

<p>c. ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions</p> <p>d. Venue Changes for Remainder of Fall Quarter CCC Meetings</p> <p>e. Implementation Team for CourseLeaf</p> <p>f. Certificate Creation Workshops</p>	<p>Armerding noted, in agenda email, resolutions which may be of interest to group: 8.01, 9.01, 9.02, 9.03, 9.04, 15.01, 18.01. No questions/comments from group. New draft will be released soon; Armerding will update group if necessary. Plenary is Nov. 1-3.</p> <p>We've been asked to move some upcoming meetings, so that the President's Conference Room may be used for other events. The Oct. 30 meeting will be held in room 3305, and the Nov. 13 & 27 meetings will be held in room 3504.</p> <p>Starer still looking for members from CCC to be involved in CourseLeaf implementation. Please contact him if interested. Kinesiology rep asked for specifics regarding frequency/schedule of meetings—Starer still finishing up initial paperwork with CourseLeaf, so unknown right now.</p> <p>Two upcoming workshop dates, Nov. 6 & 7, for faculty to work on creating certificates; specific times have not yet been set. Will be hands-on, held in computer lab. Bio Health rep asked if specifically for streamlined process—that will be the focus, but also helpful for those interested in learning more about certificate creation.</p>
<p>4. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 68B</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 68B. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>5. Proposed Process to Streamline Certificates of Achievement</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Related to the recent CCCCCO changes to certificates of achievement (discussed at last meeting), proposal is for temporary process to streamline our local approval process of changing an existing non-transcriptable certificate to a certificate of achievement. Armerding noted there will be a sunset deadline for the process, based on the CCCCCO's guidance/deadlines (not yet released). PSME rep asked if process will apply only to the certificates we're now required to submit—CCC will need to decide. Starer noted that process will not be for brand-new certificates. Noted that local approval steps have been streamlined as much as possible, while maintaining the approval steps and documentation mandated by law. Vanatta noted CCC approval step—uses Consent Calendar, with each division providing a report listing all of their proposed certificates. CCC will need to decide what information should be included on reports. Starer is following up regarding Vice Presidents approval step, to determine possible changes to current process.</p> <p>BSS rep asked about sunset deadline and the possibility that process may need to be changed based on the CCCCCO's guidelines—that is a possibility. Armerding asked group if process should also include existing non-transcriptable certificates under 12 units, which would require additional course(s)—yes. Should there be a limit to how many units/courses may be added—group doesn't think so. PSME rep asked if courses potentially being added should be restricted to existing courses—yes. Pennington noted that creation of stackable certificates may mean that courses are removed. Armerding noted that breaking up one certificate into multiple (related to creation of stackable) should follow the old process. PSME rep asked if an individual course may be included in multiple certificates—yes.</p> <p>Document will be updated based on today's discussion. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>

<p>6. Placement Test Language on CORs</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding UC faculty determine requisite(s) for UC-transferable courses, as indicated in UC TCA Guidelines, but UC faculty allow community college faculty to determine how requisite is satisfied (e.g., by a course, by assessment, etc.). Armerding displayed examples of placement test language that Day received from UCs, and asked the group for thoughts. PSME rep noted that a student is unlikely to know what “AB 705” means—group agreed. Day noted that many community colleges are using “or equivalent” along with course number (e.g., “MATH 105 or equivalent”). Counseling rep asked if course titles may be included alongside course numbers to assist students—Vanatta noted the logistical difficulties of this, including the need to manually update a title in each instance, if it changes. CourseLeaf will address this, as a user can hover-over a course number on a requisite and see information about that course. PSME rep commented that “equivalent” is better than “multiple measures,” as students likely don’t know what that means. Group discussion about “equivalent”: good because it can cover many things, including guided placement; could be too vague for students, and “appropriate placement” on its own may be better. Starer noted that if “equivalent” is not used, a student may not know that they may substitute a course taken elsewhere. Counseling rep noted that we’re no longer allowed to use placement tests, and “appropriate placement” may make students think they need to take a test. Armerding suggested adding more detail, including high school GPA and guided self-placement wording. BSS rep asked what’s included in equivalent, other than having taken an actual course—cumulative GPA, evaluation of transcripts; Armerding provided example for English placement, using GPA and transcripts to determine.</p> <p>Day noted inflexibility of C-ID—they have informed colleges that they might not re-approve courses for C-ID, depending on the nature of language changes on requisites. Day noted that “appropriate placement” should pass muster. Starer suggested “as determined by the college’s placement process.” Armerding will draft new language for discussion and possible adoption at next meeting— PSME rep suggested including both vague and specific options to discuss. BSS rep asked if changes would affect how counselors assist students— Counseling rep noted students will still need to see counselors to determine placement; hope is that language could better prompt students to make a counseling appointment. Vanatta noted that language should be universal on CORs across all divisions, not just for English and Math, even though AB 705 is prompting this. Fong noted possible changes to English eligibility Advisory language, due to AB 705—current language is related to student’s eligibility for ENGL 1A, but AB 705 assumes that all students are eligible (some with support). BSS rep asked if Advisory info entered in Banner (i.e., must Advisory specify course number)—it is not, so there is more flexibility with wording than on a prereq/coreq. Counseling rep noted that Advisory statements do help influence conversations with students.</p>
<p>7. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>8. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:09 PM</p>

Attendees: Ben Armerding (Faculty Co-Chair), Jeff Bissell (KA), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Stephanie Chan (guest—LA), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (SRC), Kimberly Escamilla (LA), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Rosa Nguyen (PSME), Simon Pennington (Dean, FA & KA), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Lety Serna (CNSL), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Mary Thomas (LIBR), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta