

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

APPROVED

Meeting of November 11, 2010
2:00 PM—District Service Center,
First Floor Conference Room

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Andersen, Libby	Articulation Officer—City College
Benard, Mary	Vice President, Instruction—City College
Ellison, Brian	Vice President, Instruction & Student Services—Continuing Education
Hess, Shelly	Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
McGrath, Tim	Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Norvell, Elizabeth	Academic Senate Representative—Mesa College (proxy for Toni Parsons)
Parker, Juliette	Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Reed, Cheryl	Academic Senate Representative—Miramar College (proxy for Daniel Igou)
Shelton, Deanna	Academic Senate Representative—City College (proxy for Jan Lombardi)
Weaver, Roma	Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education
Werle, Kathy	Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College

ABSENT:

Igou, Daniel	Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Lee, Otto	Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services and Planning—District Office
Lombardi, Jan	Curriculum Chair—City College
Matthew, Esther	Academic Senate Representative—Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn	Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
Parsons, Toni	Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Short, Duane	Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar College

STAFF:

Ficken-Davis, Amanda	Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

GUESTS:

Scott, Carmen	Curriculum Technician, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
---------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

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

Shelly Hess welcomed the Council and its guest and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: October 28, 2010 Minutes

The minutes were approved. M/S/P (Weaver/Benard)

B. Approval of: November 11, 2010 Agenda

The agenda was approved. M/S/P (Andersen/Parker)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

The curriculum was approved by consent. M/S/P (Andersen/ Weaver)

B. Approval of Program Changes

The programs were approved by consent. M/S/P (Andersen/Benard)

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

Libby Andersen informed the Council that in submitting to the second review for UC Transfer, Anthropology 115 was denied articulation. As a result, Mesa did not submit the course. Andersen added that Agriculture 108 and 118 were being submitted to UC Davis for articulation; more agriculture courses are likely to follow.

All curriculum on the District Transfer General Education Patterns list was approved, with the note that Anthropology 115 was previously denied UC articulation. M/S/P (Benard/Norvell)

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Walk-In Process (Action)

Hess reminded the Council of the previous discussion regarding the walk-in process. She referred everyone to Handout 6, the Walk-In Curriculum Approval

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Form. Hess reviewed that the form was clarified to reflect that it will be used for the catalog deadline and the final meeting of the year, the two meetings that see the most walked-in proposals. For other dates, curriculum will be walked in following the current process.

Mary Benard expressed concern that courses being walked-in were not being vetted through Student Services. Hess responded that aside from the Student Services representatives on the campus CRCs; other than that, we generally do not work with Student Services until after curriculum has been approved. A new new/updated process has been put into place to ensure that they are notified sooner of curriculum changes that will impact them. Instructional Services collaborated with Student Services to develop “Student Services Implementation Notes.” Curriculum that has potential implementation impacts is included on a report that is sent to SS after each CIC meeting. This new process has created a new level of communication between Student Services and Instructional Services. It has also added an additional level of scrutiny to our technical review process, enabling us to catch errors and potential issues sooner.

Ellison relayed the concern amongst the VPIs and VPSSs about CIC and its relation to coursework such as this one that came through as walk-in. There is an ongoing struggle with courses like English 265B. Ellison encouraged looking at preventative aspects within the curriculum process short of VPIs refusing to offer approved courses that have issues yet to be resolved.

Benard asked if there can be a student services review during technical review of the course. Hess responded that could happen, if that is what the colleges want to do. She reiterated her belief that the process should not be driving approval. Implementation is a separate issue and can be addressed as such. Benard clarified her concern is that this is an issue that was not addressed in the design of the curriculum; it may not be a mere process issue.

Ellison understood that the focus of this committee is curriculum. He would like to see a way to let people know when upcoming agenda items have potential issues. The problem with this particular course is that it was approved as a walk-in at the last meeting. Many people did not have a chance to review the course ahead of time and were not as thorough as they should have been in reviewing the course. He feels this could have been avoided.

Hess responded that many of the same questions currently being asked were asked during the May 14th discussion of the course prior to its approval.

Andersen stated that her concern is always the students. While these issues may not have been apparent at the start, there was a need to move forward in order to collect data. Maybe because this course is experimental, this should have automatically triggered a more thorough review. She mentioned a previous meeting where Student Services brought to the Council’s attention an issue with a different course.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Ellison stated that because of the issues, this course probably should not have been approved when it was. The faculty members presenting the course felt they understood the implication, but clearly did not understand the effect that the course would have.

Juliette Parker stated her belief that the student services representatives on the campus CRCs should probably be tasked with bringing up these issues. She reminded the Council that Vice Chancellor Neault used to attend CIC meetings; Parker feels that had she attended this one, many of these issues could have been brought up and discussed more thoroughly prior to approval. Perhaps she should resume attending meetings to assist us with these issues.

Hess added that the new process that has been added of sending Student Services implementation notes has added an additional level of scrutiny and communication to the process.

Cheryl Reed added that because this course was a walk-in, Miramar's curriculum committee did not have an opportunity to review the course before it was approved.

Hess summarized that issues like the one presented by English 265B are one of the reasons why we want to formalize the walk-in process, to make sure that the courses coming through (which often tend to be the ones that have the most impact) are thoroughly reviewed.

Action: The new walk-in process and form were approved by the Council for use at the catalog deadline and the final spring meeting. M/S/P (Benard/Parker)

B. District Subject Assignment List (Information)

Hess reminded the Council that they had previously reviewed and discussed the revised District Subject Assignment List (formerly known as the Discipline Deans List). She gave them a list of the roles that the Discipline Dean is expected to play, as found in previous CIC meeting minutes. Hess announced that the list would be sent out, and that the Council could discuss at a later time whether any other responsibilities need to be added.

C. CIC Subcommittees (Information)

The Council reviewed a partial list of CIC subcommittees that included the Educational Review Subcommittee and the Catalog Subcommittee. Hess explained the role of the Educational Review Subcommittee, which is to review and discuss changes to general education and graduation requirements such as the recent recommended changes to the multicultural graduation requirements.

Parker asked what the terms are for members of each subcommittee and how they are selected. Hess responded that she is not sure. The complete list of subcommittees also includes DAC, CurricUNET Steering, and Policies and Procedures. The terms have not been firmly established for any of the committees; this is something that can be decided by the Council. Generally,

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

committee members are recommended by the academic senate of each college (and Continuing Education as applicable).

Tim McGrath arrived at 2:29 p.m.

Libby Andersen asked that the list be sent out for review and brought back for further discussion. Hess agreed.

Kathy Werle arrived at 2:30 p.m.

The Council then discussed the Catalog Subcommittee. Hess informed the Council that currently, requests and recommendations are sent by each college to the District Office of Instructional Services. That office currently decides whether to implement the recommendations. This subcommittee will allow others to vet and decide on changes, making the process more inclusive and democratic.

Andersen recommended adding a co-chair to this subcommittee to mirror the set up of the Educational Review Subcommittee. The co-chair would be determined by the college academic senates.

Tim McGrath asked about the difference between this committee and the Combo Class Schedule Committee. Hess responded that the class schedule committee is run by the District's Public Information and Government Relations Office. The committee membership is different, as the class schedules have different political ramifications than the catalogs.

Hess added that Mesa's catalog committee meets twice a year; she anticipates a similar timeframe for this committee.

Hess summarized that she would be adding the selection process, term length, and meeting schedule to the description of each subcommittee and would bring this issue back for further discussion.

D. Instructional Policies (Action)

The Council reviewed the draft policy *Community Service Programs*. It was determined this draft policy is ready for submission to the District Governance Council.

Action: The draft policy Community Service Programs was approved for submission to the District Governance Council. M/S/P (Weaver/Andersen)

The Council next reviewed the draft policy *Military Courses and Education Coordination*. There was concern about the title of the draft policy. It was decided that the draft policy would be returned to the policies and procedures subcommittee for further discussion and revision.

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

Next, the Council reviewed the draft policy *Health Occupation Instruction*. It was determined this draft policy is ready for submission to the District Governance Council.

Action: The draft policy Health Occupation Instruction was approved for submission to the District Governance Council. M/S/P (Weaver/Andersen)

The Council reviewed the draft policy *Catalogs and Related Information Publications*. It was determined this draft policy is ready for submission to the District Governance Council.

Action: The draft policy Catalogs and Related Information Publications was approved for submission to the District Governance Council. M/S/P (Andersen/Benard)

The Council reviewed the draft policy *Delineation of Functions*. It was determined this draft policy is ready for submission to the District Governance Council.

Action: The draft policy Delineation of Functions was approved for submission to the District Governance Council. M/S/P (Werle/Benard)

IV. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project (Van Houten)

Hess discussed the status of the updating project. Mary Benard asked for an update list of the courses yet to be integrated to be sent out.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee (Van Houten/Weaver)

Hess reported that the Steering Committee had met and began going through the list of things to update. District Instructional Services is working with Governet to fix the FTEF and Hours to Units calculations on the CR.

Benard mentioned that there was a discussion at the CIO Conference regarding using CurricUNET to manage standalone courses. Hess responded that we would like to add several CB codes required by the new State Chancellor's Office form.

Benard added there was also discussion about ways to use CurricUNET to track and trigger reports for Distance Education courses and the substantive change form.

Andersen expressed her concern that there are courses approved for Distance Education the faculty do not offer and do not want to offer, such as language courses. There is no way to remove approval. Hess reminded the Council the Distance Ed approval list includes courses approved prior to online course offerings (such as telecourses).

C. Student Services Council (Neault)

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

No report.

D. Joint Meeting Agenda Items

Andersen recommended having Student Services look at the new procedure for walked in courses. She also added the upcoming change in validating prerequisites and corequisites.

Benard added SB 1440.

Parker added the District's practice in accepting credit.

E. State Academic Senate

The plenary session was occurring the same day as this CIC meeting.

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

McGrath informed the Council that a major topic of discussion at the CIO was SB1440. There is a fear that while a decision is in the works, it may be made at a point where we have to move very quickly. Stephanie Low was at the meeting, and emphatically asking everyone to please adopt the initial state template and make changes later in order to make the process easier on both the colleges and the State Chancellor's Office. Hess informed the VPIs that a meeting would be held in the near future where Duane would go over a presentation that included our local options.

Andersen expressed that we are waiting for SDSU to tell us what they are going to do so that we can choose our next steps. McGrath responded that he has been told that SDSU will play by the same rules as the other CSUs.

Hess asked if there was any news about SDSU's service area. McGrath responded that for the spring, they are accepting students north of the 56. CSUSM is also becoming concerned about impaction. Ellison added that Student Services has been trying to get a list of the students denied transfer and why.

Andersen added that she is concerned about the 5 models that have been sent through. Only one has a complete set of descriptors, making it difficult for us to adapt the models to our local curriculum.

Benard mentioned that Stephanie Low had talked about creating a template for language that could be added to the printed catalogs referring students to the online catalog for more up-to-date program information.

G. Articulation Officers (Andersen, Parker, Short)

Parker announced that the articulation officers had agreed that because of the issues with maintaining and creating new articulation, we will not be sending an

San Diego Community College District Curriculum and Instructional Council

articulation other than the course outline of record. In the past, sending syllabi has resulted in a loss of articulation.

Andersen added that in the past, the state academic senate has issued a series of resolutions to the CSUs and UCs reminding them that course outline is the official record and should be the only document used for articulation.

Ellison informed the Council that K-12 adult education has seen transformational change recently. A document came out of the State Department of Education regarding this change. There are questions about whether community colleges will be included in the change. The ramifications of the document are startling; much of what the state would like K-12 adult education to become is what our Continuing Education is. The problem we face is that K-12 adult education is generally funded categorically. That funding is evaporating, and these programs along with it. San Diego Unified has placed their adult education on the chopping block for 2011-2012. We are working with them to have a contingency plan in place should their program cease to exist.

Parker asked how this will impact our program. Ellison responded that this program serves about 1100 students. We do not have the facilities at this time to serve that many people; if we were able to secure access to his facilities, then it might be feasible for us to expand our operations. There are several factors to consider in whether we want to approve it such as funding, State Chancellor's Office approval (as what they offer is different than the preferred path of our students), and the consideration of other options. It is not definite that the program is going away, but they will not know until May. Our decisions will likely need to be made before than just in case.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The December 9th meeting will be held at the District Service Center, 1st Floor Conference Room.
- B. Handouts:
 - 1. November 11, 2010 CIC Meeting Agenda
 - 2. Draft Minutes from the October 28, 2010 CIC meeting
 - 3. Curriculum Summary
 - 4. General Education Course List
 - 5. Walk-In Process New Business Form
 - 6. Walk-In Curriculum Approval Form
 - 7. District Subject Assignment List
 - 8. Discipline Dean Roles and Responsibilities List
 - 9. CIC Subcommittee List (partial)
 - 10. Curriculum Updating Project

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Hess adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.