## Call to Order

## Approval of Minutes

### October 30, 2013

### New Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 - 167</td>
<td>NUR 285</td>
<td>Professional Nursing Career Development</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>C. Lynch</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 169</td>
<td>MAT 101</td>
<td>Quantitative Literacy</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>C. Harris</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 170</td>
<td>MAT 102</td>
<td>Liberal Arts Mathematics</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>C. Harris</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 171</td>
<td>C249V</td>
<td>Engineering Technology/Mechatronics Degree</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>A. Blaylock/A. Sharris</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 172</td>
<td>ENT 207</td>
<td>Robotics II</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>A. Blaylock/A. Sharris</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 173</td>
<td>C249V</td>
<td>Temporary Approved Programs to Permanent/Discontinue Status</td>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>C. Antonich/S. Campos</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other:

- A) New Curriculum Development Plan – C. Antonich/Deans
- B) Program/Course Effective Dates – S. Campos

### Distribution:

Academic Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairpersons/Coordinators, College Curriculum Committee, Agendees and the President

### Printed:

10/25/2013
CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

S. Campos called the meeting to order at 2:44 p.m.

Members present: (voting) S. Campos, L. Carvajal, C. Antonich (for D. Olson), B. Decker, C. Harris, M. Flaherty, C. Lynch, J.B. Halpin, R. Connor, A. Turner, R. Segovia and S. Hughes

Members absent: (voting) B. Griffin, S. Martella, M. Moore, C. Nicholson, L. Wester and D. Davenport


Resource Members absent: S. Tiwari, S. Zachariah and D. Baness- King (non-voting)

Agendee(s): P. Jaswilko, C. Antonich, M.A. Tobin, A. Turner and C. Harris

Visitor(s): G. Guzman

APPROVAL OF COLLEGE CURRICULUM MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of September 5, 2013, passed unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Course/Curr Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None

NEW BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Course/Curr Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-165 NUR095</td>
<td>Strat for NCLEX Success rev crs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-166 NUR 105</td>
<td>Int to Nursing Academics rev crs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-167 NUR 285</td>
<td>Prof Nursing Career Dev rev crs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-168 NUR 290</td>
<td>Leadership in the Mngmt of Patient Care rev crs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Lynch reviewed changes to the above Nursing courses to conform to the updated course outlines and standards. NUR 105 is a recommended prerequisite in the Nursing program. The textbook citing needs to be corrected for NUR 105. NUR 095 is taken for remediation whereas, if the student does not pass the State Boards. NUR 095 can be repeated once, for a total of two times. N. DeMayo asked if student pursue the LPN certificate and take NUR 095 twice, are they allowed to
repeat again if they pursue the RN degree. S. Campos replied that they can repeat NUR 190 once, which is noted in the course description. M.A. Tobin asked if and/or one time should be listed in the prerequisite for clarity as no resolution was made at the Agenda Planning meeting. N. DeMayo added we would receive additional State reimbursement if the number of times the course is repeatable is raised. S. Misasi Maratto noted that a course can be repeated for a maximum of three times, per the ICCB. S. Hughes said the repeatability is stated clearly in the syllabus and program description and said that the number of repeats should be increased from one to three. S. Misasi Maratto added that a rationale is needed to change repeatability, per the ICCB. M.A. Tobin noted that the prerequisite is different on the course proposal and course outline. The course proposal will be revised to reflect the prerequisite on the course outline. NUR 290 was revised to align with the new format. S. Campos stated that the objectives are not listed as one-to-one with the course topics. The clinical hours are being revised from 3 to 1. S. Campos noted that the Nursing department calculate their clinical hours by using a 45 contact hours to one clinical credit, which differs from how the Allied Health programs, such as Nuclear Medicine program calculate their clinical hours, which is one clinical hour for every 0-149 contact hours and one credit for every 75 hours after one credit. In Nuclear Medicine the students work with the technologists and S. Campos (chairperson) visits periodically, which differs from Nursing, where the college faculty work with the students on a one-to-one ratio at the hospital sites. The Nursing program differs in their requirements and due to shortage of available clinical sites they are able to use simulators on campus, which are considered clinical instruction and are counted the same as a clinical site. There is no regular lab time. C. Antonich added that the ICCB distinguishes between supervised and indirect supervision and she concurs with the formula, as long as it follows the ICCB guidelines. S. Hughes noted that NUR 290 is one of the easier courses that include a clinical component. N. DeMayo noted that NUR 290 is not included in the LPN program and should be removed from the Course Proposal and LPN and RN program will be added to NUR 095 Course Proposal. S. Campos suggested putting NUR 095 on the current course outline form. C. Antonich thought that the ‘Curriculum affected by’ field on the Course Proposal meant the credit hours the program was affected for programs other than the main program. S. Misasi Maratto replied that all programs the course is attached to should be listed, not only additional programs, as those programs would need to also be revised if a prefix, course number or credit changes or if the course is withdrawn or new and needs to be added. C317D will be added as program effected for NUR 105. S. Misasi Maratto noted that a course can be made repeatable with the State and would need to add that in the course description, including how many times the student is allowed to repeat. N. DeMayo read the repeatability for NUR 290 listed in the program description, which states the student can repeat twice and only receive credit once. C. Lynch added that the minimum grade allowed in Nursing is a ‘C’ or better. S. Campos asked why NUR 105 the repeatable number was changed from 0 to 1 and S. Hughes replied for better clarity for students. J.B. Halpin suggested using another term for repeatable, as there are two different meanings, number for times repeatable for State apportionment and the number of times repeatable for credit. C. Antonich noted that it is clear for the Nursing program, as the Nursing faculty and the students are aware. The definition of ‘repeating a course’ was read from the Catalog. S. Misasi Maratto stated there is a prescribed definition of repeatability in the ICCB Program Approval and Administrative Rules Manuals. S. Hughes stated that NUR 290 will not be listed as repeatable, so the Course Proposal will be adjusted.

Motion to approve item numbers 13-165, 13-166 and 13-168, passed unanimously by voice vote with suggested revisions.
OTHER:  

A) **AA/AS/AAT Degree Review – C. Antonich**

S. Campos noted that the shells in BlackBoard are formed for the AA/AS/AAS degree review committees, but the AAS Committee has not yet begun. M. Flaherty stated they are moving along. He sent out a note to all experts that were on the AA/AS Committee last time. They are looking at accrediting agency requirements. M. Flaherty stated he works regularly with students who transfer in and out of State and does not see any major problems. C. Antonich saw his email and appreciates the effort and requested the committee to work diligently and look at differently as significant things occur across the United States. We need to look at what happens at the federal and state level and what ICCB requires. She asked that the committees to review the degrees in depth, as there is a lot of information out there, e.g. the common core standards and how they feed in to the degrees. Not all students transfer, as some AAS Degree students go out into the work force and some students transfer. She encouraged the Committees to be broadminded, critically look at the degrees and not race through the review. The degrees should be situated for current and future students. M. Flaherty stated that no one has ever accused them of rushing through anything and added that he is a little apprehensive of what people are saying about things that are going to happen, as administration comes and goes and when a new president (U.S.) is elected in a few years things can change again. He added that they look at everything that people bring forward. Last time some people tried to make a case, as everyone gave the impression that their area is more important than the next. He would be willing to look at all suggestions.

B) **Temporary Program Approval to Permanent or Discontinue Program (require CCC approval?) – C. Antonich**

C. Antonich recently reviewed a certificate that received ‘temporary approval’. It was a great certificate, but no enrollment and the dean needs to determine whether or not to seek ‘permanent’ approval with no enrollment. S. Campos asked if the coordinator and dean should look at and decide. C. Antonich inquired if we should consider bringing back to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC) for a vote on whether or not to seek ‘permanent approval’ or ‘discontinue’ the program. When ICCB awards ‘temporary approval’, the program must be brought back to ICCB for either ‘permanent approval’ or to ‘discontinue’ the program, along with a rationale for the decision made. Should the CCC be involved? J.B. Halpin replied that the CCC initially approved the program and should come back to the CCC for final approval. C. Antonich stated that not everyone thinks it should and the reason she would like to discuss today, as she is seeking input from the CCC members, as this needs to be addressed. S. Campos questioned the time frame from ‘temporary approval’ to ‘permanent approval’. S. Misasi Maratto replied that a program can be on ‘temporary approval’ for three years, which she tracks because the ICCB no longer notifies the schools. M.A. Tobin added that we need to create a process to review in two years and the third bring back to ICCB. J.B. Halpin added that two years is short in her opinion and asked if Research would have information, as to how long it takes for a program to grow. S. Campos asked if
it is high demand the reason why a certificate is developed for "temporary approval". M.A. Tobin replied that "temporary approval" is designed for quick turnaround time and to trial a new program. If developing a viable program, a Form 20 would be used, as there is not much more work to complete than a Form 20T. C. Antonich suggested keeping in mind what is the purpose of the certificate and why create it if there is no interest. Some companies may request a particular certificate. P. Jensen added that he completed a Form 20T for the Facilities Engineering Technology (FET) program and will now need to complete a Form 20. S. Campos asked why not complete a Form 20 at the start. C. Antonich stated that a Form 20T is allowable by the ICCB. P. Jensen stated that either form would have been fine. M.A. Tobin stated that a "temporary approval" is really double work and concurs with C. Antonich and J.B. Halpin that the "temporary approval" should be brought back to the CCC to discuss as an action item. S. Misasi Maratto added that a Form 20T is used for a quick turnaround approval at the ICCB level. P. Jensen stated that if a Form 20T is a fit for the degree, then the department should move forward. S. Campos inquired if the "temporary approved" should be brought back to the CCC. S. Misasi Maratto stated this would require a vote as an action item. S. Campos stated that the "temporary approval" will come back to CCC at the October 30th meeting to be voted on.

S. Campos noted that many member of the CCC will be attending the DVR meeting on October 31st and would need to move the October 31, 2013 meeting to Wednesday, October 30, 2013.

C) Updated IAI & Program Approval Manuals – M. A. Tobin
M.A. Tobin stated that the IAI and the ICCB Program Approval Manuals have been updated and are now available by accessing links in BlackBoard shell. The CCC Handbook will reflect these changes soon.

D) Credit Hour Determination Chart – C. Harris
C. Harris noted that she has developed a formula for determining the credit hour and inquired what the next step is. She is unclear regarding the break policy and asked if there is anything in writing and can each department develop their own. C. Antonich responded there is nothing in writing, but past practice is a 10 minute break. Some instructors do give 15 minutes, but they are supposed to be 10 minute breaks. C. Harris asked if the break is incorporated into the class, even if it is a 5-minute break. There needs to be a minimum of 50 minutes of instructional hour and add whatever the break is to the time. M. Flaherty replied that would not be a good idea because of room scheduling, which is set for most classes to include breaks and would not be good if a break is longer than 15 minutes. C. Harris stated a 50-minute class does not have a break. M. Flaherty added that would cause havoc on campus if every area has different set break times. C. Harris suggested a built-in 15 minute break for a 3-hour course. C. Antonich stated that there is a 10-minute break after the first hour and one half. R. Segovia added that another break is taken an additional hour of instruction. C. Harris stated there should be a formula and asked where she might find it. The Math department has a policy. C. Antonich replied that E. O'Connell previously worked on a break schedule
with a committee to develop guidelines for one-, two-, three- and four-credit hour courses, which was presented at Academic Senate. M. Flaherty stated for longer classes, breaks are built in and gave example of his night classes that go to 9:45 p.m. with one 15-minute break. C. Harris asked for input on how to proceed. C. Antonich stated that G. Guzman presented both formulas in an Excel Calculator and a decision needs to be made. G. Guzman stated that 50 minutes of education equals one hour, which is what the Credit Hour Calculator uses. C. Antonich added and also what the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) uses. S. Campos thought the Calculator was going to be linked to a course as a guide. C. Harris wants a formula. J.B. Halpin suggested adding to the October 30th packet for discussion and come up with a solution. C. Harris will forward her calculations to S. Misasi Maratto. G. Guzman will assist C. Harris and send her the Calculator in Excel format.

E) Corequisites and Prerequisites for Registration – A. Turner

A. Turner requested that the corequisites and prerequisites issue for registration be addressed. C. Antonich stated there was a problem with students in classes that should have taken prerequisites first and this is a major issue, as we cannot have that many students in courses that need prerequisites. A. Turner stated that NUR 145 has a corequisite of BIS 137 and they try to encourage students to register on the WEB. Team members don’t have access to override on the WEB. S. Hughes stated that BIS 137 is a prerequisite for NUR 145 and there is a new problem now, as new students are admitted twice a year. C. Antonich clarified that an override is different than waiving a prerequisite and there needs to be justification to waive a prerequisite. A. Turner stated that we need to clean up and we were forced to waive some prerequisites, as Colleague may see differently. Another area is to look at is Science. S. Misasi Maratto read the prerequisite for NUR 145 and noted that a semicolon and comma differ greatly within a prerequisite, as they are grouped differently for each and added that the Pseudo Course listing is a work in progress, as all courses with a non-course prerequisite will need to have a pseudo course for Colleague to recognize and allow students to register on the WEB. An updated list of the Pseudo Courses will be put on the WEB.

Adjournment: S. Campos adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Submitted by: S. Campos, Chairperson

Susan Misasi Maratto: Recording Secretary