSIST, leaving people on the campuses to try and guess what the requirements are. If they are rejecting students because of a lack of major coursework, then they have a responsibility to provide those requirements. Andersen added that there were different major requirements depending on what college you were transferring form, which can hurt students who take classes at multiple colleges.

Neault said she was only aware of one student being turned down because of missing major preparation coursework. SDSU is strictly adhering to the TAG program.

Lombardi informed the Council that several English majors were rejected for transfer after being told that English is now an impacted major (meaning there are more stringent requirements).

G. Walked in Proposals

Hess invited City to present their walked in Curriculum.

Physics 181A and 181B, General Physics Lab
Lombardi explained that these courses were being renumbered from Physics
121A and 121B to make it easier for students to understand that they go with
courses 180A and 180B.

Action: Physics 181A, General Physics Lab and Physics 181B, General Physics Lab, were approved for City College pending technical review.

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

Applied Biology Track, Associate in Science

Lombardi explained the program was being reactivated due to an industry demand for entry level biotechnology.

Short expressed concern because Miramar has a degree with the same name but different requirements; employers who have students from the same district with degrees of the same name may expect the same level of preparation, but that will not be the case.

Action: Applied Biology Track, Associate in Science, was approved for City College pending technical review.

M/S/P (Benard/Andersen)

Liberal Arts and Sciences (all emphases), Associate in Arts

Andersen explained to she had updated each of the program emphases with courses that had been articulated since last year to keep them up to date. She also searched for deactivated courses in order to remove them, but did not find any.

Action: Liberal Arts and Sciences (all emphases), Associate in Arts, was approved for City College pending technical review.

M/S/P (Short/Lombardi)

Hess invited Miramar to present their walked in curriculum.

Legal Assistant 100A, Introduction to Paralegalism, Legal Assistant 100B, Introduction to Law, Legal Assistant 105, Legal Research, Legal Assistant 110, Legal Writing and Communications, Legal Assistant 115, Civil Litigation-Procedures, Legal Assistant 120, Tort Law

Carol Murphy told the Council that a representative from the ABA had met with the Dean and Director of the Legal Assistant (Paralegal) Program. In order to keep in compliance, Miramar was told that the courses need to be sequential within the discipline. The courses had been revised to follow those recommendations in order to keep accreditation. Murphy also informed the Council that the representative had indicated that English 101 should be a prerequisite for the first course, LEGL 100A. For now, the course has been added as an advisory due to the need for validation.

Armstrong added the representative who came told Miramar English 101 *should* be a prerequisite, but there are no other programs that currently have it as a prerequisite, and it is not in the official guideline. As such, Miramar feels it was likely the recommendation of the individual rather than an actual requirement; if it is later determined to be a requirement, a validation study will be performed at that time and the course will be brought back to the Council for revision.

Neault asked if the accreditation body requires the prerequisite, does it still require validation? Armstrong responded that Title 5 says requirements by state or federal agencies do not require validation; the accreditation body does not meet those criteria.

Andersen asked if a proposal had been submitted to deactivate the program at City to allow Miramar to keep its accreditation. Murphy responded that she thought City would have to originate the proposal. It was determined that a proposal had been submitted, and was currently awaiting approval by City's CRC.

Action: Legal Assistant 100A, Introduction to Paralegalism, Legal Assistant 100B, Introduction to Law, Legal Assistant 105, Legal Research, Legal Assistant 110, Legal Writing and Communications, Legal Assistant 115, Civil Litigation-Procedures, Legal Assistant 120, Tort Law, were approved for Miramar College pending technical review.

M/S/P (Bergland/Lombardi)

Lombardi asked if it was possible, as it was the catalog deadline, to walk in the Legal Assistant (Paralegal) Program deactivation for City College even though it

was not yet approved by City's CRC. Hess stated it would be allowed, pending confirmation by City's CRC that they approved the action.

Action: Legal Assistant (Paralegal) Certificate of Achievement and Associate in Science Degree, were approved for deactivation at City College pending confirmation of City CRC approval and technical review.

M/S/P (Lombardi/Bergland)

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The March 26, 2009, meeting will be held at Miramar College, Room W-248.
- B. Handouts:
 - 1. March 12, 2009 CIC Meeting Agenda
 - 2. Draft Minutes from the February 12, 2009 CIC meeting
 - 3. Curriculum Summary
 - 4. Significant Lapse of Time Handout
 - 5. Curriculum Updating Project

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Hess adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.