

**Academic Senate Agenda
March 22, 2007
3:00 p.m. I-330**

I. ROUTINE MATTERS

1. Approval of Senate summary for February 22, 2007 (page 2)
2. Approval of Senate summary for March 8, 2007 (page 3)
3. Approve discipline assignment for Karyl Kicenski (page 4)
4. Approve discipline assignment for Miriam Golbert (page 5)
5. Curriculum Summary, March 15 (pages 33 - 36)

II. REPORT/UPDATES

6. IRB
7. Collegial Celebration
8. Equivalencies (page 6)
9. Pre-Requisites (page 7, backup on pages 18 - 32)

III. ACTION ITEMS

10. Procedures for merging/splitting departments (pages 8-11)
11. The department of Foreign Languages - Change to Department of Modern Languages
(Claudia Acosta, department chair)
12. ad hoc committee to review Diversity Requirement
13. ad hoc committee to review WebCMS “approval” trail.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

14. Review of proposed Cooperative Work Experience Education Title 5 changes/updates on
proposed changes. (pages 12 - 14)
15. Chair Evaluation Program (pages 15 - 17)

**V. Open Forum/adjournment
Next meeting: April 12**

Academic Senate Summary February 22, 2007

Attendance: Edel Alonso, Joan Jacobson, Sherrill Pennington, Chris Blakey, Miriam Golbert, Mark Rafter, Rebecca Eikey, Fred D'Astoli, Colette Gibson, Tammera Rice, Pamela Borrelli, Michael Leach, Lea Templer, Mitjl Capet, James Lorgian, Nancy Smith, Debbi Rio and Ana Palmer

Approval was given to the Senate summary for February 8, 2007, with the correction of adding Sherrill Pennington to the attendance.

Update on IRB was provided by Edel. Organizational plans are still continuing. At some point a more detailed description should be provided to the faculty.

FERPA Facts handout received some corrections. The Senate approved the handout, and it will be distributed to the faculty.

Collegial Celebration of Colleagues is starting to be formed. It will be a celebration in the PAC to say goodbye to our retirees and to celebrate ourselves. Anyone wanting to help with this event please let Michael know.

Academic Staffing Committee is reviewing recommendations for new positions first, and will then follow with recommendations for replacement positions.

Documents from the State Senate were shared. The “Minors on Campus” document prompted discussion on the role of faculty as mandated reporters of child abuse. It was clear that this was a discussion that required additional research.

Grade submission statistics: For Fall, 31 people did not turn grades in on time, and only 2 had failed to do so by the time the reports were actually run. For Winter, 18 people had not turned grades in by the deadline, but all had turned grade in in time for the reports to be run.

Revisions to the Discipline list will be discussed at the Statewide Senate meeting in April. A listing of proposed changes were sent to the respective departments.

Board Policy 544, Academic Freedom, received formal approval by the Board.

What is a department? The draft proposal for procedures to merge, split, or rename a department were introduced. It was stressed that this Senate document is just a list of procedures, not a specific plan with specific departments pre-selected

Faculty Offices always receive a great deal of discussion and rumour. We will be allocating offices by seniority, according to the accepted procedures. There is no plan to have special “exceptions”. The domino process will start in mid-April.

Adjourned at 4:45 p.m. Our next meeting is March 8, 2007. As always everyone is invited.

Academic Senate Summary March 8, 2007

Attendance: James Lorigan, Thomas Lawrence, Jennifer Brezina, Edel Alonso, Miriam Golbert, Victoria Leonard, Michael Dermody, Joan Jacobson, Lea Templer, Pamela Borrelli, Deana Riveira, Tamera Rice, Sherrill Pennington, Mark Rafter, Rebecca Eikey, Ana Palmer, Fred D'Astoli, Nancy Smith, Kevin Kistler Phil Marcellin, Sue Albert, Robert Walker and Jill Zubov Schenberger

Curriculum summaries for February 15 and March 1, 2007 were approved. The Academic Senate summary for February 22nd will be on the next agenda for approval.

Prerequisite Committee reported on its ongoing review of the District prerequisite policy. The most current recommendation will be developing a system to speed up the mechanics of the challenge process. It also noted that the standard prerequisite requires a similar prerequisite form THREE, not ONE, CSU or UC schools.

Equivalency committee reported on its progress. Sherrill Pennington is hoping to send out a draft list to all faculty for input. The committee will also be developing an appeals process for those cases where the "standard" equivalencies might not apply.

Chair Evaluation committee reported on its progress. A draft will be presented to the Senate in the near future.

Calendar Committee discussed Spring Break. In general, the preference for Spring Break has been the middle week of the Semester. However, in 2008, that would be the first week of March, with the Hart District having its Spring Break a few weeks later. The general opinion was that, for Spring 2008, Spring break should occur at the same time as the Hart District.

Collegial Celebration will be chaired by Cindy Stephens. Anyone interested in helping should contact Cindy.

Got news? Anyone interested in helping to write a brief newsletter for the Senate should contact Michael Dermody.

Non-credit ESL was Equivalency was approved.

Minimum Qual for Speech language pathology & Audiology was approved. It should be noted that this is not an equivalency to the Minimum qual, it is the minimum qual.

CWEE Discipline Assignment for Nicole Lucy was approved.

A procedure for Merging/Deleting Departments was discussed. Senators were reminded that this is a PROCESS that is being discussed, not an actual specific plan. The Senate's goal is to develop a list of accepted procedures that would be used if a department was merged or split.

Attendance as part of grading: an ongoing pedagogical discussion. Unofficial opinions from around the state were shared with the Senate.

Brown Act and the Senate: Under the Browns Act (State open meeting law), individuals can not be restricted from attending Senate meetings. For more information on the Brown Act, please contact Michael.

Adjourned at 4:45 p.m. Our next meeting is March 22, 2007 at 3:00 p.m. in I-330.

Date: March 5, 2007

To: Michael Dermody
President, Academic Senate

From: Kimberly B. Abbott
Sr. Human Resources Generalist

Subject: Discipline Assignments for Spring 2007 – Karyl K. Kicenski

The following information is provided for full-time faculty and administrators hired for Spring 2007:

Karyl K. Kicenski

Dr. Karyl K. Kicenski, Speech Instructor, has requested to have her qualifications reviewed for the following disciplines:

1. Sociology

The following is provided for discipline assignment.

Dr. Kicenski has provided transcripts that confirm a Doctor of Philosophy degree with an emphasis in Cultural Studies acquired from George Mason University, degree conferred 1/13/2007.

Dr. Kicenski has also provided her undergraduate transcripts from California State University, Northridge that convey a minimum of 24 upper division units in the field of Sociology. She acquired her Bachelor of Arts Degree in Speech Communication from CSUN on May 28, 1992.

Dr. Kicenski also possesses a Master of Arts Degree in Speech Communication from CSUN which she acquired on December 22, 1994.

Equivalencies 1, 2, and 3 are currently accepted for the discipline of Sociology.

Equivalency #1: Master's degree in any discipline and 24 units of coursework in the discipline of the assignment. At least 12 of these units must be graduate or upper division. (The 24 units may have been either included or taken in addition to the master's degree.)

It would appear the Dr. Kicenski qualifies for the discipline(s) of:

- Sociology

Date: March 5, 2007

To: Michael Dermody
President, Academic Senate

From: Kimberly B. Abbott
Sr. Human Resources Generalist

Subject: Discipline Assignments for Spring 2007 – Miriam Golbert

The following information is provided for full-time faculty and administrators hired for Spring 2007:

Miriam S. Golbert

Dr. Miriam S. Golbert, Biology Instructor, has requested to have her qualifications reviewed for the following disciplines:

2. Education

The following is provided for discipline assignment.

Dr. Golbert has provided transcripts that confirm a Doctorate of Education acquired from Nova Southeastern University, degree conferred 8/10/2006.

It would appear the Dr. Golbert qualifies for the discipline(s) of:

- Education

Revised
Draft
Recommendations on Discipline Equivalencies
March 2007

Introduction

Having examined the equivalencies currently employed at College of the Canyons, solicited input from department chairs, and examined the requirements of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, the Equivalencies Committee recommends that the following list be adopted for future use. Some remain unchanged from the old list. Others are revised.

Academic Disciplines The standard minimum qualification for teachers in these fields is a discipline-specific master's degree.

Equivalency #1: Master's Degree in any discipline and 24 units of coursework in the discipline of the assignment. At least 12 of these units must be graduate or upper division.

Equivalency #2: Bachelor's degree in the discipline of the assignment, plus at least 12 units of graduate work *successfully completed in the discipline of the assignment*.

Equivalency #3: Bachelor's degree in the discipline of the assignment plus five years of professional or teaching experience in the discipline of the assignment.

Vocational Disciplines Only: As noted in the CCCCCO document on minimum qualifications, "The minimum qualifications for disciplines on this list are any bachelor's degree and two years of experience, or any associate degree and six years of experience."

Equivalency #4 Diploma in Nursing with six years of experience in that discipline. The Diploma in Nursing is typically three years of nursing school as opposed to the two years of an associate degree. This equivalency will only apply to Nursing Science: Clinical Practice and NOT Nursing Science: Academic Masters Prepared. The Board of Registered Nursing approves instructors who have a Diploma in Nursing.

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Prerequisite Review Committee
RE: Final report

The committee engaged in a thorough review of the District's pre-requisite procedures. We wanted to ensure that the District's policies as well as practices are in line with the requirements of the law as well as the Model District Policy".

In general, there is remarkable congruence between the requirements of the law, the written policy of the District, and the actual implementation of that policy. However, there are a few areas that the Senate and the Curriculum Committee will need to address.

1. Prerequisite Challenge Procedure: We need to ensure that such challenges are handled in a timely manner. We also need to ensure that all challenges are reviewed by at least two individuals (the department chair and the appropriate division dean), and that a chair designates a designee if they will be away from campus.
RECOMMENDATION: A format for a web-based program is under development.
2. New/Revised course outline form: we need to reformat the new/revised course outline form so that the requirements for prerequisites (especially the "standard" prerequisite) are clarified.
RECOMMENDATION: Will be addressed by the Curriculum Committee
3. Research: For those prerequisites that rely on data collection and verification to ensure validity, a more specific process needs to be developed that will provide specific directions on data collection.
RECOMMENDATION: The Senate should appoint an ad hoc committee to develop a procedure for data collection. At a minimum, this committee should include representatives of Matriculation, Curriculum, Institutional Research, and a representative from a department that would utilize data collection for prerequisites.
4. Required Follow-Up: All prerequisites require a 6-year revision, and some pre-requisites require disproportional impact studies after they have been implemented.
RECOMMENDATION: As part of the data collection research, we should determine a procedure to review prerequisites as needed,
5. Formal Agreement to Teach According to the Course Outline: Prerequisites are validated and established by the content of the course as listed in the Outline of Record: if an instructor chooses to ignore portions of the course outline, the prerequisite would not be valid. Therefore, the regulations require that instructors teaching courses with prerequisites must enter into a "formal agreement to teach according to the course outline". We currently do not have any such process.
RECOMMENDATION: Creation of an ad hoc committee to address this issue. At a minimum, this committee should include representation from Curriculum, the Instruction Office, and Articulation. Representation from the two bargaining groups may also be beneficial.
6. Removal of Prerequisites: Although there is extensive detail on how to create a pre-requisite, there is deafening silence on how to remove a prerequisite.
RECOMMENDATION: The Curriculum Committee should develop a proposal for the removal of pre-requisites

A complete copy of the committee's review will be available in the Senate office.

What Makes a Department? - Discussion

BACKGROUND

With the enhanced responsibilities of Department Chairs, there has been renewed interest on what constitutes a department, how a department is formed, and how the chairs are selected.

DEFINITIONS

“**Courses**” are specific, individual classes that have been approved by the Curriculum Committee.

“**Programs**” are a group of related courses, usually leading to a degree or certificate. All programs are approved by the Chancellor's office and listed on the college's "Inventory of Approved Programs”.

“**Disciplines**” are a listing of academic subject areas. Based on the statewide Discipline List, all courses must be “housed”, or assigned, to an academic subject area (i.e., a discipline). Courses may only be taught by those instructors whose academic and/or professional training satisfy the Minimum Qualification (or any appropriate equivalency) for that discipline.

“**Departments**” are college units that serve to help organize courses, programs, and faculty. While "programs" and "disciplines" are established on a state level, "departments" are established by the college.

Usually, there is a high level of congruity among programs, disciplines, and departments. For example:

Michael Dermody teaches courses in the history **program**, meets the minimum qualifications for the history **discipline**, and is a loyal member of the history **department**.

There are also situations where there is little congruence:

Lea Templer can teach History 170 since she meets the minimum qualifications for the **discipline** of History, but she is a member of the Economic **department**.

The Accounting **program** is part of the larger Business **department**.

Although we do not have a linguistics **program** at the college, we do have a linguistics **course**. English 111 (Linguistics) is part of the English **department**, but is assigned to the linguistics **discipline**. Members of the English **Department** can not teach English 111 unless they meet the minimum qualifications for the linguistic discipline.

HOW ARE DEPARTMENTS ORGANIZED?

Departments are traditionally grouped around related disciplines, although this traditional grouping may not always be appropriate with programs or disciplines that are new or non-traditional.

As departments grow and develop specialized programs, it may be appropriate for a department to split into two separate departments. Or, smaller departments might find that they have enough curricular similarity that it there might be organizational; advantages if they merged into a larger department. This could create a synergy that could strengthen the programs. It could also help by reducing duplication of effort among small departments.

WHAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHEN ORGANIZING A DEPARTMENT?

When organizing a department, the following are some factors that should be taken into account:

1. Pedagogical goals and ideas should be similar;
2. The disciplines should be similar;
3. The "Goldilocks factor" should also be considered. There should be enough faculty members to provide for efficient and productive interchange and support, but the department should not be so large as to become impersonal and bureaucratic (in other words, "not too small, not too large, but just the right size").

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION?

The first player in departmental organization is the administration. The organization of the college is one of the primary responsibilities of the administration.

However, as part of "collegial consultation", when discussing the organization of departments, we need to recognize the role played by the Senate

WHY WOULD THE SENATE BE INVOLVED?

Departments are an organizational foundation for many of the governance processes used by faculty. This is particularly true for the curriculum process: Course development, revisions, and deletions begin at the department level, often being discussed by the entire department prior to being forwarded to the Curriculum Committee. In fact, the first approval that a course must receive is that of the department chair.

In addition to curriculum, departments are the organization unit used in the hiring process for both full-time and adjunct instructors. In determining qualifications to teach in a particular discipline, departments serve as the primary forum for determining equivalencies for discipline minimum qualifications. Program review is also conducted on a departmental level.

These are all examples of processes developed by the Senate. Reorganization of departments could impact the composition or the "players" of these shared governance processes – especially in the curriculum process.

BUT IS A "CHANGE OF PLAYERS" THE SAME AS "CHANGING THE PROCESS"?

There are probably different views on this issue. For example, it could possibly be argued that by changing departments, only the players have been changed: the structure and the steps in the shared governance process have not been altered. As such, the Senate would have no inherent role in departmental re-organization.

However, you could also argue that by changing the overall numbers of the players, you are changing how the process operates. Increasing or decreasing the membership among the various groups could increase or dilute the influence of that group and/or of its members. If this is true, then the Senate, by virtue of Board Policy 345 and AB1725, would have an inherent role to play. How then could you clarify and reconcile these somewhat contradictory views?

The document, "Scenarios to Illustrate Effective Participation in College and District Governance", is a joint publication of the state-wide Academic Senate and the Community College League of California. As such it represents a consensus of faculty and administrator leadership from a state-wide level.

Although the following scenario focuses on Divisional organization, the basic concepts might easily apply to departments. (Please note that bold font is NOT in the original, but is used here to highlight significant segments. In addition, there has been some editing for the sake of clarification. The entire document can be found on the statewide Academic Senate webpage)

The administration met over the summer to discuss college reorganization. When faculty returned in the fall, they were presented with a draft plan which merged discipline departments into new divisions... The stated purposes of the draft plan were to....balance the workload of the division deans.

Issue: The issue is the extent to which this plan constitutes a change in the faculty roles in governance (and possibly other academic and professional matters) or just a reordering of the administrative organizational chart and new physical location of staff.

Citation: Title 5 '53200(c)(6) lists district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles, as an academic and professional matter....The question thus comes down to determining whether the proposal alters the governance role of faculty or just reorganizes divisions under the rights of assignment which the governing board has delegated to the CEO.

1. If the governance structure is based on faculty representation by division, then the academic senate has the right to be consulted on how the reorganization will affect that representation. **It might also be that the change alters the development and review of curriculum and educational programs, especially if such processes are based on a divisional structure of related disciplines.** (*NOTE: For COC, the curriculum, program review, and faculty hiring processes are based on the departmental structure*).

2. If the planned reorganization does not change the governance role of faculty or any related academic and professional matter, collegial consultation is not required by Title 5 regulations. Note, however, that Education Code 70902(b)(7) requires governing boards "to ensure faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration." **Even if the reorganization does not affect academic and professional matters, all constituencies must be given the chance to comment on the reorganization and to have their input considered in the plan.**

Process: The academic senate should approach the CEO with the faculty's concerns. If faculty roles are changed or **other academic and professional matters are altered, the CEO must allow for consultation with the academic senate before moving ahead.** If not, the reorganization may proceed. However, the CEO must allow for review of the plan and give reasonable consideration to opinions received.

HOW DO DEPARTMENTS RE-ORGANIZE?

Past practice at COC has been somewhat haphazard. As we continue to expand our programs, and as we continue to enhance department chair responsibilities, it would be in the interest of the faculty and the administration to establish some protocol.

PROCEDURES FOR DEPARTMENTAL CHANGES

1. Formal proposals to split a department, merge a department, or change a department's name will be brought to the Senate. These proposals can be initiated by a department or by the Instruction Office.
2. The Senate will establish a broad-based ad hoc committee to review the proposal. Among some of the items that this committee will study could include:
 - a. How will the proposal help the students of the college?
 - b. Is the proposal part of a program review recommendation? If not, what has changed since the last program review that would support the proposal?
 - c. What is the opinion of the impacted faculty members
 - d. Does the Instruction Office support the proposal?
 - e. Will the proposal provide for a more effective use of time, resources, and faculty?
 - f. Is the proposal similar to the departmental structures at other institutions?
 - g. Will this proposal increase or alleviate the "Goldilocks Factor" (e.g., "too big...too small...just right!")?
 - h. Would the proposal have any impact on negotiated agreements with either of the two faculty unions?
 - i. What impact could this have on any governance proposals?
 - j. Are there any additional issues raised by the Senate or the Instruction Office?
3. The committee will forward its recommendation to the Senate and the Instruction Office. If there is mutual agreement with the Senate and the Instruction Office, the proposal will be granted "provisional approval".
4. The proposal will receive final approval when the following conditions have been met:
 - a. The Curriculum Committee has approved of any new course numbering system (if necessary);
 - b. The Articulation Officer certifies that there are no outstanding articulation issues;
 - c. All appropriate college offices have been notified for any changes required in the college catalog, brochures, and other publications;
 - d. Any outstanding contractual issues have been resolved; and,
 - e. Any other conditions that may be requested by the Instruction Office or the Senate.
5. Final implementation will take place at the start of the next academic year.

PROCEDURES FOR MERGING/SPLITTING DIVISIONS

Although divisions are administrative structures, they are also the basis for many of the faculty governance policies and procedures. As such, if a change in a division impacts the faculty membership of a division, such a change could be an "academic and professional matter". Changes that do not impact faculty membership of a division (i.e., classified staff of a division, additional support administrators for a division) are **not** "academic and professional matters" and would not be considered area of collegial consultation subject to Board Policy 345.

The process for adjusting a division should not differ too much from the adjustment of a department. However, the following are some additional considerations:

1. Divisional adjustments and realignments are initiated by the CIO, and not by faculty members.
2. Consideration should be given to the fiscal and workload impact on the remaining divisions and departments.

In the spirit of collegial consultation, it is hoped that mutual agreement may be reached. However, as the board policy states, if mutual agreement cannot be reached, the administration retains the right to make a decision based on "exceptional circumstances or compelling reasons". The administration would extend the professional courtesy of explaining the "exceptional circumstances and/or compelling reasons" to the Senate.

INTRODUCTION TO PROPOSED TITLE 5 CHANGES

What follows are suggested changes to pertinent sections of Title V that, in the best judgment of the members of the Southern California Consortium of Tri-Regional Cooperative Work Experience Educators and the Chancellor's Statewide Advisory Committee for Work-Based Learning and Employment Services, inhibit the full participation of students and employers in Cooperative Work Experience Education programs. It is significant to note that there will be neither system-wide nor district costs associated with implementing the proposed changes.

Inherent in the mission of the California community colleges is "to advance California's economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement" (www.cccco.edu). The above-referenced members of the Tri-Regional Consortium and the Statewide Advisory Committee who have reviewed sections 55250-55257, 58051, and 53416 agree that the current regulations do not effectively allow the California Community Colleges to meet this important aspect of our mission.

NOTE: The development and approval of a district plan for Cooperative Work Experience Education (CWEE) is mandated by Title V and remains of critical importance in administering and operating effective CWEE programs throughout the state. Each community college district's CWEE Coordinator and Governing Board may, at their discretion, develop and impose stricter policies and procedures than are herein proposed and described.

Introduction

The changes recommended in this proposal will achieve the following outcomes:

- remove barriers to student access and student success,
- improve the retention of participating students by allowing them to maintain enrollment in their CWEE course, regardless of the number of units in which they are enrolled,
- allow students flexibility in choosing the most appropriate method of course delivery,
- involve students in real life situations and with educational experiences unobtainable in a classroom setting
- allow students flexibility in gaining meaningful applied education work experience opportunities,
- provide pathways for students to combine work and education,
- provide students the opportunity to acquire job skills and create an employment history,
- enable students to achieve their education and career goals,
- provide linkages between academic and career fields,
- provide instruction using twenty-first century pedagogical methodologies.

Ultimately, the recommendations that follow will improve the quality of the educational experience for both the cooperative work experience education students and the community colleges' employer-partners.

Today's college students demand flexibility. Daniel Yankelovich, author of "Ferment and Change: Higher Education in 2015" (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11/25/05) and founder of Viewpoint Learning Inc., a company that develops specialized dialogues to resolve gridlocked public-policy issues, advises that today's college students are "stretching out their education. Three quarters of today's college students are nontraditional in some way ... Many are already working, and more than a quarter are parents. We are rapidly moving away from the rigid sequencing and separation of schooling and jobs toward a new pattern in which higher education spreads out over about a 12-year period and is more closely integrated with work."

Our working students face numerous demands on their time: the demands of their coursework, of their jobs and of meeting their CWEE learning objectives on their jobs, of their families, and of their communities. A primary reason students enroll in CWEE courses is because CWEE courses offer students the opportunity to earn college credit on their own time on their own terms.

It is incumbent upon the California community colleges to increase opportunities for students to learn in a variety of contexts through a variety of instructional methodologies. Adopting the following two recommendations will achieve greater flexibility by removing barriers for student enrollment and increased opportunities for employer participation.

Recommendation 1: Eliminate the Parallel and Alternate Formats

First, we propose eliminating the distinction between the two formats of parallel and alternate. These distinctions force students to decide whether they will enroll in seven or more units (including CWEE in the parallel format) or whether they will enroll in no more than one additional course (in the alternate format).

Among the limitations of the parallel format is the required withdrawal from CWEE if a student's total units fall below seven. Students experiencing difficulty in classes other than CWEE who withdraw from those courses are forced also to withdraw from CWEE, when their total course load falls below the required seven units. Students who are in this situation frequently find that the CWEE course is the only one in which they are experiencing success, earning a passing grade, and gaining a sense of competence and mastery. Forcing a student to withdraw from a course in which he or she is experiencing success is antithetical to student development and achievement. Requiring students to also withdraw from CWEE can and has led students also to withdraw from college. The parallel format inhibits and sometimes prohibits student success.

An additional restriction presented by the parallel format is the requirement that students enrolled in CWEE must also be enrolled in other courses. Aside from a CWEE course offered in the current parallel format, there is no other community college course that requires a student to also be enrolled in a course from any other discipline, related or unrelated. It would be unthinkable to prohibit a student majoring in psychology, for example, from enrolling in Introduction to Psychology (or any subject) without also enrolling in an additional course or in additional units. Yet, this is the requirement we force upon CWEE students.

It has been suggested that the parallel format was developed to assure the academic progress of CWEE students. Academic progress by CWEE students is assured by the development and timely completion of their learning objectives, by the assignment of grades by their faculty members, and by restrictions on re-enrollment. There is no rationale for requiring a student to declare enrollment in the parallel format and to comply with its pedagogically unsound restrictions.

The alternate format is not only also restrictive, but also it inhibits students' academic progress. Community colleges promote student participation in coursework; through the completion of coursework students achieve their academic and career goals. Yet, the alternate format promotes non-participation in coursework. It restricts students' enrollment to only one or two courses per semester. Today's college students are achievement-oriented multi-taskers. If a student can complete a full course load and participate in CWEE successfully, Title V should not retard that students' progress by imposing participation in the alternate format of CWEE – a format that encourages students to interrupt their academic progress.

Perhaps at the time it was developed, in the early twentieth century, the alternate format provided students with an opportunity to apply their newly acquired skills to earn funds for college between semesters. As Yankelovich tells us, college students no longer make these distinctions between their working and academic lives. Yankelovich states that today's knowledge economy informs us that distinctions between education and the workplace "are artificial and inefficient." So, too, are the distinctions between alternate and parallel. It is time to eliminate them. Students should be allowed to enroll in CWEE and to work either concurrently or alternately as their individual circumstances allow. The antiquated distinction between the two formats serves neither the twenty-first century student nor the twenty-first century employer.

Recommendation 2: Personal On-Site Consultation Strongly Preferred, not Mandated

This is the digital age. Not only has our student population changed, but so have our methods of course delivery. There is a reason the courses most in demand on college campuses are the online courses: they offer students the flexibility of learning outside the traditional classroom. CWEE courses are in demand because they offer students the flexibility of learning outside the traditional classroom.

Not only are our students changing the way they achieve their educational goals, so too are our employers changing the way they achieve their organizational goals. Many of today's employers offer employees the opportunity to work remotely; they hire consultants they've never met who frequently live in cities and states far from where the company is located.

Current Title V regulations do not consider the growing numbers of students demanding online instruction, nor do they reward our entrepreneurial and consulting students who may not work in a traditional corporate environment. To deny our most dedicated, independent, and creative students the opportunity to take advantage of distance education opportunities in CWEE when these opportunities are available in every other discipline at our community colleges is more than a disservice. It is evidence that the CWEE program, designed to be responsive to workforce development, is in this regard being unresponsive to its students and the companies at which they work.

Recommended Language Changes

The document that follows recommends changes to CA ADC subsections: 55252, 55253, 55254, 55255, 55256, and 55257. We thank you for your serious consideration of them.

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Chair Evaluation Committee

Evaluations are an example of an issue that overlaps the jurisdiction of the Senate and the Union. Under COC tradition, the Association has traditionally relied on the Senate with developing such procedures based on pedagogical and professional practices.

After the Senate has developed proposed procedures, the Association (and the District) decide, through negotiations, whether to adopt the procedures as part of the contract. If adopted, the Senate may review the procedure and suggest revisions, while the Association maintains the role of seeing that the procedure is enforced.

In Spring 2005, the Senate was asked by the Association and the District to develop a procedure for evaluating department chairs. A senate sub committee was formed, chaired by Victoria Leonard and consisting of faculty chairs, faculty non-chairs, and administrators. A proposal was developed, and a pilot-experiment was conducted last semester. Having reviewed our pilot program, we present the attached report to the Senate.

An early question addressed by the committee was the intent of this program. Was this program to serve as a strictly evaluative program (with the potential for punitive or disciplinary action), or was it a professional development program?

Since the contract has language that refers to situations where a chair may not be performing all of the assigned chair responsibilities (Article 12-K-8, "Non-Performance"), we decided to focus on how to avert situations where such language might be invoked. We decided to respect the long standing COC culture of using evaluations as a means for individual professional improvement.

The key components of this program include

- ✓ A confidential, on-line evaluation of the Chair. This evaluation was designed with questions based on contractual requirements as well as a "best practices" for chairs, and will be made available to full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, classified department members, and division deans.
- ✓ A mentorship program for new chairs;
- ✓ A mentorship program for chairs that might benefit from additional assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. This program should be forwarded to COCFA and the District for their review.
2. To reflect the professional development aspect of the program, the title should be "Chair Enrichment Program" rather than "Chair Evaluation Program"
3. The Chair Enrichment Program be available this semester to all department chairs on an optional basis;
4. A method is developed to better reach out to adjunct faculty members; and
5. The CEP reviews the results of the Spring surveys and makes a report on the effectiveness of the survey in the Fall 2008 semester.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR EVALUATION
PRESENTING A PACKAGE
OF PROPOSED PROCEDURES
FOR YOUR PERUSAL AND PURPOSEFUL PONDERING
FOR PRESENTATION
TO THE SENATE

BACKGROUND

Department Chairs are a crucial component of the college's educational program. Department Chairs provide a critical link between students, full-time and adjunct faculty, departmental classified employees, and Division Deans. Department Chairs are involved with development of curriculum, SLOs, course and staff scheduling, adjunct hiring and evaluation, student complaints and concerns, budget development and tracking.....the list goes on and on.

While Department Chairs have received a thorough training in their academic background, they probably have not had many formal courses in being a department chair.

PURPOSE

The intent of this program is to provide an additional professional development opportunity for all chairs. Through mentoring, feedback, and self-reflection the chairs will improve their ability to facilitate the delivery of the college's instructional program.

CHAIR ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (CEP)

The Academic Senate will appoint a committee to oversee the CEP.

This committee will consist of

- Five faculty members appointed by the Senate
 - One faculty member will serve as Chair;
 - At least two of the members will be current or former chairs
- The CIO or designee
 - To avoid a potential conflict, it is preferred that the designee not be a Division Dean

The CEP committee will be responsible for:

- Chair mentoring;
- Chair Survey;
- Providing the Senate with recommendations for improving CEP
- Providing COCFA with recommendations for possible contract revisions.

MENTORING PROGRAM

Every newly elected chair will be provided with a mentor. The mentor can be a current or former chair, and may be from any division.

There will be a group meeting of all mentors and mentees each Semester. In addition, the mentors will meet with their mentees at least twice each semester.

CHAIR SURVEY

The CEP will administer a survey to help chairs gauge their effectiveness. All full-time, adjuncts and classified members in the department will be provided with the opportunity to participate in the survey. Division Deans will also be provided the opportunity to complete the survey.

The survey will include, at a minimum:

- A method to provide as much anonymity as possible;
- Questions on contractual obligations;
- Questions on "best practices" for Department Chairs

After the survey is administered, the CEP will compile, review, and then forward the results

- The dean will receive the survey results for their respective chairs, and will forward them to the chairs within 10 days.
- An aggregate report, stripped of any personally identifying notations, will be made available to COCFA and the District.

Based on the survey results, the CEP committee may choose one of the following:

- Offer a mentor to the chair who would benefit from additional assistance;
- Meet with the dean and the chair to develop an individual improvement program.

ROLE OF DIVISION DEANS

Although not required, it would be a beneficial practice for the deans to schedule individual meetings when forwarding the survey results to each chair. However, the deans must ensure the confidentiality of all survey results.

TIMING

SEMESTER 1: FALL, EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS

- ✓ Group meeting of mentors/mentees
- ✓ CEP reviews survey instrument, recommends changes to the Senate

SEMESTER 2: SPRING, ODD-NUMBERED YEARS:

- ✓ Survey administered mid semester.
- ✓ Group meeting, mentors/mentees

SEMESTER 3: FALL, ODD-NUMBERED YEARS

- ✓ Group meeting, mentors/mentees

SEMESTER 4: SPRING, EVEN-NUMBERED YEARS




- ✓ Chair elections conducted.
- ✓ CEP meets to assign mentors to newly elected chairs.


| REVIEW OF PREREQUISITE POLICY & PROCEDURE District policy compared to Model District Policy, and the footnotes for the Model District Policy | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| MODEL DISTRICT POLICY | FOOTNOTES IN MDP | COC STATUS |
| I. College Policies and Procedures | | |
| A. Information in the Catalog and Schedule of Classes Each college shall provide the following explanations both in the college catalog and in the schedule of classes: | I.A. Crucial <i>The college must be required to provide clear and unambiguous information at least in the catalog and schedule defining prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation, explaining the differences between these terms, explaining student rights to challenge prerequisites and corequisites or to enroll despite lacking the preparation recommended in the advisory, and listing every prerequisite or corequisite which will be enforced.</i> | ✓ |
| 1. Definitions of prerequisites, corequisites, and limitations on enrollment including the differences among them and the specific prerequisites, corequisite and limitations on enrollment which have been established. | | ✓ |
| 2. Procedures for a student to challenge prerequisites, corequisites, and limitations on enrollment and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to make such a challenge. The information about challenges must include, at a minimum, the specific process including any deadlines, the various types of challenge that are established in law, and any additional types of challenge permitted by the college ⁽¹⁾ | ⁽¹⁾ Colleges should also publish this information in the student handbook, if the colleges publishes one, or in whatever other documents that are published to assist students in understanding college rules and procedures. | Being reviewed by A&R |
| 3. Define advisories on recommended preparation, the right of a student to choose to take a course without meeting the advisory, and circumstances under which a student is encouraged to exercise that right. | | ✓ |
| B. Challenge Process | | |
| Each college shall establish a process by which a 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 as follows: | I.B. Regulation <i>Section 55201(e) requires that colleges have a challenge process, provide challenge at least on several specified grounds, and inform students of their rights.</i> | ✓ |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>1. If space is available in a course when a student files a challenge to the prerequisite or corequisite, the district shall reserve a seat for the student and resolve the challenge within five (5) working days. If the challenge is upheld or the district fails to resolve the challenge within the five (5) working day period, the student shall be allowed to enroll in the course. If no space is available in the course when a challenge is filed, the challenge shall be resolved prior to the beginning of registration for the next term and, if the challenge is upheld, the student shall be permitted to enroll if space is available when the student registers for that subsequent term.⁽²⁾</p> | <p><i>I.B.1. Crucial</i> <i>It is required that provision be made for resolving challenges in a “timely manner.” It is crucial that, if the challenge process takes more than five working days, the student is assured a seat in the class if the challenge is ultimately upheld.</i></p> <p>⁽²⁾. The college has an obligation to resolve challenges in a “timely manner.” [See Section 55201(e).] However, the student should not wait until the last minute to file the challenge. If the college could not meet the one-week timeline, it could reserve a seat for the student or make provision in its policies on maximum class size to exceed the set size for such a student.</p> | <p>Timely manner = 5 working days</p> |
| <p>2. Grounds for challenge shall include the following: a Those grounds for challenge specified in Section 55201(e) of Title 5.</p> | | <p>✓</p> |
| <p>b. The student seeks to enroll and has not been allowed to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment established for a course that involves intercollegiate competition or public performance, or one or more of the courses for which enrollment has been limited to a cohort of students. The student shall be allowed to enroll in such a course if otherwise he or she would be delayed ⁽³⁾ by a semester or more in attaining the degree or certificate specified in his or her Student Educational Plan.</p> | <p>⁽³⁾. If other courses are available which meet the same requirement, the student is not being delayed. There is no obligation to honor a student’s preference. The point is that this type of limitation on enrollment should not even be established unless alternative choices exist to meet any graduation requirement satisfied by taking the performance course.</p> | <p>✓</p> |
| <p>c. The student seeks to enroll in a course which has a prerequisite established to protect health and safety, and the student demonstrates that he or she does not pose a threat to himself or herself or others⁽⁴⁾</p> | <p>⁽⁴⁾. The Federal Government’s Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires further that if a student with a disability seeks admission to a course which has a prerequisite designed to protect health and safety, then the burden is on the college to establish that there is no accommodation available that would protect health and safety and permit the student to enroll without undue costs to the district.</p> | <p>✓</p> |
| <p>3. The college shall formally establish a challenge process including: a. Who makes the determination of whether the challenge is valid. For challenges concerning academic qualifications, the initial determination should be made by someone who is knowledgeable about the discipline, preferably someone qualified to teach in the discipline, but not the person who is the instructor of the section in which the student wishes to enroll.</p> | <p><i>I.B.3. Crucial</i> <i>Colleges must be required to specify who handles the challenge and the appeal process if one is being established.</i></p> | <p>✓</p> |
| <p>b. What possibility of appeal exists? If the validity of the challenge is determined by one person and not a committee, there must be an opportunity to appeal.</p> | | <p>Reviewed by Chair & Dean</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| c. The student has the obligation to provide satisfactory evidence that the challenge should be upheld. However, where facts essential to a determination of whether the student's challenge should be upheld are or ought to be in the college's own records, then the college has the obligation to produce that information ⁽⁵⁾ | ⁽⁵⁾ . For example, if a student challenges on the basis of claiming that a prerequisite was not established properly, that the student must show some legitimate reason for believing that the prerequisite was not established properly. However, if the student makes a prima facie case, the college must then produce the relevant information from its own files and not expect the student to request the files and search out the information. | Make a sample of required documentation available |
| C. Curriculum Review Process | | |
| The curriculum review process at each college shall at a minimum be in accordance with all of the following: 1. Establish a Curriculum Committee and its membership in a manner that is mutually agreeable to the college administration and the academic senate. | <i>I.C.1. Regulation</i> <i>A curriculum committee established by mutual agreement of the administration and the senate is required. However, the committee may be either "a committee of the academic senate or a committee which includes faculty and is otherwise comprised in a way that is mutually agreeable to the college and/or district administration and the academic senate." [Title 5, Section 55002(a)(1)]</i> | ✓ |
| 2. Establish prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation (advisories) only upon the recommendation of the academic senate except that the Academic Senate may delegate this task to the Curriculum Committee without forfeiting its rights or responsibilities under Section 53200-53204 of Title 5. Certain limitations on enrollment must be established in the same manner. See II.C. below. | <i>I.C.2. Crucial</i> <i>Title 5, Sections 53200-204 mandates that prerequisites are one of the issues on which a board must "consult collegially" with the academic senate. The specific language of the model is the counsel of the drafting committee but is not required.</i> | ✓ |
| 3. Establish prerequisites, corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and limitations on enrollment only if: a. The faculty in the discipline or, if the college has no faculty member in the discipline, the faculty in the department do all of the following. (1) Approve the course; ⁽⁶⁾ and, | <i>I.C.3. Crucial</i> <i>Section 55201(b)(1) requires that there be content review as part of the process for establishing any prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory. It is crucial that there be a careful content review process and that the specific steps of that process are clearly specified in the policy. It is also crucial that the approval of the prerequisite or corequisite (or advisory) be done explicitly and not be inferred from the approval of the course. Lastly, it is also crucial that provision be made for providing those with expertise on the discipline in question an adequate voice in the content review process.</i> ⁽⁶⁾ The main point here is that the faculty, and the curriculum committee as well, must approve the prerequisite as a separate action from any approval of the course. However, it is not required that the faculty in the department in fact approve the course, although there are obvious reasons why that is recommended good practice. Title 5 requires only approval of the course by a curriculum committee that is a committee of the Academic Senate or established in a manner agreeable to the Senate and the campus administration | ✓ |


| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| | (Section 55002). Title 5 further requires that prerequisites and all academic and professional matters be matters for the board to rely primarily on the Senate or reach joint agreement with it. (Sections 53200 et seq.) | |
| (2) As a separate action, approve any prerequisite or corequisite, only if: (a) The prerequisite or corequisite is an appropriate and rational measure of a student's readiness to enter the course or program as demonstrated by a content review including, at a minimum, all of the following: | | ✓ |
| i. involvement of faculty with appropriate expertise; | | ✓ |
| ii. consideration of course objectives set by relevant department(s) (the curriculum review process should be done in a manner that is in accordance with accreditation standards); | | ✓ |
| iii. be based on a detailed course syllabus and outline of record, tests, related instructional materials, course format, type and number of examinations, and grading criteria; | | ✓ |
| iv. specification of the body of knowledge and/or skills which are deemed necessary at entry and/or concurrent with enrollment; | | ✓ |
| v. identification and review of the prerequisite or corequisite which develops the body of knowledge and/or measures skills identified under iv. | | ✓ |
| vi. matching of the knowledge and skills in the targeted course (identified under iv.) and those developed or measured by the prerequisite or corequisite (i.e., the course or assessment identified under v.); and | | ✓ |
| vii. maintain documentation that the above steps were taken. | | ✓ Noted in Web CMS |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| (b) The prerequisite or corequisite meets the scrutiny specified in one of the following: II.A. 1 a. through A.1.g. and specify which ⁽⁷⁾ | ⁽⁷⁾ . It is strongly encouraged that this review be based on the actual syllabus, texts, and tests for the course. Only in that way is it possible to determine not merely what the course theoretically should be requiring students to know but, rather, what in practice the course actually does require students to know. If the course is new and exams have not yet been written, an advisory could be established instead of a prerequisite or the instructor could prepare sample tests and submit them at the same time the course is being proposed. If the prerequisite or corequisite is required for the course to be approved for degree applicable credit, then the instructor shall be required to submit sample tests at the same time the course is being proposed. |  |
| (3) Approve any limitation on enrollment that is being established for an honors course or section, for a course that includes intercollegiate competition or public performance, or so that a cohort of students will be enrolled in two or more courses, and, in a separate action, specify which. | |  |
| (4) Approve that the course meets the academic standards required for degree applicable courses, non-degree applicable courses, non-credit courses, or community service respectively. ⁽⁸⁾ | <p><i>I.C.3.a.(4) Regulation</i> <i>Section 55002 requires that courses be approved only if they meet specific criteria established for degree credit courses, non-degree applicable credit courses, non-credit courses, or community services classes. Subsections (a)(2)(D) and (a)(2)(E) of Section 55002 require further that courses that should have prerequisites to ensure academic standards may only be approved as degree applicable courses provided that the criteria have been met for establishing the needed prerequisites.</i></p> <p>⁽⁸⁾. Individual courses will need to be reviewed first to determine whether, if appropriate academic standards are upheld, the students would need to have met a prerequisite or enroll in a corequisite: “When the college and/or district curriculum committee determines, based on a review of the course outline of record, that a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course, then the course shall require prerequisites or corequisites which are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with the requirements of Article 2 (commencing with Section 55200),” and “If Success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills, then the course shall require. . . as pre- or corequisites eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics, respectively.” [Section 55002(a)(2)(E), emphasis added] Secondly, the texts and other grading criteria for the course would need to be examined to see whether in actual fact the students do need to have the indicated skills or knowledge. If a course should require a prerequisite as determined by the first review, but does not meet the criteria required for establishing the prerequisite, then it must be revised so it does meet that standard, or it may not be offered as a degree applicable credit course.</p> |  |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>(A) Review the course outline to determine if a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student had knowledge or skills not taught in the course. If the student would need knowledge or skills not taught in the course then the course may be approved for degree applicable credit only if all requirements for establishing the appropriate prerequisite have been met excepting only approval by the Curriculum Committee.</p> | |  |
| <p>(B) Review the course outline to determine whether receiving a satisfactory grade is dependent on skills in communication or computation. If receiving a satisfactory grade is sufficiently dependent on such skills, then the course may be approved for degree applicable credit only if all requirements have been met for establishing a prerequisite or corequisite of not less than eligibility for enrollment to a degree-applicable course in English or mathematics, respectively.⁽⁹⁾</p> | <p>⁽⁹⁾. See II.A.1.c.(3) for the treatment of a course which would be required to have a prerequisite or corequisite in order to be a degree applicable course but for which data is normally required before such a prerequisite or corequisite could be established.</p> | <p>Need procedure for collecting, follow-up of data</p> |
| <p>(C) A course which should have a prerequisite or corequisite as provided in (A) or (B) but for which one or more of the requirements for establishing a prerequisite have not been met may only ⁽¹⁰⁾</p> | <p><i>I.C.3.a.(4)(C) Regulation</i> <i>Section 55002(a) specifies conditions a course must meet before a curriculum committee may approve it for degree applicable credit. Subsections 55002(a)(2)(D) and (E) specify that establishing a prerequisite or corequisite is a condition for approval if “a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course,” or “success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills.”</i> ⁽¹⁰⁾. It is possible to have degree applicable courses which have no prerequisites at all. For example, although reading would be assigned in an art history class, it might be possible to learn enough through visual and auditory means to get a satisfactory grade even though the student had difficulty with the reading and, yet, the level of instruction be collegiate.</p> | <p>Need procedure for collecting, follow-up of data</p> |
| <p>[1] Be reviewed and approved pursuant to the standards for non-degree applicable credit, non-credit, or community service; (Section 55002) or [2] Be revised and reviewed as required to meet the criteria for establishing the necessary prerequisites or corequisites.⁽¹¹⁾</p> | <p>⁽¹¹⁾. For example, the committee receives a proposal for a physics course that is described as requiring calculus. The curriculum committee would first determine whether a calculus prerequisite seemed necessary to the course being taught at the indicated level. Since this course would appear to need a calculus prerequisite, the second step is to see whether all the requirements have been met for establishing such a prerequisite. If they have not, then the committee could</p> | <p>Need procedure for collecting, follow-up of data</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | not approve the course unless either (a) the further work was done to meet all the requirements for a prerequisite; or (b) the course was approved only for non-degree applicable credit, non-credit, or community service. | |
| b. The Curriculum Committee also reviews the course and prerequisite in a manner that meets each of the requirements specified in I.C.3.a.(1)-(4). | | ✓ |
| D. Program Review | | |
| As a regular part of the Program Review process or at least every six years, the college shall review each prerequisite, corequisite, or advisory to establish that each is still supported by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee and is still in compliance with all other provisions of this policy and with the law. Prerequisites or corequisites established between July 6, 1990, and October 31, 1993, shall be reviewed by July 1, 1996. 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 this policy and with the law. | <i>I.D. Crucial</i> <i>Section 55201(b)(3) requires that prerequisites and corequisites be reviewed at least once every six years. The regulation only requires that advisories be reviewed periodically. However, it is crucial that the district policy specify some reasonable frequency for reviewing advisories.</i> | Create a procedure to remove prerequisite s |
| E. Implementing Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Limitations on Enrollment | | |
| Implementation of prerequisites, corequisites, and limitations on enrollment must be done in some consistent manner and not left exclusively to the classroom instructor. Every attempt shall be made to enforce all conditions a student must meet to be enrolled in the class 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 ⁽¹²⁾ | <i>I.E. Crucial</i> <i>It is crucial that there be an explicit statement of how prerequisites, corequisites, and limitations on enrollment will be implemented. It is also crucial that the implementation not be left exclusively to each individual classroom faculty member and that it be clear in what way the registration process will be used for this implementation.</i> ⁽¹²⁾ For example, this further information might require waiting for a final grade from the previous semester to be submitted or an assessment test to be scored. If a college is not able to put information into its data base from the transcripts of all students transferring into the college, it could simply inform the student that, according to their data, he or she has not met the prerequisite. If the student believes a course taken at another institution should satisfy the prerequisite, the student could then file a challenge and be enrolled in the course pending the resolution of the challenge. A college may also routinely ask students at the time of registration if they have met the prerequisite for the course in question and permit the student to enroll if the student says he or she has met the prerequisite. The college must then routinely check to confirm that the student has indeed met the prerequisite and, if not, the student's enrollment be canceled even if instruction has already begun. | ✓ |

| F. Instructor's Formal Agreement to Teach the Course as Described | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Each college shall establish a procedure so that courses for which prerequisites or corequisites are established will be taught in accordance with the course outline, particularly those aspects of the course outline that are the basis for justifying the establishment of the prerequisite or corequisite. The process shall be established by consulting collegially with the local academic senate and, if appropriate, the local bargaining unit. | <i>I.F. Crucial</i> <i>Section 55201(b)(2) requires that there be procedures for assuring that any course for which there is a prerequisite or corequisite will be taught in a manner that fits with the documents on the basis of which the prerequisite or corequisite was established.</i> | Review this item |
| II. Review of Individual Courses | | |
| If the student's enrollment in a course or program is to be contingent on his or her having met the proposed prerequisite(s) or corequisite(s), then such a prerequisite or corequisite must be established as follows. If enrollment is not blocked, then what is being established is not a prerequisite or corequisite but rather an advisory on recommended preparation and must be identified as such in the Schedule and Catalog. Establishing advisories does not require all the following steps. (See II.B below.) | | ✓ |
| A. Prerequisites and Corequisites | | |
| 1. Levels of Scrutiny Prerequisites and corequisites must meet the requirements of at least one of the following subsections: ⁽¹³⁾ | <i>II.A.1. Regulation</i> <i>Section 55201(b)(1) requires that there be different levels of scrutiny for different types of prerequisites and corequisites. The policy must state explicitly what these levels are and for which types of prerequisites and corequisites they will be used. In addition, Section 55201(c)(2) requires that the standard of scrutiny for any course be that a student who lacked "the skills, concepts, and/or information" would be "highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course," namely a grade of "CR" or "C" or better as determined by content review alone or with data collection or other scrutiny.</i> ⁽¹³⁾ Certain types of prerequisites need not be reviewed in this way until the next time the program of which they are a part is due for Program Review. See Section 55201(d). | ✓ |
| a. The Standard Prerequisites or Corequisites ⁽¹⁴⁾ Each college may establish satisfactory completion of a | ⁽¹⁴⁾ This section would allow the standard and obvious prerequisites to be established with a minimum of review, enhancing the transfer function in particular and allowing for the resources of the college to be expended on the | Revise form to clarify |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>course⁽¹⁵⁾ as prerequisite or corequisite for another course provided that, in addition to obtaining the review of the faculty in the discipline or department and the curriculum committee as provided above, the college specifies as part of the course outline of record at least three of the campuses of the University of California and the California State University which reflect in their catalogs that they offer the equivalent course with the equivalent prerequisite(s) or corequisite(s). Any combination of University of California campuses and California State University campuses is acceptable in satisfaction of this requirement.</p> | <p>problematic cases. Examples that would fit well here are standard science class prerequisites or standard foreign language classes. Since this section is intended for very common cases, a college that is having difficulty finding three UC or CSU campuses that have the same prerequisite and the same courses should instead seek to establish the prerequisite under another subsection. However, the CAN system might provide a quick source of information on which campuses teach the most common courses. The Subject A English course is required by all UC campuses as a prerequisite for English composition classes.</p> <p>(15) Some courses have more than one prerequisite. Each prerequisite would have to be approved as provided.</p> | |
| <p>b. Sequential Courses Within and Across Disciplines⁽¹⁶⁾ A course may be established as a prerequisite or corequisite for another course provided that, in addition to the review by faculty in the department or discipline and by the Curriculum Committee as described above skills, concepts, and/or information taught in the first course are presupposed in the second course, and a list of the specific skills and/or knowledge a student must possess in order to be ready to take the second course is included in its outline or record.</p> | <p>(16) Vocational courses often have obvious prerequisites, but the courses are not offered at enough UC or CSU campuses to meet the requirements of II.A.1.a. Although most such prerequisites would be within the discipline, others would not. For example, the health professions commonly have prerequisites outside the discipline such as anatomy and physiology for nursing. The same level of scrutiny could be used for establishing one course in reading or writing courses as a prerequisite for another course in reading or writing except that such prerequisites would need to be changed to advisories on recommended preparation if the data collected to establish cut-off scores on assessment tests were not sufficient for that purpose. See II.A.1.e. below.</p> |  |
| <p>c. Courses in Communication or Computation Skills Prerequisites establishing communication or computational skill requirements may not be established across the entire curriculum unless established on a course by course basis. A course in communication or computation skills, or eligibility for enrollment in such a course, may be established as a prerequisite or corequisite for any course other than another course in communication or computation skills if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee as provided above, the following is also done:</p> | <p><i>II.A.1.c. Regulation</i> <i>Section 55202(b)</i></p> <p><i>II.A.1.c., d., g. Crucial</i> <i>It is crucial that data be required at least for establishing these types of prerequisites and corequisites. It is also crucial that the policy specify how data will be gathered and evaluated and however it is done be consistent with sound research practices. Further, it is crucial that the policy state what the criteria will be for determining whether the data do in fact justify the establishing of the prerequisite or corequisite. Lastly, the policy must specify that a prerequisite may be put into effect before the required data have been collected only when the prerequisite is determined by the curriculum committee to be necessary pursuant to Section 55002(a)(2)(D) or (E) or other provisions of law, and that the period during which such a provisional prerequisite could be in effect be no longer than two years.</i></p> | <p>Procedures for Data collection need to be developed .</p> |


| | | |
|--|--|---|
| (1) A list of the specific skills a student must possess in order to be ready to take the course is included in the course outline of record; and | | |
| (2) Research is conducted as provided in II.A. 1.g. | | |
| (3) The prerequisite or corequisite may be established for a period of not more than two years while the research is being conducted provided that a determination is made that a student who lacks the particular skills is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade because a sufficient percentage of the grade is directly dependent on these skills. ⁽¹⁷⁾ This determination must be approved both by the faculty in the discipline as provided in I.C.3.a and by the Curriculum Committee as provided in I.C.3.b and must be based on a review of the syllabus as well as samples of tests and other assignments on which the grade is based. ⁽¹⁸⁾ | <p>⁽¹⁷⁾ That percentage need not be so high that the student who lost all those points would be certain to obtain an unsatisfactory grade. For example, if the student would lose 25% of the total points possible by failing the research paper assignment, then he or she could receive a “C” only be obtaining more than 90% of the remaining points, a very difficult task.</p> <p>⁽¹⁸⁾ For example, if calculus is required and if problems involving calculus are on the exams but there are also extra credit opportunities sufficient to offset point lost by lacking the knowledge of calculus, then calculus is not in fact necessary. If material that is presented in reading assignments tested is also presented in class, so that it is realistic that a student with less than the recommended reading skills could nonetheless learn the material through the classroom presentations, then that level of reading preparation should only be an advisory on recommended preparation rather than a prerequisite.</p> | |
| <p>d. Cut Scores and Prerequisites</p> <p>Whether or not research is required to establish a prerequisite, data collected to validate assessment instruments and cut scores is always relevant to reviewing the prerequisites for the associated courses.⁽¹⁹⁾ If such data are insufficient to establish the cut scores, any course prerequisites established for the same course or courses may not be printed in subsequent catalogs and schedules nor enforced in subsequent semesters until the problems are resolved, and sufficient data exist to establish the cut scores. In such a case, the collection of this data shall be done in the manner prescribed in II.A.1.g of this policy in addition to other requirements of law.⁽²⁰⁾ Such a prerequisite may be changed to an advisory on recommended preparation while the problems are being resolved.</p> | <p>⁽¹⁹⁾ Assessment tests and cut scores may only be established in the manner prescribed in “Standards, Policies and Procedures of the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges,” August, 1992.</p> <p>⁽²⁰⁾ These requirements are spelled out in the document referenced in the previous footnote.</p> | |
| <p>e. Programs</p> <p>In order to establish a prerequisite for a program, the proposed prerequisite must be approved as provided for a course</p> | <p>II.A.1.e. Regulation</p> <p><i>Section 55201(c)(2) requires at least this justification for establishing a prerequisite for admission to a program.</i></p> | ✓ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| prerequisite in regard to at least one course that is required as part of the program. ⁽²¹⁾ | ⁽²¹⁾ . If a college wishes to establish requirements to complete a course or courses before admission to a program in order to establish priorities for admission to the program, such a requirement may only be established as provided in Section 58106 of Title 5 on enrollment priorities. For example, nursing programs sometimes require completion of all requirements for the associate degree prior to admission to the nursing program itself. | |
| f. Health and Safety ⁽²¹⁾ A prerequisite or corequisite may be established provided that, in addition to the review by faculty in the department or division and by the Curriculum Committee as provided above: | ⁽²¹⁾ . Districts should also review the applicable provisions of the Federal Government's Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 in regard to any requirements that apply specifically to students with disabilities. | ✓ |
| (1) The course for which the prerequisite is proposed is one in which the student might endanger his or her own health and safety or the health and safety of others; and | | ✓ |
| (2) The prerequisite is that the student possess what is necessary to protect his or her health and safety and the health and safety of others before entering the course. | | ✓ |
| g. Recency and Other Measures of Readiness Recency and other measures of readiness may be established as a prerequisite or corequisite only if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee as provided above, the following is also done: | | Procedures for Data collection need to be developed |
| (1) A list of the specific skills a student must possess in order to be ready to take the course is included in the course outline of record. | | |
| (2) Data are gathered according to sound research practices in at least one of the following areas: | | |
| (A) The extent to which students, those currently enrolled in the course or those who have completed it, believe the proposed prerequisite to corequisite is necessary. | | |
| (B) Comparison of the faculty members' appraisal of students' readiness for the course to whether students met the proposed prerequisite or corequisite. The faculty appraisal could be done at any time in the semester that the college determined was appropriate and based on independent assignments, quizzes and exams, participation in class, or other indicators that the student was or was not ready to take the course. | | |
| (C) Comparison of students' performance at any point in the course with completion of the proposed prerequisite or corequisite ⁽²²⁾ | ⁽²²⁾ . Student performance could be measured using final grades, or it could be measured using their performance up to any point as early as six weeks into the course. The later | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | the date chosen for measuring student performance, the more extraneous factors like change in work schedule or personal illness will also affect the data. The option described in g.(2)(b) above would permit the instructor to adjust for such irrelevant factors and even for the student who is doing the work but unsuccessfully or provide for these other factors in some other way in the research design. On the other hand, others believe that the use of faculty perception is more subjective and grades more objective. This issue is left for discussion at the campus, since all of these approaches are legitimate research methodologies, and there are no conclusive reasons to require any one of them. | |
| (D) Comparison of student performance in the course to their scores on assessment instruments in the manner required to validate an assessment instrument and cut scores for the course in question as described in II.A.1.d. | | |
| (3) The standard for any comparison done pursuant to II.A.2.(A)(D) shall be that a student is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite or corequisite. ⁽²³⁾ The research design, operational definition, and numerical standards, if appropriate, shall be developed by research personnel, discipline faculty, and representatives of the Academic Senate. If the evidence fails to meet the standard established, each college may establish the proposed prerequisite or corequisite as a recommended preparation and may seek to establish it as a prerequisite or corequisite only by following the process described in this policy and any applicable college policies. | ⁽²³⁾ This standard, that a student is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course unless the student has met the proposed prerequisite, is not an additional measure but, rather, is the point of whatever measure is used. Whether the comparison is with student final grades or with a midterm grade or student satisfaction with the prerequisite or faculty assessment of student preparation, the point is to confirm that the student would be unlikely to succeed unless he or she met the prerequisite. | Procedures for Data collection need to be developed |
| (4) If the Curriculum Committee has determined as provided in I.C.3.A.(4)(a) or (b) that a new course needs to have a prerequisite or corequisite, then the prerequisite or corequisite may be established for a single period of not more than two years ⁽²⁴⁾ while research is being conducted and a determination is being made, provided that | ⁽²⁴⁾ Although this language would permit two years of grace, the intent is that normally the issue would be resolved during the first year. A second year is permitted only if unanticipated problems arise in the data collection process itself such that the data are lost or are rendered meaningless or unintelligible. | |
| (A) All other requirements for establishing the prerequisite or corequisite have already been met; and | | |
| (B) Students are informed that they may enroll in the course although they do not meet the prerequisite. However, students who lack the prerequisite may not constitute more than 20% of those enrolled in any section of the course ⁽²⁵⁾ | ⁽²⁵⁾ Provision is made here for admitting students who have not met the prerequisite since collecting meaningful data on the value of the prerequisite requires being able to compare students who did meet it to students who did not. However, since a prerequisite of this type has been judged to be vital to maintaining academic standards, the qualified students should be at least 80% of | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | any section of the course. The college might implement this provision through labeling such prerequisites as provisional and, then, permitting individual students to challenge on that basis. The college may also simply program its computer to permit students to enroll on a first-come, first-served basis and, until the 20% limit is reached, permit students who do not have the prerequisite to simply enroll in the regular registration process. In any case, the issue of how to implement this provision is left to the district to college to determine so long as students are notified of their right under this section and so long as students who lack the prerequisite are in some manner limited to not more than 20% of the total enrollment in any one section. | |
| (C) Prerequisites and corequisites which are exempt from review at the time they are, or were, established, as provided in Section 55201(d), are not eligible for this exception, and the research must be conducted during the six years before they must be reviewed. (See I.D. above.) | | ✓ |
| 2. Additional Rules Title 5, Section 55202 specifies additional rules which are to be considered part of this document as though reproduced here. | II.A.2. Regulation | ✓ |
| B. Advisories on Recommended Preparation | | |
| Each college may recommend that a student meet a standard of readiness at entry only if recommended by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee as provided in I.C. above. This process is required whether the college used to describe such recommendations in its catalog or schedule as "prerequisites," or "recommended," or by any other term. | II.B. Regulation <i>See also I.C. A properly constituted curriculum committee and content review are required. An explicit statement of the content review process is crucial and also that the content review process be careful and the specific steps of that process be clearly specified in the policy. It is also crucial that the approval of the advisory be done explicitly and not be inferred from the approval of the course. Lastly, it is also crucial that provision be made for providing those with expertise on the discipline in question an adequate voice in the content review process.</i> | ✓ |
| C. Limitations on Enrollment The types of limitation on enrollment specified below ⁽²⁶⁾ may only be established through the curriculum review process by the discipline or department faculty and the Curriculum Committee specified above including the requirement to review them again at least every six years, for example, as part of program review. The following requirements must also be met in order to establish these particular limitations on enrollment. | II.C. Crucial <i>Section 58106 lists the only ways it is permissible to limit enrollment. In addition, it is crucial that the policy specify an adequate voice for experts in the discipline on the specific limitations mentioned in the model and that these limitations be permitted only if the student would have other ways to meet any associate degree graduation requirement. Lastly, it is also crucial that such limitations be reviewed regularly and that the policy specifies a reasonable schedule for such review.</i> | ✓ |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>⁽²⁶⁾ These limitations on enrollment are academic matters and need to be established through the curriculum process. Other limitations on enrollment may also be determine to be academic and professional matters as provided in Section 53200 et seq., or be included in collective bargaining agreements or be imposed by outside agencies such as fire departments. This document should not be interpreted to require or encourage any particular method for establishing other limitations on enrollment.</p> | |
| 1. Performance Courses | | |
| Each college may establish audition or try-out as a limitation on enrollment for courses that include public performance or intercollegiate competition such as but not limited to band, orchestra, theater, competitive speech, chorus, journalism, dance, and intercollegiate athletics provided that: | | ✓ |
| a. For any certificate or associate degree requirement which can be met by taking this course, there is another course or courses which satisfy the same requirement; and | | ✓ |
| b. The college includes in the course outline or record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which meet the same requirement. | | ✓ |
| c. Limitations on enrollment established as provided for performance courses shall be reviewed during program review or at least every six years to determine whether the audition or try-out process is having an disproportionate impact on any historically underrepresented group and, if so, a plan shall be adopted to seek to remedy the disproportionate impact ⁽²⁷⁾ If disproportionate impact has been found, the limitation on enrollment may not be printed in subsequent catalogs or schedules nor enforced in any subsequent term until such a plan has been endorsed by the department and the college administration and put into effect. (See also Sections 55502(e) and 55512.) | <p><i>II.C.1.c. Crucial</i> <i>It is crucial that courses which have try-out or audition as a means for permitting students to enroll in the course also be reviewed for whether the try-out or audition is having a disproportionate impact on any historically underrepresented group. (Section 55512 requires that “Any assessment instrument, method or procedure” must be evaluated for “disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of ethnicity, gender, age or disability, as defined by the Chancellor.”)</i></p> <p>⁽²⁷⁾ The determination of disproportionate impact should normally be done by comparing students enrolled in the course to the general student population.</p> | ✓ |
| <p>2. Honors Courses⁽²⁸⁾ A limitation on enrollment for an honors course or an honors section of a course may be established if, in addition to the review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee as provided above, there is another section or another</p> | <p>⁽²⁸⁾ If the honors section is a separate course, and an articulation agreement exists that treats the course differently upon transfer or if there are other extrinsic, concrete benefits to taking the honors course, then restriction on enrollment should be established as provided for prerequisites rather than as provided here for limitations on enrollment.</p> | ✓ |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>course or courses at the college which satisfy the same requirements. If the limitation is for an honors course and not only for an honors section, the college must also include in the course outline of record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which meet the same associate degree or certificate requirement.</p> | | |
| <p>3. Blocks of Courses or Sections⁽²⁹⁾ Blocks of courses or blocks of sections of courses are two or more courses or sections for which enrollment is limited in order to create a cohort of students. Such a limitation on enrollment may be established if, in addition to review by the faculty in the discipline or department and by the Curriculum Committee as provided above, there is another section or another course or courses which satisfy the same requirement. If the cohort is created through limitations on enrollment in the courses rather than limitations on specific sections of courses, then the college must include in the course outline of record a list of each certificate or associate degree requirement that the course meets and of the other course or courses which satisfy the same associate degree or certificate requirement.</p> | <p>⁽²⁹⁾. The Puente Program is perhaps the most well-known example of such a program.</p> |  |

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SUMMARY

DATE: MARCH 15, 2007

TIME: 3:00 – 5:00

PLACE: I-330

COMMITTEE UPDATE:

CONSENT CALENDAR: Items in “Consent” are recommended for approval by a Technical Review Committee that met on 3-07-07.

| Subject | | | | |
|--|------|----------------------------|---|--------------|
| LMTECH | 100 | Introduction to Research | Update part of the curriculum revision cycle, <u>modified DLA</u> from face/face contact to 100% Online, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | R. Karlin |
| ENGL | 101H | Honors English Composition | Per Tech Change Memo: Title change from “Honors English Composition and Literature,” implement fall 2007: APPROVED | J. Brezina |
| KPEA | 170B | Intermediate Soccer | Formerly PHYSED-165, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, from 2 units to 1, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | H. Fisher |
| KPEA | 185A | Beginning Tennis | Formerly PHYSED-130, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | D. Stanich |
| KPEA | 195C | Advanced Volleyball | Formerly PHYSED-180, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, added Advisory KPEA-195B Intermediate Volleyball, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | L. Hooper |
| KPEI | 270 | Intercollegiate Soccer | Formerly PHYSED-253, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | |
| MUSIC | 186 | Music Ensemble | The word “voice” is added to the catalog and schedule descriptions. “...preparation for public performance using the voice , woodwind, brass”, implement fall 2007: | P. Marcellin |
| PHOTO JOURN | 260 | Newspaper Photography | Move PHOTO-260 to Journalism department, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | |
| Hotel and Restaurant Management AS Degree | | | Reduces units required from 23 to 18 by removing BUS-201. Also removes recommended electives ECON-201 and 202, must submit <u>Non Substantial Change Form to Chancellor’s Office</u> , implement fall 2007: APPROVED | K. Anthony |
| AA Photojournalism, AA Photography, Certificate of Photojournalism | | | Per Tech Change Memo - remove PHOTO-260 as an option in each program since course moved to JOURN-260, no other change made to program/s, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | W. Brill |

TECHNICAL CHANGE MEMOS NOT REVIEWED AT THE 3-07-07 TECHNICAL REVIEW MEETING:

| BIOSCI | 050L | Biology Computer Laboratory | Add notation to schedule description directing students to and describing criteria for earning credit in lab, implement fall 2007: APPROVED and adopted a standard language for all lab course notations | D. Takeda |
|---------|----------|---|---|-----------|
| COUNS | 085, 095 | Career and Job Search Preparation, Intensive Workshop for Positive Change | Modifying schedule description, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | E. Alonso |
| COUNS | 090 | New Student Advisement | Modify schedule description and <u>title change</u> from “College Orientation,” implement fall 2007: APPROVED | E. Alonso |
| NC.CITZ | 01 | Citizenship for Naturalization | The current number of hours stipulated in the Noncredit ESL course outlines max | K. |

| | | | | |
|--------|------|------------------------------|--|---------|
| NC.ESL | LVL1 | Level 1 | out at 180 for Pre Level 1 through Level 4. The Noncredit ESL course titled “Communication for Employment” maxes out at 48 hours, as it is currently conducted only one morning a week. | Gorback |
| NC.ESL | LVL2 | Level 2 | | |
| NC.ESL | LVL3 | Level 3 | | |
| NC.ESL | LVL4 | Level 4 | | |
| NC.ESL | LVL5 | Communication for Employment | Requesting all the Noncredit ESL course outlines are changed to reflect 255 as the maximum number of hours, providing students with the opportunity to attend classes 15 hours a week for a semester, with the goal of matriculating more quickly into the ESL credit program and/or into employment., implement fall 2007: APPROVED | |

NEW PROGRAMS: -0-
NEW COURSES: 2

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------------------------|--|------------|
| | | | | |
| KPEA | 180A | Beginning Swimming | 1.5 units, 54 hr activity, no repeat, no prerequisite, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | D. Stanich |
| KPEA | 185C | Advanced Tennis | 1 unit and variable unit 1-3, 54 hr activity, no repeat, no prerequisite, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | D. Stanich |
| KPEI | 285 | Intercollegiate Tennis | 2 units, 108 hr activity, no prerequisite, 2x repeat, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | D. Stanich |
| NC.BCSK | 100 | GED Preparation | Implement summer 2007: APPROVED | K. Gorback |

MODIFIED PROGRAMS: See Consent Journalism and Hotel and Restaurant Mgmt

MODIFIED COURSES:

| | | | | |
|---------|-----|---|---|-------------|
| | | | | |
| ART | 085 | Art History: Field Trips | Formerly “114”, Update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | R. Walker |
| CIT | 110 | Keyboarding and Document Processing | Update part of the curriculum revision cycle ,modified DLA to include 100% online implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED TABLE | K. Clements |
| CIT | 111 | Advanced Document Processing & Skill Building | Update part of the curriculum revision cycle ,modified DLA to include 100% online implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED TABLE | K. Clements |
| CIT | 130 | Medical Office Procedures | Contact hours from 54 lect, to 36 lect and 54 lab, new DLA 100% online and hybrid, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED TABLE | M. Lipman |
| CIT | 132 | Medical Office Finances | Contact hours from 54 lect, to 36 lect and 54 lab, new DLA 100% online and hybrid, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED TABLE | M. Lipman |
| CULARTS | 121 | Culinary Fundamentals I | New course as of 2-2-06, changes HRMGT-225 Sanitation Management, from prerequisite to co-requisite, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | K. Anthony |

| | | | | |
|--------|------|--|---|------------|
| HLHSCI | 151 | Emergency Medical Technician I | Contact hours currently 130 – from no repeat to unlimited, implement fall 2007: APPROVED with new prerequisite HLHSCI-051 AHA BLS for Healthcare Providers (CPR) | P. Haley |
| HLHSCI | 153 | Emergency Medical Technician Refresher | Update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: Provisional approval , includes new prerequisite HLHSCI-151, will not implement until curriculum office receives supplemental and adds verbs to objectives, committee will review at next Tech Review – anticipate April 19, 2007 “Consent” | P. Haley |
| KPEA | 180B | Intermediate Swimming | Formerly PHYSED-167, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | |
| KPEA | 180C | Advanced Swimming | Formerly PHYSED-178, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | |
| KPEA | 185B | Intermediate Tennis | Formerly PHYSED-168, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | D. Stanich |
| KPEA | 260 | Off-Season Football Training | Formerly PHYSED-162, <u>title change</u> from “Intermediate Football,” update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: | G. Tujague |
| KPEA | 280 | Off Season Swimming Training | Formerly PHYSED-179, title change from “Swim Stroke Mechanics,” update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | |
| KPEI | 250A | Intercollegiate Basketball I | Formerly PHYSED-252A, from 3x repeat to 2x repeat, enrollment reduced from 30 to 20, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: | H. Fisher |
| KPEI | 250B | Intercollegiate Basketball II | Formerly PHYSED-252B, from 3x repeat to 2x repeat, enrollment reduced from 30 to 20, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, implement fall 2007: | H. Fisher |
| KPET | 107 | Theory and Analysis of Basketball | Formerly PHYSED-107, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, from 27 hr lect and 27 hr lab, to all lecture @ 36 hours, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | H. Fisher |
| KPET | 108 | Theory and Analysis of Soccer | Formerly PHYSED-108, update part of the curriculum revision cycle, from 27 hr lect and 27 hr lab, to all lecture @ 36 hours, implement fall 2007: NOT APPROVED | H. Fisher |

NEW DISTANCE LEARNING ADDENDUMS: -0-

MODIFIED DISTANCE LEARNING ADDENDUMS: See LMTCH-100 in “Consent”

NEW PREREQUISITES: 1

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

MODIFIED PREREQUISITES: 1

| | | | | |
|---------|-----|-------------------------|---|------------|
| | | | | |
| CULARTS | 121 | Culinary Fundamentals I | Change HRMGT-225 Sanitation Management, from prerequisite to co-requisite, implement fall 2007: APPROVED | K. Anthony |

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Learning Resources stage: Jennifer will address the Distance Learning stage in WebCMS. The approval for DLA is a faculty responsibility. The stage has changed from James Glappa-Grossklag to Deanna Riveira: The committee will ask the Academic Senate to form a subcommittee to discuss procedures for changes in WebCMS approvals and also potential improvements to the process. This subcommittee should include representative from the curriculum committee.
2. Prerequisite Committee: Audrey and Jennifer recently attended a Prerequisite Committee Meeting; they would like to discuss the need to document “like” colleges and courses with the same prerequisite indicating a standard practice: Jennifer updated the committee on the progress of the Prerequisites Subcommittee. The committee should ask for examples of at least 3 CSU or UCs that have the same prerequisite when an author is asking for a standard prerequisite for a course.
3. Diversity Requirement: Establish a process to update Diversity List: The committee will be considering new courses to add to the Diversity List at the 4/19 meeting. The committee will ask the Academic Senate to form a subcommittee to update the criteria used to determine the courses eligible for the Diversity List.
4. Enrollment Limitation, Supplemental “A” – Jennifer will research the criteria for enrollment limitations most intercollegiate sports employ.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE:

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------------------|---------|--|---------|
| Bogna, Gina - Curriculum Coordinator Non-voting member | Present | Karlin, Ron | Present | Robinson, Patty | Present |
| Green, Audrey - Administrator, Co-Chair & Articulation Officer | Absent | Lowe, Ann | Present | Solomon, Diane | Present |
| Brezina, Jennifer - Faculty Co-Chair | Present | Lucy, Nicole | Present | Stanich, Diane | Present |
| Hooper, Lisa | Present | Patenaude, Robert | Present | Sara Vogler or Steve Pemberton ASG, Non-Voting member | Absent |
| Jacobson, Joan | Present | | | | |

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY ITEMS APPROVED ON THIS AGENDA

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|-----------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| New Courses | 1 | New Non Credit Courses | 1 | New Prerequisites | 2 |
| New Programs | 0 | Modified Non Credit Courses | 0 | Modified Prerequisites | 1 |
| Modified Courses | 24 | New DLA's | 0 | Deleted Courses | 0 |
| Modified Programs | 4 | Modified DLA's | 1 | Deleted Programs | 0 |