Present: Joseph Bielanski, Nancy Cayton, Ari Krupnick, Mary Clarke-Miller, Vinh Phan, Heather Sisneros, Laura Bollentino, Iolani Sodhy-Gereben, Pinar Alscher, Rudolph Besikof, Peter Crabtree, Nghiem Thai, LaShaune Fitch, Steve Pantell, Siri Brown, Amany Elmasry, Ana McClanahan, Kuni Hay

Absent: Drew Burgess, Phillippa Calderia, Jason Cifra, Lisa Cook, Karen Croley, Francisco Gamez, David M. Johnson, Don Miller, Donald Moore, Rochelle Olive, Mario Rivas, Lynn Torres

Co-Chairs: Heather Sisneros and Siri Brown

Guests: None

Note taker: Nancy Cayton

Next Meeting: 3/4/2019, District Board Room

| **Topic** | **Discussion** | **Follow-up Action & Recommendations** | **Responsible Party** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Called to OrderReview of AgendaReview of Minutes | 1:07 pmThe 2/4/19 agenda was approved by consensus.**Minutes from 12/10/18 in Dropbox**The 12/10/18 meeting minutes were approved by consensus.  |  | A. Elmasry |  |

| **Topic** | **Discussion** | **Follow-up Action & Recommendations** | **Responsible Party** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CURRICULUM ITEMS:Berkeley City College | *Approved by consensus:*Course Update (12)Course Correction (1) | Send approved proposals to the Board. | A. Elmasry |  |
| CURRICULUM ITEMS:College of Alameda | *Approved by consensus:*New Course (1) | Send approved proposals to the Board | A. Elmasry |  |
| CURRICULUM ITEMS: Laney College | *Approved by consensus:*New Course (3)\*Course Update (8)Course Deactivation (2)New Program (1)Program Correction (1) Program Modification (2)\*(1) It was noted that WELD 204A and 204C had the same course description, but 204B had a different description. As a result, 204C was approved conditionally requiring that the welding faculty confirm if they intended for the descriptions to be the same. Any changes to the description would have to be provided to A. Elmasry by 2/5/19 to be included with the items going to the 3/4 Board of Trustees agenda. (2) It was noted that WELD 211A, B, & C had a non-standard format for the course descriptions and thus recommended these be reviewed and changed. | Send approved proposals to the Board | A. Elmasry |  |

| **Topic** | **Discussion** | **Follow-up Action & Recommendations** | **Responsible Party** | **Timeline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CURRICULUM ITEMS:Merritt College | *Approved by consensus:*New Course (1) Course Reactivation (1)Course Modifications (3)Course Update—Informational (2)Course Deactivation (3)New Program (3)Program Modification (2) | Send approved proposals to the Board. | A. Elmasry |  |
| Study Abroad ProgramDrew Gephart, International Services Manager | Presentation to inform the committee about the Study Abroad program. This included a review of the courses/ trips since 2015, the types of courses and modes of providing instruction, a review of the process for approval of a study abroad course, and a listing of services the Office of International Education provides to the faculty, campus, and students. International Education is also requesting assistance to find a way to allow study abroad students to enroll significantly earlier than students normally would.  |  | D. Gephart |  |
| Update on AP 4021: Program Discontinuance or Program ConsolidationSiri Brown, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs | Presentation to inform the committee that AP 4021 had not been employed for a number of years, but will be implemented again next year (2019-20). It is a good practice to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of programs on an annual basis. To prepare for implementation, S. Brown will be meeting with the VPIs and District Academic Senate. The review will most likely occur after APUs/Program Review. A tool for ranking programs created by the I.R. office will be revamped for use in this process. In addition, quantitative and qualitative factors will also be part of the evaluation. It is not the intention to get rid of programs, but to determine the viability of all programs and to improve, consolidate or discontinue only as needed. |  | S. Brown |  |
| Update on PCCD Consultation ProcessHeather Sisneros, CIPD Co-Chair | Feedback discussion regarding how the consultation process is going. Concerns:•N. Thai wanted clarification of whether the consultation form is required or optional. *Response: The form is one option for documenting consultation has occurred. Other methods may be used.* •V. Phan noted that there is supposed to be consultation for “all new courses,” but sometimes there are no others to consult with such as if the discipline exists at only one college, like Auto Body for COA. Also, it is unclear who is responsible for the consultation and how to find the right person to contact. *There was an unresolved discussion about who should be contacted, by whom, and how to find the correct person to contact.*•V. Phan wanted confirmation that new programs do not require consultation, based on the handbook. *The consensus was that if new courses are being proposed to make up a program, then the consultation would include the program. But, if there were no new courses, there was no need to consult on creating a program of existing, approved courses.*  A. Masrey noted that the related AP and the handbook were not in agreement on this topic because the AP requires consultation.•Several people requested that we have clear parameters for decision making when CIPD is required to vote on items for which the faculty in consultation could not reach agreement. K. Hay suggested that CIPD require campuses to provide evidence to support any claims that another campus’s proposed course or program would negatively impact their enrollment.•It was requested that the response options on the consultation form be changed to encourage more depth of discussion rather a simple, yes, no, or we don’t care. | Review Peralta Program and Course Approval Handbook to ensure it is clear that the consultation form is one option.Revise check box responses on form | H. SisnerosH. Sisneros |  |
| Adjourned | 2:51 pm |  |  |  |