

BERKELEY CITY COLLEGE
Curriculum Committee (CC)
Meeting Minutes
September 4, 2014

PRESENT: Antonio Barreiro, Joseph Bielanski, Carol Copanhangen, Carlos Cortez, Barbara Des Rochers, Heather Dodge, Dylan Eret, Rudrani Ghosh, Tom Kies, Jennifer Lowood, Emie Mitsuno Hernandez, Sabrina Nelson, Alejandria Tomas, Tram Vo-Kumamoto

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION	FOLLOW UP ACTION
I. Call to Order	10:05 a.m.	
II. Approval of Meeting Minutes		A. Tomas will send all the 2013-2014 meeting minutes via e-mail to all the members of the CC. These sets of minutes should be reviewed prior to the next meeting where they will be officially approved.
III. Announcements	D. Eret encouraged everyone who intends to serve on the CC during the 2014/2015 AY to inform Cleavon Smith, BCC Academic Senate President, and him.	
IV. Curriculum Proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 9, 2014 Curriculum Proposals • Deactivate versus Inactivate Courses 	<p>For the September 9, 2014 Curriculum Proposals, please see attached.</p> <p>A couple of questions were raised regarding this matter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the difference between deactivation and inactivation? • How and when is a course permanently or temporarily deleted? <p>The following were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, the deactivation process in the Peralta Community College District (PCCD) are as follows: • Department initiates the proposal on Curricunet. • The Department Chair approves the Proposal. • The CC approves the proposal. • The Council on Instruction, Planning, and Development (CIPD) approves the proposal. • The Board of Trustees approves the proposal. • The course is “inactivated” on the state. 	<p>MOTION: The BCC Curriculum Committee proposes that the CIPD consider subcategories for deactivations (temporary/permanent deactivation/inactivation) that will enable us to maintain articulation and that reactivations should be treated as informational items only when brought to the CIPD.</p> <p>Unanimously approved.</p> <p>Motion carries.</p> <p>D. Eret will place this item on the next CIPD agenda.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions about Curriculum Proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once inactivated in the state, the course is taken out of/placed on historical status on our databases: catalog, Curricunet, and Articulation Agreements. The reactivation process goes through steps 1 through 5 above, except that when the proposal is forwarded to the State, it only takes one click of a button to reactivate the course. It does not have to be reviewed again, so it is faster than forwarding a new course for approval. The inactivation process goes through steps 1 through 6 above except that when the course has been deactivated on the state level, articulation does not have to be affected. It was noted that when a course has been deactivated from Articulation Agreements, it is extremely difficult to have them articulated again. Several members of the CC also expressed their concern about reactivating courses. One concern was that what if once we are ready to reactivate a course, the other colleges have already created a course that will conflict with the course that will be reactivated? It was suggested that an option for inactivation be added to Curricunet. <p><u>COUN 24 and COUN 57:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The course was updated for DE Addendum. It was proposed that ENGL 204B be added to the recommended preparation of the course. Since this will necessitate a catalog change, all the other colleges who offer the same course would have to agree to the change and all colleges bring the proposal to CIPD at the same time. Allene Young will speak with the other colleges regarding this proposed change. J. Lowood expressed concern about obtaining cooperation from other colleges to add pre-requisites and/or recommended preparations to courses. H. Dodge noted that they were able to convince the LIS Department in Laney to add ENGL 204 to the recommended preparation for LIS 80 and they will be forwarding this to the CIPD during their next meeting. 	<p>All deactivations listed on the agenda will be tabled until the September 18, 2014 CC meeting.</p> <p>D. Eret will make sure that Laney added ENGL 204 to the recommended preparation of their LIS 80.</p>
--	--	---

COUN 200A:

- The course was updated for DE Addendum, lecture content and changes to the grading options.
- This course satisfies one of the mandates of SSSP regarding mandatory orientation.
- The grading option for the course changed from graded or pass/no pass to pass/no pass only. It would be difficult to grade the students because the course is more of an informational course where students are rarely given assignments.

CIS 248ZZ:

- Because experimental courses now have to go through the same approval process as new courses, we are now highly encouraging all disciplines to stop using experimental courses and just use new courses.
- CIS 248ZZ would be CIS 080. The following were discussed:
 - The course outline does not seem to necessitate a transferable course, so why not assign a number that is higher than 200, so it would not have to be transferrable.
- Essay was checked as one of the assessment tools. Was this an error?
- D. Eret reported discussing this course with Paramsothy Thananjeyan, faculty originator of the course, and that he mentioned that this course will be enticing to high school students. The following were discussed:
 - It was noted that we cannot target high school students. We should avoid stating this as a justification for the course since this would violate Title 5 guidelines.
 - What is the method used to market this course?
 - If CIS 6 is the prerequisite of this course, then it is not designed for high school students.
 - Robotics is a fast growing field and creation of a program should be explored.
- P. Thananjeyan should discuss this course with B. Des Rochers (Science), T. Vo-Kumamoto (VPI), S. Nelson (MMART), and A. Barreiro (Dean of Academic Pathways, Workforce Development, and Student Success) to discuss possible collaboration in this field.
- It was suggested that this course be a part of the General Education (GE) courses so that students can use it to explore. Several rebuttals presented were that 1) the course would drastically change if the course becomes a GE and 2) it would be extremely difficult to have it articulated with four UC

	<p>and/or CSU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further research needs to be conducted to see what other colleges offer this course. • Consider adding something like this to the justification: We would like to start with this course to see how much attention we can get from students, and the eventually put together a program. • P. Thananjeyan should be present during the next meeting so that he could answer the questions of the committee. 	
V. Curriculum Chair	<p>D. Eret Announce that he will be stepping down as the Chair of the CC by Spring 2015. The following were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He proposed the following timeline for future CC Chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1st year: Period of election and mentoring ○ 2nd and 3rd year: Period of when the Chair serves on the committee ○ 4th year: Period when the current chair can either be re-elected or mentor the incoming chair • There were a couple of discussions as to how the CC Chair of duties would be divided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There can be two chairs from the two divisions. ○ The duties can be divided be functions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Curriculum Chair (facilitating the CC meetings, representing BCC at district wide meetings, training faculty on developing proposals) ▪ Technical Review Chair ▪ Tech Person for Curricunet (A. Tomas is willing to do this.) • D. Eret currently receives a 0.4 reassigned time, and T. Vo-Kumamoto noted that members of the CC should be mindful of this when forwarding suggestions on restructuring the duties of the CC Chair. • D. Eret encouraged everyone to reevaluate this issue and forward any suggestions to him. 	<p>A. Tomas will send the curriculum related duties of the Tech Review Chair, Curriculum Specialist, and Curriculum Chair to all members of the CC.</p>
VI. Experimental Courses	<p>Because experimental courses now have to go through the same approval process as new courses, D. Eret asked the CC to consider putting an end or strongly discourage the use of experimental courses. This matter will be further discussed during the next CIPD meeting.</p>	
VII. Adjournment	<p>10:55 a.m.</p>	

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