**Minutes**

**Present**

Franchesca Amezola, Marcy Davidson (for N. Marsh), Kristine Hodges (for L. Dobusch), Cynthia Elliott, Toni Ensz, John Fitzer, Richardson Fleuridor, Kate Fourchy, Nancy Frampton, Pam Gilmore, Doug Gong, David Richey, Melanie Sanwo, Michael van Wyhe, Sheryl Young-Manning

**Absent**

Ashley Calhoun, David Clark, Michael Cole, Lore Dobusch, Kelly Fowler, Kent Kinney, ASG Representative

**Visitors**

Brian Fonseca, Lori Morton

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 3:15 p.m.

**2. ROLL**

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF April 25, 2013**

 Minutes approved with corrections.

**4. INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

**5. PRE-ECPC UPDATE**

 **A. FCC modification of Prerequisite Waiver Process**

 **B. RC English 2 / FCC English 40 (unique/common)**

 **C. Math 201/101 recommendation**

FCC will be recommending changes to the AR for the prerequisite waiver process.

 English 2 is in-lieu with FCC’s English 40, this was agreed to by both department chairs.

 At Pre-ECPC there was a recommendation that the content of Math 201 be allowed to meet the math competency requirement for students with catalog rights and those students would have to take additional five units to reach number of units required for degree.

 In 2009 the graduation requirements for math competency changed from Math 101 to Math 103 or higher and in fall 2012 Math 101 became Math 201 changing from a degree-applicable course to a non-degree applicable course.

 Michael van Wyhe asked what authorizes the college to allow a non-degree applicable course to fulfill a competency requirement.

**6. HIGH SCHOOL ARTICULATION (*Lori Morton, guest*)**

 **A. 2+2 Career Technical Education**

 **B. High School Articulation of General Education Courses**

 **C. High School Articulation of Transferable Courses**

Pam Gilmore recommended there be three categories of high school articulation 2+2 CTE, high school course articulation for general education, and high school course articulation for degree-applicable transferable courses.

 Lori Morton asked how are CTE and non-CTE courses differentiated?

 Pam Gilmore explained that courses within the district can be common and articulation of a high school course for one college applies to all the colleges in the district.

 Michael van Wyhe said since Title 5 specifically addresses general education courses the course articulation of the different types of courses should be kept separate.

 John Fitzer explained that historically 2+2 articulation applied to CTE courses.

 Lori Morton explained that occu-track applies to the teacher not the course. A teacher meeting minimum qualifications can apply for occu-track approval if there is a course that has 2+2 approval. Students taking a 2+2 course with an instructor who is occu-track approved is enrolled in the college course and receives college credit.

 Lori Morton said FSU has unitrack courses and has agreements for the three courses (PE 20, HLTH 2, EDUC 10) in question. There is no cost to students if taking 2+2 approved course through the college and if students go to FSU there is a $40 cost for unitrack courses.

 Lore Morton said the discipline faculty is to make the decision not the curriculum committee. She suggested establishing a requirement that if a student comes to the A&R office with a 2+2 certificate and the grade earned is a certain grade or higher, then the letter grade be included on the transcript.

 Michael van Wyhe said the curriculum committee is given authority by the Academic Senate on curriculum matters. New processes need authority from Academic Senate. He suggested that the committee provide direction to the Academic Senate on what is needed for the Academic Senate to provide direction to the curriculum committee via a resolution.

 Michael van Wyhe explained that when 2+2 articulation was implemented the college chose the current process of not giving credit until the student had met minimum requirements established by the college.

 Lori Morton said other colleges have eliminated the requirements.

 Kate Fourchy asked if other colleges don’t care about minimum qualifications for courses they articulate

 Kristine Hodges asked if the other colleges have a credit by exam process in place.

 Lori Morton said that some colleges do have a process in place.

 John Fitzer said the AR would have to be modified to allow articulated courses to be taken by credit by exam.

 Lori Morton said that credit by exam can be identified in different ways such as project, assessment for college credit by faculty, or by final exam. The concern is to allow students to complete college coursework while still in high school.

 Toni Ensz said it was difficult for her, as a high school instructor, to work with College instructors.  She felt, as a high school instructor, that she didn’t have credibility in the eyes of the college instructors.  There are some very qualified high school instructors that are capable of teaching a class to articulate with some of our classes, and it is in the best interest of our potential students to begin conversations with the high school instructors.

 Marcy Davidson said some of the 2+2 teachers require the 45 hour observation and some don’t. The Child Development faculty are working with those instructors.

 Michael van Wyhe said he agrees that we want high students to be recognized for their accomplishments and we want to encourage them to continue which works well for CTE. Now there are different types of courses being applied for and we need a process which includes credit by exam. Not all courses are open to credit by exam and only faculty can agree to which courses can be taken using the credit by exam process. There is a need for a credit by exam process for college courses and one for articulated high school courses.

 Pam Gilmore asked if we can take care of this now or have to wait until next semester.

 Marcy Davidson said she prefers that we don’t wait until next semester as students would have to wait a full year.

 John Fitzer said a process has to be regularized.

 Kate Fourchy asked if there is a downside to approving the courses.

 Michael van Wyhe stated that there is no process in place.

 Can we consider approval for a shorter period of time, one year and make it incumbent on the curriculum committee and Academic Senate to develop a process?

 Lori Morton said one year is not long enough and asked what additional steps would be needed for non-CTE courses?

 Michael van Wyhe said input from other instructors, and the careful, philosophical examination of what types of courses we would want to articulate with high schools.

 Kristine Hodges said careful consideration needs to be given to courses intended for IGETC or CSU-GE.

 Pam Gilmore said we don’t want to put up roadblocks, we want to protect students, and we don’t want to promise something that cannot be done.

 Richardson Fleuridor summed up that we need a process to ensure that the course standards are met, a time period be implemented until a procedure is in place.

**7. REVISIT CURRENT HIGH SCHOOL ARTICULATION AGREEMENT RENEWALS**

 **A. Health 2**

 **B. Physical Education 20**

 **C. Education 10**

 Approved Education 10 2+2 articulation renewal for additional two years and only with approved occu-tracked teachers.

 Approved Physical Education 20 2+2 articulation renewal for additional two years and only with approved occu-tracked

 teachers.

 Health 2 2+2 articulation renewal not renewed. Course has been modified and will need to be applied for after the course has been approved by the Board of Trustees.

**8. CURRICULUM CHAIR ATTENDANCE AT ECPC ON MAY 14**

Pam Gilmore will not attend the ECPC meeting due to her comprehensive final being given at the same time.

 Sheryl Young-Manning has agreed to attend in her place.

 The district was unwilling to change the time because the presidents were unavailable at different times.

9. ADJOURNMENT

 Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.