

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

J. Murphy called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

**Members present:** (voting) J. Murphy, C. Antonich (for D. Baker), S. Campos, K. Li, A. Turner, C. Nicholson, M. Flaherty, J. Cody, L. Koslow, L. Wester and W. Justiz

**Members absent:** (voting) H. Bohleke, G. Jablonski, W. Griffin and B. Zak

**Resource Members present:** S. Misasi Maratto  
 (non-voting)

**Resource Members absent:** ----  
 (non-voting)

**Agendee(s):** F. Alvino, D. Smith-Gaborit, S. Campos, M. Flaherty, G. Catena, G. Jablonski, G. Guzman, M. DiGangi

**Visitor(s):** Stu Sikora

**APPROVAL OF COLLEGE CURRICULUM MINUTES**

*Motion to approve the minutes of March 1, 2017, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Course/Curr No.</u>		<u>Proposals</u>	<u>Readings</u>			<u>Action Taken</u>
				<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	
		HIA/Hotel/Motel					
18-25	C206H	Management	rev curr	X			tabled
18-26	C206L	Culinary Arts Degree	rev curr	X			tabled
18-27	C206M	Baking and Pastry Deg	rev curr	X			tabled

J. Murphy stated that item numbers 18-25 through 18-27 are tabled to the May 3, 2018 meeting due to no representation.

M. Flaherty intended to ask why Social and Behavioral Science was selected for the HIA programs and noted the importance of having representation at the Curriculum Committee meetings. J. Murphy replied that she had sent an email, but did not receive a response.

**18-28 C451A Eye Care Assistant inactivate curr X approved**

S. Campos stated that the Eye Care Assistant program is now being inactivated due to no enrollment and it is now offered in Continuing Education. The withdrawal for this program will be submitted at the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, along with the Study Committee's recommendation.

*Motion to approve item number 18-28, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

**18-29 U224A21 English and Rhetoric rev curr X approved**

M. Flaherty noted that the changes made to the English and Rhetoric emphasis are to accommodate the reduction of the A.A. Degree from 64 to 60 credits. He noted for clarification that these changes do not reflect the pathway at this time, only the reduction in credits.

*Motion to approve item number 18-29, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

**Criminal Justice**

**18-30 U224A43 Administration-AA Deg rev curr X tabled**

J. Murphy stated that item number 18-30 is tabled to the May 3, 2018 meeting due to no representation.

J. Cody questioned if there are no questions or concerns, do we really need to table an item for no representation? C. Antonich suggested checking the by-laws in the College Curriculum Committee Handbook. M. Flaherty concurred with C. Antonich that if submitters know there is no contention, they would not attend the meeting and it would then become the norm, which would slow down this process, especially when there are questions that need to be addressed with no representation. He had intended to ask questions regarding the Culinary Arts submission, which could not be addressed due to no representation. W. Justiz asked, if there are no questions, then why pull the submission(s), as the question(s) could have been addressed in the TRC. J. Murphy stated that the tabled items will on the agenda for the May meeting. S. Campos added that with no representation, we would then have a backlog at the May meeting. J. Murphy questioned if there are no questions, could they vote on the item without having representation. C. Antonich replied that if a vote is allowed without representation today, that would set a precedence and reiterated to review the by-laws of the in the College Curriculum Committee Handbook. M. Flaherty stated that the deans usually are in attendance to address a question, but were not today. S. Campos stated that there are two readings for the submission, which the TRC is the first and the College Curriculum meeting is the second and the Curriculum Handbook does say that a representative or proxy should be in attendance, but we may need to rethink representation in the future. M. Flaherty raised a concern that if there is again no representation at the May meeting, and if there were no questions, he would be ok with voting. S. Campos stated that in prior circumstances, if there was an issue, an online vote was conducted. M. Flaherty noted that those were special circumstances and any representative (proxy) could attend to address possible questions. C. Antonich suggested adding this topic as an agenda item and then update the CCC Handbook. **Representation at the College Curriculum Committee will be added to the May 3<sup>rd</sup> agenda.**

**Computer Science**

**18-31 U230A11 (Information Systems) rev curr X approved**

**Computer Science**

**18-32 U230A12 (Technical) rev curr X approved**

**18-33 U230A27 Mathematics rev curr X approved**

**Pre-Professional/**

**18-34 U230A30 Pre-Engineering rev curr X approved**

J. Murphy noted that F. Alvino is present to represent item numbers 18-31 and 18-32, which CIS 195 is being deleted from those programs, as it is being deleted and will be presented at the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. W. Justiz questioned if CIS 195 is withdrawn from these programs, does it not need to be attached to a program, per the ICCB. S. Misasi Maratto replied that both Computer Science items are AS Degree emphases and do not go to the ICCB, only CIS 195 will be submitted for withdrawal.

F. Alvino stated that CIS 121 and CIS 195 were duplication of content, therefore, CIS 195 is being withdrawn, as CIS 121 is an approved IAI course. CIS 121 is replacing CIS 195 in U230A30. K. Li questioned if CIS 121 is being added as an additional IAI course and F. Alvino replied that it is being replaced. J. Murphy stated for clarification that CIS 195 was removed from item numbers 18-31 and 18-32 and CIS 195 has been replaced with CIS 121 in item numbers 18-33 and 1834.

*Motion to approve item numbers 18-31 through 18-34, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

<b>18-35</b>	<b>C247J</b>	<b>Honda/Acura (PACT) Deg new curr</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>approved</b>
<b>18-36</b>	<b>C347J</b>	<b>Honda/Acura (PACT Cert new curr</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>approved</b>

J. Murphy noted that these two new programs total 72 credits for the degree and 58 credits for the certificate. Concerns were raised regarding the additional credit hours and the rationale above 60 for the degree and 30 for the certificate. The maximum number of credits for a degree according to the ICCB is 60, but can have additional credits if providing a strong rationale. S. Sikora stated that M. DiGangi contacted ICCB regarding this issue. M. DiGangi supported the rationale, which is to accommodate NATEF standards that are above 60 credits. These credits are not more than the required ICCB AAS Degree requirement of 60-72 and if the numbers exceeded the maximum number allowed, there would be an issue. The new Honda program is mirrored off of the parent program, C247D, Automotive Technology, which is 67 credits. He sent the ICCB the submission, which T. Broughton reviewed and noted that the credits for parent program need to be higher than the extension program, so the parent program will be switched to C247C, Automotive: General Motors/AC Delco ASEP, which is 72 credits. This is not an issue, as they both have the same core courses. The automotive coop course requirement is above and beyond those required by NATEF, depending on the business(es) they are partnered with for a total of 1240 contact hours and the total required contact hours for NATEF is 1200. M. DiGangi has copies of correspondence with ICCB. AUT 299 is being adding to C247C, (GM) AUT, which will bring the total credits to use as the parent program that will be used for both the new degree and certificate, which Honda has requested. He was asked in the TRC why there is a PED class added in the fourth semester, which he responded to ensure the students would be eligible to receive Financial Aid if they have a minimum of twelve credits. S. Camos questioned if the internships are 1220 clinical hours. M. DiGangi replied that he would like that changed, as clinical refers to patients, and this is a coop. M. DiGangi stated that the 1440 contact hours at the dealership are above and beyond the required 1200 NATEF hours. J. Murphy asked the certificate is 1240 total seat time, plus 640 more at the dealerships. **M. DiGangi noted that TEC 122 should read MAT 122.** C. Antonich added that we are aware that internships are not clinical but ICCB uses that terminology to calculate hours. S. Campos asked who is supervising the students, as in Nursing they are different. M. DiGangi replied there are persons in the shop with the students all under the same umbrella. T. Broughton was the contact person M. DiGangi communicated with at ICCB. C. Antonich stated for clarification that the ICCB recognizes that some degrees may exceed 60 credits, and they require a strong rationale as to why the program is higher than 60 because they will need to explain this to their Board. We are not saying there can't be 72 credit hours. M. DiGangi questioned why would this need to be verified if the parent program was approved at 72 credits. C. Antonich replied they have to go to their Board with a viable rationale as to why the program the new program is over 60 credits, and we are aware that in career and technology, program are sometimes above 60 credits, but will require justification. The concern was if you had enough or too many hours for NATEF. C. Antonich asked if the internship hours part of the core courses. M. DiGangi replied they are not, they are outside of the core courses, which corresponds with paperwork from NATEF. C. Antonich stated that when we looked at the breakdown of hours it appeared they were part of the core, and she added that the goal is to get these programs approved and sent to ICCB even if an additional CCC meeting is needed. M. DiGangi stated that he did the Math as 1 coop for 2 credits for 16 weeks, which is 20 hours per week for 16 weeks totals 320

hours, which is the minimum, with many students working longer. The second two coops are only one credit hour is only 160 hours at dealership for 16 weeks at four hours a day. Students will put in above and beyond those hours. J. Murphy stated that for all curriculum, the State has recommended that we get to 60 hour total and if above those hours, a strong rationale is required. **M. DiGangi will provide additional documentation for rationale.** J. Murphy requested from the deans to provide the rationales up front. The main concern was what is the actual seat time compared to what is required by NATEF and if this was submitted up front there would not be additional questions. J. Cody stated that was mentioned in the rationale. J. Murphy stated there was no mention of the accrediting body and what the actual curriculum hours were. She added that all programs should be reviewed to see if the calculated seat time meets the standards of the accrediting bodies. M. DiGangi calculated the Math and LHEs in program. J. Murphy noted that labs are 2 to 1 lecture. C. Antonich stated that is why the hours were being questioned, as it did not seem like the calculations were correct. S. Campos noted that 30 contact hours of lab is equal to 1 lab credit. M. Flaherty questioned where this formula originated. C. Antonich replied this is the ICCB's requirement. J. Cody stated that the computations from the State have changed. S. Campos stated that the ICCB will defer to the college to decide how to handle coop / practicum, etc. S. Campos noted that a lab is held on campus. M DiGangi stated that for 40 years it was left up to college and they were not paid correctly. S. Campos noted that the labs have been in existence forever and how it was calculated at the dealership hours were as internships. M. DiGangi added they were paid more for lecture than for lab. A. Turner noted that students do not need to be a full-time student can receive financial aid for full or part time. L. Wester questioned if AUT 136 prerequisite is AUT 112 and AUT 127, and for AUT 240 the prerequisite is AUT 127. M. DiGangi stated that would need to be changed. AUT 136 prerequisite was AUT 112, 240 and will need to be changed for the Honda program. J. Murphy asked if they are confident of the 1240 hours for the certificate. M. DiGangi noted that NATEF hours are clock hours, which is actual time spent in the lab and their board has accepted our requirements for 20 years. C. Antonich noted that outside entities do not override the ICCB's requirements.

*Motion to approve item numbers 18-35 and 18-36, passed unanimously by voice vote.*

M. Flaherty questioned that if all AA Degree emphases are not brought down to 60 credits, does the reduced hours for the AA Degree not begin in Fall. K. Li will send another reminder to those that are still outstanding. S. Misasi Maratto replied that the AA Degree was submitted to ICCB to lower from 64 to 60 credits. The emphases are not submitted to ICCB, but they do need to emulate the degree's new 60 credit hour requirement, which would have an impact on degree audit. A. Turner added that would also impact the IPR report. J. Murphy stated that the changes needed do not require a lot of time to complete and she is available for assistance. L. Wester questioned if the AFA Degree is also being submitted. K. Li is still waiting for the submission of the AFA in Music. M. Flaherty noted that this is not the revisions for the pathway at this time, only the reduction in total credits.

**OTHER: A.) Draft of New Policy by ASSC – K. Li**

K. Li stated that the ASSC Committee has asked this Committee to be aware the ASSC proposing and alignment, which will impact curriculum. What the ASSC Committee is working on is a policy that will require consecutive enrollment with the reason that student success policy when students take a break between sequence courses, e.g. MAT or RHT, etc. They are looking at other community colleges, which all have rules. We are looking at how this policy may differ for CTE courses and will bring concerns to this Committee to see if we foresee any problems. L. Wester asked for clarification if there will be mandatory enrollment in their first semester or whenever the student begins the sequence. K. Li replied in their first term will be mandatory placement. J.

Murphy asked if this is for Math and Rhetoric. K. Li replied yes and Reading. J. Murphy noted that we would need to look at our curriculum to see if it would be impacted in any way. M. Flaherty stated this is not to prevent someone from taking courses, but to take required courses at same time, which is one reason to put RHT 101 early in your programs to ensure that they cannot take both if the student tests below in their third or fourth semester. K. Li sent research a request to see if students are enrolled in sequential courses. We do not intend to have students segregated in a developmental education lab forever. C. Antonich asked if this will be discussed at Academic Senate. K. Li replied that it will. A. Turner asked if more research being conducted regarding Math placement levels. K. Li wants to ensure that the change is being made to promote student success and that some programs may not adhere to this. A. Turner stated as we look to put this in place for student success we need to make sure that the institution provides those courses the students are required to take. K. Li concurred with A. Turner and added there will need to be a substantial change. C. Antonich asked if there is representation from Career and Tech on the ASSC Committee. K. Li replied that D. Anderson is representing that area. C. Antonich asked how the communication is getting to the Career and Tech faculty. M. Flaherty replied that B. Cliffler brought to Academic Senate and does not see this being voted on in May. C. Antonich stated that the Career and Tech faculty don't always get the information and noted that Communication was one of our challenges noted by the HLC. It is important that CTE faculty are aware. M. Flaherty noted that H. Bohleke is also on the ASSC Committee.

**Adjournment:** J. Murphy adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

**Submitted by:** J. Murphy, Chairperson

**Susan Misasi Maratto:** Recording Secretary