

**MISSION COLLEGE
CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE
March 14, 2012
2:15 – 4:00**

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

- The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. Minutes of the February 29, 2012 meeting were approved unanimously (M/S Lamkin/Brunson). A request was made by Cindy Vinson (Distance Learning Committee) to add discussion of possible DE addendum changes to support regular effective student contact policy changes, and that will be discussed if time permits.
- Course and Program Approvals: CONSENT AGENDA**
The following course proposals were approved by consent (M/S/U Vinson/Sanchez):
Course Archive: LIB 006, Using the Internet for Research
Course Inactivation: ENGL 903, Basic Grammar and Sentence Structure
Cathy noted that CRC reps should be alert to a large number of inactivations and archives that are coming through for approval as the database is cleaned up.
- REGULAR AGENDA**
New Courses – Second Read:
IS 980 Academic Strategies for ESL I
IS 981 Academic Strategies for ESL II

These two courses were tabled and will not be considered by CRC at the request of Amelia Akers-Martin, the originator. It was explained that the ASC is reconsidering the direction of their program in light of discussions about noncredit offerings, changes in state funding and regulations, and various other issues. Rebeca Sanchez did advise CRC that the Counseling department wanted to go on record as opposing these courses on the grounds of course overlap, particularly 981. An additional concern is the presence of ESL as a discipline assignment for these courses, as they are not sure that ESL minimum qualifications would give subject expertise for study skills. She noted that Counseling has many ESL students who take their courses on study skills and that ESL is not the subject being taught. Norma noted that it is extremely important that students be appropriately referred to necessary courses to get the proper skills needed to succeed. In some ways this is an enrollment opportunity, if the right "fit" can be found between student needs and courses.

4. **Prerequisite Task Force** – the call has gone out from the Academic Senate for faculty to sit on the Prerequisite Task Force. CRC should have at least two members on the task force. Scott Brunson, Steve Lipman, Diane Lamkin, and Cathy Cox are all interested in sitting on this body. Yolanda Coleman has already submitted her name as a representative from Student Services. Cathy will forward names to the Academic Senate, who will approve the final membership.

5. **Review of ASCCC paper for Spring Plenary Session: *Setting Course Enrollment Maximums: Process, Roles, and Principles***

This paper is being considered for adoption by the ASCCC next month, and it was sent out to CRC members last Friday for review. Discussion in today's meeting centered on the whether or not there should even be an "optimum class size" listed on the course outline. Norma stated that the class size was a negotiated item; Cathy responded that the efficiencies were negotiated, but the size of individual classes was not. General agreement on the idea that departments need flexibility to allow some smaller sections of individual courses as long as the departmental efficiency is met. CRC should be the body that decides this issue.

There are many reasons why a specific course might need/want to vary from a "standard" class size – safety, regulatory requirements, legal requirements, etc. The discipline and department need to set the class size but outside factors need to be taken into account. After some discussion about elements of the proposed paper, an alternative to "optimum class size" was suggested: in CurricUNET, institute a checklist of factors that might affect the class size for a specific course, such as regulatory requirements, laws, safety considerations, amount/type of work required from students, amount of oversight required, special population needs, etc. This would allow demonstration of those special factors to be considered, while sidestepping the issue of a hard-and-fast number to be placed on the COR.

6. **Program Review and Curriculum**

Pat Hernas, Program Review chair, came to discuss possible connections between Program Review and Curriculum Review. The college is purchasing Governet's Program Review module, which coordinates with CurricUNET. She is developing proposals for the type of reports and outputs that will be most useful to the college. Currently the CRC chair runs a report each summer for PR on courses and programs that have not been revised in many years. There is, however, no easy way to extract information from completed program reviews and send it back to Curriculum. She asked CRC to think about what information would be helpful to the committee:

What kind of info would CRC like to receive from PR?

What kind of info should departments get from CRC through Program Review?

Who should get that information? (department chairs, CRC reps, etc.)

How should it be sent out? (via system-generated emails? Reports? Other?)

Pat will come back to CRC in early May to get ideas for implementation as the system is developed.

7. **SLO Subcommittee**

Cathy advised CRC that at last week's Academic Senate meeting, the Senate discussed the formation of a SLO committee to be a subcommittee of the Curriculum Review Committee, with its chair sitting on CRC. This subcommittee will work with faculty on development of SLOs for academic courses and programs.

8. **Distance Education**

Cindy Vinson reported that the Distance Learning committee is recommending a change to

the DE addendum that would clarify the activities carried out by faculty to meet the required hours of contact per unit taught, as well as the activities expected of students on a regular basis. She asked whether changes to the DE addendum needed to go to the Academic Senate; it is CRC's understanding that as long as the screens are asking for data required to support the Senate-approved policy or required for compliance with regulation or accreditation, the CRC can implement changes. Cindy will bring a sample of what the DL committee is suggesting and CRC will review it.