1. It is well documented that the more time that passes for a student pursuing a degree has multiple negative effects. It takes longer for students to enter the workforce, costs the state more money with classes filled with these same students, and students are more likely to "give up" and drop out of college.
2. The state Chancelor's Office and state legislation have been pushing to increase graduation rates to assist students in achieving their goals in a more reasonable timeframe
3. The largest "bottlenecks" that students face at PC seeking to complete a degree is getting in to a GE Science course. It is well known that these classes fill up first and almost always have long wait lists.
4. Adding faculty contact hours leads to fewer sections available for students and makes these bottlenecks worse. This is due increased facility usage and a faster rate a faculty member meets load obligations.
5. Aligning with minimum required contact hours directly leads to increased sections for students and lower facility demand
6. Other schools are successfully getting students through at the CID minimums
7. CID is an agreement that combined all discipline specific faculty experts from both the CSUs and community colleges into what the minimum required units should be required and what it can be done in that relative amount of time
8. The primary claim put forth in the Unit/Contact Hour Rationale forms for the Microbiology (BIOL P160) and Physiology (BIOL P120) are that: *“The 5 unit course enables better understanding for better success in both the class and future goals”*
	1. **At this time there has been no factual quantitative evidence submitted demonstrating that our students would have significantly lower letter grades if we were to adopt C-ID minimums**
	2. **There has also been no factual quantitative evidence submitted on file that demonstrates our students would have significantly lower success rates courses at C-ID minimum contact hours like our nearby CSU's or other CC's who already are using those guidelines**
9. The assertion that students need higher grades to place better in lottery systems such as the RN program may be true but again there is no factual quantitative evidence submitted as proof our students do better than those with fewer contact hours. It also ignores the fact that many other programs requiring these courses do not have such lotteries.
10. It is also true that many of the programs which have these courses as electives or requirements also struggle with unit and contact hour caps and mandating these higher for all increases the time and difficulty students face in completing their degree programs. The RN program has recently gone through entire curriculum revisions that reduced units on the recommendations of their consultants and other constituency groups to great success. However, they have advocated we reduce the units and contact hours for pre-requisite courses like these as well.
11. For students who may want additional help to achieve higher grades, there are other ways to achieve this including tutoring, open labs, office hours, PASS Leaders, etc. These programs could all be scaled up without adding required contact hours for all enrolled.
12. Furthermore, our resources are very limited at a smaller college so every decision we make effects every program on campus
13. The more contact hours and faculty resources that go towards one discipline means fewer for the other disciplines. While not popular to say out loud, there is only so much money that we are allocated and have to spend on faculty

It is for all these reasons that we should not be hasty in approving courses requesting additional units and/or contact hours even if we have done so in the past. These are not personal arguments "against" our peers making these requests. As I say all the time in my Argumentation course, we debate topics not people.

At this time, the Fine & Applied Arts division does not support the Microbiology (BIOL P160) and Physiology (BIOL P120) courses as presented. I did not receive any response from the Natural Science division to the email questions about these proposals that I sent on April 18th. If new evidence is presented at the meeting on Tuesday, we think a good discussion should take place but only after we have all had the opportunity to consider it and take it to our divisions. We hope that other divisions also share their concerns for these courses.

We have no objections to any of the other course action items on the agenda including those from the Natural Science division.