A. Routine Matters
   1. Call to order
   2. Approval of the Agenda
   3. Approval of the Consent Calendar
      a) Academic Senate Summary: February 12, 2015 (pg. 2)
      b) Curriculum Summary: February 19, 2015 (pg. 7)
   4. Academic Senate President’s Report – Paul Wickline
   5. Academic Senate VP Report – Rebecca Eikey

B. Committee Reports

C. Unfinished Business
   1. Policies on Counseling Services – in Policy Review Committee
   2. Formation of Ongoing Accreditation Committee – for Senate Discussion in Fall 2014
   3. Local Graduation Requirements – for Senate discussion in Fall 2014

D. Discussion Items
   1. BP 4260 Prerequisites and AP 4260 Prerequisites – David Andrus – (pg. 12)
   2. Institutional Learning Outcomes – Rebecca Eikey (pg. 31)

E. Action Item
   1. Approval of discipline assignment for Daniel Otto, Culinary Arts instructor (pg. 37)
   2. Program Review –

F. Reports
   • Division Reports

G. Announcements
   1. Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy, February 28th 10:00 am to 3:00 pm Palomar College
   2. Supporting Student Completion, March 6th 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. location TBD
   3. Academic Academy, March 13-14, Westin South Coast Plaza, Costa Mesa
   4. 2015 Noncredit Regional Meeting, March 20th 9:30 am to 2:00 pm, Cerritos College
   5. Day of Assessment I March 20th 9:00 am to 3:00 pm in UCEN 107
   6. Spring Area C Meeting, March 28th, Location TBA
   7. Spring Plenary Session, April 9-11th, Weston San Francisco Airport
   8. Vocation Leadership Institute, May 7-9th, San Jose Marriott
   9. Day of Assessment II May 9th 9:00 am to 3:00 pm location TBA
   10. Faculty Leadership Institute, June 11-13, San Jose Marriott
   11. Curriculum Institute, July 9-11th, Anaheim-Orange Country, Doubletree

H. Open Form

I. Adjournment:

The next Senate meeting will take place on March 12, 2015
As always everyone is welcomed
Summary of Academic Senate Meeting February 12, 2015

Attendance: Paul Wickline, Lee Hilliard, Thea Alvarado, Ruth Rassool, David Andrus, Ann Lowe, Bob Maxwell, Diane Solomon, Chelley Maple, Patty Robinson, Michael Sherry, Philip Marcellin, Dr. Jerry Buckley, Andy McCutcheon, Rebecca Eikey, Shane Ramey, Regina Blasberg, Edel Alonso, Deanna Riviera, Kelly Burke, Ron Karlin, Heidi McMahon, Peter Hepburn and Amy Shennum.

A. Routine Matters
   1. Call to order: 3:00 p.m.
   2. Approval of the agenda some changes that Ann Lowe brought to the Senate’s attention. Motion to accept agenda Ann Lowe, seconded Edel Alonso. Unanimous. Approved
   3. Approval of the consent calendar: Motion Ron Karlin, seconded David Andrus. Unanimous. Approved
   4. President’s Report, Paul Wickline
      ✓ Paul passed a correspondence for the Senators to read from Dr. Van Hook. Vince Devlahovich, Paul Wickline, the ASG President, AFT President, the head of CSEA and Patrick Backus, Classified Senate President, were called to a joint meeting regarding the California Voting Rights Act lawsuit against the college and surrounding districts, including Hart.
         o As part of the settlement/agreement, the district needed to meet with the senate and other presidents to inform them of the details. Paul has to draft a letter to the district by February 17th stating whether we support the district’s sharing of this information and some of the changes or we abstain or we oppose. Paul heard from Vince last night at the board meeting and talked to COCFA leadership and they are going to support it. The settlement changes some of the dates instead of off years cycles we are going to even-year cycles for the election. In essence, the board members currently serving would each serve an additional year.
         o Paul was given an FAQ sheet, but was told he could not give it out. The settlement also move the district to representation by cumulative voting. Paul asked if anyone was an expert in this to please chime in. Instead of votes being split up for numerous seats you can give all your votes to a particular candidate. David stated each voter is going to get three votes in the district. Supposedly this process is better than what it was. He stated that the voters will have to be educated. Paul clarified that this is not a discussion item it is going before the board. Bob Maxwell stated that the City of Santa Clarita was also sued and has also agreed to go to cumulative voting so this is something that will become more consistent within the community. Paul stated he is challenged as the Senate President to entertain a recommendation from the senate.
         o The letter stated that the district invites the Academic Senate’s support of this waiver. If the Academic Senate opposes the waiver, the district requests a written explanation of its opposition. Paul stated he is happy to take the feedback from the Senate. As this is in the President’s report, according to the
Brown Act, we won’t have a chance to really discuss and people may have lots of questions.

- A question was asked what would be the consequences if we abstain simply because they were not given sufficient time to discuss the item. Paul said he was not aware of any consequences. Ruth Rasool stated that the AFT president has not decided as of yet. The question is “what are we waving” (in the letter)? It is not stated what we are waving in the two provisions, (1) prescribe specified election methods for school districts and community college districts, (2) provide for community college district elections to be conducted by the County Registrar of Voters. David stated that he thought what they were waving, and he could be wrong, that this was originally an election year for three of our board members so they are tacking on another year of trustee service without being elected so that the election will take place in an even year and meet the provisions of the settlement that the court has overseen. He is assuming the wavering the requirement to hold it regularly scheduled election so that they get on the even years cycle. Paul said that was correct and right on target. It was stated that that was not on the correspondence that was passed out. Paul stated he had three more documents that he did not make photo copies that are all the resolutions (1) using cumulative voting in November in even years, (2) Implementing cumulative voting (3) to discontinue the use of numbered seats for electing members of the board for the cumulative voting. Edel Alonso said that it was still not clear, but it did say that the waiver is for the two provisions. Number two says provide for community college district elections to be conducted by the Country Registrar of Voters. In the second paragraph it states, “The district agreed that it will conduct its own elections if it proves to be feasible for the Los Angeles County Registrar to do so”. Paul stated he took notes and one of the concerns was how LA County runs elections and the expense that is incurred because of that and the lack of significant resources at the county for changing the balloting process etc. What came out of that was the district’s recommendation that we go to even numbered years and do it ourselves because it would be cheaper and easier than trying to deal with the LA County. Kelly Burke stated that every trustee who is in an odd year will get an additional year and COCFA supported it because it is going to happen, but they did write a strong resolution and debated it a lot.

- The Senate chose to Abstain and Paul said he had a sense of why. He said he would formulate a memo to the Chancellor and send it to the Senate before he forwards it on.

- Paul spoke on AB 86. He just got the list from Lita about the faculty work group and Dr. Buckley contacted Paul and said he wants to talk so they can coordinate what is going on with Diane Stewart who is kind of leading that effort. Paul stated he will be sending out the list of people that will be meeting to work on the non-credit issues.

- Paul stated he spoke to Edel about Equivalencies. As chair of the Equivalencies Committee, she noted that examination of the equivalencies a department will accept is a five year process. Paul and Edel have spoken that we may want to reexamine that
for people to get an earlier look at what they have said in terms of acceptable equivalencies. Paul wanted everyone to know that this conversation will take place and he will have it in the appropriate committee. He and Edel will keep you appraised.

✓ Paul sent out a letter to you from our ASCCDC executive director Julie Adams about the OEI (Online Educational Innovative), CID for Basic Skills ESL, English and Math and the Institutional Effectiveness Technical Assistance Program (IETAP).

  o All four are very important state-wide initiatives that we want faculty represented on. If you have any questions about that please see Paul individually or send him an email.
  o He received an email from Heather Maclean that said she already submitted a letter of interest about the OEI and has received no feedback from them. So if that is the case with anyone else please let Paul know and he will send that to Julie Adams and give her the heads up.
  o As part of the IETAP, Technical Assistance (or “Partnership Teams”) advisory teams will be put together in the near future to go out and will go out and help with assessment other issues before they head into accreditation. Dr. Buckley stated that this is the Institutional Effectiveness Grant roughly 12.5 million dollars over five years. A very interesting initiative because it has the opportunity to enhance our institutions better than many other initiatives currently in place.
    ▪ We have three primary task forces with one additional task force to be formed in the near future on Policy. Currently, the IETAP advisory team is helping institutions understand what the initiative is and what it is not. The advisory team is a little concerned that colleges will assume that teams will come in and try and change these site visiting teams and actually what we are trying to do is make it a gentler approach by naming these site teams “Partnership Resource Teams.” The team is recruiting people that have various skills sets in the institutional effectiveness areas to help them redesign what they are doing/enhance what they are doing. One of the first things the team will be doing is rolling out workshops to help explain what the initiative is, like the Basic Skills initiative. Goals include designing a collaborative mechanism, developing a library or resource center with information for all 112 colleges to use, having very targeted workshops to help people address the very first legislative piece which is establishment in the first year of metrics that determine what our institutional effectiveness can be judged upon and then set our targets individually by colleges for those metrics. So -- how will you design your individual targets? That will be a collaborated discussion. Later on we will be helping five institutions that have already volunteered to go through this process. They will have been on an accreditation warning or audit. If you are interested in serving on the Partnership team, please let Paul know.

✓ A letter from Audrey Green was sent out for The Performance Indicators Committee. This is on Supporting Student Completion set for Friday, March 6, 2015, 9:00 am to 3:00
pm. LOCATION is TBA. Participants will receive a stipend of $400. The focus of the day will be creating sequenced pathways for completion for our degree and certificate programs. More information will be coming next week along with details and the mechanism for signing up.

- There is a Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy, Saturday, February 28, 2015 10:00 am to 3:00 pm at Palomar College. If you can attend this is faculty specific.
- There will be an IAC meeting on March 27, 2015 8:30 am to 10:30 am Advisory Committee in MENH 343. Further follow-up on April 24 and May 22. Dr. Buckley will be sending an email out to everyone to remind everyone.
- A question was asked about the Accreditation results and Dr. Buckley stated that it was already posted on the website. There were four recommendations policy review was pulled back. This is all on the website. Dr. Buckley thanked everyone for all their hard work on this.

5. **Vice President’s Report Rebecca Eikey:** N/A

B. **Committee Reports:** N/A

C. **Unfinished Business**
   1. Policies on Counseling Services – in Policy Review Committee
   2. Alignment of LEAP Principles with Institutional SLO (ISLO) – in Division Discussion
   3. Formation of Ongoing Accreditation Committee – for Senate Discussion in Fall 2014
   4. Local Graduation Requirement – for Senate discussion in Fall 2014

D. **Discussion Items**
   1. **BP 4260 Prerequisites and AP 4260 Prerequisites**
      David Andrus passed around a cleaner copy of the BP 4260 and AP 4260. The numbering was off on the one attached to the agenda. David went over the revisions that were made to the policies and thanked the individuals on the committee for their hard work on this. David presented the issue for discussion. He described the history of how the revisions came about and that there were statewide discussion about whether we should move away from statistical validation and adopt something called content review as an option. That conversation went on for a few years throughout the state. Some people were troubled by content review being allowed. Those people lost that fight and content review was eventually allowed as a local district option throughout the state. About two years ago the Academic Senate adopted content review as an optional methodology for adopting prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories, etc. It then fell on Ann and the committee to revise the procedure and the policy for prerequisites to come up with something that allowed content review to be implemented as well as statistical validation. The changes that came were not that significant. Title V was pretty well laid out about statistical validation and a lot of processes that have to occur, but content review had us do a wholesale change and make sure we are current with our practices. So that has been done. Previously, the policy was 2½ but has now been replaced by the minimum amount. The definitions section of the procedure is where you are going to look at content review. David went over what a content review is and urged that faculty takes this seriously. David then went over the sources they went
to for this AP. He is hoping you will look through this document and bring your questions to the next meeting. This document will be on the agenda for discussion for our next meeting. There will be a Prerequisite Sub-Committee. This will be housed with the current Curriculum Committee. Take it back to your Divisions and take it apart and come back with your changes and questions. Thea came up with a flow chart and David will add it to the AP. Ann stated the committee has labored long and hard on this. Trying to get everything in that is involved. They worked hard to get a Committee. It is mandated that we have a procedure for handling these out of sequence cross Disciplinary prerequisites and we decided to spell it out in the AP rather than the BP. Ann went over the AP and the changes and reasoning behind it and then took questions. There were many questions and after a lengthy discussion it was decided that this will come back to the Senate for more discussion. It was suggested that Senators look over the document and give Ann and David your feedback on any changes, comments, etc.

3. Academic Senate Program Review
   Paul went over the draft for Academic Senate program review and the reasoning behind why he is asking what he is asking for. The link is attached to the senate agenda, but you can go to the Senate website and you will see the link and the document. Any questions please let Paul know.
   Suggestion made to revise the objective #3 concerning Academic Staffing Committee to clarify that the procedures would not be approved by the Board of Trustees as these are internal committee procedures.
   Request was made to include new chairs in the budget request.
   Paul will ask MIS to return the document and will make changes and forward these to Jerry for level 2 examination. He will ask the Senate to take action on the program review submission at the next meeting.

E. Action Items

F. Reports: N/A
G. Announcements: see agenda
H. Open Forum: N/A
I. Adjournment: 4:35 pm. motioned Ruth Rassool, seconded David Andrus. Unanimous. Approved
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SUMMARY

February 19th, 2015   3:00 pm – 5:00 pm   BONH-330

Items on "Consent" are recommended for approval as a result of Technical Review meetings held on January 21st and 22nd, 2015.

Members present: Backes, Patrick – Curriculum & Articulation Coordinator; Brill, David – Fine & Performing Arts; Green, Audrey – Co-Chair, Administrator; Hillard, Lee – Career & Technical Education; Hyatt, Rhonda – Physical Education & Athletics; Karlin, Ron – Learning Resources; Lowe, Ann – Co-Chair, Faculty; Marenco, Anne – Social Science & Business; Matsumoto, Saburo – Member at Large; Ramsey, Shane – Adjunct Faculty; Soloman, Diane – Student Services; Walter, Tina – Allied Health.

Members absent: Bates, Mary – Math, Science & Engineering; Jacobson, Julie – Member at Large; Ruys, Jasmine – Admissions & Records; Stephens Cindy – Education; Veth, Joseph – Humanities.

TECHNICAL CHANGE MEMOS on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLISC</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Changed repeatability to &quot;May be taken a total of 4 times&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Language Interpreting</td>
<td>A.A. Degree</td>
<td>Changed heading on last section of degree outline to &quot;Plus a minimum of three units from the following, a minimum of 1 unit of CWR-188SIGN is required;&quot; making 1 unit of CWR-188SIGN mandatory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELETED COURSES on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Personal Watercraft Surf Rescue</td>
<td>Course has been combined with FIRETL-911.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MODIFIED COURSES on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Careers in Architecture, Interior Design and Related Fields</td>
<td>Revised content, updated textbooks, Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHT</td>
<td>200A</td>
<td>Sustainable Development and Environmental Design</td>
<td>Revised S.O., revised objectives and content, updated textbook, Rationale for revision: 3 year revision and department discussion indicated revised S.O. would serve student assessment better than previous S.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Revised or Updated Details</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHT</td>
<td>Design III – Environmental Design Lab</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 3 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRON</td>
<td>Survey of General Astronomy</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;General Astronomy&quot;). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRON</td>
<td>Stars and Galaxies</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;The Stellar System&quot;). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRON</td>
<td>Our Solar System and Other Planetary Systems</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;The Solar System&quot;). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSCI</td>
<td>Molecular and Cellular Biology</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSCI</td>
<td>Molecular and Cellular Biology - Honors</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: Revisions to non-honors version reflected in revised SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Knife Skills</td>
<td>Changed units to 2 (formerly 1.5 units). Revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content, added textboxes. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Culinary Safety and Sanitation</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Culinary Fundamentals I</td>
<td>Revised description, objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Culinary Fundamentals II</td>
<td>Changed units to 3 (formerly 4 units). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Principles of Garda Manger I</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS</td>
<td>Culinary Fundamentals III</td>
<td>Changed units to 3 (formerly 4 units). Revised description, revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, title change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>Hip-Hop Dance</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>Ballroom &amp; Social Dance</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>Flamenco and Spanish Dance</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Infant/Toddler Development Curricula</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>School Age Child Care Programs and Curriculum</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Recreational Leadership in School Age Child Care</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETC</td>
<td>Principles of Fire and Emergency Service Administration</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;Fire Company Organization and Procedures&quot;). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETC</td>
<td>Fire Protection Hydraulics and Water Supply</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;Fire Hydraulics&quot;). Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRNCH</td>
<td>Elementary French I</td>
<td>Revised description and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMD</td>
<td>Digital Illustration</td>
<td>Changed title (formerly &quot;2-D Computer Illustration&quot;). Revised description, objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and title change.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMD</td>
<td>Graphic Design I</td>
<td>Revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMD</td>
<td>Type and Typography</td>
<td>Revised description, objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILSCI</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Music for Film, Television and New Media</td>
<td>Revised description, Revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbooks. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNG</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Physical Assessment</td>
<td>Changed units to 1.25 (formerly 2 units), Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Added prerequisite of NURSNG 111. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSIC</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>General Physics II</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content, updated textbook. Added DLA. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, DLA addition, and department discussion indicated revised SLO would serve student assessment better than previous SLO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MODIFIED ISA COURSES on consent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Ocean Lifeguard Training Academy</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>A. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Lifeguard Cadet</td>
<td>Changed units to 2 (formerly 4.25 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and unit change.</td>
<td>D. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Ocean Lifeguard Recheck Instructor Training</td>
<td>Changed units to 0.5 – 1.5 (formerly 0.15 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and unit change.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Lifeguard Academy Instructor Training</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), changed units to 1.5 (formerly 2 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and unit change. and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Annual Ocean Lifeguard Recertification/Inservice</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), changed units to 0.25 (formerly 1.75 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>Annual Ocean Lifeguard Recertification/Inservice – Recurrent</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), changed units to 0.25 (formerly 1.75 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Junior Lifeguard Instructor Certification</td>
<td>Changed units to 2 (formerly 1.75 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and unit change.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>Advanced Diver Inservice Training</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), changed units to 4 (formerly 4.25 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Personal Watercraft Surf Rescue Instructor</td>
<td>Revised SLO’s (2), changed units to 0.75 (formerly 0.50 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO’s would serve student assessment better than previous SLO’s.</td>
<td>M. Scene</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEW ISA COURSES on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Boat and Marine Firefighting</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 1.25 (formerly 2 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Personal Watercraft Surf Rescue - Basic</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 1 (formerly 2 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Rescue Boat Operator</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 1.25 (formerly 2 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>CPR Instructor Certification</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 0.5 (formerly 0.25 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>EMT Recertification for Lifeguards - Permanent</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 0.50 (formerly 0.25 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>EMT Recertification for Lifeguards - Permanent</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 0.50 (formerly 0.25 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>Ocean Lifeguard Specialist Orientation</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 1.5 (formerly 1 unit), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision, unit change, and department discussion indicated revised SLO's would serve student assessment better than previous SLO's.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>Lifeguard Captain</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>Basic Boating Skills and Operations</td>
<td>Revised SLO's (2), changed units to 1.25 (formerly 3 units), revised objectives and content. Rationale for revision: 5 year revision and unit change.</td>
<td>A. Renner</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MODIFIED PROGRAMS on consent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>Certificate of Achievement</td>
<td>Required units decreased to 33.5 (formerly 35 units) due to unit changes in CURARTS-055, 123 and 132.</td>
<td>D. Bambower</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Motion to approve all Consent Calendar Items on the February 19th, 2015 Curriculum Committee Agenda; Motion by Anne Marenco, second by Saburo Watanabe. All in favor: Unanimous.

### MODIFIED COURSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO</td>
<td>103M</td>
<td>Cultural Anthropology - Honors</td>
<td>Revised description, Revised SLO, revised objectives and content based on C-ID reviewer comments, updated textbooks. Rationale for revision: C-ID requested changes.</td>
<td>J. Hawley</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Calculus I</td>
<td>Revised objectives and content based on C-ID reviewer comments. Rationale for revision: C-ID requested changes.</td>
<td>J. Hawley</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>Comparative Government &amp; Politics</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content based on C-ID reviewer comments, updated textbooks</td>
<td>J. Hawley</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Physiological-Psychology</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO, revised objectives and content based on C-ID reviewer comments, updated textbooks</td>
<td>J. Hawley</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATR</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Costume Crafts</td>
<td>Revised description, revised SLO's (2), revised objectives and content based on C-ID reviewer comments, updated textbooks. Rationale for revision: C-ID requested changes.</td>
<td>J. Hawley</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Motion to approve ANTHRO-103M, MATH-211, and THEATR-130; Motion by David Brill, second by Lee Hilliard. All in favor: Unanimous.
NEW/MODIFIED PREREQUISITES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Suggested Enrollment Limitation</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULARTS 050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Skills</td>
<td>Added co-requisite of CULARTS-055, removed recommended preparation of MHMGT-225. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL 020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Sand Diving</td>
<td>New Lifeguard prerequisite. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRETL 021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paramedic Continuing Education</td>
<td>New Lifeguard prerequisite. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMD 144</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Design I</td>
<td>Added prerequisite of GMD-101. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESD 034</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edged Weapon Defense</td>
<td>New POST prerequisite. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESD 037</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control, Escort, Restrain and Takedown (CHART) Series #2</td>
<td>New prerequisite of LESD-028. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESD 039</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taser Instructor</td>
<td>New POST prerequisite. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESD 040</td>
<td></td>
<td>Force Refresher</td>
<td>New POST prerequisite. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSNGL 212</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Assessment</td>
<td>Added prerequisite of NURSNGL-112. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW DISTANCE LEARNING ADDENDUMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>TYPE OF DELIVERY</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASTRON 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stars and Galaxies</td>
<td>100% Online. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRON 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our Solar System and Other Planetary Systems</td>
<td>100% ONLINE. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSIC 111</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Physics II</td>
<td>Online/Hybrid. - Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Items:

1. TD-117 and TD-211 Discussion of Need and addition to the Interior Design Certificate of Achievement.
   The curriculum committee was supportive of the two new Interior Design course proposals. The committee suggested that the Interior Design Certificate of Achievement be shaped into a certificate that will give students general options in the core required courses and focused options in the restrictive electives.
620.4260 GENERAL POLICY ON PREREQUISITES/COREQUISITES/ADVISORIES and LIMITATIONS on ENROLLMENT

The CEO is authorized to establish pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories on recommended preparation for courses, and allowable limitations in the curriculum. All such pre-requisites, co-requisites, and advisories shall be established in accordance with the standards set out in Title 5. Any pre-requisites, co-requisites or advisories shall be necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which they are established. The procedures shall include a way in which a pre-requisite or co-requisite may be challenged by a student on grounds permitted by law. Pre-requisites, co-requisites, and advisories shall be identified in District publications available to students.

620.1 Philosophy

The SCCCD Board adopts this policy in order to provide for the establishing, reviewing, and challenging of pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and certain limitations on enrollment in a manner consistent with law and good practice.

The District recognizes that pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories and limitations, if established unnecessarily or inappropriately, constitute unjustifiable obstacles to student access and success. It is the policy of the Board that caution and careful scrutiny are used when establishing these.

Nonetheless, the Board also recognizes that it is as important to have pre-requisites in place where they are a vital factor in maintaining academic standards as it is to avoid establishing pre-requisites where they are not needed. For these reasons, the Board requires that any procedure adopted to implement this foster the appropriate balance between these two concerns.

620.2 Dissemination of Definitions and Procedures

The College shall provide the following explanations both in the College Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes:

e. Definitions of pre-requisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment including the specific differences among them and the specific pre-requisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment which have been established pursuant to Section 55200 (a-f) of Title 5.

b. Procedures for a student to challenge pre-requisites, co-requisites, and limitations on enrollment and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to make such a challenge.

c. Definitions of advisories on recommended preparation, the right of the student to choose to take a course without meeting the advisory, and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to examine that right.
620.3 Challenge Process
The College shall establish procedures by which any student who does not meet a prerequisite or corequisite or who is not permitted to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment, but who provides satisfactory evidence, may seek entry into the class according to a challenge process as required in and according to provisions of Section 55201(f) of Title 5 and Section 1.8-1.3 of the Model District Policy.

620.4 Curriculum Review Process
The College certifies that the Curriculum Committee has been established by mutual agreement of the administration and the Academic Senate as required in Section 55021(a)(1) of Title 5. The Curriculum Committee shall:

a. Establish prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories on recommended preparation, and limitation on enrollment pursuant to Sections 55021, 55201, 55202, and 58106 of Title 5 and Section 1.8-1.4 and 1.8-1.5 of the Model District Policy.

b. Verify and provide documentation that prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories meet the scrutiny specified in one of the measures of readiness specified in Section 55201(b)(1) of Title 5 and Sections 1.8-1.4 and 1.8-1.5 of the Model District Policy.

c. Provide for review of each prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory at least every six weeks pursuant to Section 55201(b)(3) of Title 5 and Section 1.8-1.5 of the Model District Policy. Any prerequisite or corequisite which is successfully challenged under subsections (1), (2), or (3) of Section 55201(f) shall be reviewed promptly thereafter to assure that it is in compliance with all other provisions of the law.

d. Provide for a review of any prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory upon the request of any faculty member or educational administrator.

e. Provide for a review of each limitation on enrollment at least every six years pursuant to Section 1.8-1.5 of the Model District Policy.
620.5 Implementing Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Limitations on Enrollment

The College shall establish procedures wherein every attempt shall be made to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be

enrolled through the registration process so that a student is not permitted to enroll unless he or she has met all the conditions or has met all except those for which he or she has a pending challenge or for which further information is needed before final determination is possible of whether the student has met the condition pursuant to Section 55202(g) of Title 5 and Section 1.6.

of the Model District Policy.

Every attempt shall be made to make certain that changes in prerequisites or corequisites do not adversely affect currently enrolled students.

620.6 Instructor's Formal Agreement to Teach the Course As Described

The College shall establish a procedure whereby courses for which prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories on recommended preparation, are established will be taught in accordance with

the course outline pursuant to Section 55201(b)(2) of Title 5.

ADOPTED: OCTOBER 12, 1984
PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

AP 4260 PROCEDURES ON PREREQUISITES/COREQUISITES/ADVISORIES

Reference: California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 55000 et seq; 55003 et seq

4260.1 Purpose

These procedures are to provide for the establishing, reviewing, and challenging of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories on recommended preparation, by faculty, in a manner consistent with Board Policy 4260, law and good practice.

The District permits the use of content review (alone), or in the alternative, content review accompanied by statistical validation as means to substantiate the appropriateness and need of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories.

4260.2 Definitions (CCR Section 55000; 55502)

The District shall adopt the following definitions and explanations and provide them in the College Catalog and in the Schedule of Classes:

A. Advisories (a.k.a. Advisory On Recommended Preparation) - means a condition of enrollment that a student is advised, but not required, to meet before or in conjunction with enrollment in a course or educational program.

B. Prerequisites - means a condition of enrollment that a student is required to meet in order to demonstrate current readiness for enrollment in a course or educational program.

C. Corequisites - means a condition of enrollment consisting of a course that a student is required to simultaneously take in order to enroll in another course.

D. Content Review - is a rigorous systematic process that is conducted by faculty to identify the necessary and appropriate body of knowledge or skills students need to possess prior to enrolling in a course, or which students need to acquire through simultaneous enrollment in a corequisite course. Content Review, at the minimum, has the following elements:
   1. Careful review of the course outline of record to identify the skills and knowledge necessary for student success.
   2. Determination of how the preparation can be obtained in order to advise or require students to acquire the necessary preparation prior to enrolling in a prerequisite or corequisite.
   3. Review of all departmental faculty syllabi for the target course, sample exams, assignments, instructional materials, grading criteria for the
target course, SLOs, course objectives, required and recommended reading and essay requirements to determine a sufficient correlation/association of required skills/knowledge students must have prior to enrolling in the target course and matching those skills/knowledge to the proposed prerequisite or corequisite course(s).
4. Direct involvement of the discipline faculty to collaborate on identifying course content, skills and requirements and determine how the course outline is being implemented departmentally.
5. Specification of the body of knowledge and/or skills which are deemed necessary at entry and/or concurrent with enrollment.
6. Identification and review of the prerequisite or corequisite which develops the body of knowledge and/or measures skills necessary for enrollment in the target course.
7. Documentation of the review undertaken.
8. The prerequisite or corequisite meets the appropriate level of scrutiny specified in Section 4260.3(B) of this AP.

E. “Necessary and Appropriate” (as it relates to Content Review) - means that a strong rational basis exists for concluding that a prerequisite or corequisite is reasonably needed to achieve the purpose that it purports to serve. This standard does not require absolute necessity.

F. Content Review with Statistical Validation - is defined as conducting a content review (as defined in subdivision (c) of section 55000) and the compilation and analysis of data according to sound research practices which shows that a student is highly unlikely to succeed in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or co-requisite.

G. Statistical Review – differs from statistical validation. It is a process in which to compare historical data to justify a prerequisite or to determine recommended action on review and revisions of prerequisites, corequisites and advisories.

H. Health and Safety Prerequisites – is a prerequisite or corequisite necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

I. Educational Program - an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

J. Sequence of Courses – content and thematically related courses in a discipline showing a progression of complexity.
K. Disproportionate Impact – Disproportionate impact occurs when the percentage of persons from a particular racial, ethnic, gender, age or disability group who are directed to a particular service or placement based on an assessment instrument, method, or procedure is significantly different from the representation of that group in the population of persons being assessed, and that discrepancy is not justified by empirical evidence demonstrating that the assessment instrument, method or procedure is a valid and reliable predictor of performance in the relevant educational setting. CCR Section 55002(d).

L. Target Course – the course that a proposed prerequisite, corequisite or advisory shall be applied to.

4260.3 Permitted Prerequisites and Corequisites

A. Purpose - No prerequisite or corequisite may be established or renewed unless it is determined to be necessary and appropriate to achieve the purpose for which it has been established and supported by substantiated evidence.

1. Prerequisites or corequisites may be established only for any of the following purposes:

   a. The prerequisite or corequisite is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation; or

   b. The prerequisite will ensure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established [CCR, Section 55003(d)(2)]; or

   c. The corequisite course will ensure that a student acquires the necessary skills, concepts, and/or information, such that a student who has not enrolled in the corequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course or program for which the corequisite is being established; or

   d. The prerequisite or corequisite is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

B. Levels of Required Scrutiny - All adopted prerequisites, corequisites or advisories must meet the appropriate level of scrutiny required per CCR 55003 et seq. The scrutiny levels are:
1. Advisories – content review required. For advisories only, the minimum standard of content review will require only of a comparison of the course level Student Learning Outcomes for both the target course and the intended advisory course. All other content review must follow the standard set forth in Section 4230(D) of this administrative procedure.

2. Prerequisites/Corequisites Requiring Content Review Alone:
   a. Course in a sequence in a discipline – content review required
   b. Course for a sequence in vocational disciplines – content review required

3. Content Review and additional substantiating requirements:
   a. Course out of discipline but not an English or Math course – content review plus evidence that an equivalent requirement exists at three CSU/UC’s
   b. Course or eligibility for a course out of discipline in English or Math – content review, plus one of the following:
      i. Evidence that an equivalent requirement exists at three CSU/UC’s, or
      ii. A letter from a CSU/UC requiring that prerequisite/corequisite, or
      iii. Data collection and analysis, or
      iv. Research with statistical validation.
   c. Health and Safety Requirement
      i. Content review may be used to establish a health and safety prerequisite.
   ii. Mandated Health and Safety Prerequisites:
      1. Mandated by Statute or Outside Agency Regulation – no content review required, but documentation is required, to include legal or regulatory citation.
      2. Mandated by the Outside Agency - if a prerequisite or corequisite is mandated by industry or outside agency, a minimal content review shall be required to align the required skill set determined necessary. Documentation is required to cite the source of mandate.

4. Limitations on Enrollment - Requiring Criteria Other Than Content Review
   a. Auditions for performance courses – documentation of the audition process plus disproportionate impact study at least every six years related to the audition. Additionally, other courses must be available to meet degree/certificate requirements.
   b. Honors courses restricted to an honors cohort – other sections/courses must be available to meet degree/certificate requirements
c. Blocks of courses or sections (cohorts) – other sections/courses are available to meet degree/certificate requirements.

5. Assessment Test Prerequisites
   a. Cut score for use within the same discipline sequence – content review, plus a test approved by the Chancellor's Office in accordance with established standards, plus validated cut-off scores, plus multiple measures, plus disproportionate impact study
   b. Cut score for use outside assessment area – same as 6(a) above plus data collection and analysis.

C. Proposing faculty may elect to include statistical validation with their content review.

4260.4 Exemptions

A prerequisite or corequisite need not be scrutinized using content review or content review with statistical validation if:

A. It is required by statute or regulation; or

B. It is part of a closely-related lecture-laboratory course pairing within a discipline; or

C. It is required by four-year institutions; or

D. Baccalaureate institutions will not grant credit for a course unless it has the particular communication or computation skill prerequisite.

4260.5 Criteria and Processes for Establishing Cross Disciplinary Prerequisites/Corequisites/Advisories

All District personnel involved in the proposal, analysis, substantiation, and approval of a prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory shall adhere to the following sequential and substantive process:

A. Faculty may establish an advisory, prerequisite, or corequisite if it:
   1. Is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation
   2. Will assure that the student has the skills, concepts, and/or information needed to succeed for the target course if it is established

Title 5 Language: Will assure that a student has the skills, concepts, and/or information that is presupposed in terms of the course or program for which it is being established, such that a student who has not met the prerequisite is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course within the program) for which the prerequisite is being established; or
3. Is necessary to protect the health or safety of a student or the health or safety of others.

B. Cross Disciplinary Prerequisite Sub-Committee

The Curriculum Committee will establish a standing “Prerequisites Sub-Committee” to address out of sequence prerequisites (cross disciplinary) in the areas of reading, written expression or mathematics. Committee membership will be reported to the Academic Senate at the beginning of each academic year and approved via the Academic Senate’s consent calendar. All participating members of this sub-committee shall be trained in the prerequisite process each academic year prior to any official meetings. This training will be documented in the Curriculum Committee Summary submitted to the Academic Senate.

1. Subcommittee Membership
   a. Standing Members:
      i. Faculty Curriculum Committee Chair, or designee,
      ii. Four members of the Curriculum Committee other than the Faculty Chair,
      iii. Chair, Department of Math, or designee,
      iv. Chair, Department of English, or designee,
      v. Member of the Academic Senate other than any other listed member to this committee,
      vi. CIO, or designee.
   b. Ad Hoc/Temporary Members
      i. Chair of the proposing faculty member’s department, or designee,
      ii. Course Author

2. Voting – only standing faculty committee members shall have voting rights.

3. Subcommittee Duties
   a. Review proposals and ensure that the proper method of scrutiny is applied to the out of sequence prerequisite in reading, written expression or mathematics.
   b. Consultation with Enrollment Management to ensure equitable and practical implementation of prerequisites or corequisites.
   c. Consultation with the Articulation Officer to safeguard unintended consequences to articulation agreements, *inter alia*.
   d. Assessment of impact on District resources.
   e. Ensure that any academic department, and the College as a whole, will not be harmed, pedagogically or otherwise, by the
establishment of a prerequisite or corequisite and will not impact the viability of any existing program.

f. Initial determination as to the appropriateness of the proposal.

i. Data pertinent to determining the appropriateness of the proposal:

   (1) Evidence of appropriate scrutiny applied to support the prerequisite.
   (2) Patterns of student success in the target course.
   (3) Placement assessment data correlating with required skill level for success.

ii. Decisions will be based on a majority vote of a quorum of voting members of the sub-committee. A quorum is said to exist if a simple majority of voting members are in attendance at the time of the vote.

iii. The Curriculum Committee decision will be recorded in the Curriculum Committee Summary and submitted to the Academic Senate for approval on the consent calendar.

g. Formally communicate the recommendations for the sub-committee to the Curriculum Committee chair. The chair will put the recommendations of the sub-committee on the next Curriculum Committee agenda for a vote of the Curriculum Committee.

C. Proposals

1. Faculty members initiating a proposed prerequisite or corequisite in reading, written expression, or mathematics for a course not in sequence in those areas must:

   i. Undertake a Needs Assessment that serves as an initial determination as to the appropriateness of the proposal. Data pertinent to the proposal is:

      (1) Evidence of appropriate scrutiny applied to support the prerequisite.
      (2) Patterns of student success in the target course.
      (3) Placement assessment data correlating with required skill level for success.

ii. Create the proposal in CurricUNET, satisfying all required scrutiny standards applicable under Section 4260.3(B) of this Administrative Procedure.

iii. Submit a proposal to the Curriculum Committee chair and the chair of his/her department notifying them of the prerequisite request.
iv. Submit the proposal by the deadline established each academic year by the Curriculum Committee and published in the Curriculum Committee Calendar.

2. The chair of the Curriculum Committee will initiate a meeting of the sub-committee to evaluate the proposal.
3. The Subcommittee will either recommend approval or denial of the proposed prerequisite, corequisite or advisory to the Curriculum Committee.
   a. Standard of Review
      The completed written proposal must contain conclusions supported by documented substantiating evidence and data. The data may be qualitative or quantitative in nature. The written proposal must be explicit in validating the prerequisite by defining the need and level of need.
   b. Sub-Committee Review Form – the sub-committee shall adopt a standardized form for use to document its findings and recommendations. The form, coupled with the final written proposal, will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee.
   c. If the sub-committee rejects the proposal for further consideration it shall communicate, upon request, written rationale for the denial to the proposing faculty and Chair of the proposing department. The proposal may be submitted for reconsideration if additional supporting data is included in the revised proposal.

5. The Curriculum Committee will review the complete proposal and accompanying recommendation forwarded from the Subcommittee. The Curriculum Committee will either accept or deny the proposed prerequisite or corequisite based on a finding of its necessity and appropriateness. The Curriculum Committee shall institute a standardized form to serve as its written documentation its findings and determination. Any determination by the Curriculum Committee must be by majority vote of a quorum of the Curriculum Committee for the date on which the proposal is to be reviewed.

6. Approval by the Board of Trustees will result in the prerequisite, corequisite or advisory being enforced at the earliest possible date that will not result in inequitable application.

4260.6 Prerequisites Requiring Precollegiate Skills

If a prerequisite requires precollegiate skills in reading, written expression, or mathematics, the District shall:
A. Ensure that courses designed to teach the required skills are offered with reasonable frequency and that the number of sections available is reasonable given the number of students who are required to meet the associated skills prerequisites and who diligently seek enrollment in the prerequisite course.

B. Monitor progress on student equity in accordance with CCR Section 54220. Monitoring shall include:

1. Conducting an evaluation to determine the impact on student success including whether the prerequisite or corequisite has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age or disability, as defined by the State Chancellor.

2. Where there is a disproportionate impact on any such group of students, the district shall, in consultation within the State Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate impact. Implementation shall take effect no later than two years from the end of the semester in which disproportionate impact was identified. Upon subsequent review, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.

4260.7 Implementation of Content Review with Statistical Validation

If the Curriculum Committee, using content review with statistical validation, initially determines that a new course needs to have a communication or computation skill prerequisite or corequisite, then, despite Section 4260.4 of this policy, the prerequisite or corequisite may be established for a single period of not more than two years while the research is being conducted and the final determination is being made, provided that all other requirements for establishing the prerequisite or corequisite have been met.

A. Finding of Disproportionate Impact

1. New Courses — where disproportionate impact is proven to exist outside the parameters of Section 4260.7(B), the prerequisite or corequisite shall be suspended until an implementation plan is established to correct the disproportionate impact. Review of the implementation plan shall be undertaken at least once every six years. Upon subsequent review, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.
4260.8 Mandated Review Process

All prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories must be reviewed to assure they remain necessary and appropriate. This process shall occur at least once each six years, except that prerequisites and corequisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed

2. Existing Courses – where content review with statistical validation is utilized, no prerequisite or corequisite shall be established until the completion of the substantiating statistical research and no disproportionate impact is proven to exist. Review of the prerequisite for the existence of disproportionate impact shall be undertaken at least once every six years. Upon subsequent review, if a disproportionate impact is found to exist, the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until an implementation plan is established and in force.

B. The requirements of Section 4260.7 of this policy related to collection of data shall not apply when the prerequisite or corequisite is required for enrollment in a program, that program is subject to approval by a state agency other than the Chancellor’s Office and both of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. Colleges in at least six different districts have previously satisfied the data collection requirements of this subdivision with respect to the same prerequisite or corequisite for the same program; and

2. The district establishing the prerequisite or corequisite conducts an evaluation to determine whether the prerequisite or corequisite has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age or disability, as defined by the Chancellor. When there is a disproportionate impact on any such group of students, the district shall, in consultation with the Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate impact.

a. Review of Disproportionate Impact – where disproportionate impact is found to exist under Section 4260.7(B) and upon subsequent review to be undertaken at least once every six years, if the disproportionate impact continues to exist the prerequisite or corequisite will be suspended until a revised implementation plan is established and in force.

C. Prerequisites establishing communication or computational skill requirements may not be established across the entire curriculum unless established on a course-by-course basis.
4260.8 Mandated Review Process

All prerequisites, corequisites and advisories must be reviewed to assure they remain necessary and appropriate. This process shall occur at least once each six years, except that prerequisites and corequisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed every two years. Every attempt shall be made to make certain that changes in prerequisites or corequisites do not adversely affect currently enrolled students.

4260.9 Student Challenge Process

Prerequisite challenge petitions are available in the Admissions and Records office.

A. A prerequisite may be challenged for the following reasons:
   1. The prerequisite has not been made reasonably available;
   2. The prerequisite was established in violation of regulation, or in violation of District approved processes;
   3. The prerequisite is discriminatory or applied in a discriminatory manner; and/or
   4. The student has knowledge or ability to succeed in the course despite not meeting the prerequisite.

B. In each case the student must provide documentation to support the challenge. Examples of documentation are transcripts, copies of certificates, proof of knowledge of the required material, etc.

C. The procedure for prerequisite challenge petitions will be adequately published for students:
4260.10 Implementation and Enrollment Management

Whenever a prerequisite or corequisite course is established, sufficient sections shall be offered to reasonably accommodate all students who are required to take the corequisite.

A. Other Degree Applicable Courses – the College shall ensure other degree applicable courses are available to students impacted by implementation of prerequisites or corequisites as to prevent enrollment barriers to students.

B. Implementation – the Office of Instruction, in consultation with the Curriculum Committee, shall develop a plan to determine when adopted prerequisites and corequisites shall be made operational.

4260.11 Satisfaction of Prerequisite

The determination of whether a student meets a prerequisite shall be based on successful completion of an appropriate course or on an assessment using multiple measures, as required by section 55521(a)(3). No exit test may be required to satisfy a prerequisite or corequisite unless it is incorporated into the grading for the prerequisite or corequisite course.

4260.12 Enforcement of Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Limitations on Enrollment

The District shall make every attempt to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be enrolled through the registration process so that a student is not permitted to enroll unless he or she has met all the conditions or has met all except those for which he or she has a pending challenge or for which further information is needed before final determination is possible of whether the student has met the condition pursuant to CCR Section 55003, et seq. Enforcement standards shall be established by or within District Administrative Procedure(s).

A. Faculty

1. Courses for which prerequisites and corequisites are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline of record, particularly those aspects of the course outline that are the basis for justifying the establishment of the prerequisite or corequisite.

2. Each section of the prerequisite or corequisite is to be taught by a qualified instructor and in accordance with a set of objectives and with other specifications defined in the course outline of record as required per CCR Section 55002.
4260.13 Publication

Prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation must be identified in college publications available to students, to include the College Catalogue and Schedule of Classes, as well as the course outline of any course for which they are established.

4260.14 Annual Report to Chancellor’s Office

By August 1 of each year the District, should it have chosen to established enrollment limitations, shall submit to the Chancellor’s Office in the manner specified by the Chancellor the prerequisites and corequisites that were established during the prior academic year. The District shall also specify the level of scrutiny, i.e., content review or content review with statistical validation, used to determine whether the prerequisite or corequisite was necessary and appropriate for achieving the purpose for which it was established.

4260.15 Instructor’s Formal Agreement to Teach the Course As Described

The District shall establish a procedure whereby courses for which prerequisites, corequisites, or advisories on recommended preparation, are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline pursuant to Section CCR Section 55003 et seq.

4260.16 Annual Training

The Curriculum Committee and all appropriate sub committees will be trained annually on the appropriate criteria, scrutiny, and documentation required to establish advisories, prerequisites, and corequisites based on CCR Section 55003 et seq and District procedures. Training may consist of any local workshops developed by the District but shall include attendance of the annual Curriculum Institute of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.
LEVELS OF SCRUTINY

Title 5 outlines different types of limitations on enrollment, which require different levels of scrutiny. The following is a table outlining the most common types of scrutiny. These processes are mandated by law and have always been followed by the Curriculum Committee with the exception of the one highlighted in yellow. It is the only optional type of scrutiny that is allowed by Title 5. It was adopted in 2012 to permit English/Math prerequisites to courses outside of those disciplines. The College of the Canyons Academic Senate decided to allow that option, but the committee cannot use it until BP & AP 4260 is adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of limitation on enrollment</th>
<th>Level(s) of scrutiny required</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisories</td>
<td>Brief content review, examining SLO’s, objectives, and/or content</td>
<td>English 101 or 101H for History 101H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite/co-requisite – in a sequence within a discipline</td>
<td>Content Review</td>
<td>English 101 for English 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite/co-requisite – outside of discipline not in English or Math</td>
<td>Content review, plus a listing of 3 equivalent UC/CSU courses also requiring the same prerequisite</td>
<td>Chemistry 201 for Engineering 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite/co-requisite – outside of discipline in English or Math</td>
<td>Content review plus: • a listing of 3 equivalent UC/CSU courses also requiring the same prerequisite, or • a letter from a 4 year school requiring the prerequisite for articulation, or • research and statistical validation, or • data collection and analysis</td>
<td>• Math 060 for Chemistry 110 • Math 070 for Biology 107 • English 101 for Honors Sociology 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-requisite – closely related lecture/lab pairing</td>
<td>Specifically allowed in Title 5. Exempt from content review.</td>
<td>Geography 101 and Geography 101L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Content review for health and safety plus documentation if mandated by outside agency</td>
<td>Red Cross requirements for KPEA 140 Lifeguard Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Restrictions</td>
<td>May be imposed by either contract or law</td>
<td>Valid RN license for NURSNG 250 Transition into Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audition for performance courses</td>
<td>• Document audition process and collect data for disproportionate impact study, and • Alternative courses are available to meet degree/certification requirements</td>
<td>Audition for THEATR 190A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohorts – courses are restricted to a specific group of students</td>
<td>Other sections/courses are available to meet degree/certificate requirements</td>
<td>PACE, learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors courses restricted to Honors Program Cohort</td>
<td>Other sections/courses are available to meet degree/certification requirements</td>
<td>English 101 is available to all students, whereas English 101H is only available to honors students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment test (cut score) within a discipline</td>
<td>Content Review + Test approved by CO + Validated cut-off scores +Multiple Measures +Disproportionate impact study</td>
<td>English 094 or placement via assessment are required to enter English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment test (cut score) outside of discipline</td>
<td>Same as when assessment is used within a discipline, plus data collection and analysis</td>
<td>English 094 or placement into English 101 via assessment as prerequisites for History 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program prerequisite</td>
<td>Establish for one required course in the program</td>
<td>Anatomy required to enter a program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prerequisite Process

1. Professional Development
   - Proposing Faculty receive training and multi-confer regularly

2. Faculty complete content review & needs assessment
   - Submit course proposal in curriculum

3. Cross-disciplinary prerequisites sub-committee approval

4. Curriculum committee approval

5. Year revision process

6. Institutional development

7. Disproportionate impact studies

8. Implementation and enforcement
   - Scheduling
   - Student services

9. Notify of approved prerequisite

10. Academic Senate approval
Institutional Learning Outcomes
Revisited 2015

Students acquire knowledge and skills through their coursework and in co-curricular activities. When students graduate with a degree/certificate, transfer to university, or enter the workforce, they should have evidence (least two Signature Assignments) that demonstrate each of the six Institutional Learning Outcomes. The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are the umbrella that all degree, program, and course-level outcomes are housed under.

Effective Communication

**Students communicate effectively.** This includes developing critical literacies—reading, writing, speaking, listening, visual understanding—that they can apply in various contexts; Organizing and presenting ideas and information visually, orally, and in writing according to standard usage; Understanding and using the elements of effective communication in interpersonal, small group, and mass settings.

ACCJC Standard IIA11 “communication competency”

A. **AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric**
   **Definition:** Written communication is the development of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

B. **AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric**
   **Definition:** Oral communication is prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners’ attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

**Previous ISLOs**

- **Language and Rationality - #1 (English Composition).** Produce logical, analytical writing that is focused, fully developed and supported, and conforms to the conventions of standard written English.

- **Career Technical Education** – Achieve recognized skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in chosen career.
Working with Others

Students develop the knowledge and skills to work with others in a professional and constructive manner. This includes engaging with a diverse set of others to produce professional work; Interacting competently across cultures; understanding and appreciating human differences; Understanding and acting on standards of professionalism, ethics, and civility, including the COC Student Code of Conduct.

A. AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric

Definition: Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions).

Previous ISLO:

- Career Technical Education – Achieve recognized skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in chosen career.

Critical Thinking

Students think critically and creatively. This includes reasoning effectively from available evidence; demonstrating effective problem solving; engaging in creative thinking, expression, and application; Engaging in reflective thinking and expression; Demonstrating higher-order skills such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation; Demonstrating ethical reasoning by analyzing an issue/problem and arriving at a solution while using a set of ethics or morals as strict guidelines; Making connections across disciplines; Applying scientific methods to the inquiry process.

ACCJC Standard IIA11 “analytic inquiry skills” and “ethical reasoning” and “ability to engage in diverse perspectives”

A. AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

Definition: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

B. AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric

Definition: Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.
C. AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric

Definition: Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

D. AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

Definition: Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Previous ISLOs

- **Natural Sciences** - Evaluate natural phenomena and human activities through the use of scientific inquiry.
- **Social Sciences** - Demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives, theories, methods, or core concepts of the behavioral and social sciences.
- **Humanities and Fine Arts** - #1. Analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic, or cultural importance. (Lecture-based courses)
- **Humanities and Fine Arts** - #2. Demonstrate aesthetic understanding or artistic expression through disciplined-defined proficiencies in a chosen area or focus in Arts and Humanities. (Lab/Studio courses)
- **Language and Rationality** - #1 (English Composition). Produce logical, analytical writing that is focused, fully developed and supported, and conforms to the conventions of standard written English.
- **Language and Rationality** - #2 (Communication and Analytical Thinking). Apply systems of reasoning in solving problems or analyzing and evaluating arguments.
- **Diversity** - Identify how culture and identity impact individual and group experience in society.
- **American Institutions** - Trace and analyze the historical development of American institutions and ideals and the operation of representative democratic government.
- **Career Technical Education** – Achieve recognized skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in chosen career.
Information Literacy

Students develop computer and information literacy. Gathering and analyzing information using technology, library resources, and other modalities; Understanding and acting upon ethical and security principles with respect to computer technology and to information acquisition and distribution; distinguishing between credible and non-credible sources of information, and using the former in their work in an appropriately documented fashion.

A. AAC&U Information Literacy VALUE Rubric

Definition: The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand.

Previous ISLOs bases on GEs

- Language and Rationality - #1 (English Composition). Produce logical, analytical writing that is focused, fully developed and supported, and conforms to the conventions of standard written English.

Quantitative Literacy

Students develop quantitative literacies necessary for their chosen field of study. This includes approaching practical problems by choosing and applying appropriate mathematical techniques; Using information represented as data, graphs, tables, and schematics in a variety of disciplines; Applying mathematical theory, concepts, and methods of inquiry appropriate to program-specific problems.

ACCJC Standard IIA11 “quantitative competency”

A. AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric

Definition: Quantitative literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a “habit of mind,” competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide variety of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).
Previous ISLOs bases on GEs

- **Language and Rationality** - #2 (Communication and Analytical Thinking). Apply systems of reasoning in solving problems or analyzing and evaluating arguments.

- **Natural Sciences** - Evaluate natural phenomena and human activities through the use of scientific inquiry.

**Community Engagement**

*Students develop the knowledge and skills to community engaged learners and scholars.* This includes understanding the natural, political, historical, social, and economic underpinnings of the local, national, and global communities to which they belong; Integrating classroom and community-based experiential learning; Identifying and articulating the assets, needs, and complexities of social issues faced by local, national, and global communities; Evaluating personal strengths, challenges, and responsibility for effecting positive social change in local, national, and global communities; Drawing upon classroom and community-based learning to develop professional skills and socially responsible civic behaviors; Engaging in service-learning for community building and an enhanced academic experience.

A. **AAC&U Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric**

*Definition:* Civic engagement is “working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. This means promoting quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes.”

B. **AAC&U Global Learning VALUE Rubric**

*Definition:* Global learning is a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people’s lives and the earth’s sustainability. Through global learning, students should 1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, 2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and 3) address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.

C. **AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric**

*Definition:* Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is “a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts.”
D. AAC&U Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric

Definition: Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

Previous ISLOs

- **American Institutions** - Trace and analyze the historical development of American institutions and ideals and the operation of representative democratic government.
- **Social Sciences** - Demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives, theories, methods, or core concepts of the behavioral and social sciences.
- **Humanities and Fine Arts** - #1. Analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic, or cultural importance. (Lecture-based courses)
- **Diversity** - Identify how culture and identity impact individual and group experience in society.

ILO Assessment Process

1. Collect student work as Signature Assignments with Reflection. Faculty can submit three examples of student work (high, mid, low).
2. Evaluate sample of 100-150 Signature Assignments in paid teams of 2 faculty per rubric (12-15 faculty) using VALUE rubrics and other rubrics as needed. Evaluate after spring semester ends.

The institution will need courses to have at least one Signature Assignment that meets at least two of the ISLOs.

1 Accredit Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Accreditation Standards, Adopted Jun 2014, Standard II.A.11. The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage in diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.
The following information is provided for discipline assignment:

**Daniel Otto**

Mr. Otto has been hired as a Culinary Arts (Restaurant Operations) Instructor with an effective start date of February 18, 2015.

The following is provided for discipline assignment:

- Associate of Occupational Studies Degree from Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts in San Francisco, California, plus over nineteen (19) years of professional experience in the Culinary industry

It would appear that Mr. Otto qualifies for the discipline(s) of:

- Culinary Arts