## System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC)
### October 18, 2012 Meeting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members Present:</th>
<th>ASCCC: Julie Bruno, Cori Burns, Kim Harrell, David Morse, Cynthia Rico-Bravo, Erik Shearer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCCCIO: Randy Lawson, Erica LeBlanc (ACCE Liaison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCCCO: Sally Montemayor Lenz, Barry Russell, Elisa Orosco Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members by phone:</td>
<td>CCCCIO: Leslie Buckalew, Sharon Lowry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members Absent:</td>
<td>CCCCIO: Kim Schenk (CCCAOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
<td>CSSO: Erika Endrijonas (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Reps: James Varble and Kevin Sabo (by phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Chair:</td>
<td>Randy Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Location:</td>
<td>CCCCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Summary from August 30, 2012 Meeting**—The meeting summary from September 27, 2012 was approved as amended.

**Announcements and Updates**—Discussions in Sacramento have centered primarily on the upcoming elections and the ramifications of Prop 30 failing to pass.

**Fall 2012 Conference Updates**

- CCCCIO Fall Conference—October 3 – November 2, The Dana on Mission Bay, San Diego. Randy Lawson will present at the “CIO 411 Academy” on October 30. Robert Deegan will provide the welcome. Topics include transfer and degrees, regulatory trends, accreditation issues, and basic skills.
- ACCE—November 8 at NOCCCD in Anaheim. Scott Lay and Patrick Perry are scheduled to make keynote presentations.
- CCCAOE Fall Conference—October 17 – 19, Long Beach Renaissance Hotel. Eric Skinner’s presentation at the CCCAOE conference included discussions regarding the priority of CTE students versus other students, program discontinuance (should Proposition 30 not pass) for smaller, more expensive CTE programs, and how to make CTE courses part of the GE pattern.
- ASCCC Fall Plenary Session—November 8 – 10, Marriott Hotel, Irvine. The keynote speaker on Thursday is Chancellor Brice Harris. The conference will also feature a panel on governance issues, presented by a panel comprising representatives from the Academic Senate, FACCC, Community College League of California, and one other administration organization (most probably ACCCA or ACBO).
AA-T/AS-T Degree Approvals Status/Update—The current count is 497 approved degrees, and 100% of the colleges have a minimum of two degrees approved. The Chancellor’s Office is testing the approval process.

There is some concern about the marketing phrase “A Degree With A Guarantee” being used by the CSUs because of the potential for misperceptions as to what a guarantee might mean. Also discussed was the situation in which a student only applies to one CSU. Students are guaranteed into the system but not necessarily to the campus they specify. If students do not specify multiple CSUs, they could be at disadvantage because they would be chronologically behind students who did specify multiple campuses. Also if only one campus is specified by a student, the question remains as to whether the student’s application would be forwarded to other CSUs for consideration.

Repeatable Courses (title 5 section 55041)—The Chancellor’s Office has received no feedback from the Department of Finance.

Draft Guidelines for Repeatability Changes—Work on a draft guidelines document has begun, but further development of the guidelines is on hold until the Department of Finance responds to the proposed title 5 changes.

Student Success Task Force Update—Retired CIO Pam Deegan will serve as facilitator for the “Recommendation 4.1 Task Force” which will hold its first meeting on November 29 and 30th. Class scheduling will be a key topic.

Curriculum Inventory, Version 2 (CIV2) Implementation—Revisions to the PCAH are in process. Signature requirements at the local level are being streamlined. Currently, multiple signatures are required. Title 5 requires three levels of signatures (the curriculum committee, a college administrator (typically the college’s CIO or another college representative at that level), and the college’s governing board). For CTE, approval from the appropriate regional consortium is also required. The proposed change is to have colleges decide on how to document course approval (i.e., whether to have a signature page or meeting minutes), but use a radio button or some other means of summarizing the college’s approval process on the Curriculum Inventory. Whether an Academic Senate signature is required would be determined at the local level. Discussion focused mainly on what the signatures of various entities meant (and the implications thereof), but the final consensus was that the governing board has the final signature and certification of that approval would be sufficient. A memo regarding signature page refinements will be issued by the Chancellor’s Office.

Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH)—Changes in the PCAH resulting from CIV2 are in process. There is concern that some terms used in the PCAH have become obsolete. For example, “Certificates of Achievement” are issued to students who choose not to get a degree but to fulfill the CSU GE or IGETC requirements for transfer. This term is still being used by some colleges and the consensus was to keep this language intact.

Changes to the PCAH will be submitted to Consultation Council in November and to the Board of Governors in January.

Stand-Alone Courses—Data Analysis in Preparation for Report to Legislature: Discussion centered on whether the system should request an extension or a new sunset date. Clear definitions of stand-alone courses are needed. All basic skills and noncredit courses are defined as stand-alone, even if the courses are tied to a noncredit certificate of completion or competency.

AA-T/AS-T Degrees—Clarification of C-ID Approval Path: Many local AA-T/AS-T degrees have been approved based upon the colleges’ affirmation that the courses included in their AA-T/AS-T degrees were, in fact, what the colleges claimed them to be. No determination has yet been published regarding
what would happen if, during C-ID or other review, a college’s courses were not found to not match the C-ID. Currently, colleges have the option to submit courses to C-ID to match against the descriptors. Discussion centered on the pros and cons of submitting courses to C-ID for review (e.g., unintended effects on UC agreements and the length of time it takes for C-ID reviews). SACC’s role is to document and clarify the process.

**Auditing and/or Combining Credit/Community Services Classes**—Based on feedback from the field, colleges want the option to allow students to audit credit classes, especially among the performing arts and CTE disciplines. Colleges seeking to exercise this option by Fall 2013, when the repeatability guidelines are in place will have to abide by the $15/unit limit currently imposed by the Education Code, in which the language would need to be updated or, preferably removed. To accomplish the changes to the Education Code, a legislator will need to carry a bill forward.

The audit fee language needs to be changed to “no lower than the enrollment fee” (or proportionally greater than the unit fees charged for a course). Other language needs to be crafted to ensure that credit students will not be displaced by students wishing to audit a class.

The action plan for SACC is to make recommendations to take to the legislature.

**Next Meeting Date**—December 7, 2012 (changed from November 29)