# In Attendance:

Dee Aceves; Liz Barrow; Jeanette Calo; Jose Contreras Jr.; Sebastien Cormier; Caylor Cuevas; Angela DiDomenico; Dave Dillon; Carl Fielden; Marshall T. Fulbright III; Karen Hern; Tate Hurvitz; Desirae Jenkins; Felicia Kalker; Sharon Sampson; Jason Stevens; Alan Traylor; Karen Wong; June Yang

# Not in Attendance:

Martha Clavelle; Sara Laila; Hadeel Yaqoub

- 1. Call to Order Cormier called to order at 2:06pm
- 2. Approval of Minutes
  - a. 02/28/23
    - i. Stevens motion to approve
    - ii. Calo seconded the motion
    - iii. (12) Yes/(0) No/(0) Abstentions
- **3. Proposals** Curriculum approval, General Education, requisite validation, distance education, and student learning outcomes have been placed on the Consent Calendar as distinct items. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a committee member or guest requests that particular items be removed for further discussion or review. Removed items will be considered separately. All matters remaining under the Consent Calendar will be approved by one motion.
  - a. Information Items
    - i. ARBC 168 Update
      - Aceves: As we discussed in the committee in February, this course requires more discussion between Arabic, the BOT department, and alignment with Cuyamaca courses. The course will be pushed to the fall semester if we don't find a resolution before our next meeting. They want to talk about how they're going to move forward. The BOT department felt that there was a duplication, and they have to work through this. I mentioned to Sonia that the curriculum committee had a difficult time understanding from the title what the course was trying to convey and what the course description was about. The course outline needs some work, and she'll be moving forward and working with other colleagues.
    - ii. BIO/GEOG/GEOL/OCEA 150 Update
      - Aceves: This is a course that is cross-listed across multiple programs.
         We've been working on trying to get all of these courses in because they're out of date. We might get one in one year and two in another year, and we can never get all of the content review. This has been a challenge. At the last check for this particular set of courses, the faculty were discussing what the appropriate requisite should be being that it's five courses, and each of them will require their own content review.

We wanted to bring this here to hear what your thoughts were about pushing this group of classes into our next cycle because it's too close to our ending, and we don't have all of the information. Any thoughts? 
Ocalo: Is that all one department?

- Aceves: No. It includes Biology, Geology, and Geography, so it's three departments, and they all have to agree and figure out which classes are best for admitting students to this course.
- Sampson: I think we should move to have it moved to the next semester so they can at least collaborate and streamline what they're expecting to do.
- o Calo: Are the course outlines out of date?
- Aceves: Correct.
- o Calo: The main concern is with content review, correct?
- Aceves: Yes, they have to determine their requisites for the course.
   They did not come to a conclusion on that.
- o Barrow: Don't they have to have the same ones to be alone?
- Aceves: Yes. I'm going to go to the BIO 150 since it's the closest one.
   They're about ten years.
- o Fielden: I agree with Sharon to push this into the future and have them update these things. What is the reason for not doing them?
- Aceves: I think it's a lot of courses all at once, and they have to reassess how they want students to come in. It's something we're working on as a college to ensure that course outlines are up to date, and we're trying to change the culture.
- O Calo: Is there a way to tentatively approve the course outline pending content review next year so that it becomes updated, or does it all have to go together?
- O Aceves: I would say that they should. They should figure out what they're going to do first. If the content review was set and they could give us all of the outlines with all of the updates, because again it's ten years. It's not going to be only the content review, but that's the real sticky part that they haven't worked through yet. All of the outlines have to come in uniform with the strike-throughs and fully ready if they were just content review. I think we did that in the past. But, everything needs to be looked at, and they all need to come in exactly the same. That's where I feel like it will be a challenge. Do we have consensus to push these proposals to next cycle? Yes? Ok.

## iii. MATH 095, 180L, 280L – Update

 Aceves: For AB 1705, there is a course addition which was an alignment issue, and that course was in your review today. The corequisite which was a second round of modification will not be added to this pile again because we already reviewed this course, and this one will be coming back in the fall. The tech review committee made the recommendation to continue to offer the 299 and hold off on 180L and 280L, and these will be pushed into next year so that they have more time to gather information on those courses.

# iv. GERM, COUN, ECON, OTA - Update

• Aceves: OTA can be crossed off this list now because they were able to get everything in. We reviewed the German, Counseling, and Econ courses that previously were missing content review or examples on the course outline and some minor edits. The committee has given their feedback with the faculty. The one that could be replaced is Dance. We're just waiting for them to send back the edited versions or the content review. If you didn't see them on this week's agenda, you will see them on next week's agenda because the review is already done. They will send us the final versions if they can get them to us on time, and they'll be in your pile for next week.

## v. ES 299 request – Update

Aceves: They submitted a late request. We noted in our discussion that
the email sent over to the committee did not state that this is an
emergency. We recommended that the 299 be reviewed as our first
order of business in the fall semester in order to stay with our practice
and policies that we've maintained for all of the faculty.

## vi. Distance Education Form – Update

- Dillon: The DE addendum form went through what we are calling non-substantive changes. We are district team of curriculum folks and distance head coordinators outlined Title 5 changes. It's really simple, that's all we're looking at. We looked at the Title 5 changes that took place here, the ones that correlate with what we have on the form and what should be updated. We added that Title 5 language into the form for the folks that thought the form was lengthy as it was. I apologize because now it's longer. There were a couple of discussions about if we should link to this Title 5 language, and we landed on no because we were concerned that faculty might not read it if it wasn't right in front of them. The form is a little longer, but it includes what is needed for folks to be aware of. It is going, or has already been, to tech review curriculum committee OTLC, and it is scheduled to go to Senate in early April as informational items. We don't expect questions, resistance, or a vote.
  - O Aceves: I showed them the one with the gray and yellow highlights to go over those two. So, it's just Title 5 changes being added to the form to make sure the statute information is in there so that we're covered for accreditation. Did you want to share anything else for the 23-24 cycle?

o Dillon: I think that we are anticipating the cycle will open towards the end of April or early May with Dee's and Sebastian's continued support and curriculum's. There is the conversion from Formstack to NextGen that may cause that cycle to open later rather than sooner, but I'm hopeful that it will be ready by the end of April.

## b. Overview of Review Items

# <u>Curriculum Proposals for April 11, 2023 Board Packet:</u>

#### **ALLIED HEALTH & NURSING**

Degree Deletion: Disability Services Management

• Cormier: No questions or comments.

### **ANTHROPOLOGY**

Degree Modification: Anthropology (AA-T)

• Cormier: No specific questions or comments here.

#### ART

Course Modification: ART 283A, 283B, 283C

Course Deletion: ART 283D

#### **ART 283A**

- Cormier: Edits to formatting on Semester Hours, Special Materials, and Textbooks, missing Content Review, and question for Methods of Evaluating Student Performance. Alan and Caylor, have you had a chance to look at the course description?
  - o Cuevas: There are no edits.
- Cormier: Instructional Facilities?
  - o Hurvitz: I can't remember if I looked at this.
  - Cormier: We'll give you a chance to have a look later. Carl, what does "equipment is needed" for 6b? They should list what the special equipment is? Felicia, do you have a question?
  - Kalker: So, this was one course and it's becoming four, or what's going on with the ABCD switching to A and B and C and D?
- Fielden: There was a comment such as additional equipment that is needed, and I thought they should specify what the equipment is. For section 9a, they weren't really clear on what they were evaluating there. They need some examples for 9b and 9c. 9d talked about safe practices in the classroom, and I question how they're going to evaluate that. It's a thing and not really a method, and that's the same issue for 9a. They should look at that again and come up with actual methods of evaluation for those two and give some examples to illustrate them.
- Cormier: Can anyone clarify about the ABCD?

- O Aceves: This was one of the old courses that was not split out into its own course outline of record. We had one outline for four courses, and moving forward as these come up, they need to have their own unique course outline when we submit to the state. When they submitted this one for modification, we had to ask them to split them out, and you'll see there are levels for beginning, intermediate, and advanced. There was a title change to these as well, these are now Foundry. This is their first go at these courses.
- Fielden: If they have questions, I can work with them on that.

### **ART 283B**

 Cormier: Edits to formatting on Semester Hours, Special Materials, and Textbooks, missing Content Review, and question for Methods of Evaluating Student Performance.

#### **ART 283C**

 Cormier: Edits to formatting on Semester Hours, Special Materials, and Textbooks, missing Content Review, and question for Methods of Evaluating Student Performance.

### **ART 283D**

- Cormier: No questions or comments.
- Kalker: I noticed the SLOs are changed. Even though on the outline they
  didn't mark any changes, they're actually different. That's not what we
  have under the ABCD course currently.
  - o Cormier: So, these learning outcomes are not the same.
  - o Kalker: I'm sure they're fine, but they weren't marked as changes.
  - o Cormier: I'll make a note of that.
  - o Kalker: I will go now and double check that they are, so now those have to be leveled.
- o Cormier: Any other comments?
  - Kalker: If you're sending this back to them with other notes, I'll put a
    question in there if they want to revisit the leveling.
- O Hurvitz: It's a process that I think you want to be careful about this, because they went in and made changes in the SLO development process. It's inventive prior to making the changes on the course outline of record. Is that correct?
  - o Kalker: No, not exactly. Some of the outlines didn't have SLO changes marked, and the SLOs were all the same. There's two questions: Are they changing them for all? Are they leveling them now? They weren't all marked as being changed. Does that make sense?
  - o Hurvitz: Yes.

#### **ASTRONOMY**

Course Modification: ASTR 105, 110

#### **ASTR 105**

 Cormier: Edits to formatting on Semester Hours, Methods of Evaluating Student Performance, Outside Class Assignments, and Textbooks, note on Semester Hours

## **ASTR 110**

 Cormier: Edits to Methods of Evaluating Student Performance and Textbooks, question on Method of Instruction

### **BUSINESS**

Degree Deletion: Business Administration (AS-T, 1.0)

- Cormier: The question is "Once deleted, will the new Business
   Administration still need 2.0 in the title? Answer, yes students have
   catalog rights to 1.0 and we can not change the name of the degree on
   the TMC. Dee".
  - Aceves: Karen, did you leave this comment? I agree with you. I hate this 2.0, 1.0 business, but we have to stick with what the Chancellor's Office put on the TMC. I don't know why they just didn't phase one out before they gave us the new one.
  - Wong: Yeah, I assumed.

### COMMUNICATION

Degree Modification: Communication Studies (AA-T)

- o Cormier: No comments or questions. Anyone?
  - Aceves: This is the next 2.0 coming through. So, we'll have a 1.0, then the CSUs will phase out the 1.0. We'll have two for a year, and once this one gets approved, we'll do what we're doing with the Business 1.0.

#### **COUNSELING**

Degree Modification: General Studies, Humanities and Fine Arts (AA), General Studies, Science and Quantitative Reasoning (AS), General Studies, Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA), General Studies, Wellness and Self Development (AA), University Studies, Business and Economics (AA), University Studies, Humanities and Fine Arts (AA), University Studies, Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA)

General Studies, Humanities and Fine Arts (AA)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

General Studies, Science and Quantitative Reasoning (AS)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

General Studies, Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

General Studies, Wellness and Self Development (AA)

- o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.
  - O Aceves: For General Studies and University Studies, these are just our annual updates to these degrees to include our new courses. These particular ones have a title update to the upper and lower case but making them the same as all of the other degrees in the catalog, so very minor changes. We didn't have very many GE courses brought in this year. This is also the same for University Studies, except we track the transferability. You'll see some of the asterisks are underlined. If they weren't transferable to UC, those asterisks go away, and all the new courses get plugged in with an asterisk until they become transferable, and then we change it next year.

University Studies, Business and Economics (AA)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

University Studies, Humanities and Fine Arts (AA)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

University Studies, Social and Behavioral Sciences (AA)

o Cormier: No edits, comments or questions.

### **ECONOMICS**

Course Modification: ECON 215

 Cormier: Edits for Instructional Facilities, Outside Class Assignments, and Textbooks, note for Method of Instruction. We got the content review in.

## **ENGLISH**

Degree Modification: English (AA-T)

- Cormier: Edit, question, and note for Total Units. Do we need to update the table?
  - Wong: This is where they made changes to the catalog. It's hard to see the before and after.
  - o Cormier: It would be helpful to have a table that shows both of them

together, so we can see how it's changed. Is that correct? 
O Wong: Yes.

#### **EXERCISE SCIENCE**

Course Modification: ES 255

Degree Modification: Exercise Science (AS), Kinesiology (AA-T)

### ES 255

Cormier: Edits to formatting on Semester Hours, Instructional Facilities,
 Outside Class Assignments, Textbooks, question and note for
 Instructional Facilities, note for Textbooks

# Exercise Science (AS)

o Cormier: Edit to Total Units. No other questions or comments.

# Kinesiology (AA-T)

o Cormier: Edit to Total Units. No other questions or comments.

#### **HEALTH SCIENCES**

Course Deletion: HESC 099, 110, 112, 150, 152A, 152B, 154, 205, 206 • Aceves: These are all of the courses inside the disability services management degree. Since we're deleting the degree, we're also deleting the courses at the same time.

# **MATHEMATICS**

Course Addition: MATH 080

Course Deletion: MATH 087, 088, 088L, 089, 096, 097, 160L, 177

Course Modification: MATH 178

# **MATH 080**

Cormier: Edits to Outside Class Assignments and Textbooks. Any comments?

o Barrow: They did put in the corequisite form, so I changed the Content Review.

Course Deletion: MATH 087, 088, 088L, 089, 096, 097, 160L, 177

o Cormier: No comments or questions.

### **MATH 178**

o Cormier: Edits to Outside Class Assignments and Textbooks. This one was also missing Content Review.

o Barrow: Now it's there.

# Nursing

Degree Modification: Nursing (ADN)

# **OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSISTANT**

Degree Modification: Occupational Therapy Assistant (AS)

O Cormier: Edit to Total Units and note for DEI. No questions or comments.

#### **PHILOSOPHY**

Degree Modification: Philosophy (AA), Philosophy (AA-T)

Course Deletion: PHIL 112, 114, 116, 118

Philosophy (AA-T)

o Cormier: Edit and note for Total Units. The math checks out.

# Philosophy (AA)

- o Cormier: Edit and note for Total Units, question for Degree.
  - Aceves: June, I put a question at the top because the two degrees are duplicates. So, I was wondering if you want to maintain the local degree and the ADT? Or, would you like to keep just the one?
  - Yang: I want to keep them both, because depending on what happens with implementation of 928 I have some ideas that I'd like to float to folks. I think the local degree would be important, because that's where those units would be required.
  - Aceves: Do you want to make them slightly different? I think Karen saw the same thing, they're identical except for the unit count with 3 units off. You don't want the local one to be different?
  - o Yang: I don't think so. I'm not understanding that question. Should they be different?
  - o Aceves: What's the benefit of having 2 if they're exactly the same?
  - Yang: I see, because they could get 2 degrees for the price of one.Should I scratch one class then?
  - O Aceves: You have 18 units required in the major, so you don't want to scratch too much. There is usually a difference between the local degree and the ADT, and the local degree has a slightly different focus, whereas the ADT is only geared to transfer and compliance with the TMC. We'll send this back to you so you have a chance to look, respond to it, and make a slight adjustment if you want to. Yes, we do want them to be different.

Course Deletion: PHIL 112, 114, 116, 118

o Cormier: Any comments?

- Aceves: Jose, did the 14 and 16 become 15 and 17, correct? Should we move these from this list?
- o Contreras: 112 and 114, I believe, were the ones that got converted.
- o Aceves: It's just deleting the 116 and the 118, correct?
- Contreras: Let me confirm the numbers because I forgot which one was which.
- Aceves: We have 2 deletions, not 4.Cormier: 2 or 4 to make a note.

#### **PHOTOGRAPHY**

Course Deletion: PHOT 166

o Cormier: No questions or comments.

### **POLITICAL SCIENCE**

Degree Modification: Political Science (AA), Political Science (AA-T)

Political Science (AA)

- Aceves: Do we have 2 proposals in the pile for this, or do we only have the AA-T, Jose?
  - Contreras: We had some confusion with that one, and we were waiting to hear back because there was only one proposal. I think it listed both, and I need to check.
  - o Aceves: Potentially, it's only the ADT?
  - Contreras: Correct.

Political Science (AA-T)

o Cormier: No questions or comments.

## **RESPIRATORY THERAPY**

Degree Modification: Respiratory Therapy (AS)

o Cormier: No questions or comments.

## 4. Grossmont Curriculum Committee's Commitment to District Alignment

i. Math 176 Discussion

# ii. GCCCD Alignment Policy

O Aceves: In previous meetings, we talked about alignment in the district and the possibility of our 2 district technical review committees to work together to update our policy from 2012. We have now bumped into an issue with a course that is aligned and the way that the 2 colleges are working together to abide by our alignment policy. We have a couple of steps where if you are engaging in curriculum work you send your letter of intent or you send your alignment letter. We had a request that made its way around very late in the semester and didn't complete the paperwork

process until very recently. Cuyamaca is proposing a change to an aligned course in the prerequisite. Our current policy states that all curriculum alignment items requiring action from both curriculum committees must be approved by both committees prior to being sent forward to the governing board as a docket item. Right now, we're in a situation where Cuyamaca would like to move forward with a prerequisite change on an aligned course and Grossmont faculty are not prepared to make that same change. If we're following process, the next step is mediation. The initiating college should begin a dialogue with all of the stakeholders to facilitate a resolution to the alignment issue. This is the step we're stuck on. Our sister college has decided to move forward with being out of alignment. Now, we need to decide what the next steps will be as the curriculum committee. For example, Exercise Science has an alignment issue, course, and title change with Cuyamaca on ES 255. We held that course approved it at curriculum in December. You saw it here today because Cuyamaca and Grossmont finally agreed on the title change and can move forward together. Cuyamaca needs to get their paper work submitted in order for us to send it over to the board as a docket item. If Cuyamaca does not get that approved and their paperwork in by the deadline set by their curriculum committee, we can't send that over to the board as a docket item for the policy. We're continuing to follow the policy as these things come up. We're in a situation where our sister college has decided we are going to choose the path of an alignment.

- Fulbright: We will have a meeting for mediation and in conversation later this week. I have been working with our math colleagues to formulate alternatives. Our colleagues put in committee to be approved prior to us having these conversations. We want to be as collegial and professional as we possibly can while maintaining our own ability to consult and have conversations. This type of consultation in other districts is done. They do have district curriculum committees where they all come together to have these conversations. It's a policy or guideline that we should be adhering to, but this is also a curricular issue with the faculty as to this is just one course. Have we set a precedent? Do we just get rid of what we've agreed upon? Are you open for discussion?
- Yang: I think the issue with alignment goes beyond curriculum. I noticed that there's not a lot of talking among departments, especially as we shift more to online learning. They're getting classes up there a lot faster than we are, and they're not talking with us. Would it be that they're going to take a class at their school because they don't require that prerequisite, or how is it working? There's an unlevel playing field, and Grossmont students are going to pay the price for that because we lose out on funding that could provide student support services for our folks, and many of our folks are on campus and Cuyamaca a lot of what they do is online. We need that money here.

- Sampson: I think self-advocacy on behalf of our students and our campus is important, and we need to figure out best ways or practices to make sure that we put ourselves first. We need to move forward because they seem to benefit financially. Their budget seems to exceed ours in all aspects.
- o Fielden: It causes quite a few problems. We want to make things as streamlined as we can. If we're in alignment, it's going to make it a lot easier for our students to not only plan their courses but schedule their courses. It creates a lot of hassles in terms of developing an education plan.
- Ocuevas: I'm going to use an example that was vey helpful to both colleges that involved the streamlining of the Physics sequence. When we became aligned in that area, it made things very easy. I believe creating these certain things where we're going to have different requirements for different schools or different prerequisites that are not going to be the same is going to hurt our students. It was a very challenging thing with Physics when we didn't have that alignment. When we created that alignment, it made things so much easier.
- Dillon: Physics was the example I was going to talk to you as well. I had a student who took the first of the Physics sequence at Grossmont, took the second course of the Physics sequence at Cuyamaca, and then came to see me in counseling. I informed the student that the transfer institution that they wanted to transfer to wasn't going to accept that because the agreement was that they had to have the sequence from the same college. It puts students in jeopardy when things are not aligned, and unfortunately, we can't communicate here's the rule. Counseling can't take on that burden to communicate every detail to every student for every situation, so the less that is misaligned the better.
- o Fielden: Students don't discover this problem until they come to us. Being aligned will go a long way towards ensuring that they're starting off their career on a smoother note. Then, trying to patch it up and remediate it once they get to counseling and find out that they should take these classes at one place or the other because then it's almost too late. It's cost them time and money. I think it's a preemptive strategy to be an alignment.
- Cuevas: How is MATH 176? That's a huge 6-unit class which is also concerning. How are they on aligning the class?
- O Aceves: The requested change is for Cuyamaca would like to remove a MATH 110 prerequisite and only have placement. Grossmont would like to maintain that as a prerequisite on the course as it's still in our books. In this case, a lot of back end issues can happen with this, so when the student takes the self-placement what options are they going to get at one school versus the other school. How are they going to navigate the 2 different systems? So, they'll have one message for Grossmont and one

- message for Cuyamaca. IOPS will have to code things. Are we going to follow the policy, or are we not going to follow the policy?
- Cuevas: You never know if those remedial classes may come back in the future for AB 705. It would be a good idea for the student to have that prerequisite.
- Fulbright: This is not about the course. This is about the process and the collegial consultation and the discussions that have to take place. We want to make a change. We think this is the best thing for students. We have to be clear about having the conversations and coming to some sort of agreement amongst the masses with the students in mind. This is for MATH 176. Now, it could be anything tomorrow or anything a year from now. We'll meet and have a conversation on Thursday and then next week is another meeting.
- o Aceves: Karen, do you want to add anything?
- Wong: I don't even know if the system will be able to have the two when thinking about A & R as a whole, for example, how that will work when students are trying to enroll in this class compared to Cuyamaca and how they will be placed in placement. But, yes, definitely for graduation purposes as well.
- o Barrow: We have these conversations, but it's about the students and all this confusion about what happened. It's already been discussed. Why would we even go there, right? I hope things go well with your meeting. That's not student-friendly or student-centered.
- Hurvitz: Historically, we have proven that not having an agreed upon process for alignment caused a lot of problems, and we need an agreed upon process.
- O Aceves: This feels administratively the policy is not the policy. Until we have a different policy, or until we agree, I don't know why we're moving forward. One of the other suggestions that we came up with in a meeting with Dr. Fulbright, Sebastien is to create a statement for the Senate about our commitment when it comes to alignment.

### iii. Statement or Resolution for the Academic Senate

- o Fulbright: I think it's a good idea. We should keep it as short as possible and take that to the Senate for a review.
- Aceves: We need to put a position together that says we are supportive of maintaining the alignment. What is our position on district alignment?
- Fulbright: Grossmont College is committed to supporting student success through alignment of our curriculum across the district. Therefore, we value streamlining the process through our previously approved procedures.
- Traylor: It might be helpful to write down the things we want to include, and then I can draft a statement based on that.
- Fulbright: I concur.

- o Calo: I like Felicia's wording in the chat reducing confusion for students.
- Traylor: There is a thing to consider if we clarify that we value professional and collegial collaboration, it could be construed as our partners in this process are not being professional and are not being collegial, and I'm not sure if that's a message we want to convey.
- Sampson: I think when we're using terminology as a value, there's so many things that we value, but we don't impart any kind of change. We're looking for transformational changes in our processes and seeing things like valuing. We want to move forward and be innovative, and how we deal with the level of confusion for our students.
- o Traylor: Innovative and transformational probably should be a statement.
- o Barrow: I like the idea of student focused.
- Calo: Student first.
- o Barrow: Student centered.
- Traylor: Dr. Fulbright, are you saying the main goal of this statement is to emphasize our desire to collaborate?
- o Fulbright: Yes.
- O Hurvitz: I think if we say innovative and transformational, Cuyamaca will say is that is precisely what our proposal is about and what Grossmont is preventing. In fact, what we want is to be able to engage in a process that was mutually agreed upon as a means of addressing this issue. We hope that we can work in partnership with Cuyamaca in pursuit according to that mutually agreed upon process.
- Calo: Should we include a sentence? Why is it good to be a multi-college district?
- Aceves: You can have some programs and be specialized, and the other college can have other specialized programs.
- Calo: This needs to be about students and protecting them. We have to advocate for them.
- Aceves: Is Friday a good deadline for Allen to create a draft and everyone can take a peek?
- Traylor: Yes.

# iv. Task Group

## 5. Chair Report

- Brown Act grace period
  - Cormier: We have been given the go ahead to continue via Zoom for the remainder of the semester, and we will be meeting in person in the fall.
- Alignment Meeting 3/16
  - o Cormier: We are going to be meeting and figuring out how to proceed.
- AB 927 CCC Baccalaureate degrees

- Ocormier: We went to the California baccalaureate degree workshop two weeks ago. 15 were approved initially, and there's been a few more. They have been approved in a variety of subjects. In this cycle (cycle 2), there are 29 applications that have been submitted, being reviewed, and decisions will be made any day. They're going to approve another 15, and there's another cycle that is due this summer. It's going to be evaluated for complying with policy and by program quality. There has to be intersegmental agreement with the CSUs and UCs and ACCC, JC, and Chancellor's Office approval. We're putting together a workforce team to start evaluating how we're going to approach this.
- o Fulbright: We are committed to developing an overall program development process over the next three semesters, year and a half. We have two months to put this together. In order to move forward with it, we are the group that went to Golden West to meet and have a conversation. We're going to see who else needs to be involved to review that application process, put together a rubric for scoring that people know what the criteria is that is more open and transparent. I put together a meeting for us to meet on Friday. Everyone will be aware of the process. It has to move quickly if we're going to make a cycle to be done not for 23-24 but 24-25.
- o Cormier: Dee, do you want to add anything?
- O Aceves: We have two competing items. How do we develop programs district where they're the same lower division? Cuyamaca submitted an application, and I believe it got approved for the waste water program. The application doesn't mean that your curriculum is done. I think that if we are fair and transparent on how we decide to select a program to move forward for upward division, and we move through the collegiate collegial consultation process that we have in place for making big decisions like this that we do have a template for how to do that.

#### Other

o Cormier: None.

# 6. Articulation Report

- Catalog Policy Presentation at Academic Senate 3/6
  - Aceves: This was well received at the Senate, and there weren't too many questions. It will go back out as an attachment for the actual document to the Senate in this week's agenda. Usually, those go out on Thursday, and we'll vote on that.
- AB 928 GE Charts
  - o Aceves: At the baccalaureate program conference, they were directing

the articulation group to look at general education for lower division, baccalaureate degrees and upper division. They're discussing and working on these because there will be an additional 9 units required of upper division. AB 928 is changing the way our associate degree GE package looks. They will discuss these updates at the spring plenary. There will be some more work on what upper division looks like. For example, can a technical writing course be included? What are the other two courses going to be? They're thinking about standardizing upper division GE, but we're not quite there yet.

- Other
  - o Cormier: None.
- 7. Information/Other Items: The committee will review as many items as is reasonable and will not exceed the regular meeting time. Remaining items will be rolled over to the next meeting.

Meeting ended at 3:36pm