**BERKELEY CITY COLLEGE**

**Curriculum Committee**

**Special Meeting Minutes**

**May 22, 2014**

**PRESENT:** Antonio Barreiro, Carol Copanhagen, Carlos Cortez, Heather Dodge, Johnny Dong, Dylan Eret, Jennifer Lowood, Lee Mars, Emie Mitsuno Hernandez, Sabrina Nelson, Alejandria Tomas,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION** | **FOLLOW UP ACTION** |
| 1. **Call to Order** | 10:13 a.m. |  |
| 1. **Purpose of the Meeting** | The special meeting was called to discuss the Preliminary Credit Course Repetition Guidelines and the exceptions to repeatability. The following are excerpts from pages 22 and 23 of the guideline:  Significant Change in Industry or Licensure Standards (§ 55040(b)(9))  Student enrollment limit: District policy may permit students to re-enroll in courses where there has been such a change in industry or licensure standards that repetition of the course is necessary for employment or licensure. This requirement is two-fold:   * that there has been a significant change in the industry or licensure standards since the student previously took the course, AND * the student must take the course again for employment or licensure.   The change should be one that without the updated course, the student could not obtain or maintain his or her employment or license. For example, a state-licensed construction contractor may request to re-enroll in a course on building codes. Repetition of this course would be allowable if those codes changed since the student last took the course and the student could not remain state licensed without taking the course again.  Audit documentation requirements: Although districts are ultimately responsible for ensuring that adequate documentation exists to support their determination that repetition is allowable, districts may, by policy require the student to certify or document that re-enrollment in that the course is necessary as a result of a significant change in industry or licensure standards. Adequate documentation must demonstrate the significant change in industry or licensure standards since the student previously took the course, AND the student’s need to take the course again for employment or licensure. A letter from the student’s current or prospective employer stating that the student must take the course again for employment coupled with documentation of the significant change in the industry standard since the student last took the course is an example of adequate documentation.  Grade/credit: District policy may not allow previous grade(s) and credit(s) to be disregarded in computing the student’s GPA. (§ 55021(b).)  The following were also discussed:   * MMART, specifically courses surrounding software, seem to be the discipline that will be greatly affected by guidelines on repeatability. Other disciplines that will be affected: American Sign Language (ASL), Biotechnology and Computer Information Systems (CIS). * The primary goal of the meeting is to make recommendations regarding the above repeatability exception in two possible ways:  1. Identify both appropriate and inappropriate evidence needed to fulfill these guidelines. 2. Suggest curriculum-based solutions for students needing to learn particular forms of software in MMART (or even disciplines that may have a similar issue with this repeatability exception). For example, what would a parallel-run, non-credit, fee-based course look like alongside a credit-based course? |  |
| 1. **Solution: Collecting Letters from Advisory Board or Reputable Company** | In terms of identifying both appropriate and inappropriate evidence needed to fulfill the course repeatability guidelines, L. Marrs proposed collecting letters from the advisory board or any reputable outside company. The following were discussed:   * L. Marrs suggested that the printed-out letters (not emails) would: * Have a logo and address on them * State that the letter writer is a member of MMART's advisory board (if so) * State that the new/changes in software (specific software is named) has caused a "significant change" in the industry for all candidates for employment and/or current employees must learn the changed software * These letters must be kept in various places (our Dean's office, V.P. of Instruction, V.P. of Student Services & Head of Counseling) + archived in a file on our server. This is due to fill in the blank's pattern of "losing" vital records over the months/years. * When the student needs to repeat, he/she will fill out the Course Repetition form and attach the aforementioned applicable letter. * Several concerns were raised: * Students might have a hard time finding individuals from the advisory board or reputable outside company to sign the letter for them. Would it be possible for instructors to find a point person from the advisory board and/or reputable company to sign for all students? * What is self-employed? * Can a standardized form be created so that the advisory board and/or reputable company do not have to draft their own letters? * Students should not be using this petition more than once. * Creating new classes every time a software changes might not be a viable solution at this point because it might delay the teaching of the new course/material and it might clutter the curriculum. This might be an option in the future. * Who will be keeping copies of these petitions? | The Curriculum Committee approved the following motion:  Letters from advisory board members, employers, or licensing agencies are acceptable evidence of the need for students to repeat a course if they   1. Have a logo and address on them; 2. State that the letter writer is a member of the relevant advisory board or licensing agency or an employer; and 3. State that the changes (e.g., software) have caused a "significant change" in the industry for all candidates for employment, and current employees must repeat the course in order to maintain or gain employment or licensure.   When the student needs to repeat, he/she will fill out the Course Repetition form and attach the aforementioned applicable letter.  These letters must be kept in the Office of Student Services and archived in a file on our server. |
| 1. **Solution: Running Fee-Based Courses Alongside Regular Classes** | The following were discussed:   * It was reported that Dr. Joseph Bielanski, Articulation Officer, is looking into the viability of running fee-based students with regular students in the same class. The regular students would be taking a course for the first time. The fee-based students would be taking the new-to-them software in some fee-based course that is not described in the same way as the official course. Currently, Berkeley City College run combined courses and this could follow that pattern. What would make this appealing to the administration is the cost of the fee-based course would be dinky (cost of instructor already covered), and the location and time of the course would not be difficult. This would guarantee a higher enrollment as well. * There are several issues surrounding fee-based courses, and these are heavily discussed by the Peralta Federation of Teachers (PFT). * There are a lot of “unknowns” with fee-based courses, so the Curriculum Committee has decided to do further research on this option. | D. Eret and A. Tomas will conduct further research on the viability of running fee-based students with regular students in the same class. |
| 1. **Adjournment** | 10:55 a.m. |  |

***Berkeley City College’s mission is to promote student success, to provide our diverse community with educational opportunities, and to transform lives.***