Cañada College

Response to External Evaluation Report

October 21-24, 2013 Site Visit

Cañada College
4200 Farm Hill Boulevard
Redwood City, CA 94061

Cañada College
Response to External Evaluation Report
2013 Recommendations
October 21-24, 2013 Site Visit

Contents of the Report

This report is written to "respond in writing (no less than 15 days in advance of the Commission meeting) to the External Evaluation Report on **issues of substance** and to any **Accreditation Standard deficiency** noted in the Report."[1]

The following pages outline the actions taken by the college and the district to address the recommendations made by the Team. These actions occurred both before (September/October) and after (November/December) the site visit. In addition, on page 7 of this report, there are several "Errors of Fact" that were included in the Summary of the Report.

This report is organized as follows:

---

[1] *Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation*, June 2013, page 32.

College Recommendations to Correct Deficiencies (from Page 9 of the Final Report)

College Recommendation 2
In order to meet the Standard, the College must review its system for identifying course outlines of record that are out of date to improve and implement a curriculum process that ensures all Course Outlines of Record are reviewed and curriculum currency is maintained. (2.A.2.e)

Background

In this recommendation, the Team felt that the system for identifying out of date course outlines of record (CORs) needed improvement. However, the Team's Findings & Evidence section of Standard 2A from the *External Evaluation Report* (page 37), states: "The *Curriculum Committee Handbook* provides clear guidance for faculty in creating, modifying and updating courses to ensure currency and relevancy in courses and Course Outline of Record (COR)." In addition, the report reads, "This document also details the processes that are intended to ensure currency of courses and programs."

These statements are not consistent with the Team's recommendation and assessment that the college is deficient in providing a system for identifying out of date course outlines of record. As evidence, the table of contents for the *Curriculum Committee Handbook* is included in Appendix A (page 7) and the entire *Handbook* is located on the college website: (http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/cancurriculum/Curriculum%20Committee%20Handbook/Curriculum%20Committee%20Handbook.pdf .

In addition, during the Comprehensive Six Year Program Review cycle, programs are required to respond to the following item: *List courses with CORs over 6 years old (data from CurricUNET).* The Instructional Deans and VPI then review these documents along with the Instruction Planning Council (IPC). For the Annual Plan/Program Review documents, the IPC again makes comments on a feedback form, which includes, as the first area of comment: "1. *Status of curriculum updates for all courses."* The members of the IPC complete these annual feedback forms during the spring semester.

Conclusion: The college had, at the time of the Team Visit, a system for identifying course outlines of record that ensured regular review to assure currency.

Nevertheless, in early September 2013, prior to the arrival of the Accrediting Team in October, the new Vice President of Instruction[2] reviewed the status of the course outlines of record as part of the orientation process for his new position. After his review, he noted, similar to the team's finding[3], there were CORs which were out-of-date. The VPI met with the Instructional Deans on September 9 to discuss the need to assure currency. Subsequent to this meeting, Deans immediately began communicating with faculty members the need for courses to be current. Early in September (after his review), he also communicated with the College President regarding his

---

[2] The new Vice President, Instruction, Dr. Gregory Anderson, began on July 2, 2013.
[3] A similar finding was noted by the team on page 37 of the *External Evaluation Report* where "several CORs were out-of-date and exceeded the College's stated six-year cycle (e.g. Paralegal)".

concern, including the need for additional resources (funding) to assist faculty leadership in reviewing and strengthening the curriculum review process. This funding was approved by the President and provided support for another faculty member to assist the Curriculum Chair in the revision of the process and review of the CORs.[4]

Information about outdated CORs was shared with the Curriculum Committee at their September 27 meeting, and they too were concerned about the currency of the curriculum and the processes used to make certain CORs are regularly reviewed and revised. At that time, the VPI discussed with the Curriculum Committee the process by which CORs are regularly reviewed and how that process ensures the review is completed in a timely manner. The group discussed methods for communicating effectively with faculty about updating CORs[5].

At the exit interview on October 24, the Team Chair identified the need to develop a means of ensuring CORs are current. She recommended that action be taken to ensure "curriculum currency is maintained." While this was a meaningful recommendation, the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate had already been working to revise the process to assure that COR changes were addressed.

In late October and early November, faculty leadership engaged in a series of discussions to complete the revisions that had been underway for almost two months. The draft of this revised policy: *Ongoing Review of Prerequisites, Co-requisites, Advisories, and Course Outlines of Record* was first reviewed by the Curriculum Committee on November 8.[6] The Curriculum Committee provided revisions at this meeting and the revised draft was circulated to the faculty as part of the attachments for the November 14 Academic Senate meeting[7]. The Senate made comments on the draft document and provided those to the Curriculum Committee. The final document was approved by the Curriculum Committee on November 22[8] and endorsed by the Academic Senate on December 12.

This document more clearly defined the timeframe for reviewing CORs (two years for CTE courses and five years for non-CTE courses) and described the sanctions for not completing the review and revision within that timeframe (classifying courses as inactive and not including them in the class schedule).

Conclusion: The college has, since the time of the Team visit, revised its existing system for identifying course outlines of record that more fully ensures regular review and secure curriculum currency.

---

[4] An email was sent to the College President requesting resources as well as to the Academic Senate President requesting assistance of an additional faculty member to assist the Curriculum Committee (page 12)

[5] Cañada College Curriculum Committee Minutes – September 27, 2013:
https://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/cancurriculum/Minutes/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2fSiteDirectory%2fcancurriculum%2fMinutes%2f13%2d14&FolderCTID=&View=%7bA8125750%2dED89%2d4EDD%2dB865%2dC11A61A209E2%7d

[6] Ibid

[7] http://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/meetings.php

[8] The revised policy is included in the Evidence Section of this report, page 9.

Actions Completed to Fully Address the Recommendation

- *"Review of the System [Process] for Identifying Course Outlines of Record that are Out-of-Date"*

The College has reviewed the process for identifying course outlines of record that are out-of-date. The revised process adopted by the Curriculum Committee will be included as a revision to the *Curriculum Committee Handbook.* The revised process approved on November 22 is included on pages 9-10. The following is an excerpt which outlines the process to be used to **identify CORs that are out of date**:

Each January the Office of Instruction will generate a list of all CTE courses that have reached their two-year review cycle and a separate list of all other courses that have reached their five-year review cycle. These lists will be distributed to all faculty, the Curriculum Committee, Division Deans, and posted online no later than the third week of the spring semester.
Faculty will have one calendar year to update all courses that will remain active. For example, in January 2014, a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the 2015-2016 catalog.

- *Implementation of a Curriculum Process to Ensure Timely Review and Currency*

In order to assure that CORs are regularly reviewed, the Curriculum Committee identified strategies for addressing those which are not reviewed within the two-year (CTE courses) or five-year (non-CTE courses) cycles. The following excerpt from the revised process provides **assurance of timely review and currency**:

In accordance with Title 5 and C-ID, the Office of Instruction will generate a list of any courses that have failed to meet the required review deadline. The Curriculum Committee will bank (classify as inactive) and remove from the schedule of classes and catalog those courses until such a time as the COR is updated and approved. The Committee will provide a list of all affected courses to the Academic Senate Governing Council.

Conclusion: The college has met the directive of the Team's recommendation outlined in the External Evaluation Report through the current processes: 1) Annual Plan/Program Review, 2) Comprehensive Six Year Program Review, 3) Curriculum Committee Handbook, and 4)Revised Course Outline of Record Review process adopted by the Curriculum Committee. We believe no additional action is necessary to further review our system or implement additional processes.

College Recommendations for Improvement

College Recommendation 1
In order to improve institutional effectiveness the college should record the robust dialogue that exists at the College between planning councils and governance groups, particularly the exchanges that relate to planning and resource allocation outcomes and processes. (I.B.4)

Background

The college sincerely appreciated the commendation made by the Team on "imbuing a culture of inclusion by fostering a high level of participation in the decision making process leading to outstanding collegiality and collaboration among the faculty, staff, students, and administration." And, we recognize it is our responsibility to communicate the outcomes of the conversations resulting from this high level participation through minutes, postings on the website, etc. As the team noted on page 31 of the *External Evaluation Report*, "The College demonstrated robust dialog to the visiting team; however providing a record of the dialog and resource decisions could be better communicated."

Of particular concern to the Team was the communication of information in our primary resource allocation activity – the new position proposal process. In this process, the dialog among the four participatory governance groups was robust, and although we captured the comments, these were not posted or distributed campus-wide. In addition, when the President made his decision about the positions to hire, he sent an all-campus email, but this was not documented in the minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council meetings nor posted to the website.

The college recognizes the need to correct this process and make certain campus conversations are recorded, circulated among the campus communities, and documented on the website. Beginning in December, we employed this documentation process with our group discussions about new positions for 2014-2015. These discussions were communicated widely to campus and included in the minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council and were recorded for future reference. The revised process is described below.

Actions Completed to Fully Address Recommendation

- ***Record the robust dialogue that exists between planning councils and governance groups***

To assure that the robust dialogue occurring during our planning and resource allocation joint meetings is well documented, the following process is being used:
1. Discussion Groups: The groups will discuss the pros and cons of the proposal (in the case of December 4, this is for each of the ten new positions proposed).
2. Posting: The pros and cons from each group will be posted during the meeting so all attending will be able to review them.
3. Documenting: The pros and cons from the meeting will be transcribed.
4. Presenting: The pros and cons information will be sent out as part of the agenda packet for the Planning and Budgeting Council meeting and discussed as a report. The report will be posted to the website as part of the attachments to the meeting minutes.
5. Decision-making: When the President makes a decision (in this case about hiring), he will send an email to campus, and also formally announce the information to the Planning and Budgeting Council. A document will then be included as an attachment to the Planning and Budgeting Council meeting minutes.

Conclusion: The college has expanded the system of documenting discussions by the campus community and is currently implementing this process.

District Recommendations for Improvement

District Recommendation #1 *In order to increase effectiveness, the District and Colleges should broadly communicate the modification of the evaluation process for faculty and others directly responsible for student progress, which includes student learning outcomes, and ensure that the process is fully implemented. (III.A.1.c)*

The District completed and implemented a comprehensive modification to its faculty evaluation process which incorporated, among other enhancements, student learning outcomes as an integral part of that evaluation process. Although there has been much correspondence to faculty and related constituents regarding the modified evaluation process, the District has not issued an all-inclusive communication to highlight such changes. Accordingly, the District will deliver that announcement to faculty and other interested parties in a timely manner.

District Recommendation #2 *In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the Board of Trustees should develop goals for increasing its professional development and orientation of new Trustees. (IV.B.1.f)*

Members of the Board of Trustees have served SMCCCD in their elected capacity ranging from 10 years to 24 years with the average term in excess of 17 years. In addition, three of the Trustees have served several years as elected members of other local school boards or the County Office of Education prior to serving in their current capacity. Throughout that long tenure, each Trustee has attended many conferences and workshops to enhance their knowledge and awareness of a wide variety of academic, fiscal, legislative and governance matters. Recently, due to the extensive and extended statewide financial exigency, the Board has elected to attend fewer conferences and workshops. Nevertheless, the Board will incorporate in its annual development of Board Goals for 2014-15 a commitment to increase its participation in professional development activities and ensure newly elected Trustees receive orientation training.

The Student Trustee typically attends the bi-annual Statewide Student Senate General Assemblies (Fall and Spring) as well as the Student Leadership Conference hosted by the California Community College Student Affairs Association. Also, all newly elected Student Trustees attend a Student Trustee workshop sponsored by the Community College League of California. Often, Student Trustees attend the National Student Advocacy Conference hosted by the American Student Association of Community Colleges in Washington DC.

District Recommendation #3 *In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the District should establish a regular cycle for the evaluation of its services and provide documentation regarding the outcomes of the evaluations. (IV.B.3.b, IV.B.3.g)*

Although the District Office regularly and continuously evaluates it services to the Colleges and documents its findings to improve such services, it will begin immediately evaluating its service to the Colleges on a formal six year interval – in conjunction with the six year accreditation cycle – to enhance institutional effectiveness.

Cañada College
Additional Errors in Fact
External Evaluation Report
October 21-24, 2013

Page #	Excerpt from the External Evaluation	Errors in Fact Comments
4	"First, the College Self Evaluation Report, while complete in its description and presentation of facts, did not include any self-identified improvement plans to **address the needs identified in the document…"**	In the *Self Evaluation,* there were no sections of the document where there were identified needs to address the accreditation standards. If needs were identified, the college would have developed actionable improvement plans. We did not develop any plans for improvement to meet the standards as the campus felt all of the standards had been met.
5	"Second, the District Chancellor was off-site for the first two days of the visit and, although available by telephone, **was not available to interact with the District Team** and others on-site until the final days of the visit."	It is unclear what questions were raised that district staff members were unable to address and why this was a problem. At the college, we did not receive any feedback or questions from the Team that "the Chancellor's absence" impeded their evaluation.
5	"…as an improvement in preparing for future evaluation visits that: • A summary of plans to **address problems identified in the College's Self Evaluation** be included either in the document itself or as an addendum"	In the *Self Evaluation,* the Team did not provide information to the college on "problems which had been identified in the College's Self Evaluation", so this statement is somewhat confusing. If the college had identified problems in meeting the standards, then actionable improvement plans would have been developed. We did not feel we had any issues in meeting the standards, thus did not need the plans.
7	"Missing from the College Self-Study are any self-identified improvement plans. This was a challenge for the Team overall as the College **embedded areas of improvement within the narrative,** but did not call out any actions to improve. When asked why this was the case, it was suggested that the College's were advised district-wide to omit these sections."	In our review of the document, we are not aware of any "embedded areas of improvement" within the *Self Evaluation* and the colleges were not advised to have "no action plans" by the district. If there had been areas where improvement was needed to address the accreditation standards, the college would have created actionable improvement plans. It is unclear what areas of improvement the Team identified and wished to see addressed.

Table of Contents

For additional information on curriculum issues, please visit http://www.asccc.org

Cañada College Policy:
Ongoing Review of Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories and Course Outlines of Record
Approved by the Curriculum Committee, November 22, 2013

Whereas, Title 5, §55003 states that "at least **once each six years** all prerequisites and corequisites established by the district shall be reviewed, except that prerequisites and corequisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed **every two years**. These processes shall also provide for the periodic review of advisories on recommended preparation."

Whereas, the University of California's *Policy on Course Transferability, Directions for Revising the UC Transferable Course Agreements and Special Regulations for Courses in Specific Subject Areas* states that for UC transferable course agreements, "Outlines should be current (not more than seven years old)." The CSU system also demands currency of course outlines in order to articulate the courses.

Whereas, the C-ID (Course Identification Numbering System) requires that course outlines submitted for C-ID designation be **no more than five years** old. Outlines that have not been reviewed within five years therefore cannot be assigned a C-ID designator.

Resolved, the Academic Senate of Cañada College requires a routine review and updating of Course Outlines of Record for CTE courses every two years and for all other courses at least once every five years. During the routine review of the required and recommended preparation, a department should:

1. Determine whether prerequisites, corequisites, and/or advisory courses are still appropriate

2. Check to see if the content of any preparatory courses has changed

3. Add or delete prerequisite, corequisite, and/or advisory courses, as necessary

4. Make any other revisions in the course, such as changes to current textbooks

5. Submit the revised Course Outline of Record for approval

Failure to update the Course Outline of Record within five years for non-CTE courses, and within two years for CTE courses, will result in the course being banked (classified as inactive) by the Curriculum Committee and removed from the schedule of classes and the college catalog as detailed in the following procedure.

Procedure

Each January the Office of Instruction will generate a list of all CTE courses that have reached their two-year review cycle and a separate list of all other courses that have reached their five-year review cycle. These lists will be distributed to all faculty, the Curriculum Committee, Division Deans, and posted online no later than the third week of the spring semester.

Faculty will have one calendar year to update all courses that will remain active. For example, in January 2014, a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the 2015-2016 catalog.

Departments will identify a faculty member with discipline expertise to be responsible for reviewing and updating the affected Course Outlines of Record.

If there are no discipline experts with the appropriate FSA at the college, an expert from the other two district colleges will be sought to consult with local faculty from related disciplines in updating the COR. In the event that no discipline experts are available within the district, the division Dean may seek experts from other colleges or the private sector subject to the approval of the college's Academic Senate Governing Council.

CORs must be updated and approved by the Curriculum Committee before the deadline for inclusion in the next fall schedule of classes.

In accordance with Title 5 and C-ID, the Office of Instruction will generate a list of any courses that have failed to meet the required review deadline. The Curriculum Committee will bank (classify as inactive) and remove from the schedule of classes and catalog those courses until such a time as the COR is updated and approved. The Committee will provide a list of all affected courses to the Academic Senate Governing Council.

In extenuating circumstances, the Curriculum Committee may recommend a one-year extension for updating a COR, during which time the course will continue to be listed in the schedule of classes and catalog. The extension is subject to approval from the Academic Senate Governing Council and Vice President of Instruction.

iDeans & VPI Cabinet
Agenda

September 9, 2013
1:15 pm – 2:15 pm
Building 8, Rooms 203

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	TIME	PROCESS (Action, Information, Discussion)
A. Curriculum: 695, old courses, meeting agenda	Anderson	20 min.	Information, Discussion
B. Late Adds	Anderson	5 min.	Discussion, Action
C. Retreat recap	Anderson, Johnson, Stringer	15 min.	Discussion
D. Plans for thank you email: enrollment, degree, UC course approval, retreat news	Anderson	5 min.	Action
F. Distance Education update	Stringer	10 min.	Information
G. Arts & Olive Festival	Hayes	5 min.	Discussion
H. Process for Research Data	Hayes	5 min.	Discussion
I. Clarification of Lucy Carter's role as grant writer	Hayes	5 min.	Discussion
Adjournment			

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Anderson, Gregory" <andersong@smccd.edu>
Date: 17 October 2013 12:57
Subject: Additional resources for Curriculum Committee
To: " **Buckley, Lawrence** <buckleyl@smccd.edu>

Dear Larry,

You will recall that at the beginning of September I became aware of the courses that had somehow escaped our policy of needing to be updated. Since then, I've been working with the iDeans and the Curriculum Committee Chair and José Peña to get them updated and work on the process.

Today I met with Alicia Aguirre and we sketched out a plan that we would propose to bring on Dani Behonick early to help provide additional capacity for the Curriculum Committee to complete this work and other tasks. The details of that plan are below. Alicia will be sending this proposal to Doug Hirzel and the rest of the AS leadership next week.

Thanks for helping to find the funding for this important task.

gregory

Need for this plan:
- additional complexity of state regulations (pre-requisities, co-requisites, ADTs, CIDs, etc)
- length of time in position for current chair
- additional activities for curriculum committee to engage in

Duties expected of current chair (Aguirre):
- encourage and facilitate 100% ADT completion (by fall 2014)
- continue to serve as district curriculum chair
- serve as college curriculum chair (official capacity)
- train incoming chair in all duties
- coordinate activities of curriculum committee with other planning efforts, including new strategic enrollment plan
- facilitate decision and plan for compliance of updating CORs

Duties expected of incoming chair (Behonick)
- develop skills and abilities for full assumption of duties (after Spring 2014)
- chair committee as needed
- share technical review duties
- support official chair until term ends in May, 2013
- attend Curriculum Institute and Workshops offered by Statewide Academic Senate.
- attend some District Curriculum Meetings to develop an understanding of district and other two colleges' policies and processes

Alicia Aguirre
Gregory Anderson

> ## Outline of the Six Year Comprehensive Program Review
> Note: To complete this form, **SAVE** it on your computer, then send to your Division Dean/VPI as an **ATTACHMENT on an e-mail message.**

Program Title [Click here and type]   **Date Submitted** [Click here and type]
1. Planning Group Participants (include PT& FT faculty, staff, students, stakeholders)
2. Contact Person (include e-mail and telephone): [Click here and type]
3. Program Information
      A. Program Personnel
      B. Program mission and vision
      C. Program Student Learning Outcomes
4. Curricular Offerings and Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Cycle
 Tools: TracDAT https://sanmateo.tracdat.com/tracdat/
 CurricUNET http://www.curricunet.com/smcccd
All curriculum and SLOAC updates must be completed when planning documents are due.
      A. Attach the following TracDat and CurricUNET data in the appendix:
- List courses, SLOs, assessment plans, and results and action plans (attach report from TracDat for the CURRENT year only. The others will be in your previous annual plans).
- List courses with CORs over 6 years old (data from CurricUNET)

      B. Identify Patterns of Curriculum Offerings

> Reflections:
> - Review the 2-year curriculum cycle of course offerings to ensure timely completion of certificates and degrees.
> - Identify strengths of the curriculum.
> - Identify issues and possible solutions.
> - Discuss plans for future curricular development and/or program modification.

5. Program Level Data
6. Action Plan
7. Resource Identification
      A. Faculty and Staff hiring requests
      B. Professional Development needs
      C. Instructional Equipment requests
      D. Facilities requests
      E. Office of Planning, Research & Student Success requests

ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

Department/Program Title: **Date submitted:**

0.   Key Findings:

1. Planning Group
2. Writing Team and Contact Person:
3. Program Information
        A. Program Personnel
        B. Program mission and vision
        C. Expected Program Student Learning Outcomes
4. Response to Previous Annual Program Plan & Review

5. Curricular Offerings *(current state of curriculum and SLOAC)*

All curriculum and SLOAC updates must be completed when planning documents are due.
   SLOAC = Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle
   Tools: **TracDAT folders in SLOAC** sharepoint
http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/CANSLOAC
        Curriculum Committee http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/cancurriculum/
        A. Attach the following TracDat and Curriculum data in the appendix:
- List courses, SLOs, assessment plans, and results and action plans (attach report from TracDAT folders in SLOAC sharepoint).
- List courses with COR's over 6 years old (attach documents from Curriculum Committee)

        B. Identify Patterns of Curriculum Offerings

6. Program Level Data

        A. Data Packets and Analysis from the Office of Planning, Research & Student Success and any other relevant data.
        B.   Analyze evidence of Program performance. Explain how other information may impact Program (examples are business and employment needs, new technology, new transfer requirements)
        C. Other Considerations
7. Action Plan
        Include details of planning as a result of reflection, analysis and interpretation of data.
8. Resource Identification
        A. Faculty and Staff hiring requests
        B. Professional Development needs
        C. Classroom & Instructional Equipment requests
        D. Office of Planning, Research & Student Success requests
        E. Facilities requests

Friday, September 27, 2013
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10

Members Present: Alicia Aguirre, Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Danielle Behonick, Maria Lara, Rafael Rivera, Paul Roscelli, Katie Schertle, Janet Stringer, Diana Tedone, José Peña (Ex-Officio), Gregory Anderson (Ex-Officio).

Members Absent: Kurt Devlin, Robert Lee, Soraya Sohrabi.

Guests: Linda Hayes, David Johnson, Joan Tanaka.

---

1) Approval of Agenda – **Approved as amended:** move articulation report before curriculum items, add announcements and research as agenda items.

2) Approval of Minutes – September 13, 2013 – **Approved**

3) Articulation report
> Articulation Officer, Janet Stringer, presented an excel spreadsheet which shows status of courses that have been submitted for C-ID. Discussion followed on how to communicate to faculty to update their course outline of record.

4) <u>MODIFICATION OF COURSES</u>

5) <u>ADDITION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES FOR TRANSFER</u>

6) <u>Information/Discussion/Report/Approval Items</u>

7) <u>Adjournment</u>
> The meeting adjourned 11:05 am.

EXCERPT From
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES OF

Tuesday, November 8, 2013
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2 Room 10

Members Present: Alicia Aguirre, Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Danielle Behonick, Kurt Devlin, Maria
                         Lara, Robert Lee, Elmer Martinez , Rafael Rivera, Javier Santos, Katie Schertle,
                         Soraya Sohrabi, Janet Stringer, Diana Tedone, José Peña (Ex-Officio), Gregory
                         Anderson (Ex-Officio).
Members Absent: Paul Roscelli
Guests: Victoria Clinton, Valerie Goines, Linda Hayes, David Johnson, Denise Erickson,
                         Annie Nicholls.

---

1) Approval of Agenda – **Approved**

2) Approval of Minutes – October 11, 2013 – **Approved**

3) Articulation report
        Articulation Officer, Janet Stringer, reported the status of C-ID submitted by our college.

4) MODIFICATION OF COURSES

5) DELETION OF COURSES

6) REACTIVATION OF COURSES

7) ADDITION OF COURSES

8) MODIFICATION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES AND/OR CERTIFICATE

9) ADDITION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES AND/OR CERTIFICATE

10) ADDITION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES FOR TRANSFER

11) Course Outline of Record Policy
        VPI Anderson outlined that one of the recommendations from the accreditation team is to update
        COR (Course Outline of Records). In response to this recommendation, the college will institute a
        process to update COR which speaks directly to the accreditation recommendation. Updating COR
        must be completed by middle of January, before ACCJC meets and makes their final
        recommendations to the college.

        The policy outlines that once each six years, all COR must be reviewed except for vocational courses
        or programs which must be reviewed every two years. In extenuating circumstances, the Curriculum
        Committee may recommend a one year extension for the COR update.

16

Curriculum Chair Aguirre read aloud the proposed COR policy. It was requested that division representatives take this policy to their respective division meeting to received feedback. The committee will review the policy and for changes, please submit to Alicia Aguirre & Dani Behonick.

There was a question of defining what "banking" means, distinguishing from "deletion". Banked courses are inactive courses which doesn't need to be updated. A discussion of the exploring the idea of deleting courses that has been on "banked" status, therefore resulting in updating CORs that have more than six years old.

It was also noted that when updating courses, keep in mind that other programs may also be affected, therefore, you should run the "proposal impact report" in CurricUNET.

Link to the new legislation SB 440 is http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_0401-0450/sb_440_bill_20131010_chaptered.htm

6) Announcements

7) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:36 am.

EXCERPT From
Cañada College Academic Senate Governing Council
Meeting Minutes for
Thursday, November 14, 2013 Room: CIETL (9-154)
2:10 to 4:00 p.m.

Academic Senate Governing Council Members in Attendance: *Doug Hirzel, Anne Nicholls, Sandra Mendez, Denise Erickson, Alicia Aguirre, Leonor Cabrera*
Academic Senate Members in Attendance: *Heather Ott, Anniqua Rana*
Guests in Attendance: *VPI Anderson, Dean Chialin Hsieh, Dean Stringer, Dean Lopez, President Buckley, Claire Shariff*

1. **Call to Order:** *2:15PM*
2. **Introductions:** *None.*
3. **Adoption of Agenda:** *Moved/seconded/approved unanimously*
4. **Approval of Minutes 10/23/13:** *Moved/seconded/approved unanimously.*
5. **Questions/comments on non-agenda items:**

VPI Anderson wanted to thank faculty for the quick follow up on curriculum course updates.

6.1 Curriculum – *Reviewed courses and discussed Course Outline of Record Policy. The plan is to address the recommendation from the accreditation team and implement a policy for courses to be updated in a timely manner. "Faculty will have 1 calendar year to update all courses that will remain active. For example, in January 2014 a list of courses will be generated that must be updated for inclusion in the Fall 2015-Spring 2016 catalog. The Curriculum Handbook Revision Subcommittee and the Bylaws Revision Subcommittee will be created to support these efforts.*

6.2 Prof. Personnel – *No report.*
6.3 Distance Education
6.4 Basic Skills – *Transfer Discipline Parade.*
6.5 ASGC Treasury – *$13569.98*
6.6 Division Reports – *No report.*
7.1   Fall Plenary of ASCCC Report
7.2 Appointment to PBC: Paul Naas, Workforce Rep
7.3 Curriculum Committee Chair Transition Plan
7.4 Adoption of Revised ILOs
7.5 Review of Faculty Selection Procedures
7.6 Improving Program Review
7.7 Resource Allocation Model: Faculty factors
   This agenda item was postponed to a future meeting.
Adjourn: *4:00PM*
Next meeting: *December 12, 2013*

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES OF

Tuesday, November 22, 2013
9:30 am – 11:30 am, Building 2, Room 10

Members Present: Alicia Aguirre, Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Danielle Behonick, Kurt Devlin, Robert Lee, Rafael Rivera, Paul Roscelli, Javier Santos (ASCC), Eli Smith (ASCC), Soraya Sohrabi, Janet Stringer, Diana Tedone, José Peña (Ex-Officio), Gregory Anderson (Ex-Officio).
Members Absent: Maria Lara, Katie Schertle.
 Guests: Linda Hayes, Denise Erickson, David Johnson, Dave Meckler, Paul Naas, Lezlee Ware.

1) Approval of Agenda – Approved
2) Articulation report
3) MODIFICATION OF COURSES

4) DELETION OF COURSES

5) ADDITION OF COURSES

6) MODIFICATION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES AND/OR CERTIFICATE

7) DELETION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES AND/OR CERTIFICATE

8) ADDITION OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES FOR TRANSFER

9) All Divisions – Inactivation of Courses and Modification of affected Programs

10) Course Outline of Record Policy
Committee discussed changes to the draft COR policy. Paul Naas will look at the overall look of the document. Once all changes/additions are made to the document, it will brought for action then submitted to Academic Senate for final approval.

11) Announcements
- **Handbook**

12) Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 10:35 am

Cañada College Academic Senate Governing Council

Meetings of the Governing Council are open to all members of the campus community.

Agenda 12/12/13
2:10pm – 4:00pm
CIETL, Room 9---154

No.	Item/Topic	Presenter	Time	Action/ Procedures/ Discussion/ Information
1	Call to Order	Doug Hirzel	1	Procedure
2	Introductions	Anne Nicholls	2	Procedure
3	Adoption of Agenda	Anne Nicholls	1	Action
4	Approval of Minutes: 11/14/13	Anne Nicholls	2	Action
Public Comment				
5	Questions/comments on non-agenda items	Public	3	Information
Subcommittee & Division Reports				
6.1	District Committees	Doug Hirzel/Anne Nicholls	5	Information
6.2	Curriculum	Alicia Aguirre	2	Information
6.3	Prof. Personnel	Denise Erickson	2	Information
6.4	Division Reports	Division Representatives	1	Information
Senate Business				
7.1	Annual Program Plan Survey http://tinyurl.com/AnnualProgramPlan Inclusion of Release Time in APP	Doug Hirzel	10	Discussion
7.2	Adoption of Distance Ed. Checklist	Jane Rice/Janet Stringer	5	Action
7.3	Endorse COR Review policy	Alicia Aguirre	5	Action
7.4	Prioritization of New Faculty Position Proposals	Doug Hirzel	3	Action
7.5	Resource Allocation Model: Faculty factors	Doug Hirzel	2	Discussion
Other Reports				
8.1	CIETL	Denise Erickson	2	Information
8.2	PBC	Doug Hirzel	2	Information
9	Adjourn	Doug Hirzel	1	Action