GAVILAN COLLEGE CURRICULUM MEETING
Monday, September 12, 2005
2:10 pm, PH 101
Minutes

Present:
F. Lozano, J.Harmon, S. Au-Yeung, S. Carr, J. Parker, D. Van Tassel, K. Warren, B. Donovan, S. Dodd, J. Olivas, A. Rossette, E. Luna, K. Bedell, L. Tenney, R. Lee, E. Alster, K. Campbell, M. Segal, G. Cardinalli

Guests:
R. Perez, S. Smith, D. Paleto

I.   CALL TO ORDER at 2:10 p.m.
Note to all: there is a math class until 2 p.m. so please, as a courtesy to our students, do not arrive prior to 2 p.m.

II.   AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS
S. Dodd withdrew item IV.A.3.

III. Approval of Consent Agenda
Item D was removed from the Consent Agenda and placed under "Curriculum – New Business"
Motion was made to approve consent agenda.
MSC
All in favor - Unanimous

IV.   ISSUES
   A. **Information**

      1. Identify Voting Members

         S. Dodd passed out copies of the Curriculum Committee By-Laws. Item VII "Membership" was discussed. She will 'clean' them up and bring them back before the committee for approval.

         Questions were raised as to how non-members can become voting members. A comment was made that the Curriculum Committee is a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate.

      2. Courses to be Updated Fall 2005

         S. Dodd passed out a list of courses to be updated. Most of these courses need ILO's, textbook updates, etc…

         J. Olivas noted that it had been some time since some courses were last reviewed (1995).

         R. Lee asked what the deadline was for submitting courses. S. Dodd responded that they are to be updated by the end of the school year.

   B. **Discussion**

      1. Non-credit Basic Skills Classes

         ESL non-credit courses were the main focus of discussion as there are many issues. ESL Department will have a meeting next week to discuss credit and non-credit ESL classes. They will then invite R. Perez to meet with them to continue discussions on how they can work together.

Main concerns, no duplication of courses and not taking away student enrollment from current credit programs.

R. Perez said the non-credit program could also offer GED, vocational, or citizenship classes. It was noted that there is a great need in the community that is not currently being met.

J. Harmon stated there is definitely a place for this and it needs to be part of the overall picture. Non-credit courses would prepare students for an actual college ESL course without financially overburdening them. The courses meet the need of the student. May be useful to look at where people need to be to come into a credit course (part of assessment).

E. Alster is also in favor of a pre-ESL non-credit class (preparatory).

Pay of instructor for non-credit is on hourly basis and does not include grading homework.

R. Perez said the legislature is looking at other ways to reimburse colleges with non-credit courses.

E. Luna is concerned about what criteria should be used by the curriculum committee to judge these type (non-credit) of classes. How do we know that credit and non-credit courses do not overlap.

S. Dodd said that non-credit courses still have standards, such as course learning outcomes, student performance objectives, and content.

If a student has been assessed/tested into non-credit ESL we need to make sure that student will not have a negative "stigma" attached to that placement.

K. Campbell stated there are two ways to determine placement and help students 1) formation of courses (stair step progression) and 2) actual assessment test.

J. Parker asked, do we want a record of non-credit students? Currently there is no transcript for these students.

R. Perez said these students are entered into her department's database.

Discussions will continue within departments and between R. Perez and those departments. It will then be put back on the curriculum agenda for additional discussion.

2. Topic Based Course Outline

Student performance objectives and homework still need to be included in topic based course outlines. S. Dodd handed out an example of a topic based course outline and asked the respective departments to discuss this format at their next meeting. She was hoping to start using this format in the Spring semester, as an option.

E. Luna suggested that we already are doing this.

K. Campbell stated that if we go by topics we do not need to redo our courses when we change to different lengths of semester.

I. CURRICULUM
A. **New Business**
1. New Course Proposal – Second Reading
a. AJ 176

Steve introduced Dave who authored AJ 176.

Concern about "repeatable once" and the appropriateness of this class as GE was discussed.

J. Olivas said courses listed only as AJ were not appropriate as GE, but it does transfer.

E. Luna suggested it was repeatable because gangs do change. The question is should the whole class be repeated or is there another method for updating certain information within a class.

F. Lozano said repeatability refers to certain skill building as determined by state regulations.

E. Alter pointed out that cultural diversity was not checked. It was indicated that this was an oversight.

It was moved to approve AJ 176 without the repeatability option.

MSC

Approved unanimously

b. CSIS 183

Motion to approve

MSC

Approved unanimously

c. PE 13A

MSC

Approved unanimously

2. <u>Modification to Existing Courses – Form C</u>

a. CSIS/ENGR 5

J. Olivas questioned why this course is splitting. "Please let me check this out before we vote on this. How can we best meet the needs of our students."

R. Lee stated the needs of the students who need ENGR 5 are quite specific. If there is a need for it, it would be offered again.

J. Harmon said if we have a course that can meet the needs of two sets of students, we should keep it.

R. Lee felt it would be misleading to keep ENGR 5 as it would appear that the college is offering an engineering program.

F. Lozano asked if we can articulate/re-articulate and how long would it take?

The committee chose to table this item so that J. Olivas can research. It will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

MSC

3. <u>Distance Education – Form D</u>

a. CSIS 5

As this was contingent on the approval of removing the cross listing of CSIS/ENGR 5, which was tabled, it was removed from the agenda.

4. Form D's – Distance Education

This item was removed from the consent agenda and placed here.

E. Luna noted difference in phrasing and feels we need to have uniformity of descriptions.

B. Donovan stated that if we are moving to more distance ed. classes we should still alternate between on-line and in class so no one is alienated

Motion to approve Form D's for Distance Education.

Motion approved.

MSC

2 opposed

1 abstention

Meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.