

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 15, 2011
2:08 p.m. - 3:36 p.m.
Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: March 1, 2011	Minutes approved as written. M/S/C (Schultz, Hartwell)
2. Announcements	Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft, Bernie Day
a. Credit for IB Exams	a. Announcement: Although the committee has been working on this wording/pattern, it had become clear that we are not going to be able to approve the entire pattern as recommended by ASCCC. Instead, CCC reps should forward the decision(s) regarding individual IB subject exams from appropriate discipline faculty to Orrell, Holcroft and Nuñez. The information will be added to the 2011-12 Catalog. These are due no later than 3/21.
b. AS Update: Transfer Degrees	b. Day: Some departments have met to discuss. There are more questions than answers from the State. Some community colleges are holding back to wait to see how this is going to work/impact students and campuses. The first FH drafts are very inclusive but that may not be the ideal purpose of the transfer degree. Rather, faculty should specifically consider the requirements of our <u>local</u> CSUs. It's critical that the faculty understand the transferability of our courses before they're included in our transfer degrees. Please continue to encourage your faculty to participate in CID as course descriptors and model TMCs continue to be developed.
c. Regional Curriculum Training	c. Major areas of discussion will be transfer degrees and Title 5 changes regarding prerequisite implementation. Stephanie Low will be here. 10-4 on Saturday, April 9. Lunch will be provided.
d. COR Training Suggestions	d. Holcroft shared with the committee that the BHS division has been successfully collaborating on COR in their division meetings. At each, every faculty brings one COR most in need of update. Gillian presents a mini-training outlining the requirements for one section of the COR per meeting (e.g. course descriptions at one mtg, need/justifications at another, etc.) The mini-trainings are short which keeps people engaged in the topic and the hands-on application has been extremely effective. Holcroft suggests that divisions consider trying this or something similar to help faculty with maintaining and writing outlines.
e. SLO update	e. We have almost 100% of course-level SLOs done! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder that faculty must assess a minimum of two SLOs per course per year. Once SLOs are assessed, reflections/revisions are due no later than the third week of the following quarter. If SLOs are assessed in Spring quarter, deadline for completing reflection/revisions is the third week of the following Fall quarter. • Program-Level SLO's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ November 28 deadline was for at least 2 PL-SLO's for each program. Most were completed on time but SLO coordinators continue to follow-up with several that are outstanding. 3/21 is the drop-dead date for these to be included in the Catalog.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PL-SLOs will be compiled and sent to all faculty. ○ Next step is to develop assessment strategy for each PL-SLO. Faculty will receive a tool help them map courses in their program to each PL-SLO. Holcroft and Schultz gave a brief orientation to the planning tool and recommended that program faculty collaborate to complete it. One completed plan per program must be submitted to the Office of Institutional Research and Instruction no later than 5/27 at 5 p.m.
3. Red-lining Policy and Procedure	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</p> <p>Some wording changes were suggested: the wording reads as though the deans would be making these decisions regarding the equivalency and that an area of faculty primacy. Suggested language change to indicate the dean as the filtering agent to move petitions to the appropriate faculty to make the call. Please bring this to your constituency groups for discussion and action at the next meeting. Is it possible to see if it can be accessed thru MyPortal? Electronic form storage? Holcroft will check on this option.</p>
4. FHGE vs. IGETC/CSU GE	<p>Speaker: Bernie Day, Carolyn Holcroft</p> <p>Holcroft: As faculty consider developing AA-T degrees, we must consider whether to include a transfer degree <u>in addition to</u> <u>OR in place of</u> our standing AA degree. One of the considerations is the difference in the FHGE vs. IGETC/CSU GE patterns. Day prepared a document which compares/contrasts the three patterns in terms of FH course applicability. Please share with your faculty and encourage conversations. Some things to consider in these conversations: is the degree that the student getting a terminal degree? A Transfer degree would be preparing the student for future study vs. the “regular” AA degree possibly to go into the workforce, and these two student populations may/may not best be served by different GE patterns.</p>
5. Credit-by-Exam	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</p> <p>Catalog wording considered. Suggestion that the form should have 2 signators: dean and dept chairs/discipline faculty so that there are checks and balances. Tech Prep (HS/ROP) courses will need to be added to the list. Holcroft reminded that only courses listed will be eligible for CBE, and CCC reps foster discussions with constituents to determine if any courses in their division will offer it. These decisions must be forwarded to Nunez no later than 3/21 for catalog inclusion. Holcroft also reminded that the “units in residence” requirement is currently under review by the state so we will need to be aware of any changes to this requirement going forward.</p>

Atendees: B. Cashmore, S. Connell, B. Day, J. Dye, M. Francisco, R. Hartwell, C. Holcroft, K. Jones, K. Jordahl, M. Knobel, A. Lee, L. Meade, D. McNeil, E. Orrell, G. Schultz, K. Svetich, V. Villanueva