

I. A. Reflect upon and provide an analysis of the four years of data above

The drop in curriculum submitted for GE and transfer in 2011-12 reflects the faculty's commitment to writing Student Learning Outcomes during the academic year rather than developing and expanding our curriculum. The ratio of submitted transfer and GE courses to approved courses indicates that faculty continues to write strong, rigorous curriculum that is readily accepted by the CSU and UC systems. The number of AA-T and AS-T degrees is low due to the newness of both the SB 1440 legislation and guidelines for implementation. Three more transfer degrees are currently in CurricuNet for approval this academic year. Over 40 Course Outlines of Record have been submitted for C-ID approval. The process is being slowed up by the need for revisions and outdated textbooks on our course outlines. In the past, I had looked at only new, changed and deactivated curriculum. Due to the importance of this issue, I have requested that I be placed in the queue for all reviews of course outlines. Textbooks need to be updated to THE MOST CURRENT EDITON every time a Course Outline of Record is touched.

Curriculum in the 2012-2013 academic year was dominated by the necessity to meet state mandates resulting from new Title 5 language regarding repeatable courses. The entire year was spent identifying courses with related content (CRC), creating CRC groups, and leveling courses where appropriate. The leveling of courses accounts for the large increase in UC and CSU transferable courses.

The Fall 2014 deadline for full implementation of SB 1440 also impacted our curriculum as faculty began the development of new Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T). In late November 2012, the state mandated that all courses contained within the AD-Ts must have a California Identification number (C-ID). This process assures the CSU system that the courses within an AD-T meet the content required for major preparation. The mandate created many course revisions and an increase in C-ID submissions. Several AD-Ts were unable to be submitted in the 2012-13 cycle due to the necessity for course revisions.

GE for both the CSU and UC system remains reasonably stable, with approval rates being very high.

I. B. Please summarize the findings of SAO assessments conducted.

The Service Area Outcomes written for 2010-11 came as a result of the complexity of the American History and Institutions requirement. It has always been difficult for counselors to combine out-of-state courses with CCC courses to determine if the requirement had been met. It became apparent that Counselors needed more in-depth training regarding this requirement. The American History requirement was broken down into three components. Training was given on how to identify the three components, ascertain which components were met and how to advise the student as to which Palomar courses(s) would meet the deficiency. The Assessment shows a marked increase in their understanding of the requirement and their ability to advise students.

The Service Area Outcomes written in 2010-11 and subsequent training has proved to be very successful. The Evaluations Department does not often see the types of errors and issues that constantly came up prior to our training. I rarely receive a phone call asking for assistance in making the determination regarding American History and Institutions requirement.

I. B. Please summarize the findings of SAO assessments conducted.

The Service Area Outcomes written for 2011-12 assumed that we would be able to implement the Academic Advising module. However, that goal was not met. Our hope is to implement in Spring 2013. No training or assessment was able to be administered.

We spent 2012-13 continuing to work on the implementation of the Academic Advising module. Once again, our goal was not met and so no training was able to take place and no assessment was conducted. We hope to implement with limited populations in Spring 2014. Once we have used this limited populations as a test group, we can go live in Fall 2014 (assuming no huge glitches).

I. C. Reflect upon the SAO assessment findings in Box B above. Discuss overall observations and any areas of concern or noteworthy trends.

Continuous and systematic training will be necessary in order to keep counselors abreast of the constant changes taking place in our curriculum.

Questions regarding American History and Institutions typically arise from a new adjunct counselor who did not have the benefit of our training. I need to establish a consistent, reoccurring training at the beginning of each academic year to catch new faculty members and anyone else who wants a refresher. I think that I have been remiss in making sure new full-time and part-time faculty get the training.

STEP II. PLANNING

Reflecting on the 4-year trend data, the SAO assessment results, and the college's [Strategic Plan 2016](#), describe/discuss the discipline planning related to the following:

II. A. Programs changes and improvements (consider changes due to growth in FTES and Headcount, CSU/UC transfer language updates, articulation, workforce and labor market projections, certificate or degree completions, etc.)

Huge changes have come from the state the last few years that dramatically affect this office: 1) the necessity of creating both AA and AS degrees; 2) a complete revision of Title 5 language that resulted in new guidelines for repeatability and repeatable courses; 3) legislation that created AA-T and AS-T degrees; 4) a common numbering system (C-ID) to streamline articulations and the development of the transfer degrees; 5) and using content review to establish prerequisites. As with all new things, confusion reigns until we get a grip on the issues and deal with them. 6) In the middle of all of these changes, we were trying to implement a degree audit.

CurricuNet has streamlined our curriculum process, but requires a great deal of time on the part of the Articulation Officer as every new, changed and deactivated course requires the AO's scrutiny, as well as doing a technical review of all program additions, changes and deactivations .

State legislation and mandates continue to impact my job as an Articulation Officer. 1) The need to create AS degrees on our campus is largely resolved; 2) Repeatability continues to be a problem. Faculty who were somehow not aware of the issue last year is now realizing how the new regulations impact their disciplines. We have many career tech courses which the new regulations dramatically affect. Our Performing Arts departments are very large and the faculty worked many, many hours with me to resolve the issues that resulted. Our entire curriculum should be looked over to see that we are in compliance. This would be an absolutely enormous job; 3) Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD—T) required much of my time. Faculty need assistance developing the degree, revising courses for C-ID submittal, inputting it all in CurricUNET; and writing the narrative which is turned into the state. It is necessary that I track all of this and keep everyone on task so that we can go forward with the submission of the degrees; 4) Courses used in an AD-T must now have a C-ID number. This has proved to be quiet time-consuming. All steps

II. A. Programs changes and improvements (consider changes due to growth in FTES and Headcount, CSU/UC transfer language updates, articulation, workforce and labor market projections, certificate or degree completions, etc.)

in this process must be tracked. Faculty has been enormously agreeable and cooperative about revising courses when I request it. 5) Content review is still largely a conversation. Faculty seems to agree in concept, but there are many variables to be considered before we start this process. Given the large curriculum we have, it needs to be accomplished incrementally so as not to overwhelm math and English. There are many issues which need to be fully examined so that we are not caught unaware of the ramifications of content review.

II. B. Additional programs to develop (consider enrollment trends, student demands, wait times, comprehensiveness, etc.)

The Articulation Officer is working in conjunction with Evaluations Department on the implementation of the Transfer Credit and Academic Advising PeopleSoft modules. We have not met our original or revised “go live” dates due to the enormity of this project; the fact that no one is dedicated full-time to the implementation project; and not having a consultant to guide us through the Transfer Credit process. We have all been trying to accomplish this huge task while continuing to complete our regular duties and responsibilities.

Late in spring 2013 we were able to meet with a consultant. She was outstanding. The PeopleSoft advising module was developed for four-year institutions. The consultant was able to understand our perspective as a community college. We have very different issues than those of a four-year institution. Although extremely close to being done, we had a few issues that we were simply unable to resolve on our own. With her help, we have been able to address all these issues and learned about some things we didn't know that we didn't know. It has been a study progression forward since meeting with her in late spring. We are excited about the project and hope to go start with small, controlled populations (veterans and nursing students) for the 13-14 academic year.

New Title 5 requirements for repeatable course work will require close scrutiny of our curriculum to make sure that our repeatable courses are in compliance with the new guidelines. Given the number of repeatable courses in our curriculum (999 out of 1600 courses), this will prove to be a substantial project for this academic year. We want to be fair to our faculty and remain compliant at the same time.

The scrutiny of our curriculum concerning repeatability was an extensive project and is on-going. The VP of Instruction, the Articulation Officer and the Dean and faculty of the target disciplines spent many hours working to determine the CRC groups. Groups of relevant faculty, staff and administrator worked to create procedures to make this transition as easy as possible for students, staff and faculty. Many variables had to be taken into account. Firm guidelines were not established by the state until we were well into the process. The heavy workload last year paid off. We had a very smooth transition given the volume of courses at Palomar and the lack of definitive guidelines.

The development of more transfer degrees (AA-T, AS-T) will continue to be a top priority. Counselors and Evaluators will need systematic training as new/revised guidelines are constantly being given to us.

I have had two training session with the counselors regarding advising for the transfer degrees. Much of this was complicated because the state had not yet answered many of the questions that Articulation Officers and counselors were asking. Training for evaluators took place late last year. Two training sessions have taken place with the counselors. The Curriculum Committee has passed a Reciprocity Policy for the acceptance of course work from other instructions. Faculty continues to work diligently to develop new degrees.

STEP III. RESOURCE REQUESTS FOR DISCIPLINE:

III. A. Describe the resources necessary to successfully implement the planning described above. Provide a detailed rationale for each request by referring to the analyses of data and SAO assessment results in Step I and/or to any other evidence not apparent in the data or SAO Assessment results.

a. Equipment (per unit cost is >\$500) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
a1.							
a2.							
a3.							
a4.							
a5.							

b. Technology (computers, data projectors, document readers, etc.) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
b1.							
b2.							
b3.							
b4.							
b5.							

c. Budget for 4000s (per unit cost is <\$500 supplies) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
c1.							
c2.							

c. Budget for 4000s (per unit cost is <\$500 supplies) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
c3.							
c4							
c5.							

d. Budget for 5000s (printing, maintenance agreements, software license etc.) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
d1.							
d2.							
d3.							
d4.							
d5.							

e. Classified staff position (permanent/contract position requests unique to this discipline) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
e1.							
e2.							
e3.							
e4.							
e5.							

f. Classified staff position (temporary and student workers position requests unique to this discipline) Enter requests on lines below.

Resource	Describe Resource Requested	Prioritize these requests 1,2,3, etc.	Strategic Plan 2016 Goal/ Objective Addressed by This Resource (Link)	Provide a detailed rationale for the requested resource. The rationale should refer to your discipline's plan, analysis of data, SAO assessments, and/or the College's Strategic Plan	Estimated Amount of Funding Requested	Will this be one-time or on-going funding?	Is resource already funded (in part or in full)? If so, name source. Why is that source not sufficient for future funding?
f1.	Restructure the Articulation and Project ASSIST Specialist position			See below in Comment Section VI.			
f2.							
f3.							
f4.							
f5.							

III. B. Are there other resources (including data) that you need to complete your discipline review and planning?

Continued institutional support, in time, money and resources, is necessary for the successful completion of the Academic Advising and Transfer Credit module. Once we 'go live' updating the data will be a continuous task that requires, in my opinion, a dedicated position for updates and writing rules.

The hiring of a consultant from Cedar Crestone for a three week period was approved. We met with her in late spring and early summer of 2013. This was the support that was needed to reach the point where we could "go live". The need for dedicated positions has yet to be approved. These positions are essential to the success of this project. Much time, money and effort has gone into the development of the degree audit. Without consistent maintenance, the entire project would eventually fail. A degree audit is only as good as the data it pulls from. The educational plans which would be generated from the degree audit will constitute an "abbreviated educational plan" for the Student Success and Support Program. The comprehensive Educational plans would still need to be done by the counselors.

STEP IV. SHARE YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS Please include at least one discipline accomplishment that you'd like to share with the college community.

The last two years I have evaluated all Region X curriculum and put that information in spreadsheets in such a way as to allow the information to be "dumped" into the Academic Advising module for the degree audit. It was an enormous project that to this day is constantly being revised and refined as we learn more about the implementation and updated with new curriculum from the last two academic years.

For the 2012-13 academic year I wrote rules for CSUSM and refined what I had already written for Region X schools. RDs are requirement designators used to tell the audit how a course which is an exception to a rule can be applied. We developed numerous iterations of the RD table as we learned more and more about other schools curriculum and the audit process itself. Once re-written, then we had to go back and place them on all of the rules already written in our spreadsheets. I spent most of the year, along with Linda Cox, creating and recreating RD schemes that would address the many exceptions we can expect.

STEP V. ACCREDITATION For programs with an external accreditation, indicate the date of the last accreditation visit and discuss recommendations and progress made on the recommendations.

N/A

STEP VI. COMMENTS Other comments, recommendations: (Please use this space for additional comments or recommendations that don't fit in any category above.)

With the purchase of CurricuNet, an on-line curriculum management system, the process by which we review our curriculum changed. That new process places the Articulation Officer as the first person who scrutinizes new, changed, deactivated, and reactivated courses, as well as, all course reviews and programs. Although there is currently a Technical Review, I am looking for so much more than formatting and punctuation problems. When I pass a course or program on, I have "approved" it; in essence I am saying that I have looked it over and have no issues or concerns. The new process is helping us create Course Outlines of Record and programs that meet the standards as stipulated in Title 5 regulations, and as such, is not a process we want to give up. However, the level of scrutiny required of me has taken over my job, to the exclusion of my articulation responsibilities. We have literally hundreds of courses and programs in any given curriculum cycle.

With the retirement of my assistant, the Articulation and Project ASSIST Specialist, it seems to be a perfect time to restructure that position, incorporating some current duties from the job description and developing new responsibilities, making the job a curriculum analyst or specialist. This position can take over the technical review from the Instruction Office and the detailed review that I am currently doing. As the second person in the review process, I could then be looking for only those issues that relate to transfer and articulation.

Please identify faculty and staff who participated in the development of the plan for this department:

Gloria Kerkhoff <i>Name</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Name</i>
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------

<i>Name</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Name</i>
-------------	-------------	-------------

Department Chair/Designee Signature Date

Division Dean Signature

Division Vice President Signature

Date

- Provide a hard copy to the Vice President Vernoy no later than **September 14, 2013**
- Email an electronic copy to jpettit@palomar.edu by **September 28, 2013**
- Email an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu by **September 28, 2013**