

GAVILAN COLLEGE CURRICULUM MEETING
Monday, March 14, 2005
2:10 p.m., LS 104
MINUTES

Present: M. Abad-Cardinalli, S. Au-Yeung, K. Bedell, S. Carr, S. Dodd, B. Donovan, L. Franklin, B. Lawn, R. Lee, F. Lopez, F. Lozano, E. Luna, J. Olivas, J. Parker, M. Segal, S. Sweeney, L. Tenney, D. Van Tassel, K. Warren, J. Hall
Guests: R. Beede, R. Perez

I. Call to Order

S. Dodd called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

II. Agenda Adjustments

Add Item V – B – 2 Articulation information
Item III.- C – 3 is not a PLO it is a Form F

III. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes of February 28, 2005
 - B. Minutes of March 7, 2005
 - C. PLO's
 - 1.AH
 - Certified Nursing Assistant
 - Home Health Aide
 - Clinical Medical Assistant
 - Licensed Vocational Nurse
 - Registered Nurse
 - 2.ESL
 - D. Form C's
 - 1.Math 3 – numbering
 - 2.required prerequisite for UC's – BIO 1, 4, 5
 - E. Form F's
 - 1. Physical Education Major – add PE 9 to options
- MSC (K. Bedell, S. Au-Yeung) All in favor

IV. Form C

- A. **Chem 1A** – required prerequisite for UC's
 - J. Olivas asked everyone to note that these need to be completed with a grade of C or better.
- MSC (M. Abad-Cardinalli, F. Lozano) All in favor

V. Issues

A. Discussion

1. Course Outlines – Topic vs. Weekly Format

The question from the last discussion was what needs to be on a course outline?
According to good practices for curriculum development, the following items should be listed:

- # of units
 - Instructor methodology
 - Methods of evaluation
 - Updated text
- Course content should be topics taught in the course. They should be arranged by major headings with subtopics.

S. Dodd handed out a copy of a Topic based course outline from another community college.

M. Segal asked if the courses need to be rewritten? S. Dodd said that if the topic outline is agreed upon, then as new curriculum comes in it would be written in the new format. Then as your courses need to be updated they would be updated in the new format.

B. Lawn said that it feels like a lot of work to change again.

J. Olivas had an example of the format that he has to turn in for articulation and the topic outline works for him.

R. Lee asked what the appropriate level of detail is and noted that the standards might be lowered if more information isn't included.

J. Olivas said that all of the classes need a syllabus as well as a Topic/subtopic outline. Student Performance objectives still need to be included.

B. Lawn agreed with R. Lee and said that once something is in writing it gives it more backbone. Course standards might be lowered if the information is not included on the outline.

F. Lozano asked for clarification from R. Lee as to whether or not he thought minimum standards need to be set to the topic outlines or whether he doesn't agree with the topic outline at all.

R. Lee responded that adding some type of a schedule to the outline gives it more depth. He added that a PT instructor needs to know the importance of each topic and a time frame will allow you to see this better.

E. Luna added that the topic outline might not give the depth of the course. He also added that it is his opinion that we shouldn't completely dump what we are doing because the "wave" may go in a different direction or come back around to what we are currently doing.

S. Dodd pointed out that this change is not driven by accreditation. She has brought it to the committee to look at and possibly recommend that it be put into action. The current model that Gavilan uses is a K-12 model. The Topic outline is a more collegial model.

S. Carr said that by looking at the models presented today and at what Gavilan is currently doing, it looks like we would be going from one extreme to another. She agreed that for PT faculty the strict Topic outline does not give any direction. Perhaps Gavilan is looking at something in between.

R. Beede added that Gavilan's outlines are instructional based versus the learning based topic outlines. He believes the State wants the Colleges to go to the learning based outlines. He also pointed out that the outline is not to replace the syllabus.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

2. **Non-credit program**

R. Perez shared the following information with the Committee. There are various areas of non-credit programs that the Chancellor's office recognizes and the 2 areas that she is focusing on right now are Staff Wellness and an Older Adults program. At an open enrollment function, the Staff present was surveyed on their interest in a Staff Wellness program. 49 out of 52 responses were in favor of Staff wellness. R. Perez was able to identify the Older Adult need by her work in the community and by visiting other existing programs. Most of the Older Adult programs will be held at the Senior Sites.

The Adult Basic Literacy program & Adult Basic Education programs are coming in the near future. R. Perez is sponsoring a non-credit forum on April 18th where speakers will talk to a joint meeting of Department Chairs and the Student Services group. The speakers will be from SF City College, a representative from the Chancellor's office and a person from West Valley.

E. Luna asked if there would be competition between the Gavilan non-credit program and the Adult Education programs that are run by the High Schools? It is his opinion that we shouldn't be competing for the same pool of students.

M. Abad-Cardinalli expressed her support of the non-credit program but also pointed out that some of her colleagues are expressing some concern with the confusion in the titles of the courses. She suggested that we make sure they are not similar in title and content to the credit courses offered at Gavilan.

B. Donovan pointed out that it is important to keep a division between the credit and non-credit courses so that they are not intermingled in the class schedule.

B. Lawn is interested in how the non-credit program will interact with the continuing education and Adult school courses that already exist.

K. Bedell pointed out that by putting the non-credit courses under their own "umbrella" this might clear up a lot of misgivings and questions.

D. Van Tassel agreed that the titling of the courses is important.

R. Perez responded to the question about competition for students and said that she is working closely with the other institutions to ensure that the same courses are not being offered. The other community organizations support Gavilan and the non-credit program. At SF City College there is a 40% matriculation rate from non-credit to credit courses. R. Perez said that this points out that there is a link to credit from the non-credit program. She acknowledged that it would be important to keep the credit & non-credit courses totally separate in the catalog and in advertising so it is not confusing to the students.

R. Perez says that she does not have a problem renaming the non-credit courses. She also pointed out that the curriculum for each of the non-credit courses always goes through the Department that houses that particular course.

D. Van Tassel asked if regular Faculty can teach the non-credit courses and if it affects their load. R. Perez answered yes, regular Faculty can teach the courses and yes it affects your load. She also noted that there is a different pay scale. D. Van Tassel then asked if he would be able to satisfy part of his load by teaching these courses? The answer was theoretically, yes.

R. Beede asked what the fee is for the non-credit courses? Non-credit courses are free, where as Community Education courses are fee based.

Gavilan gets paid by the state for the non-credit courses.

M. Segal asked how the non-credit courses would hurt the Community Education program. R. Perez said that it will not as they are offering different topics.

As needed, discussion will continue on this topic at further meetings.

3. **First and Second Reading Required for Approval**

S. Dodd pointed out that the reason the Curriculum Committee has a 1st & 2nd reading for new curriculum is because of the Brown Act. F. Lozano pointed out that another reason is to make sure we give some thought about the curriculum being proposed. K. Bedell added that the 1st reading lets the Committee ask, "Is this a worthwhile course?"

4. **Discussion on procedure for forms that are received late**

S. Dodd asked the Committee for direction when late forms are received.

There were several opinions that said, "A deadline is a deadline." There were several opinions that said that we need to be flexible as extenuating circumstances do come up. Also opinions which said that rules need to be flexible when a student is going to be affected.

Committee members can help by making sure their department understands the importance of the deadlines and how difficult it makes it on B. Donovan when the deadlines are not adhered to.

It was the recommendation by the majority of the Committee that deadlines need to be followed and it is up to the discretion of the Chair to bring extenuating circumstances back to the Committee for consideration.

5. **Request for meeting location with individual computer access**

S. Dodd informed the Committee that rooms with individual computer access are not available for the rest of this semester, at least not at 2 pm.

Several members of the Committee expressed their preference for individual computers.

R. Lee said that in the fall, the math lab will be open for Curriculum meetings at 2pm. S. Dodd said that she will check with the Committee again at the end of this semester to discuss a change in location.

6. **FW Grade**

S. Dodd said that the FW grade was on the Curriculum Committee agenda in September/October 2001. In December 2001, the Curriculum Committee voted no on adding this additional grade.

S. Carr would like the Committee to again vote on this. It will be put on the next meeting as an Action item.

B. Information

1. 54 Hour Semester

Per state guidelines, semester hours can range from a minimum of 48 to a maximum of 54. Gavilan is on a 54 hour semester.

The question is: Will students choose or not choose Gavilan because of the 54 hour semester versus a 48 hour semester?

It was pointed out that when the College converts to the 16 week calendar, it is important to increase the #of hours not decrease the # of hours or we will lose FTS.

R. Beede asked if a Staff development week could be counted in to the hours. J. Parker said there will be a week of flextime in the fall and spring.

2. Articulation Information

J. Olivas brought up 2 issues for information.

Issue #1: 3 Community College students took Chemistry classes at 3 different Community Colleges and were not prepared for the Chemistry classes at San Jose State. SJSU has therefore cut off articulation with those 3 Community Colleges. Among the many things they are requesting from the colleges is the verification on the competency of the Instructors teaching the courses at the Community College level. J. Olivas requested that he be notified immediately if any of the Faculty receive "the big binder" full of requests from SJSU.

Issue #2: J. Olivas is submitting information to R. Lee with regards to a combination course in Chemistry & Physics with a lab due to a new UC requirement. He added that if we don't offer it here, our students may take it somewhere else.

VI. Adjournment

The Curriculum Committee was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, April 11, 2005

Deadline for Curriculum forms: Wednesday, March 23, 2005