**BCC CIPD Report**

**October 5, 2020 Meeting**

1.The following proposals were approved:

A. New Course

EDUC 510A

EDUC 510B

B. Course Update (Informational Only):

148 Distance Education updates

C. Course Deactivation:

COUN 048UA-ZZ

D. New Program

Tutor Training Certificate of Completion

2. Discussion Items

A. ADT Updated Check List

This informational item from S. Brown was on the September agenda as well this one. A list of ADTs was provided as a hand out; it has one tab for each campus. The list shows which ADTs the campus has approved, which local degrees or certificates it already has that might correspond to a not-yet-approved ADT, and a list of all ADTs that exist. As noted previously, with the SCFF (Student Centered Funding Formula) the district receives more money for ADTs than for local degrees and certificates. The “lost revenue” from ADTs we are not offering (but could) was noted in the FCMAT report. S. Brown will soon send an announcement that faculty can receive a stipend if they successfully create a new ADT or update an existing one.

There was some concern among CIPD members about competition among campuses that have the same ADTs, but N. Thai noted it is a state mandate for a campus to create an ADT where they have an existing local degree in the same major. It was agreed that despite the mandate, consultation for any new degrees should take place. Only in the case of ADTs that are “optional” would there be any discussion about possible enrollment and competition among campuses. “Optional” ADTs are those for which campuses do not already have a well-matched existing program.

B. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

A draft of Board Policy 4235 (heretofore known as Credit by Exam) was provided to CIPD members to review and endorse. PCCD must have a board policy on CPL in place by the end of December to ensure compliance with changes to Title 5. Members are asked to share the draft with local committees. It will also need to be reviewed by the academic senate before going to the Board of Trustees for adoption. It must be on the board agenda once as an informational item and then a second time for approval.

J. Bielanski will provide a draft of the administrative procedure to go with this board policy. Note that APs don’t need BOT approval. J. Bielanski is asking campus curriculum committees to review the AP and provide feedback.

C. Noting Noncredit DE information

As stated at the 10/1 curriculum committee meeting, A. Krupnick requested this topic for discussion at CIPD. It was mistitled as “BCC proposed update to DE tab in META” on the CIPD agenda. As discussed at BCC, the need to document instructor contact hours for noncredit DE classes was noted and the sample from Santa Barbara City College was shown. Some options were briefly discussed, but this requirement was new to most people in attendance. V. Phan suggested that each campus’s curriculum committee discuss it and then CIPD members could discuss it at the December meeting. Like at BCC, there was some discussion about whether the information requested could be standardized and put on a COR, and if so how, or if it was too instructor-specific. L. Cook noted that if the hours varied per instructor, the FTES would also vary by instructor, making predicting the cost of running such a course unpredictable and difficult to ensure that we would not lose money offering it.

The number of instructor contact hours is used by A. Elmasry to report attendance information. She provides the information to the IR office and they have a custom process that they run because of the complicated attendance accounting formula, and then they report it to the state.