**IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AGENDA**
Regular Meeting, Thursday, April 21, 2016
12:50 p.m. – Administration Building Board Room

The mission of Imperial Valley College is to foster excellence in education that challenges students of every background to develop their intellect, character, and abilities; to assist students in achieving their educational and career goals; and to be responsive to the greater community.

I. **Opening of the Meeting**

    A. **Call to order**

    B. **Approval of the Minutes**

        1. **Regular Meeting of April 7, 2016**

            M/S (_____/_____) to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2016, regular meeting of the Curriculum Committee, as presented.

II. **Action Items**

    A. <u>**Credit Courses**</u>

        1. **Deleted Course**

            a. **BUS 167 – Machine Calculation (1)**

                M/S (_____/_____) to approve the deletion of BUS 167 from the credit curriculum, effective 2016-2017. The motion:

        2. **Revised Courses**

            a. **AJ 162 – Regular Basic Course Modular Format Level II (13.5)**
            b. **AU T 130 – Automotive Electronics I (3)**
            c. **ENGL 059 – Grammar and Usage Review (3)**
            d. **RELS 104 – Ethics (3)**

                M/S (_____/_____) to approve the revision to items a. through d. above as indicated in CurricUNET, effective 2016-2017. The motion:

III. **Discussion Items**

    1. **Academic Senate Rostrum Items**
        a. **Beyond Efficient Curriculum Approval Processes**
        b. **Ensuring the Quality of Your Online Courses**
        c. **The Reemergence of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges**

IV. **Information Items**

V. Other Items

VI. Next Regular Meeting: May 5, 2016, 12:50pm in the Board Room

VII. Adjournment

CC Meeting 04-21-16				Banner	State
AJ 162	Regular Basic Course Modular Format Level II	13.5	Update to grading criteria to Letter Grade Only		
AU T 130	Automotive Electronics I	3	Description update		
BUS 167	Machine Calculation	1	COURSE DELETION		
ENGL 059	Grammar and Usage Review	3	Updated description, content, texts, and removal of recommended preparation		
RELS 104	Ethics	3	Textbook Update		

PROGRAMS					

Present:	☑Nicholas Akinkuoye	☑Craig Blek	☑Tina Aguirre	☑David Drury
	☑Kathleen Dorantes	☐Gaylla Finnell	☑Daniel Gilison	☑Carol Hegarty
	☑Allyn Leon	☐Jose Lopez	☐Norma Nava	☐Trinidad Argüelles
	☐Frank Rapp	☑Jose Ruiz	☐Sydney Rice	☑Veronica Soto
	☑Kevin White	☐Cathy Zazueta	☑ASG Representative Victor Alcantar	
Consultants:	☑Ted Cesar	☐Becky Green	☐Gloria Hoisington	☑Ashok Naimpally
	☑David Zielinski	☐Jill Nelipovich	☐Norma Nunez	☑Efrain Silva
Ex-officio	☑Michael Heumann			
Visitors:	Lorrainne Mazeroll			
Recorder:	Dixie Krimm			

I.   Opening of the Meeting

A.   Call to order

Frank Rapp called the regular meeting of the Imperial Valley College Curriculum Committee to order at 12:56 pm on Thursday, April 7, 2016.

B.   Approval of the Minutes

1.   Regular Meeting of March 17, 2016

M/S/C (Drury/Leon) to approve the minutes of the March 17, 2016, regular meeting of the Curriculum Committee, as presented.

II.   Action Items

A.   Credit Courses

1.   Revised Courses

a.   COMM 125 – Interpersonal Communication (3)

M/S (Ruiz/Drury) to approve the renumbering of COMM 120 to COMM 125, effective 2016-2017. The motion carried.

B.   Catalog Textual Items

1.   IVC Graduation Requirements (2015-2016 Catalog, pp. 46 & 49)

M/S (Soto/Leon) to approve the revision to the Certificate of Achievement and IVC Associate Degree Graduation Requirements catalog statements (2015-2016 Catalog, pp. 46 and 49), effective 2016-2017, as presented. The motion carried.

2.   Military and Veteran Success Center (MVSC)

M/S (Soto/Gilison) to approve the addition of the Military and Veteran Success Center statement to the 2016-2017 Catalog page 25, effective 2016-2017, as presented. The motion carried.

III. Discussion Items

1. Course Outline of Record (COR) and Large Quota designation

Dr. Nick will be discussing this at the next instructional council meeting. This affects courses that are offered at or above double the current class size. Departments will discuss which courses can be offered as large quota and designate them as such on the COR and submit through the normal curriculum approval process in CurricUNET. The option should be available in CurricUNET by April 21st for departments to submit requested large quota designation for approval at the May 5th meeting.

IV. Information Items

Michael sent out the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges resolution packet.
Most of the resolutions are curriculum related
- Open Educational Resources and Z degree pathways require zero textbook cost.
- AAT issues – Music is an example – creating two TOP codes for those transferring and those not. CSUs do not like the current ADT, guaranteed access to a program that must be auditioned for is problematic.
- Academic Senate is pushing to transcribe low unit certificates (less than 12 units)

Regarding Credit by Exam –
Frank reminded the department chairs that in addition to the list of courses to be offered credit by exam they should provide the list of potential instructors.

V. Other Items

VI. Next Regular Meeting: April 21, 2016, 12:50pm in the Board Room

VII. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Enter keyword or phrase

FIND

✚ IN THIS SECTION...

Beyond Efficient Curriculum Approval Processes – Timely Catalog Publication

March 2016

John Freitas, ASCCC Curriculum Chair

Craig Rutan, ASCCC Area D Representative

The efficiency of curriculum approval at the local, regional, and state levels has been and continues to be a hot topic in the California community colleges. The report of the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy, with its focus on Career and Technical Education (CTE), includes a recommendation to "evaluate, revise, and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval." In response to this recommendation, the ASCCC Curriculum Committee drafted a white paper on effective curriculum approval processes which was distributed to local senates in Fall 2015 and presented at the curriculum regional meetings and the ASCCC Fall Plenary session. The ASCCC also adopted a resolution and published a *Rostrum* article encouraging local senates to review, evaluate, and improve their local curriculum approval processes as needed; furthermore, the Curriculum Committee is bringing forward a position paper on effective curriculum approval processes for adoption at the Spring 2016 plenary session.

Many colleges are already examining their local approval processes and are working to shorten their curriculum approval times to a matter of weeks instead of months or years. Even with the most efficient college curriculum approval processes in place, other processes that occur after final local curriculum approval may delay the availability of new courses and programs to students. For example, approval by the Chancellor's Office could take several weeks, depending on how many proposals have been submitted by other colleges. Additionally, the review of career technical education program proposals by regional consortia can add delays of several weeks or even months. While delays because of regional and state processes are beyond the control of colleges, other local processes may delay the availability of curriculum once it is approved by the governing board. One important post-approval process that falls into this category is catalog publication.

Many colleges started reviewing their curriculum approval processes several years ago when they transitioned from paper curriculum management processes to electronic curriculum management systems. What colleges found is that processes that once took only days suddenly required months. Colleges quickly realized that by implementing their existing processes using technology, they had become less efficient. While many colleges have been able to streamline the approval through the curriculum committee, they often only went to the governing board for approval once or twice a year. This practice raised the

question of why curriculum should not be forwarded to the board upon every instance of the curriculum committee or the local academic senate approving curriculum recommendations. The answer was simple: Every course, degree, and certificate that a college offers, through credit or noncredit, must be included in the college catalog. When colleges originally developed their approval processes, those processes were designed to make certain that the governing board approval was coordinated with the publication of the next edition of the catalog. In other words, the availability of new curriculum to the students was being driven by catalog publication schedules.

Catalog production can sometimes take months, and most colleges will produce a new catalog every year or two. Title 5 §55005 requires colleges to publish course standards before a course can be offered to students, including transferability, degree applicability, and whether the course is eligible for general education. For many colleges, this information is only published in the college catalog, which means that new courses are not available to students until the new edition of the catalog is published. Therefore, while curriculum committees and academic senates streamlined their curriculum approval processes, students may have been forced to wait months or years before the new courses would be available. Furthermore, any changes to course standards that are legally required to be published in the catalog will also face a similar publication delay, which has serious implications for students who are intending to transfer or graduate. Finally, many colleges will not offer new degrees or certificates until they are published in the college catalog due to confusion about catalog rights, even though the course has been approved by the district governing board and the Chancellor's Office and is listed in the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory.

While the curricular content of the college catalog is within the purview of local senates and curriculum committees, its publication is a college operational matter. Typically, the college curriculum specialist is responsible for preparing the new catalog for publication based on an established schedule. If the catalog publication schedule is preventing the offering of new curriculum or the dissemination of updated curricular information to students in the timeliest manner possible, then local senates should work with their college administrations to identify and implement improvements to the publication process and timeline. Some possible solutions are as follows:

- Producing a catalog addendum each semester.
- Producing an online version of the college catalog that is updated each semester once all applicable course and program approvals are final.
- Including each of the course standards information required by §55005 in each schedule of classes.

Finally, technology plays an important role in helping or hindering catalog production. After all approvals are final, if course or program information is not entered into the curriculum management system in a timely manner, or if the curriculum management system and student information system are not communicating with each other, catalog production may be further delayed. The ability to offer new curriculum and disseminate the correct curricular information should never be driven by technology. Rather, the technology should be adapted to the needs of the college to properly serve its students. If issues with the curriculum technology are causing delays in offering new curriculum, then local senates should work with their administrations to identify solutions.

Curriculum is the heart of the college. Faculty develop and revise curriculum to meet the needs of their students, and students are right to expect that their colleges will do everything possible to ensure the additions and revisions to the curriculum are implemented. Publishing the college catalog on an annual or biannual basis does not serve students well. Such a publication schedule limits access to new courses and programs and prevents important changes to information about transferability, degree applicability, and general education applicability from being published and available to students and transfer

institutions. As local senates continue to refine their local curricular processes, they also need to be mindful of the catalog publication process. If the catalog publication process is delaying the offering of new curriculum, then local senates need to work with administrators to identify and implement solutions to ensure that newly approved and revised courses and programs are offered to students as soon as possible.

The articles published in the Rostrum do not necessarily represent the adopted positions of the academic senate. For adopted positions and recommendations, please browse this website.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

+ IN THIS SECTION...

Ensuring the Quality of Your Online Courses: Considerations for Local Policy and Practices

March 2016

Dolores Davison, Chair, ASCCC Online Education Committee

Michelle Pilati, Interim Chief Professional Development Officer, Online Education Initiative

While local curriculum processes for the approval of courses for online delivery are intended to ensure that the course in question can be effectively taught online, these processes often do not involve any means of ensuring the quality of online instruction. Although some faculty argue that additional scrutiny of any sort that is not applied to campus-based courses should not apply to online courses, the truth is that the modalities are fundamentally different. If a campus-based course is taught in a room without seating, ventilation, lighting, or an instructor, the remedies are readily at hand. In fact, seating, ventilation, and lighting are not even controlled by the campus-based instructor. In contrast, the online faculty member is in complete control of the online classroom and may effectively create an environment as uncomfortable and chaotic as a room lacking seating, ventilation, and lighting. Furthermore, faculty may even opt to send students elsewhere – beyond the environment maintained by the college – potentially placing students in a space without technical support and potentially even in violation of laws intended to ensure student privacy. For these reasons, local senates should take steps to promote and ensure the quality of their colleges' online courses.

One obvious approach is to locally adopt a rubric intended to inform and possibly assess the quality of online offerings. Various sources exists for such rubrics, including Quality Matters (https://www.qualitymatters.org/ (https://www.qualitymatters.org/)), Blackboard (http://www.blackboard.com/consulting-training/training-technical-services/exemplary-course-program.aspx (http://www.blackboard.com/consulting-training/training-technical-services/exemplary-course-program.aspx)), and the Online Education Initiative (http://ccconlineed.org/faculty-resources/professional-development/online-course-design-standards/ (http://ccconlineed.org/faculty-resources/professional-development/online-course-design-standards/)). A review of any of these rubrics provides the reader with standard principles related to quality online course design, principles that should be evident in the design of all online courses. Such rubrics can be employed to engage in formal reviews of existing courses or to facilitate a self-check. Ideally, such rubrics are used in the development of new online offerings.

The criteria employed to ensure quality in online courses also ensures the accessibility of all course components. This area is an increasing concern that all colleges should be actively addressing, as was discussed in the September 2015 *Rostrum* article "Accessibility in Online Education" (http://asccc.org/content/accessibility-online-education (http://asccc.org/content/accessibility-online-education)). Educating the entire college community about the importance of accessibility is essential to ensuring the availability of necessary resources. Identifying accessible options becomes a higher priority when colleges are faced with the students who need those options, which can be particularly challenging in online classes. Colleges need to continue to ensure that the needs of all students are being met, regardless of modality.

While quality course design and accessibility are important to offering the best possible online learning experience for students, another area of consideration relates to the use of proprietary resources that are not instructor-generated. While this subject often is a reference to materials provided by a publisher, various entities may offer materials or tools that faculty integrate into their courses. A number of levels of concern may arise with the use of such resources, including concerns regarding over-reliance on such materials, accessibility, the availability of support when using technologies not supported by the college, and student privacy rights (i.e., FERPA).

The use of and concerns regarding proprietary materials are not limited to online classes; the increased availability of these materials has led to more faculty using them in all course modalities. While many of the materials are useful and in some cases provide information for students that are necessary for success in the course, the use of proprietary materials to the exclusion of instructor-generated content raises the question of why the instructor is teaching the course in the first place. While the physical presence of an instructor in a classroom-based class at least ensures that he or she is present to provide context to any proprietary resources employed to facilitate the presentation of course materials, no such assurances exist in the online realm. Materials produced by publishers with problem sets, ancillaries for the text, test banks, and even lecture materials are readily available and are often offered free of charge to the faculty member. Merely providing such resources to students in an online course absent any supporting instructor-generated material is akin to asking students in a classroom-based class to read the text in lieu of attending lecture. The presence of the instructor in the online classroom is more than simply regular, effective, and substantive contact; it is his or her involvement in all aspects of the course, including the construction of the materials used for instruction. Both preventing and defining "over-reliance" on proprietary materials are unique challenges best handled through local policies that are consistent with the local culture. Colleges need to find an appropriate balance between respecting faculty autonomy and ensuring an effective experience for students.

Accessibility is a concern whether or not proprietary resources are employed. Publishers often provide exciting tools that are beneficial to many students but may be woefully ineffective in meeting the needs of students with a wide variety of limitations. Only through our advocacy will publishers make the investment necessary to ensure comparable accessible experiences for our students who need them. Before requiring students to access any proprietary materials, faculty should consult with the appropriate campus entity to ensure the accessibility of such resources. This practice is even more important if you are requiring students to purchase access to such materials. The recent amendments to Title 5 regarding instructional materials and access must also be followed. More information on those regulations can be found at http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/Miscellaneous/InstructionalMaterialsGuidelines1.28.13.pdf (http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/Miscellaneous/InstructionalMaterialsGuidelines1.28.13.pdf).

Another issue regarding student access to proprietary materials arises when the students are leaving the local course management system and engaging with technology that is not supported by the college. The use of such resources potentially creates additional issues related to the Family Educational Records Privacy Act (FERPA). Local policies could address these issues by borrowing the following language from the Online Education Initiative Course Design Rubric:

- Software used for the course is adequately supported by the institution, including information for students on where they can obtain help
- All activities that might create educational records (as defined by the Family Educational Records Privacy Act) or that involve regular effective contact are conducted within district- or college-supported systems.

As accreditation standards require that online students have access to the same resources as campus-based students, such policies would ensure that faculty are not permitted to run afoul of those standards and students are not directed to resources that are not supported.

Ensuring that quality exists within online courses is a responsibility of both the individual faculty member and the local academic senate. In the interest of addressing this issue, the ASCCC and the Online Education Initiative will be working together to develop materials on effective practices with respect to integrating proprietary materials into online courses as well as other guidelines to ensure that online courses meet federal, local, and accreditation standards and provide the highest quality education to the students enrolled in those courses.

The articles published in the Rostrum do not necessarily represent the adopted positions of the academic senate. For adopted positions and recommendations, please browse this website.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

| Enter keyword or phrase | FIND |

➕ IN THIS SECTION...

The Reemergence of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges

March 2016

Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, ASCCC Noncredit Committee Chair

Jan Young, Glendale College, ASCCC Noncredit Committee

According to the website of the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, "The California Community Colleges is the largest postsecondary education system in the nation." In 2014-2015, the latest full year of data available on the Chancellor's Office Datamart, the system served 2,317,934 students and generated 1,176,671.31 FTES. While little doubt exists that the system serves an incredible number of students, some might question whether the system and its individual colleges are serving all the students who need to be served.

The Chancellor's Office also notes that the "primary missions of the system are preparing students to transfer to four-year universities, workforce development and training, and basic skills and remedial education." To those working within the system, this three-pronged focus is nothing new. But California community colleges are not in all cases truly serving all students seeking transfer, workforce training, or basic skills development.

As of 2014-2015, 94.2% of the 1,176,671.31 system FTES were credit, meaning that only 5.8% of system FTES were generated through noncredit (67,816.39). Noncredit has never been much more utilized; even at its peak in 2008-2009, noncredit only accounted for 7.5% of the system's total FTES. An estimated 80,000 students were lost in noncredit during budget cuts, resulting in a loss of 31,142 noncredit FTES. Noncredit felt cuts more significantly because of the lower funding rate for noncredit: colleges felt less incentive to retain noncredit sections.

If the California community colleges desire to serve all who seek transfer, workforce training, or basic skills development, then a large majority of the system's 113 colleges need to do more with noncredit.

Noncredit opens doors to students who may not otherwise consider attending a community college. Financial barriers are eliminated by the fact that zero unit courses carry no fees for students. Therefore, students do not need to navigate a complicated financial aid process to access a no cost education.

Noncredit courses also offer more flexibility and options than credit. Courses do not need to be structured around lab versus lecture hours and unit computations; courses can be written for the actual amount of time needed to accomplish outcomes,

whether 3, 11, or 75 hours. Noncredit courses can be offered with structured enrollment start dates and end dates like credit, or they can be offered in an open entry/open exit format that allows students an opportunity to start the day they show an interest in the course and leave whenever they accomplish the outcomes.

The flexibility in noncredit extends to the fact that students can repeat a class until all outcomes or educational goals are met. For a student struggling with basic math, the chance to take parts of a class over again before moving on to the next level or even while taking the next level can improve understanding and boost confidence.

Noncredit courses also work well in environments closer to and less intimidating to prospective students than community college campuses where credit courses are primarily taught. Elementary schools, adult schools, workplaces, and community-based locations are more accessible, more familiar, and more comfortable to noncredit students.

Although noncredit can start students on a path to transfer, workforce preparation, or basic skills, students can also accomplish very different educational goals. Noncredit can be used to improve language skills for second language learners, to prepare for citizenship, to become familiar with parenting skills, to learn to help children learn basic skills, to retool job skills as seniors or reentry workers, to improve one's own basic skills, and more. Some of these goals might be possible through credit, but the barriers of an enrollment process, assessment, and financial aid can be daunting to students; in addition, some of these goals rank very low among college priorities when measured against the transfer and workforce preparation focus of credit.

Noncredit courses also have the advantage of often having more counseling and student support embedded within the courses, and noncredit can be structured in a way that encourages more hands-on pedagogy and instructor-student interaction with material to better foster student development. While credit courses may very effectively embed student support and offer a tremendous amount of instructor engagement with individual students, such a structure is more the norm in noncredit.

Colleges have long made less use of noncredit because the fact that noncredit was funded at a lower rate was a deterrent, especially when budgets were tight. At many colleges, faculty compensation also differs between credit and noncredit sections, with noncredit being paid at a lower rate per hour. In addition, noncredit has been stigmatized as "not college" when in fact California community colleges offer noncredit courses that may be as rigorous as credit counterparts.

California community colleges are currently undergoing an effort to increase access through noncredit, and California state legislators and the governor are to thank. The education trailer bills for the last three years all included items that encouraged an increase in noncredit instruction to better serve underserved populations.

In 2013, AB 86 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2013-2014) was passed. AB 86 amended California Education Code §84830 and directed the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the State Department of Education to provide two-year planning and implementation grants to regional consortia comprised of community college districts and school districts for the purpose of developing regional plans to better serve the educational needs of adults through elementary and secondary basic skills, classes and courses for immigrants including citizenship, English as a Second Language, and workforce preparation courses in basic skills, education programs for adults with disabilities, short-term career technical education programs with high employment potential, and programs offering pre-apprenticeship training activities. All five areas of focus are noncredit areas, and consortia were encouraged to first identify underserved adult populations then begin considering how to increase access and services to these populations.

In 2014, AB 860 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2014-2015) amended California Education Code §84750.5 to increase the funding of Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) FTES to the same rate as credit beginning in the 2015-2016 year. While noncredit FTES continued to be funded at 60% of credit FTES rates, CDCP had been enhanced to 71% of the credit rate since 2006 but still at level less than credit. The equalization of funding for CDCP created an opportunity for colleges to consider maintenance and development of noncredit courses without the disincentive of lower funding.

Building on the adult education efforts started under AB 86 (2013), in 2015 AB 104 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2015-2016) amended California Education Code §84900 to establish the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) under the supervision of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the Superintendent of Instruction. AEBG expanded the scope of the adult education programs eligible for development by regional consortia to serve underserved adults. In addition to the original five areas of emphasis, two additional areas were added: programs for adults, including, but not limited to older adults, that are primarily related to entry or reentry into the workforce, and programs for adults, including but not limited to older adults, that are primarily designed to develop knowledge and skills to assist elementary and secondary school children to succeed academically in school. These areas are also included under noncredit.

Three years of legislative efforts have led to increased conversations about adult education and noncredit. These conversations are long overdue. While five of the system's 113 colleges generated 50% of noncredit FTES in 2014-2015 and the top 10 of 42 districts delivering noncredit generated 90% of the system's CDCP FTES in 2014-2015 (CCCCO presentation to ACCE, October 19, 2015), times are changing and more faculty are considering ways in which noncredit can open access to students. These changes require conversations about current course and program offerings, conversations that can be difficult, but the opportunity to redesign community college curriculum to better serve students and create greater access will be worth pursuing as more students can achieve their educational goals.

> The articles published in the Rostrum do not necessarily represent the adopted positions of the academic senate. For adopted positions and recommendations, please browse this website.