

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

Minutes
November 22, 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	E	Mary Johnson	X	Tom Mauch	X	Christine Tunstall
E	Donna Burns	X	Eric Kaljumagi	X	John Pellitteri	X	Jamaika Fowler
Student Representative: Epifanio Zamora x				Recorder : Irene Inouye x			

Item/Comments/Discussion		Outcome
I	Approval of Council Minutes November 8, 2011	Approved, with minor corrections.
II	Information	
III	Distance Learning Committee Minutes: October 25, 2011	Approved
	Educational Design Committee Minutes: November 8, 2011	Approved
	Equivalency Committee Minutes:	
	Outcomes Committee Minutes: November 1, 2011	Approved
	Transfer & General Education Subcommittee Report:	
IV	New or Substantive Program Changes	
	New fee-based course offerings – Winter/Spring 2012 Noncredit Tutor Training Certificate	Concerned about noncredit WATR being confused with credit course due to the absence of VOC prefix. L. Garrett will contact Donna Burns and request modification to avoid confusion. Approved. Move to Academic Senate as consent.
V	Items for Discussion/Action	
	Disciplines List – SOC and ANIM	Approved. Move to Academic Senate as consent.
	SLO Process Update – J. Chevalier	Update on SLO Committee. Next semester the Committee will focus on program level assessment. Have SLOs been created for AA degrees? Can SLOs of courses belonging to programs reflect program SLOs? It will be a problem for the science courses and programs. How would results from courses from different disciplines apply to an AA degree outcome? We will need a task force for this issue. How can SLOs of a program be assessed if the students are in their first or second semester or have not completed enough courses? It will make more sense to assess those programs at a GE level. Some faculty members are concerned that SLOs are an evaluation of their teaching performance. Modify second bullet and title of document by deleting "process." This is information of good practices. Jason to provide modified document. Send forward as information item to Academic Senate
	Follow-up on IDE program concerns – T. Long	Terri met with Jemma Blake-Judd and Matt Lizarraga to convey the concerns of C&I. They provided a letter (attached) in which they addressed those concerns. The question still is whether this program is designed for students to advance all the way to level three? Still have the core program problem. What will happen if a student fails one course in a corequisite cluster?

		<p>They will be out. Technology and Health Division believes that students will move just fine through this program and students will be well prepared to take on the demands of the industry. There will be a problem related to repeatability of courses. What problems will students encounter if they have to petition for an exceptional action if they fail a class? Other programs using the cohort model use an application process in which students are informed of the requirements to stay in the program. The Architecture and Engineering Design Technology (AEDT) department is asking for a faculty replacement. Are they actually requesting two positions for the new IDE program? The department will not need two faculty in at least four years. The department has enough human resources to start this program tomorrow, because they claim no need for more faculty. How were the retention percentages calculated without having the courses in place? The division calculated retention using similar courses. There has to be a communication to the student that this is a cohort program that includes a readmission policy. There are many CTE program operating with this model. How will the AEDT department be adding students to the cohort and how will students move forward if they had an issue or a problem that prevents them from succeeding in one course and getting back in the program? How will this concern be addressed? EDC needs direction to act on IDE courses. Will students have some form of consent and admission policy, also the repeatability concern. The identified potential problems will become big problems. Need more clarification on what happens if students fail a corequisite.</p> <p>Approved IDE program. EDC to review courses. Clarification on corequisites, repetition, and Title 5. AEDT department needs to provide proposal on how they will inform students of the cohort model and consequences of corequisites that are not successfully completed. (T. Long)</p>
	<p>Course and programs submission form – T. Long</p>	<p>Terri informed C&I that recommendations were incorporated in the forms. Title was modified to imply that the form is an “application” to submit courses and/or programs. Revise course support area because minutes are required. Omit the “no” option. Deans should not be responsible for approving curriculum moving forward. Instead Deans should “recommend”. Clarify if course is developed for transfer or GE. Concerns with the area requesting transfer documentation from two of the 10 top colleges that Mt.SAC students transfer to determine lower-division status. Mt.SAC should not offer courses that are upper-division in four-year universities. For new programs section: Remove Basic Skills Terri will revise forms and bring back to next C&I meeting 12/13/2011.</p>
	<p>Stand-alone courses – L. Garrett</p>	<p>LeAnn commented about the stand-alone data extracted from 2011-12 catalog. List of stand-alone courses presented by division and alphabetical order. Stand-alone cannot be grouped into one category. Mt.SAC is not in violation of Title 5, but the courses need to be discussed. L. Garrett will continue discussion next C&I meeting 12/13/2011.</p>

	Course Integration Review – M. Grimes-Hillman	Tabled for next C&I meeting 12/13/2011.				
	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 13, 2011	March 13 & 27 April 10 & 24, 2012	May 8 & 22, 2012 June 12, 2012 (if needed)