

College Curriculum Committee  
 Meeting Minutes  
 Tuesday, February 3, 2009  
 1:31 p.m. - 3:16 p.m.  
 Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: January 20, 2009	<p>#3 New Certificates of Achievement: Part of the discussion was we wanted to have students participate in commencement pending okay from Commencement Committee and it's under discussion (Fall 2009 decision)</p> <p>Viticulture: Name of certificate should be vetted by CCC before approval.</p> <p>So moved to allow exception to rules of order. Yeahs have it. One No</p> <p>So moved to approve the minutes as amended. Yeahs have it.</p>
2. Viticulture Curriculum Sheet	Curriculum sheet tabled until the next meeting
3. Program Planning	<p><b>Speaker: Katie Townsend-Merino</b></p> <p>More colleges are on warning for alignment of planning, budget and policies and SLOs. Our process must be open and transparent. WASC also demands that money spent be aimed at student learning. Thus the need for really good program plans. At meeting in your division, review ACCJC rubric level-- sustainable level of planning. And that the plans were vetted and connected. Need to demonstrate cycles of program planning and budgeting.</p> <p><i>Starts from course plan and moves up:</i></p> <p>Planning Committees (much like Roundtable/Ed Resources) using Strategic planning goals</p> <p>Unit Plan /Division Plan</p> <p>Course Plan</p> <p>SEE Draft of program planning document and note that we want to test it out.</p> <p>Annual Plan due from every program</p> <p>Comprehensive program review rotating through every five years.</p> <p>This new doc replaces program review.(it's by department)</p> <p>How do you define a program? It depends on the college. You might think about a program in terms of basic skills, transfer, career, etc?</p> <p>This process will make budget decisions more transparent. And we'll thus get a sense of the collective needs of the college.</p>
4. GE Breadth Statement	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft-Burns</b></p> <p>Revising group will meet and consider suggestions to the statement from the faculty. Be sure faculty get feedback. Maybe we should incorporate SLOS/FRAMES in the GE statement since that's what's required by accreditation?</p>
5. Draft Stand Alone Course Approval Form	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft-Burns</b></p> <p>Open for comments. The draft gives a brief overview of the issues. Suggest that we review this document based on the old mission statement for now. New courses can be brought forward in the interim.</p> <p>We would like to get some stand-alone approvals before summer. CCC <i>agreed</i> that this doc would meet its needs as a way to approve stand alone courses with some amendment to the form and sign off page (for curriculum rep triage and signature) There will be an electronic</p>

	<p>version of this form, ideally.</p> <p>Questions around which course will need to be submitted for stand-alone approval arose. CHB reported that by March 1 Nunez should have an updated list of stand-alone course. Elizabeth Barkley suggested that Judy Baker might be able to assist with the development of an online form. CCC reps are encouraged to review their division's stand-alone list for accuracy. Peter Murray questioned whether non-credit courses were required to submit stand-alone forms. Katie will research this and report back to CCC. In response to a question regarding courses that are stand-alone because the CCC has frozen review of GE courses, Bernie reminded CCC that the CCCCCO allows a one-year grace period for course with degree applicability or transfer/articulation agreements pending.</p>
<p>6. Advanced Placement Questions</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Bernie Day</b></p> <p>Day electronically distributed an Advanced Placement Primer she developed to CCC members for discussion with their local faculty. CCC representatives will share the document with their divisions. CCC will develop a policy for the review of AP; however, the decision regarding awarding of AP credit rests with discipline faculty. Faculty reported that the document would be helpful in explaining AP to their constituents.</p>
<p>7. Division Reports</p>	<p><b>Counseling:</b> No report.</p> <p><b>F A:</b> Looking at developing a certificate in popular culture. Kay Thorton is currently engaging in dialogue with stakeholders from other divisions about he certificate.</p> <p><b>Adaptive learning:</b> There are a few upcoming minor SPED changes.</p> <p><b>BSS:</b> Title 5 updates are underway.</p> <p><b>BH:</b> Department directors reviewing curriculum sheets, viticulture with CCC.</p> <p><b>PSME:</b> Discussing AP and updating the General Studies: Science degree.</p> <p><b>Library:</b> No report</p> <p><b>PHED:</b> No report</p> <p><b>L A:</b> Revising curriculum sheets</p> <p><b>CTIS:</b> No report</p>
<p>8. GE-American Cultures Feedback</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Question whether criteria language is broad enough for courses outside social sciences? Committee members responded that they made an effort to be inclusive of other disciplines (e.g. BIOL 14) in their language.</li> <li>2. Language seems much more clear than previous defining language.</li> <li>3. Consider inviting the committee chair (Ziegenhorn) to speak to BHS division?</li> </ol> <p>Bring back to CCC for discussion and/or vote next meeting?</p>
<p>9. GE- Lifelong Understanding</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Question regarding whether this description demonstrates as much rigor as other areas?</li> <li>2. Pros and cons of keeping the criteria fairly general or making the criteria more specific were examined. CCC reps should forward specific suggestions to the committee chair (Serna).</li> <li>3. Question whether most currently approved "Lifelong Learning" courses would qualify for this area given the new description.</li> <li>4. Question whether there had been discussion about requiring courses from two areas? Is it to ensure</li> </ol>

	<p>breadth and exploration or because there was confusion regarding whether it was due to confusion about the parallel CSU GE requirement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. Question whether we should we engage in a campus-wide discussion about what lifelong learning constitutes?</li><li>6. Discussion ensued that demonstrated consensus that this is important to students' lives.</li><li>7. Discussion about the historical perspective regarding this requirement.</li></ol>
10. Other	<p>Expressed need to develop ways to help faculty support students with limited English skills. This is a challenge we'll continue to face in the future. CHB is working with Kate Jordahl to outline regular and effective contact in distance learning. Rich discussion thus far, with faculty weighing in online.</p>

**Distribution:**