

**Mt. San Antonio College
Curriculum & Instruction Council**

**Minutes
November 8, 2011
3:30 – 5:00 pm**

x	Jason Chevalier	X	LeAnn Garrett, Co-Chair	X	Terri Long	X	Richard McGowan
x	Virginia Burley, Co-Chair	X	Mary Johnson	X	Tom Mauch	X	Christine Tunstall
x	Donna Burns	X	Eric Kaljumagi	X	John Pellitteri		
X Jamaika Fowler: Articulation Officer,							X Recorder : Irene Inouye
X Epifanio Zamora: Student Representative							

Item/Comments/Discussion		Outcome
I	Approval of Council Minutes October 25, 2011	Approved
II	Information	
III	Distance Learning Committee Minutes: Goals	Suggestions were made to amend the goals Forward to Academic Senate
	Educational Design Committee Minutes: Goals October 25, 2011 November 1, 2011	Forward to Academic Senate Approved Approved
	Equivalency Committee Minutes:	
	Outcomes Committee Minutes: October 18, 2011	Approved
	Transfer & General Education Subcommittee Report:	
IV	New or Substantive Program Changes	
	IDE programs prior to EDC review – T. Long and L. Garrett	<p>Cohort model presents concerns about students not passing a course and not being able to progress with the cohort. Will students be able to move through the program without the need of overrides? If the number of students in the cohort decreases, will the District support small classes for the students remaining in the cohort? This certificate has the potential of placing students in jobs according to the statistics presented in the proposal. Another option would be 9-unit courses instead of using the cohort model. Would it be a better proposal if it used a corequisite model? Concerned that if a student dropped one course, all of the corequisite courses would also be dropped. What are the benefits of the cohort? Cohorts provide cohesion and support to students. As far as enrollment, these classes will never grow as the cohort advances in the program. Proposal indicates the need for a another faculty member. Why prioritize resources for a program that has not started before an existing program? Another problem may be repeatability. Is the objective to develop this program with the same staff and existing resources? Preference is to support this department, but afraid they will request additional financial support to maintain the program. The cohort model is C&I's main concern because of potential consequences related to student success and progress. Could and should the program be changed if the cohort model does not work? We need to advise the department of C&I's concerns before the courses are reviewed. There were also concerns about who participated during the</p>

		<p>advisory committee. Terri will consult with the Department about the following concerns before C&I makes a recommendation: Cohort model (corequisites, repeatability, academic process) Additional faculty Adequate resources EDC will not review the courses until these issues are resolved in C&I.</p>
V	Items for Discussion/Action	
	<p>Proposal to determine feasibility of programs – G. Burley</p>	<p>Terri presented a draft of new course, program, and certificate submission forms. Criteria was extracted from the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH).</p> <p>Discussion: If lifelong learning is currently not a priority of the CCCCCO should it be a local option? Need clarification of criteria used to determine appropriateness to College mission. Retain PCAH criteria and revise statement on form to "Appropriateness to College mission: Basic Skills, Transfer, and CTE Transfer is a vague term. Does appropriateness of mission relate to currently funded CCC priorities? Should the stand-alone line be kept? GE is important. How many courses should be added to the GE list when there are currently many options? There is cost involved in GE courses. Is there student demand and how do we keep a manageable list of GE courses? Never offered courses are another issue. There would be no student demand for them. Faculty and administration should work closely together when developing programs and courses. Faculty need to be informed about the criteria for course or program development. Develop lower-division criteria. PIE information should be considered and included. When creating new programs or courses, Faculty should complete the form and meet with Terri and the Division Dean. Terri to refine forms and bring back for discussion.</p>
	<p>SLO Report – J. Chevalier</p>	<p>Jason informed Council about program levels SLO's Committee is working on making SLO's meaningful.</p> <p>Forward to Academic Senate as information item.</p>
	<p>Stand-alone courses currently in the catalog that are not being offered – Should explanatory statement be added? – T. Long</p>	<p>Will the College communicate to students that certain courses, which will not be eliminated, may not be offered due to fiscal crisis? Should these courses be removed or kept in the Catalog? Consistency needs to be applied across campus as far as not approving new stand-alone courses and courses rarely offered. Do we have to publish all courses we offered? Yes. But we need to know how permanent this situation would be. It is a problem for transfer students because if a course appears in the catalog, 4-year Universities assume that a course is available for students to take before transfer. There are courses that are valuable to transfer students that may not be part of a program, but need to be offered. So if there is no action, then should a course be considered for elimination? That is where the form for proposal of new courses is important. Can we use PIE when making decisions? We need to consider stand-alone courses that are required for</p>

				transfer. Continue discussion. LeAnn will provide list of stand-alone courses.		
	Update on course management – L. Garrett					
	Other: Repeatability					
	2011/12 Meetings: 3:30-5:00—2 nd & 4 th Tuesday	September 13 & 27 October 11 & 25, 2011	November 8 & 22, 2011	December 6, 2011 (if needed)	March 13 & 27 April 10 & 24, 2012	May 8 & 22, 2012 June 12, 2012 (if needed)