

**MISSION COLLEGE  
CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE  
February 8, 2012  
2:15 – 4:00**

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Cathy Cox (chair)					
Scott Brunson (Applied Sciences)		x	<b><u>Ex-Officio Members:</u></b>		
Liz Dietz (Applied Sciences)		x	<b>Articulation Officer – Yolanda Coleman</b>	x	
Betty Ensminger (Language Arts)	x		<b>VP of Instruction – Norma Ambriz-Galaviz</b>		x
Zoya Kravets (Math & Science)	x		<b>Curriculum Assistant – Aileen de Guzman</b>		x
Diane Lamkin (Math & Science)	x				
Steve Lipman (Language Arts)	x		<b>GUESTS:</b>		
Thanh Nguyen (Liberal Studies)	x				
Rebeca Sanchez (Student Services)	x				
Cindy Vinson (Business & Tech)	x				

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m.
2. The minutes of 12/7/2011 were approved unanimously (M/S Sanchez/Lamkin)
3. **CurricUNET Update:**  
Cathy summarized recent changes in CurricUNET over the winter break. A major new development is the ability to generate a report, similar to the course outline or DE report, for each course showing the Learning Outcomes for that course. All three – COR, DE, and Learning Outcomes – can be accessed even by people who are not logged into CurricUNET, which means they are accessible to students and the general public (a requirement for accreditation). The icon to run the Learning Outcomes report is currently a red square, although Cathy is trying to get a better icon installed to replace it.  
  
Search option in CurricUNET were also demonstrated, and CRC reps were encouraged to use the SEARCH / COURSE function to selectively retrieve lists of all the “Draft” courses in their areas, etc. Searches can be limited by status and by proposal type.  
  
The committee discussed the input of administrative data into CurricUNET, and there was consensus that the “Dates” field on the CODES AND DATES screen was not used – Yolanda Coleman clarified that it was a holdover from the template used at the time of installation. At Mission, those dates are pulled from ASSIST. There was consensus that barring objections from the office of instruction, the dates fields on this screen could probably be removed without objection.
4. **Update: State Changes**  
This item was intended to discuss changes in CB coding and also issues with the state Curriculum Inventory. Due to the absence of Office of Instruction staff, it will be held to a future agenda.
5. **Spring Project and Timeline Planning**  
The committee discussed the two major projects facing it this semester: Development of a prerequisite implementation process, and reviewing and potentially making changes in the processes used to approve curriculum. After some discussion, it was agreed to tackle the

prerequisite implementation process first as that is likely to entail more discussion at the Academic Senate and must then be approved by the Board. Cathy will forward out relevant background materials to the committee members, and their “homework” for this week is to read them prior to next week’s meeting.

There was also extensive discussion on the issue of processes and proposal types for credit and noncredit curriculum. Credit courses must be built on a credit course outline, and require specific types of information per Title 5. Noncredit courses are built on at different course outline that requires substantially different information. The approval of noncredit courses is complicated here at Mission by the fact that historically most of our noncredit courses have been housed and taught in Community Ed, which also houses and teaches “Not-For-Credit” courses (also called fee-based courses). Since the noncredit courses do generate apportionment, they require approval by CRC and regular revision – which has been difficult to manage as the only process that exists requires signature by department and division chairs (who do not exist in Community Education).

The issue of course approvals for noncredit courses is going to become increasingly urgent as the state moves to push the lowest levels of basic skills courses out of credit and into noncredit formats. Cathy distributed a chart showing how decisions made during the curriculum development process should ideally drive what type of proposal is generated as well as what type of approval process is used for each proposal type. New proposal types need to be set up by Governet; new approval processes can be set up by Cathy on our system.

There is widespread confusion about the distinction between “noncredit” and “not-for-credit” courses, and many faculty do not understand that noncredit courses can be housed and taught in instructional programs of the college or in Community Education.

Cathy will send out electronic versions of documents that may help clarify some questions about noncredit courses. In the meantime, there are a few noncredit course approvals from the Community Education department in the queue that need signoff at the level of the Department and Division chairs. The committee approved giving Dean of Instruction Stephanie Kashima authority to sign off on those proposals so that they can move forward to the Curriculum Committee, subject to final approval by the Academic Senate.

When the committee reviews the approval processes and proposal types, it may also look at creating two new proposal types to facilitate tracking of materials fee changes and also SLO revisions. These processes should not require a full course revision, and probably do not require CRC approval – but use of Curricunet to track changes would provide needed documentation of the processes used and also provide for review by appropriate parties. The committee will be exploring this later in the semester. Changes will have to be implemented during the shut-down period at the end of Spring.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Notes taken by Cathy Cox.