



# Curriculum and Instruction Council

May 23, 2023 Agenda

3:30 – 5:00 PM

Room 4-2440

X Malcolm Rickard, **Co-Chair**  
 X Madelyn Arballo, *Provost, School of Continuing Ed*  
 X George Bradshaw, *Admission & Records*  
 X Meghan Chen, *AVP Instruction* **Co-Chair Designee**  
 X Jamaika Fowler, *Articulation Officer*  
 Kelly Fowler, *VP Instruction* **Co-Chair**  
 Hong Guo, *Library*  
 X Carol Impara, *DL Coordinator*

Briseida Ramirez Catalan, *School of Continuing Ed Faculty*  
 X Sara Mestas, *VP Academic Senate*  
 X Christopher Jackson, *Outcomes Co-Coordinator*  
 X Dianne Rowley, *Assistant Curriculum Liaison*  
 Sylvia Ruano, *Dean of Instruction*  
 Om Tripathi, *Faculty*  
 Roger Willis, *Academic Senate President*  
 Student Representative, *Vacant*

Jimmy Tamayo, *Faculty*  
**Non-Voting Members**  
 X Irene Pinedo, *Curriculum Specialist II*  
 X Lannibeth Calvillo, *Curriculum Specialist II*  
 X Lesley Cheng, *Curriculum Specialist I*  
**Guests**  
 X Pauline Swartz, *Curriculum Co-Liaison*  
 X Anne Walker, *Curriculum Co-Liaison*

Meeting Agenda		Outcomes
I.	Approval of Minutes: May 9, 2023	Approved.
II.	Public Comments	
III.	Agenda Check	Approved with flexibility.
IV.	Information 1.	
V.	Acceptance of Minutes A. Distance Learning Committee 1. April 25, 2023 B. Educational Design Committee Minutes 1. May 16, 2023 2. May 23, 2023 C. Outcomes Committee Minutes 1. May 2, 2023 D. Mapping and Catalog Committee Minute None	1. Accepted  1. Accepted 2. Accepted  1. Accepted
VI.	New Courses	
VII.	New and Substantive Program Changes	
VIII.	New Stand-alone courses	
IX.	Course Disciplines	

## X. Items for Discussion or Action

## 1. Curriculum Submission Deadline – M. Rickard

## 2. 2023-2024 General Education Review Decisions

–J. Fowler

1. Three major objections to the submission deadline change: 1) faculty perceive change as more work being put on faculty 2) CE tight curriculum turnaround and more impactful 3) confusion about what was being presented. Recommendation to start the change December 2024. Faculty need clarity on what was being presented to them. Faculty gave example of Santa Monica City College, two-month turnaround. More research is needed to see. Faculty feel that it is on the Instruction Office (IO) to get the catalog/curriculum approved in time. IO can talk about what was done to help catalog production this year but that is not going to be enough in the future - Is the IO doing everything that they can to get the catalog printed in time? CE – advisory in the winter, consult with industry and write curriculum to submit in May. Are we preventing them from following their process and using the data from the classes they are teaching to make the improvement to their programs. They want to use Santa Monica example to split CE and transfer. This doesn't solve the time it takes to get CE programs approved by the Chancellor's Office. Another consideration – when we turn things in early, we have more time to deal with corrections through the school year instead of rushed like they are now. Also need to talk about holding the curriculum submissions to the deadline. This catalog is closer to being printed on time because we held the line and didn't keep approving curriculum. Timeline needs to be clarified so people can understand the deadlines better. Carol – faculty were focusing that if the deadline is earlier, they need to get things submitted earlier to their department and dean. The proposal was created when we were nervous of getting everything approved for the catalog. Since then, we have approved 500 courses and over 70 programs. The circumstances have changed since the deadline change was proposed. Still anticipate a landslide of proposals coming through because of AB 1111 and AB 928. Proposal for CE to review their timeline and shift their advisory meeting time to accommodate for updated timeline. Don't have control over when faculty respond to curriculum team or the time it takes for the chancellor's office to approve new CE programs. Exceptions aside trying to streamline the process and create space to make sure that catalog is always printed on time. EDC already meets every week, having more staff won't make a difference because the curriculum still needs to be reviewed by the faculty. Everyone needs to be on the same page and able to answer the questions of the faculty that don't understand the steps that happen after the curriculum is submitted by the faculty. This year didn't have anyone coming asking to be an exception, in previous years had programs submitted in June for approval. Will clarify for senate next time.
2. Jamaika reviewed the general education submissions. She gave an overview of the process and making sure the textbook is up to date. Faculty were notified of decisions. AO never says no to submitting the course for GE submission but advises them and lets them know what is needed to get approved, submitted and the feedback is given back to the faculty. Courses submitted for IGETC must have UC approval before they can be submitted. Child development courses typically not on IGETC, the CHLD faculty modifying to see if they can get them approved. Fewer courses on IGETC than

Meeting Agenda		Outcomes	
<p>3. Distance Learning Amendment Form Updates and Synchronization with Course Approval – M. Rickard</p> <p>4. <a href="#">AP 4020</a> Program and Curriculum Development – M. Chen, M. Rickard</p> <p>i. Review of draft changes to AP</p>		<p>CSU because the courses must be approved by both CSU and UC. Have the next year to submit for IGETC and CSU GE Breadth and then the following year will have to submit for Cal-GETC.</p> <p>3. DLC allowed a consent item this past year. If programs submitted a DL amendment form during the pandemic and were not making modifications, the committee would take a form from 2020. If programs made any changes, they are supposed to submit another form. C&amp;I agreed to retire the consent process and have all course forms go through DLC. Malcolm will report to the senate that programs must submit a DL form even there is already a DL form and there are no modifications.</p> <p>4. Background: AP and BP are both sitting in OnBase for years. BP went to PAC and senate pulled it and it has said that it was in review since then. There are some updated versions in OnBase, but we may be reviewing a different document. Mediation process needed to be added to the document. Meghan review of additions: update to language to reflect approval of new and updated curriculum, inclusion of mediation process for curriculum disputes (that is not easy to find right now/making the process transparent), yellow highlighted mediation addition (process very formal, had an informal conversation for both areas to share concerns and prevented it from going further into the formal process), SOC and PSYC discussion of stat course (there was a clearly defined workgroup that. Workgroup will review the comments about the purple text and CCLC language and will review the BP as well. Will continue this into the fall.</p>	
<p>XI. On Hold/Tabled Items</p> <p>1. <a href="#">AB 928 – Workgroup Report</a> – awaiting statewide recommendation by May 31st</p>			
<b>2022-23 Meetings</b> 3:30-5:00PM 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Tuesdays	<b>Fall 2022</b> September 13 & 27 October 11 & 25	November 8 & 22	<b>Spring 2023</b> March 14 & 28 April 11 & 25 May 9 & 23