

Others Present: L. Gerasimchuk (Administrative Assistant, Instruction Office), J. Hughes (Evaluator), L. Miller (Curriculum Specialist)

I. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

Hearing no objections, the order of the agenda was approved.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/U (L. HATCH, M. GARCIA) to APPROVE the minutes of 03/13/2012.

III. COURSE NOTIFICATION AGENDA

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSCR 230</td>
<td>Clinical 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: Fall 2012</td>
<td>Expedited administration update to fee Granted by VPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for Expedited Approval: Materials fees for liability insurance are illegal, according to division staff in ALHE. This course was missed. It should be noted that this course is not compliant, and that updates to the fees will require a change to the active course record. L. Miller will attach the existing fee report to the active course record, and update the fee information in CurricUNET so that no fee appears on the active course. The fee removal will be effective Fall 2012. L. Miller has advised the division to bring this course into review-cycle compliance ASAP to avoid inactivation and to ensure it can continue to be offered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFY: Materials fee (on active CurricUNET course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Fee Status: Removing fee of $12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee was notified of the expedited changes to RSCR 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC Transfer Articulation: History Subject Area Review Results

From: Jennifer Forsberg [mailto:Jennifer.Forsberg@ucop.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Ruth Cranley
Subject: History Subject Area Review Results - Modesto Junior College

Dear Community College Articulation Officer:
Below you will find a detailed breakdown of the courses identified by the UCOP transfer articulation staff as a part of the 2011 UC history subject area review. The designated courses for your college are divided into the following sections:

- courses submitted by you and approved upon review
- courses submitted by you and not approved (these should be resubmitted during the 2012-2013 TCA cycle)
- courses identified by the reviewer but not submitted (these need to be submitted during the 2012-2013 TCA cycle)
- courses submitted by you that are not part of this review (thus approved without review)

In reviewing your courses, we have strived to give valuable and detailed feedback about courses that do not meet the established requirements. Should you or your faculty have questions about the results, Dawn and I would be happy to set up a conference call with you to go over the results and give further feedback.

Submitted and retained

- HIST 101 History of the United States to 1877
- HIST 102 History of the United States Post Civil War
- HIST 104 Western Civilization to 1650
- HIST 105 Western Civilization since 1650
- HIST 106 World Civilization to the 16th Century
- HIST 107 World Civilization from the 16th Century
- HIST 145 History of Latin America

Submitted and phased out
None

Not submitted and phased out
None

Submitted and automatically retained (not part of review)

- HIST 119 Social and Cultural History of 20th Century America

Courses that currently have phase out notices are due to be phased out after summer 2013; this will us time to work with you to make the course(s) transferable. If you wish to re-submit these course(s) for review during the 2012-2013 TCA cycle, please submit outline(s) in OSCAR in the 2012 calendar year.

If your outlines have gone through curriculum committee review and you’d like us to take a look at them ahead of the 2012-2013 TCA cycle, send them to me for an unofficial review (meaning, the course will not be marked as retained until it goes through the official TCA review, but we can look at it to see if there are any problems that should be addressed).

As a reminder, you can find the criteria for the history subject review in the 2011 UC TCA letter, found here: http://info.assist.org/tca_guidelines.html

Best regards,

Jennifer Forsberg
University of California Office of the President
Student Affairs/Transfer Articulation Analyst
1111 Franklin Street, 9th Floor
The committee was notified of the UC Transfer “History Subject Area Results” for HIST 101, HIST 102, HIST 104, HIST 105, HIST 106, HIST 107, HIST 145, and HIST 119.

IV. COURSE CONSENT AGENDA

V. COURSE DISCUSSION AGENDA

INACTIVATIONS

EHS 250  Landscape Irrigation  3
Effective: Summer 2013
INACTIVATE
Program Impact:
1. Environmental Horticultural Science A.S. Degree
2. Landscape and Park Maintenance Certificate of Achievement
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, J. SOLA) to INACTIVATE EHS 250

INTDS 215  Interior Design Studio 1  2
Effective: Summer 2013
INACTIVATE
Program Impact:
Stand Alone
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, J. SOLA) to INACTIVATE INTDS 215

MACH 310  Advanced Topics in Machining  1
Effective: Summer 2013
INACTIVATE
Program Impact:
1. CNC Programmer Certificate of Achievement CNC Programmer Skills Recognition Award
2. Machine Tool Technology 2 Certificate of Achievement
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, J. SOLA) to INACTIVATE MACH 310
UPDATES (including modifications/reactivations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>MODIFIED</th>
<th>Enrollment Restrictions</th>
<th>Distance Education Status</th>
<th>Materials Fee Status</th>
<th>Articulation Status</th>
<th>General Education Status</th>
<th>Program Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLSC 235</td>
<td>Plant Propagation/Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours/faceto face modalities, content, typical assignments, textbooks, course goal, leaning goals, methods of assessment</td>
<td>Maintaining: (A) Before enrolling in this course, students are strongly advised to satisfactorily complete PLSC 200.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Transfer to CSU</td>
<td>Not approved for GE</td>
<td>1. Fruit Science A.S. Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS 235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MODIFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M/S/U (J. BEEBE, J. SOLA) to MODIFY PLSC/EHS 235 with the clarification by M. Garcia that PLSC 235 is cross-listed with EHS 235. This is to be corrected in the agenda.

*M/S/U (S. CIRCLE, P. UPTON) to MAINTAIN ADVISORY for PLSC 235/EHS235.

NEW COURSES

None

VI. PROGRAM NOTIFICATION AGENDA

Program Learning Outcomes

C: Mechanized Agriculture Technician

Adopt

Effective: Summer 2012, Expedited pending a directive to produce a 2012-2013 Catalog Addendum

Students who earn a Certificate of Achievement in Mechanized Agriculture Technician will be able to:

1. Describe the various employment opportunities available within the mechanized agriculture field and demonstrate the minimum educational requirements for entrance into each.
2. Locate, read, and interpret appropriate plans, manuals and equipment documentation in order to fabricate and/or repair equipment effectively.
3. Select proper tools and equipment for various applications, staying within the desired financial restraints.
4. Maintain tools and equipment and demonstrate the value of preventative maintenance and proper equipment usage.
5. Demonstrate and relate the use of skills developed across various general education disciplines (ex. English, math, physics etc.) to help solve problems within the mechanized agriculture field.

The committee was notified of PLOs adopted for C: MECHANIZED AGRICULTURE TECHNICIAN

AA: University Preparation: Emphasis in Humanities
In addition to demonstrating the abilities listed as General Education Student Learning Outcomes, students who earn an AA in University Preparation, Emphasis in Humanities in will be able to:

1. Describe how cultural beliefs, values and practices have influenced societies in various times.
2. Analyze the ways that individuals and various cultural groups act in response to their societies and environment.
3. Demonstrate awareness of the various ways that culture, ethics, history, belief, and ethnicity affect individual experience and society as a whole.
4. Demonstrate the ability to interpret and analyze works of art for meaning and to forge aesthetic judgments.
5. Demonstrate critical thinking in the analysis of cultural production using both thematic and historical synthesis.

The committee was notified of PLOs adopted for AA: UNIVERSITY PREPARATION, HUMANITIES During transcription of the minutes, L. Miller noted that the wrong degree had been identified in the agenda as “AA: General Studies: Emphasis in Humanities.” The meeting minutes show the correct degree.

Chancellor’s Office Approvals:

PROGRAMS: CCC-501, CCC510, CCC-511, CCC-300 Application Approvals

(None)

Chancellor’s Office Denials: PROGRAMS

Chancellor’s Office Updates

VII. PROGRAM CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. PROGRAM DISCUSSION AGENDA

Program Changes that do not require Chancellor’s Office Notification/ Application

ADOPT:
Skills Recognition in Gerontology
Effective Term: Summer 2013
M/S/U (M. ROBLES, L. HATCH) to ADOPT SR: GERONTOLOGY with the friendly amendment to revise the award header language to match those used in the catalog by removing redundant course requirement language.

CCC-501: Application for Approval - New Credit Programs
(Non)

CCC-510: Substantial Changes to an Approved Credit Program

CCC-511: Non-Substantial Changes to Approved Program or Change of Active–Inactive Status

NACTIVATE:
Agriculture Laboratory Technician Certificate of Achievement

March 27, 2012
Effective Term: Summer 2013
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, L. HATCH) to INACTIVATE C: AGRICULTURE LABORATORY TECHNICIAN

INACTIVATE:
Agriculture Laboratory Technician A.S. Degree
Effective Term: Summer 2013
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, L. HATCH) to INACTIVATE AS: AGRICULTURE LABORATORY TECHNICIAN

INACTIVATE:
Food Processing Certificate of Achievement
Effective Term: Summer 2013
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, L. HATCH) to INACTIVATE AS: FOOD PROCESSING

INACTIVATE:
Food Processing A. S. Degree
Effective Term: Summer 2013
M/S/U (J. BEEBE, L. HATCH) to INACTIVATE AS: FOOD PROCESSING

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Action Items

1. Course Substitutions for Academic Awards

   M. Robles / B. Adams

   M. Robles opened discussion stating that L. Miller has not yet worked on the form, but that she could provide previously recommended updates on the existing form for the committee to preview. The goal of this new form is to make sure that it goes to all appropriate divisions, specifically in the instance of a cross-listed course. Members reviewed the form and provided extensive feedback. One member asked if a field might be provided wherein a justification could be provided for any course substitution denials. J. Fay asked if records were kept on denials. “No,” stated J. Hughes. “That should be a goal”, stated J. Fay. J. Zamora countered by saying that records of substitutions may be misleading, as each substitution may have different influencing factors, for example, a student must graduate, or a course is not being offered in a semester. C. Hudelson Putnam noted that inconsistencies in how a department handles this can be problematic for students. One member noted a bullet stating that courses used for substitution must be compliant. K. Ennis expressed clear concern, “Why should we punish our students for our own delinquencies?” Other members agreed. M. Adams countered that it is analogous to accredited schools. We do not accept transcripts from non-accredited schools. Some members thought that was not an accurate analogy. M. Robles noted that the process will allow for divisions to uphold their own substitution processes. What are the criteria? It appears to be inconsistent across the board already. Attention was called to the signature required of the Curriculum Representative. “What is that necessary for?” asked some members. It was noted as an example that SPCOM 106 is frequently substituted for SPCOM 100/102. B. Adams noted that the form will allow interested parties to see any patterns of substitution so that curriculum changes to program requirements may possibly be considered. L. Lanigan indicated the nursing division is very concerned about another party being able to deny a substitution. She referenced email dialog from the division addressing this concern, and that the program should retain the right to substitute coursework, as they are familiar with their requirements of the BRN. B. Adams noted that her research into the issue showed that the BRN requirements call for 6 semester units of communication skills, including oral communication as one type of communication skill, and if nursing students really need oral communication skills, SPCOM 100 or 102 would fulfill that need, while SPCOM 103 would not seem to be an appropriate substitute since it does not emphasize oral communication skills. SPCOM 106, an often-substituted course, does not emphasize oral communication through public speaking. However, if SPCOM 106 fulfills another type of communication skill that the BRN allows, then perhaps it should be considered to be added into the program requisites. Patterns of substitution like this can cause concern for the discipline faculty, for example, “Are students detouring public speaking for graduation by taking other courses? Is this appropriate?” The intent is not to deny course substitution requests. The conversation turned to varying interpretations of “equivalency” and “substitution.” R. Cranley asked the intent of a “bullet” on the form stating that “any substitution must be the equivalent.” She questioned the appropriateness of that requirement, explaining to the committee that it is a moot point, because if a course is identified as an equivalent through the transcript evaluation process, it is automatically satisfies any equivalent listing. Substitution is different from equivalency – this requirement makes them one and the same. Members then noted that the form lacked clarity about...
the substitution process. “Who is this form for? Students? Faculty?” One additional bullet deemed “courses used for G.E. requirements [at other institutions] cannot be substituted.” Various members took issue with this. R. Cranley commented “it does not make sense that a course that has been used on another campus, and has satisfied their Title 5 requirements for GE, cannot be used as a substitution to satisfy our similar area Title 5 requirements. Is that what this is saying?” J. Hughes was asked about current process pertaining to enforcing this. “We are inconsistent at this time.” M. Robles reminded them that this was only a draft. L. Hatch attempted to summarize the real issue behind the technical problems with the document saying “It ultimately seems like the question we are facing is ‘how do we support student success while maintaining academic rigor?’” L. Miller will work on the form prior to the next meeting.

2. Placing Courses within Disciplines

M. Adams/B. Adams

J. Zamora opened discussion by presenting a graphic drafted from collaboration between L. Miller and himself. The graphic serves to better illustrate instruction and human resources terms such as “department”, “program”, “discipline” and “minimum qualifications” to help the committee and others understand the way that any “placing courses in disciplines process” will affect things like the hiring process, course outlines, and certificated applicants. The committee received the document well, and was encouraged to share it with colleagues to get feedback for any improvements. J. Zamora reminded them that this is a working draft, not final. B. Adams pointed the committee’s attention to the Placing Courses within Disciplines “fast track” form that was presented at the last meeting. L. Miller explained the electronic form’s technology “Google Forms” and how it has some limitations, but is a drastic improvement over using a Word form. Limitations include that faculty cannot submit more than one course at a time. It was noted that some disciplines may be missing. L. Miller noted she had not been able to proofread the list of disciplines and that it needs to be reviewed. L. Miller asked if the use of this form should have a sunset clause so that it is not used indefinitely in lieu of CurricUNET. The committee agreed and determined that it be used for one year. Members recommended that this be shared at IAC. When asked about “next steps” for use of the form, M. Adams reminded the committee that no Academic Senate approval is necessary, as they delegated authority to the Curriculum Committee to determine the process and set it in motion.

M/S/U (M. Adams, K. Ennis) to approve the proposed process for “placing courses within disciplines” as drafted for CurricUNET and its “fast track” alternative, the form on the Curriculum Website, which will be available for one year, with the friendly amendment that it be proofread.

3. Revisions to CurricUNET Course Proposal Fields and Word Report

B. Adams

Committee reviewed and briefly discussed.

M/S/U to approve (S. Circle, P. Upton)

Informational Items

1. Equating Courses and Repetitions
   Postponed Indefinitely
   L. Miller

2. Independent Study and Work Experience Course Outlines
   Postponed Indefinitely
   B. Adams

X. NEW BUSINESS

Action Items

1. Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory/Limitation on Enrollment Language Standardization
   No Report
   L. Miller

2. Curriculum Committee Meeting Schedule for 2012-2013
   L. Miller
   L. Miller had prepared a draft of the meeting calendar for 2012-2013 that closely resembles the current calendar. The committee briefly reviewed and B. Adams asked members to review so a vote could be taken at the next meeting.

3. Curriculum Committee Co-Chair Election
   J. Zamora
B. Adams presented on behalf of J. Zamora who had to depart the meeting early. She reported that the co-chair election will need to take place at either this meeting or the next meeting, and that any interested candidates are encouraged to put forth their names. Lively banter ensued as curriculum representatives expressed playful disdain at the idea of B. Adams departing from the role. Many expressed gratitude to B. Adams for her work as co-chair, and also, concern that she may depart. B. Adams clarified that her decision to remain is largely related to the amount of reassign time for the role and the lack of certainty that it will continue. Many representatives then began to express the essential nature of the reassign time, and how much work is required of the co-chair. Based on sentiment from committee members that Academic Senate would understand the importance of maintaining the status quo, B. Adams agreed she would gladly serve another two-year term as Co-Chair. **M/S/U (C. Mulder, E. Maki) to elect B. Adams as Curriculum Co-Chair.**

### Informational Items

1. Policies for Prerequisites/Corequisites/Advisories

   M. Robles

---

**JACK SCOTT, CHANCELLOR**

---

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE
1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA  95811-6549
(916) 445-8752
http://www.cccco.edu

**DATE:** February 8, 2012

**TO:**  
Chief Instructional Officers  
Academic Senate for California Community Colleges  
Chief Student Services Officers

**FROM:**  
Barry A. Russell  
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Division  
Linda Michalowski  
Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs

**SUBJECT:** Guidelines for Title 5 Regulations Section 55003: Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation

Guidelines addressing the title 5 Regulations regarding policies for prerequisites, corequisites and advisories on recommended preparation adopted by the Board of Governors in March 2011, are now available for your reference. The guidelines focus on the changes made to section 55003. However, for the convenience of the user, the guidelines incorporate information regarding prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation from other references, as well as a Q&A that addresses the regulations in a topical fashion.

The guidelines are available on the Chancellor’s Office website from either the Student Services and Special Programs Division or Academic Affairs Division home pages under “What’s New.”

Questions regarding the guidelines can be directed to Mark Wade Lieu at mlieu@cccco.edu or 916.327.2987.

**cc:**  
Sally Montemayor Lenz  
Mark Wade Lieu
M. Robles opened discussion on this item by informing the committee that MJC is compliant with Title 5 Regulations, Section 55003. Members agreed, noting the “levels of scrutiny” prompts embedded in CurricUNET for prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories. K. Ennis brought to the committee’s attention ongoing frustration within certain academic departments about challenges in establishing a prerequisite of ENGL 101 for various academic disciplines to ensure that students can succeed in the written component of the course. Departments often desire this prerequisite, but have been discouraged from doing so for various reasons, including but not limited to the idea of impacting the sequence, as well as the data gathering process. She questioned how reliable the data is for revealing whether students might succeed, given the multitude of factors that can influence student success in a sequence. Some members responded that, over time, patterns can be seen within the dataset. She confessed her colleagues’ as well as her own frustration with the deteriorating competency level of her students over time, and how other instructors have shared they have had to adjust expectations and remove major writing assignments to ensure students pass their courses. She also referenced Delta College, noting that an ENGL 101 prerequisite is established for many disciplines. With respect to local institutional culture, J. Fay remarked that it is not likely that our student population is very different from that of Delta’s in terms of their potential for success. One member asked “what do other schools do statewide,” It was asked why we cannot use other college’s established prerequisites to justify our own. K. Ennis mentioned that the recent change to regulations on repetitions – limiting students to three completions - is all the more reason why we should evaluate this issue. It was asked if K. Ennis was interested in joining a subcommittee were one to be convened, and she agreed. There was no movement towards creating a subcommittee during the discussion. M. Robles mentioned she could discuss this issue in more depth with K. Ennis. It was decided it did not need to appear on the next agenda.

2. **Curriculum Representatives – Terms Expiring**

   B. Adams

   After lively, humorous discussion, it was confirmed that all outbound representatives would be returning to complete another term as curriculum representatives.
XI. WORKGROUPS

1. Operations Workgroup J. Zamora / B. Adams / L. Miller
   Catalog Production Update/Final Report

XII. TASK FORCES

1. CurricUNET Implementation Task Force Update B. Adams/L. Miller
   B. Adams indicated this item was considered through unfinished business Action items 2 and 3.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM