PRESENT: Fabian Banga, Leonard Chung, Barbara Des Rochers, Mary Clarke-Miller, Ari Krupnick, Jennifer Lowood, Linda McAllister, Alejandria Tomas, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Jenny Yap

GUEST(S): Thomas Kies, Rachel Mercy Simpson

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION	FOLLOW UP ACTION
I. Call to Order	10:05 a.m.	MOTION: The CC approved the agenda as is. Unanimously approved. Motion carries.
II. Approval of Meeting Minutes		MOTION: The CC approved the November 3, 2016 meeting minutes as amended. Unanimously approved. Motion carries.

III. CIPD Report	Below are the highlights of the November 14, 2016 CIPD Meeting:
	1. All course proposals were approved.
	    a. ENGL 508A Academic Composition Skills: Prewriting and Organization
	    b. ENGL 508B Academic Composition Skills: Paragraph Development, Analysis, and Research
	    c. ENGL 508C Academic Composition Skills: Sentence Structure and Proofreading
	2. All program proposals were approved.
	    a. Academic Composition Skills Certificate of Competency
	    b. Communication Studies Associate in Arts for Transfer
	    c. Film, Television, and Electronic Media Associate in Science for Transfer
	3. Consultation Procedures Review—A taskforce will not be formed yet. A google doc will be created to document and collect CIPD members ideas about what the current issues are with consultation.
	4. We will be ppdating UC Transfer Status in Peoplesoft/Catalog/Meta/Curriculum Inventory.	

IV. Curriculum Overview Presentation: Multimedia Arts Department	Due to time constraints during the last meeting, Mary Clarke-Miller and Rachel Mercy Simpson, Multimedia Arts Department Co-Chairs, continued the presentation of their department's curriculum overview. The following were discussed: • Certificates of Proficiency (CPs) in the disciplines were once created to track	Due to time constraints, the presentation will be continued onto the next meeting.

	students who take only a few classes to advance their skills. However, the department was encouraged to consolidate their CPs because of the following reasons:
	    ○ CPs do not qualify for financial aid.
	    ○ Filing for CPs is a manual process, which makes it complicated for students. There are other ways to track students.
	• The department is also exploring the possibility of creating noncredit curriculum.
	• The department was encouraged to create a flowchart that shows the relationship amongst their Associate in Arts Degree (AA), Certificates of Achievement (CAs), and CPs.
	• The department needs to review their courses and see which can be submitted for course to course articulation.	

V. Technical Review Strategies	Can we correct minor areas
	Should rep be cocontributors in our rep courses?
	Thursday before tech review google doc
	Send the agenda on Monday no matter what. The course will be tabled on tech review if significant question arise and
	
	It was noted that we need to improve our system of reviewing proposals. The following were discussed:
	• J. Lowood, A. Krupnick, and M. Clarke-Miller are creating a curriculum development manual, and this will help faculty become more familiar with the process.
	• It was suggested that a google doc be created listing all the proposals that will be on the Technical Review agenda. Each member of the Curriculum Committee will be assigned a particular area in the course proposal to review and they will be providing their feedback on the google doc. The feedback will be sent to the faculty originators, and they would have to address the requested revisions before the proposal can be added back into the agenda. Below are the members' assigned area(s):
	    ○ A. Tomas—justification, list of changes, units/hours, degree transfer
	    ○ L. McAllister—Distance Education
	    ○ B. Des Rochers—Lecture/Lab Content
	    ○ J. Lowood—Student Performance Objectives, Student Learning Outcomes
	    ○ J. Yap—Library, Texts, Readings, and Materials, Lecture/Lab Content
	    ○ F. Banga—Assignments	

		o J. Bielanski—Cover, General Education o M. Clarke-Miller—Methods of Instruction o A. Krupnick—Requisites, Content Review o L. Chung—Ensuring that the Lecture/Lab Content matches with the Student Performance Objectives • A test run will be done for the November 10, 2016 Technical Review agenda with the understanding that no proposal will be tabled if requested revisions were not addressed prior to the meeting. • Implementation timeline will be discussed during the next meeting.	
VI.			
VII.	**Review of BCC's Independent Study Courses—Removing Lecture Hours**	We recently submitted CHEM 49 to the State Chancellor's Office, and we were advised by the reviewer that we cannot have lecture hours on Independent Study Courses. The following language was sent with the revision request as a reference to Title 5 language: § 58009. Application of Alternate Attendance Procedure for Independent Study, Work-Experience and Certain Distance Education Courses. (a) For independent study, cooperative work-experience and distance education courses using the attendance accounting procedure specified in subdivision (f) of section 58003.1, one weekly student contact hour shall be counted for each unit of credit for which the student is enrolled as of the census day prescribed in section 58003.1(b) or (c), except for independent study or distance education laboratory courses. For independent study or distance education laboratory courses, weekly student contact hours shall be equivalent to those which would be generated for the same student effort in a laboratory course computed pursuant to subdivisions (b) or (c) of section 58003.1. For purposes of this section only, a "distance education laboratory course" means a distance education course which consists partly or exclusively of laboratory work. Some members of the Curriculum Committee disagreed with the interpretation of the reviewer stating that the language does not specify whether independent study courses can or cannot have lecture hours.	A. Tomas will send an request for a clarification from the State Chancellor's Office regarding their interpretation of §58009.
VIII.	**Curriculum Committee By-Laws—Curriculum Committee Chair Elect Qualifications**	The Curriculum Committee decided that a faculty member should be a current or past member of the Curriculum Committee to be nominated as a Chair Elect, and in the event that no one from the Curriculum Committee runs for election, the nomination will be opened to all faculty members. Nominations from within the Curriculum Committee are due on the last meeting of the Curriculum Committee in the fall. Nominations from outside of the committee are due February first of the following year.	
IX.	**Technical Review Strategies**	Can we correct minor areas Should rep be cocontributors in our rep courses? Thursday before tech review google doc	

	Send the agenda on Monday no matter what. The course will be tabled on tech review if significant question arise and
	
	It was noted that we need to improve our system of reviewing proposals. The following were discussed:
	• J. Lowood, A. Krupnick, and M. Clarke-Miller are creating a curriculum development manual, and this will help faculty become more familiar with the process.
	• It was suggested that a google doc be created listing all the proposals that will be on the Technical Review agenda. Each member of the Curriculum Committee will be assigned a particular area in the course proposal to review and they will be providing their feedback on the google doc. The feedback will be sent to the faculty originators, and they would have to address the requested revisions before the proposal can be added back into the agenda. Below are the members' assigned area(s):
	    o A. Tomas—justification, list of changes, units/hours, degree transfer
	    o L. McAllister—Distance Education
	    o B. Des Rochers—Lecture/Lab Content
	    o J. Lowood—Student Performance Objectives, Student Learning Outcomes
	    o J. Yap—Library, Texts, Readings, and Materials, Lecture/Lab Content
	    o F. Banga—Assignments
	    o J. Bielanski—Cover, General Education
	    o M. Clarke-Miller—Methods of Instruction
	    o A. Krupnick—Requisites, Content Review
	    o L. Chung—Ensuring that the Lecture/Lab Content matches with the Student Performance Objectives
	• A test run will be done for the November 10, 2016 Technical Review agenda with the understanding that no proposal will be tabled if requested revisions were not addressed prior to the meeting.
	• Implementation timeline will be discussed during the next meeting.	

X. Curriculum Committee By-Laws • **Curriculum Chair and Chair Elect Job Announcement**	While the job announcement was being drafted, it was noticed that the desirable/minimum qualification(s) for the Curriculum Chair Elect was not clearly stated on the Curriculum By-Laws. The current draft of the Curriculum Committee By-Laws states "Every two years, the Curriculum Committee will elect a new "Chair Elect" from among its faculty members,…" Some members of the Curriculum Committee felt that	

	• **Curriculum Chair Elect Qualifications**	the intention of this sentence is to convey that someone must have been a member of the BCC Curriculum Committee to be nominated as Chair Elect. Others felt that this is too restrictive and that the qualification for nomination should be broadened to include individuals who have served in a Curriculum Committee or in a faculty role that supported curriculum development, and that a rubric can be established for the election.	This item will be added to the next meeting agenda for further discussion.
	• **Correction to the Curriculum Committee's By-Laws**	We should not lightly change the by-laws as this has already been approved by the senate. If we sent it out to all faculty, then we are saying its open to all faculty. In the event that no one from the curriculum committee members volunteers to be chair elect, the nomination will be opened to all faculty The opportunity will become availabile to faculty members Last meeting of curriculum committee meeting in the fall for nominations from inside the committee February 1 for outside the committee	
XI. **Curriculum Proposals**		See attached.	MOTION: The CC approved all of the course and program proposals on the agenda. Unanimously approved. Motion carries.

XII. **Other**
    • **Textbook Affordability**
		J. Yap, Librarian, reported that BCC received a grant to implement open educational resources (OER) at our college. The goal of the grant is to encourage faculty to convert from expensive textbooks to free or low-cost online materials that help make college more affordable and accessible to students. Professional development workshops will be held to train faculty.
		
		It was also announced that BCC is applying for a planning grant to create zero textbook cost degrees and certificates called Z-Degrees. J. Yap will soon be attending a meeting/conference about this. The following were discussed:
		    • Will general education requirements also need to be participate in the program to qualify as a Z-degree? If so, we might not any qualifying programs.	

Notes Taken by: A. Tomas

	• Departmental and faculty leaders will be convened to discuss Z-degrees in early spring to see if we have enough interest.	
XIII. Next Meeting Date	Tech Review: October 13, 2016 and Curriculum Committee: October 20, 2016	
XIV. Adjournment	12:04 p.m.	

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