

College Curriculum Committee Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, May 3, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Action	Attachment	Presenter
1. Minutes: April 19, 2016	Action	#5/3/16-1	Escoto
2. Announcements a. Notification of Proposed Requisites b. New Course Proposals c. Curriculum Representation d. SLO Review Cycle e. ASCCC Spring Plenary Update	Information	#5/3/16-2 #5/3/16-3-4 #5/3/16-5 #5/3/16-6	Escoto
3. Checklist of Topics for Cross-listed Courses	2nd Read/Action	#5/3/16-7	Escoto
4. AP Credit Policy	Discussion	#5/3/16-8	Day
5. COR Review	Discussion		Escoto
6. Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities	Discussion	#5/3/16-9	Escoto
7. Report Out from Division Reps	Discussion		All
8. Good of the Order			Escoto
9. Adjournment			Escoto

Attachment List:

- #5/3/16-1 Draft Minutes: April 19, 2016
- #5/3/16-2 CCC Notification of Proposed Requisites
- #5/3/16-3 New COR Proposal: EMT 50A
- #5/3/16-4 New COR Proposal: EMT 51A
- #5/3/16-5 Discussions at the Academic Senate about Student Learning Outcomes
- #5/3/16-6 ASCCC Spring 2016 Plenary Report
- #5/3/16-7 Topics for Cross-listed Courses
- #5/3/16-8 California Legislature—Assembly Bill No. 1985
- #5/3/16-9 Policy and Procedures for Providing Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities

2015 -2016 Curriculum Committee Meetings

Fall 2015 Quarter

~~10/6/15~~
~~10/20/15~~
~~11/3/15~~
~~11/17/15~~
~~12/1/15~~

Winter 2016 Quarter

~~1/19/16~~
~~2/2/16~~
~~2/16/16~~
~~3/1/16~~
~~3/15/16~~

Spring 2016 Quarter

~~4/19/16~~
~~5/3/16~~
~~5/17/16~~
~~5/31/16~~
~~6/14/16~~

* Standing reminder: items for inclusion on the CCC agenda are due no later than one week before the meeting

2015-2016 Curriculum Deadlines

- ~~12/1/15~~ Deadline to submit courses to CSU for CSU GE approval.
- ~~12/1/15~~ Deadline to submit courses to UC/CSU for IGETC approval.
- ~~2/1/16~~ Curriculum Sheet updates for 2016-17.
- ~~2/15/16~~ Deadline to submit local GE applications.
- ~~6/1/16~~ Deadline to submit new/revised courses to UCOP for UC transferability.
- ~~6/17/16~~ COR/Title 5 updates for Summer 2017.
- Ongoing* Submission of courses for C-ID approval and course-to-course articulation with individual colleges and universities.

2015-2016 Professional Development Opportunities & Conferences of Interest

Professional Development Day for Faculty & Staff | 10/9/15 | Foothill College

~~[ASCCC 2015 Fall Plenary Session](#) | 11/5–7/15 | Irvine Marriott~~

~~[ASCCC Fall 2015 Curriculum Regional Meeting \(North\)](#) | 11/13/15 | Solano College – Fairfield~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 CTE Curriculum Academy](#) | 1/14–15/16 | Napa Valley Marriott~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Instructional Design and Innovation](#) | 1/21–23/16 | Riverside Convention Center~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Accreditation Institute](#) | 2/19–20/16 | Marriott Mission Valley – San Diego~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Academic Academy](#) | 3/17–19/16 | Sheraton Sacramento~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Spring Plenary Session](#) | 4/21–23/16 | Sacramento Convention Center~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Career Technical Education Institute](#) | 5/6–7/16 | DoubleTree Hilton – Anaheim~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Faculty Leadership Institute](#) | 6/9–11/16 | Mission Inn – Riverside~~

~~[ASCCC 2016 Curriculum Institute](#) | 7/7–9/16 | DoubleTree Hilton – Anaheim~~

Distribution:

Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Beth Beiers (DRC), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Konnilyn Fieg (BSS), Owen Flannery (KA), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), Carolyn Holcroft (AS President), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), Don MacNeil (KA), Kimberlee Messina (Acting President), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Barbara Shewfelt (KA), Rachel Solvason (Articulation), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA), Suzanne Weller (FA)

COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Committee Members – 2015-16

Meeting Date: 5/3/16Co-Chairs (2)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Isaac Escoto	7350	Vice President, Academic Senate (tiebreaker vote only) escotoisaac@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrew LaManque	7179	Associate Vice President, Instruction lamanqueandrew@foothill.edu

Voting Membership—12 total; 1 vote per division

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Benjamin Armerding	7453	L A	armerdingbenjamin@fhda.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kathy Armstrong	7487	PSME	armstrongkathy@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rachelle Campbell	7469	BH	campbellrachelle@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bernie Day	7225	Articulation	daybernie@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LeeAnn Emanuel	7212	CNSL	emanuelleeann@fhda.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brian Evans	7575	BSS	evansbrian@foothill.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Konnilyn Feig	7430	BSS	feigkonnilyn@fhda.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Valerie Fong (W & S)	7135	L A	fongvalerie@fhda.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marnie Francisco	7420	PSME	franciscomarnie@foothill.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brenda Hanning	7466	BH	hanningbrenda@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kay Jones	7602	LIBR	joneskay@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marc Knobel	7049	PSME	knobelmarc@foothill.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don MacNeil	6967	K A	macneildon@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Teresa Ong	7394	Dean	ongteresa@fhda.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lety Serna	7059	CNSL	sernaleticia@fhda.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Barbara Shewfelt	7658	K A	shewfeltbarbara@fhda.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paul Starer	7227	Dean	starerpaul@foothill.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Victor Tam	7472	Dean	tamvictor@foothill.edu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kristin Tripp-Caldwell	7562	F A	trippcaldwellkristin@fhda.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suzanne Weller	7262	F A	wellersuzanne@fhda.edu

Non-Voting Members (3)

<input type="checkbox"/>		7231	Evaluations
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary Vanatta	7439	Curr Coordinator vanattamary@foothill.edu
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nataly Wijono		ASFC

Visitors:

Allison Meezan, Bill Ziegenhorn, Basil Farooq, Sam Lu

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 19, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 15, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus. Approved. 4 abstentions.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following proposals were presented: CHEM 12AL, 12BL, 12CL, 13AH, 13BH, 13CH; ENGL 34C; SOSC 1, 2. Please share with your constituents.
a. New Course Proposals	<p>Chemistry previously submitted proposals for CHEM 13AH/BH/CH series, related to creation of the Chemistry ADT. Department has received word that the TMC for the Chemistry ADT might be pulled, making their previously proposed changes no longer necessary. Department still wishes to de-couple labs from lecture courses for Organic Chemistry; also creating Honors versions of labs (no Honors version of lectures). Articulation Officer not in attendance to comment—will follow up at future meeting.</p> <p>Media Studies expressed interest in adding ENGL 34C as elective to MS degree, in development.</p> <p>SOSC courses related to the Global Studies ADT, in development.</p>
b. CORs for Update 2017-18 (Title 5 list)	Vanatta compiled list of courses that need to be reviewed/updated for the 2017-18 catalog, per Title 5. Will follow-up with email to Curriculum Reps and Deans. Note that these required updates are subject to our regular curriculum deadline for 2017-18, which will be June 17th.
c. Draft Foothill GE list for 2016-17	Foothill General Education requirements for 2016-17. Newly approved GE courses have been added, and deactivated courses have been removed. In some cases, Honors versions have been added that were not previously listed. As a reminder, for those deactivated courses being removed from the lists, if a student took the course in a previous year, the course will count for GE (as long as it was listed as GE when taken). Please share with your constituents.
d. Apprenticeship Requests—outcome	CCC allowed Apprenticeship department to resubmit their Course Deactivation Exemption Request forms, for consideration by CCC instead of BSS Division. Voting was done electronically; all courses approved to remain active for 2016-17.
e. Spring Plenary Resolutions	ASCCC conducts a Plenary Session every Fall and Spring, to vote on resolutions written by the body. Escoto noted that resolutions shared with CCC agenda will be discussed at upcoming session and have not yet been adopted; furthermore, additional resolutions and amendments may still be drafted. Comment that previous CCC co-chair had practice of highlighting relevant resolutions—question as to which current resolutions may be relevant to group. Escoto noted "Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses" (9.07 S16) as relevant to recent CCC discussions. Also noted "Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment" (18.01 S16), as relevant to Assessment Task Force. Comment

	<p>regarding "Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter" (9.06 S16)—question as to whether this could result in CCC review of SLOs. Escoto noted that resolution is related to clarifying that SLOs are relevant to senate work and that local boards work in consultation with local senates regarding SLOs. Question regarding new or noteworthy changes to Disciplines list—Escoto did not make note of any. Comment regarding "Explore Changes to Minimum Qualifications" (10.02 S16), related to recent brown bag session and discussion around MQs for CTE faculty. Question regarding how to access list of CTE programs at Foothill—LaManque noted that CTE program status denoted by TOP Code. Vanatta can supply list of programs with CTE Top Codes. Escoto acknowledged need to appoint specific point-person on campus for state-wide CTE matters, and conversations continue as to how that would work.</p>
3. COR Review part 1	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto In previous years, separate COR trainings were offered but often resulted in low attendance. New plan is to offer short COR training sessions during CCC, to spend a few minutes focused on specific portion of COR. Escoto asked for suggestions regarding which parts of COR to focus on. Suggestions made: Need/Justification field; Hours fields in general; Out of Class Hours field specifically; Representative Texts field (specific question regarding texts being required vs. recommended—must textbooks be used if listed?); incorporation of OER materials in Texts. Escoto noted need for more people, outside of CCC, to be trained on CORs—hope is that Reps will share-out with others who review/create CORs. Comment that Dental Hygiene department recently revised every D H COR for BS degree creation; noted some difficulty regarding Types and/or Examples of Required Reading, Writing and Outside of Class Assignments field—balance of specific and general information. Question regarding SLOs not being in C3MS (currently entered in TracDat), and whether Course Objectives may be used as SLOs. Suggestion that SLOs be incorporated as field in COR, as it would streamline process. Escoto noted need for SLO training, in general. Suggestion to create walk-through video training for C3MS, specifically logging into system and accessing CORs—would be great help to those who only use system a few times each year (TracDat, as well). Mention of COR Title 5 Compliance Check List being helpful (note: available on CCC webpage). Escoto thanked group for suggestions—will review and revisit in future meetings.</p>
4. Checklist of Topics for Cross-listed Courses	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Follow-up to previous meeting. Based on previous discussion, Escoto drafted checklist of suggested topics to discuss when faculty come together to propose/create cross-listed courses. Plan is for the checklist to be a CCC document and provide specific recommendations and information. Intent is to look at courses from both sides: most importantly, how they provide benefit to students, but also consider potential for negative effects. Comment that C-ID should be taken into consideration—how would cross-listed course affect C-ID, as well as ADTs?</p> <p>Comment regarding GE applicability and how cross-listed courses would count in multiple GE areas. Clarification that whether or not a course is cross-listed, it's a matter of individual course content, in regard to where on a GE sheet a course would count. Escoto reminded the group that the Social Sciences area of CSU GE will no longer be divided by section; instead, students will select courses in different disciplines, from a single list—example of how cross-listed courses could assist students in taking courses</p>

	<p>in multiple disciplines. Comment that cross-listed courses could potentially also require FSA discussions. Please share with your constituents and bring any feedback to next CCC meeting.</p>
5. AP Credit Policy	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Ongoing discussion regarding granting of AP credit for local area content, including number of units to grant to student. Escoto shared example of recent memo sent out by Articulation Office, following extensive research done to determine how UCs/CSUs grant AP credit. Memo sent to Curriculum Reps and Deans, with information for AP exam(s) relevant to their division—for each AP exam, memo lists every UC and CSU, and how each grants credit. Some grant credit for a specific course, some only award units. Comment that current Foothill policy can create discrepancy for students who wish to receive associate degree as well as transfer—Foothill might not grant credit for a specific course, whereas UC/CSU might. Comment about ASCCC's view of AP credit as local curricular matter, and importance of considering students' needs first (resolution 18.03 S16 on Plenary document).</p> <p>Escoto noted that a student can take AP test without taking corresponding class, but that this rarely occurs. Concern expressed that student could end up at a disadvantage when skipping a course and applying AP credit, then changing major and finding oneself behind in coursework. Counseling noted preference of referring student to discipline faculty over automatically requiring student to retake course for which student has AP credit. Concern expressed regarding science lab courses—belief shared that High School lab experience generally not at same level as college, putting student at disadvantage. Comment that College Board requires student to provide lab notebook for AP Physics, to prove rigor of lab. Escoto noted that Articulation Office memos provide recommendation for change to current AP policy, but divisions may decide if they would like to adopt. Question regarding history and creation of current local AP policies. Escoto wasn't able to provide history on current AP policy as a whole, but noted that climate of CCC changes over the years, which is why topics such as this should be revisited. Question regarding who specifically sets requirements at UC/CSU—institution as a whole, or program? Note that GE policy set at institutional level; majors policy set per department, per institution. LaManque noted that we could adopt institutional policy for GE, similarly. Escoto noted that, last year, CCC approved a motion to adopt a resolution, recommended by ASCCC, regarding AP credit for GE courses. Noted that a single course may be used by many different majors, which should be taken into consideration when creating policies. Please discuss at division level; next step at CCC is to bring back feedback and/or decisions to discuss as group. Articulation Officer requested deadline of May 20 for policy decisions by divisions.</p>
6. Program Review Update on Curricular Issues	<p>Speaker: Andrew LaManque Update from Program Review Committee. Will be bringing recommendations to PaRC tomorrow for first read. PRC focused on providing feedback, as well as commendations for good work being done across campus. Many departments continue to struggle with Program Level Assessments—important to take into consideration, as issue will likely be raised at next accreditation visit. LaManque shared examples of commendations to be presented, including those related to SLO assessment. Shared examples of recommendations to departments. Escoto</p>

	<p>mentioned SLO Advisory Committee, which is meant to provide assistance to departments—reach out to SLOAC division member for support. SLOAC plans to review GE learning outcomes in the near future. Question regarding SLO requirements—how often must they be reviewed, what are standards? LaManque noted that Academic Senate passed resolution, last year, which included standards. Divisions may adopt 3-year cycle, ensuring that SLOs for every course be reviewed within 3-year period. All program outcomes should also be reviewed within 3-year period. Comment that part-time faculty being compensated for SLOs, and question regarding any expectation that all faculty work on SLOs every year. LaManque noted that there is no requirement, but it is suggested as best practice. Question regarding how non-instructional units are reviewed. LaManque noted that programs clearly defined as degree/certificate or pathway, but other departments (e.g., student services) are harder to define. Department provided example of their process: every winter quarter, faculty review SLOs for every course, and meet in spring to discuss. Escoto will follow up and provide AS resolution/standards to group.</p>
<p>7. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p>Speaker: All BSS: Working on ADT in Social Justice Studies; contact John Fox if you have a course in gender, ethnicity, and related studies you'd like to include. Discussion regarding separation of Apprenticeship from BSS division—LaManque noted that topic of representation on Academic Senate agenda. Escoto noted that curricular structure might not necessarily mirror senate structure. One option is that Apprenticeship fall under CCC at large. BSS noted that faculty have no affinity for topics of Apprenticeship courses—suggested CTE umbrella for representation. LaManque noted Apprenticeship working on new degrees/certificates. Escoto noted need for more robust conversation around topic of representation. Proposal may be submitted to senate regarding change in representation; Escoto will follow up with senate and report back. Question regarding why Apprenticeship doesn't qualify to be its own division, considering number of courses. Concern from faculty that difficulty exists when attempting to evaluate or measure standards of Apprenticeship courses or programs, considering the specialized nature of work involved. Comment that need for vocational degrees is important, and perhaps a new Administrator be hired to oversee Apprenticeship division under separate entity. Escoto noted that role of faculty when reviewing curriculum isn't limited to knowledge of course content, but also providing procedural guidance and big picture discussion guidance. Comment that faculty are normally on campus and accessible, for Curriculum Reps to easily contact when necessary, but Apprenticeship faculty are offsite. Note that BSS Dean cannot necessarily compel Apprenticeship faculty/staff to attend meetings, as they do not report to BSS Dean. Concern expressed that when Apprenticeship asks to, for example, double course units, or offer multiple courses in one subject, BSS faculty have a difficult time knowing if these are reasonable requests. LaManque noted that programs are offered by each location/center, resulting in new programs being created that mirror existing programs but are offered in a different location and not directly aligned. Comment that trade unions also involved in approval process for courses/programs. Suggestion to propose to house Apprenticeship under CCC—Escoto will continue</p>

Draft Minutes, April 19, 2016

	discussions with senate and the Office of Instruction. PSME: Computer Science writing series of Big Data courses, pursuing trend. LaManque asked if all divisions had provided Online Standards— Escoto will follow up.
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	3:28 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta

CCC Notification of Proposed Prerequisites/Co-Requisites

The following courses are currently undergoing review for requisite additions or changes. Please contact the Division Curriculum Rep if you have any questions or comments.

[illegible]

**Foothill College
College Curriculum Committee
New Course Proposal**

*This form should be completed by the faculty author as preparation to writing a new course. Your division CC rep can assist you in completing it appropriately, and will forward it to the Office of Instruction for inclusion as an announcement at the next available CCC meeting. The purpose of this form is **interdisciplinary communication**. The responsibility to rigorously review and approve new courses remains with the divisional curriculum committees.*

Faculty Author: Dave Huseman

Proposed Number: EMT 50A

Proposed Units: 0.5

Proposed Hours: 18 hours laboratory (total)

Proposed Transferability: CSU

Proposed Title: Emergency Medical Technician Simulation Lab I

Proposed Catalog Description & Requisites:

First in a two course series, which provides the student with hands on application of skills necessary to work as an emergency medical technician (EMT). Students will participate in patient assessment scenarios focused on medical complaints and treatments of various diseases, to build competence and prepare to sit for the state certification exam and enter into the EMT workforce.

Proposed Discipline:

Emergency Medical Technologies

To which Degree(s) or Certificate(s) would this course potentially be added?

EMT certificate

Are there any other departments that may be impacted from the addition of this course? Please identify those departments and the effect: No

Comments & Other Relevant Information for Discussion:

EMT 50 would be a co-requisite, which provides the didactic knowledge needed which will be evaluated through scenario based training.

Instruction Office:

Date presented at CCC:

Number assigned:

Foothill College
College Curriculum Committee
New Course Proposal

*This form should be completed by the faculty author as preparation to writing a new course. Your division CC rep can assist you in completing it appropriately, and will forward it to the Office of Instruction for inclusion as an announcement at the next available CCC meeting. The purpose of this form is **interdisciplinary communication**. The responsibility to rigorously review and approve new courses remains with the divisional curriculum committees.*

Faculty Author: Dave Huseman

Proposed Number: EMT 51A

Proposed Units: 0.5

Proposed Hours: 18 hours laboratory (total)

Proposed Transferability: CSU

Proposed Title: Emergency Medical Technician Simulation Lab II

Proposed Catalog Description & Requisites:

Second in a two course series, which provides the student with hands on application of skills necessary to work as an emergency medical technician (EMT). Students will participate in patient assessment scenarios focused on trauma and treatment of various mechanisms of injuries, to build competence and prepare to sit for the state certification exam and enter into the EMT workforce.

Proposed Discipline:

Emergency Medical Technologies

To which Degree(s) or Certificate(s) would this course potentially be added?

EMT certificate

Are there any other departments that may be impacted from the addition of this course? Please identify those departments and the effect: No

Comments & Other Relevant Information for Discussion:

EMT 51 would be a co-requisite, which provides the didactic knowledge needed which will be evaluated through scenario based training.

Instruction Office:

Date presented at CCC:

Number assigned:

Discussions at the Academic Senate about Student Learning Outcomes

By Andrew LaManque & Carolyn Holcroft

SLOs on CORs

The academic senate continues to facilitate review and revision of Foothill's Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) policies and procedures. ACCJC released new Standards this summer which include new language for Standard II.A.3 that requires SLO statements to be included on Course Outlines of Record.

At its February 23 meeting the academic senate adopted a resolution that included the following statement:

"Resolved, that the Foothill College Academic Senate supports the addition of student learning outcomes statements to course outlines of record and that if/when faculty revise their SLOs in the future, they must also change them on the COR for submission to the Office of Instruction consistent with the established processes in place for making changes to the COR."

This has two implications for faculty and our students:

1. Course-level SLO statements from TracDat will be transferred onto the course outlines of record. The Office of Instruction will orchestrate this process for faculty and we anticipate this task can be completed by the end of Spring quarter. Stay tuned for more detail about timing specifics.
2. After the initial transfer has occurred in Spring quarter, if faculty later want to change their SLOs in TracDat they will also need to change them on the course outline of record in C3MS. Such a change would be processed by your division curriculum committee in the same manner that you handle other changes to your CORs.

Length of SLO Assessment Cycle

Also of note, the academic senate adopted a resolution to allow each division to adopt its own SLO Assessment Cycle timing. To this point, as a campus we have all been on the same (minimum) cycle of assessing/ reflecting on at least one SLO every year for every course taught. Going forward, however, each division may agree to adopt a different cycle if desired, provided that each SLO for each course is assessed and reflected upon at least every three years. This three-year time span is intended to ensure that divisions will have a minimum of one full set of SLOAC data for every course by the time their comprehensive program review is due. Divisional curriculum representatives are asked to lead faculty discussions to determine the SLOAC timing that will make the most sense for their division. The Office of Instruction will assume divisions will continue with the current (default) cycle unless they hear from the division curriculum committee representatives that you've decided to adopt something different.

The Office of Instruction will also be facilitating discussions about the implication of this change for units completing Service Area Outcomes and Administrative Unit Outcomes.

ASCCC SPRING 2016 PLENARY REPORT

Foothill academic senate president Carolyn Holcroft and secretary/treasurer Patrick Morriss attended the Spring 2016 plenary meeting of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges on April 20 – 22 in Sacramento, California. The full program can be found on the ASCCC spring 2016 [plenary meeting web page](#) and a [PDF version](#) is also available.

The ASCCC held elections for many positions on their 2016-2017 [executive committee](#). Congratulations to Foothill College faculty member Dolores Davison, who ran unopposed for the officer position of ASCCC secretary! The body also elected a new Area B representative, Cleavon Smith of Berkeley City College.

Holcroft served as the official Foothill College academic senate voting delegate and was in close consultation with De Anza College academic senate delegate Randy Bryant and FHDA district academic senate delegate Mayra Cruz throughout the voting procedures. Patrick Morriss and Paul Setziol (De Anza academic senate secretary/treasurer) were also present and actively participated in discussion and debate.

The final packet of resolutions for consideration on Saturday may be accessed at [ASCCC Saturday resolutions packet](#). Many, but not all, were adopted. Holcroft will distribute the final packet of adopted resolutions as soon as it is published by ASCCC. In the meantime, *several adopted resolutions included recommendations requiring immediate local senate attention/action*. These directives are listed below.

6.04 S16 Mental Health Services: Resolved, that the ASCCC urge local senates to advocate for the improvement of and access to mental health services at their local campuses.

Recommended action: agendize for discussion at an upcoming senate meeting

9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates*. Resolved, That the ASCCC adopt the paper [Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates](#) (as of April 2, 2016) and disseminate the paper to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Recommended action: Escoto to distribute paper to the Foothill College curriculum committee for discussion, with particular attention to the “Conclusions and Recommendations for Local Senates” portion.

9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts: Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates and curriculum committees to review their certificates of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units or more but less than 18 semester units or 27 quarter units that have not been submitted to the Chancellor’s Office and evaluate the efficacy and potential benefit to students of submitting such certificates to the Chancellor’s Office for approval and allowing such certificates to be recorded on student transcripts, as a potential benefit.

Recommended action: Escoto to bring this to the college curriculum committee.

9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid: Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates to review and consider for submission to the Chancellor’s Office any existing local certificates that are 16 or more semester units and less than 18 units or at least 24 quarter units and less than 27 quarter units to more immediately expand student access to federal financial aid.

Recommended action: Escoto to bring this to the college curriculum committee.

Prepared for the April 25, 2016 meeting of the Foothill College Academic Senate by officers Carolyn Holcroft and Patrick Morriss

9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter: Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates to ensure that institutional decisions regarding student learning outcomes assessment are understood to be a curricular matter and therefore institutions should consult collegially with local senates; and

Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senate leaders to advocate for outcomes assessment as a form of academic research that emphasizes improvement in student learning; and

Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates to advocate for recognition of these additional research contributions on the part of faculty to the institution, and to advocate for substantial professional development resources for training and reassigned time.

Recommended action: Escoto to bring this to the college curriculum committee as an information item. Holcroft and Schaefer to bring this to the Foothill College Student Learning Outcomes Committee for discussion and recommendations.

9.09 S16 Z-Degrees and Faculty Primacy: Resolved, That the ASCCC encourage and support local and statewide discussions regarding degree paths with zero text book cost to students, known as Z-Degrees; and

Resolved, That the ASCCC recommend that the 2016 budget trailer bill language ensure that the primacy of faculty is retained by including the local academic senate's approval of the development of Z-Degrees, as well as participation in any kind of incentive program related to Z-Degrees.

Recommended action: agendaize for discussion at an upcoming academic senate meeting

18.02 S16 Placement Model for Transfer Statistics Using High School Transcript Data: Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates to work with their administrations to ensure that the proposed statistics placement model is analyzed using data for their students to ensure that the model works as predicated prior to using it to place students;

Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates to review the proposed statistics placement model and make any necessary modifications to ensure that there is no negative impact on existing articulation agreements between their college and four year universities

Recommended action: Holcroft and Morriss to bring this to the Foothill College Assessment and Placement Ad Hoc Committee.

19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators: Resolved, That the ASCCC urge local senates that intend to apply to participate in the Textbook Affordability Act ensure that the process for the selection of the Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator involves collegial consultation with the local academic senate.

Recommended action: The Foothill College academic senate has discussed the Textbook Affordability Act and concluded we do not intend to apply to receive a grant through this initiative. Therefore, at this time no action on this resolution is required.

19.03 S16 Infusing Equity throughout College Processes: Resolved, That the ASCCC recommend that local senates work with their administrators to incorporate equity as a foundational value into college educational master plans and strategic plans;

Recommended action: The college has just completed revision of its ed master plan and our college community has already worked to ensure equity is at the core. At this time the recommendation is to continue to work diligently with administration (as well as classified staff and students) to achieve the equity goals we've identified in our plan.

10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*: Resolved, That the ASCCC adopt the proposed revisions to the paper [*Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*](#).

Recommended action: Although this resolution does not explicitly call for local senate action, it is implied as the adopted paper does include recommendations for local senates. As such, we recommend the paper be distributed to the Foothill College academic senate and agenda'd for discussion at an upcoming meeting, with particular attention to the recommendations for local senates.

Items for Consideration to Aid in Cross Listing Course Discussion
College Curriculum Committee

What is the value to students when considering cross listing a course? Are there potential negative effects?

Possible enrollment consequences when cross listing a course (splitting students up into more than one course).

The possibility of helping students meet a specific discipline requirement.

The need for multiple courses (with a shared outline) to be updated during our curriculum cycle.

Needing to keep track of more courses when reviewing degree/program curriculum.

Cross listing courses may help students meet the two disciplines requirement for CSU Area D.

Possible need for FSA consideration.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 21, 2016

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2015–16 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 1985

Introduced by Assembly Member Williams

February 16, 2016

An act to add Article 9 (commencing with Section 79500) to Chapter 9 of Part 48 of Division 7 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to Advanced Placement credit.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1985, as amended, Williams. Postsecondary education.

Existing law requires the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate consultation with the Academic Senates of the respective segments, to jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a shared core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer.

This bill would require the *office of the Chancellor of the* California Community Colleges to develop, and each community college district to adopt, a uniform policy to award a pupil who passes an Advanced Placement exam with a *minimum* score of 3 ~~or higher~~ *course* credit for ~~a course within this curriculum~~ *certain requirements in a course*, with subject matter similar to that of the Advanced Placement exam.

To the extent that this bill would impose new duties on community college districts, it would constitute a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 *SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares each of the*
2 *following:*

3 *(a) It is the intent of the Legislature to establish a uniform*
4 *Advanced Placement (AP) credit policy for general education*
5 *within the California Community Colleges.*

6 *(b) Studies consistently find that pupils who earn AP exam*
7 *scores of three and higher are likely to demonstrate multiple*
8 *measures of college success.*

9 *(c) The lack of a uniform AP credit policy often serves as an*
10 *academic and financial barrier for students enrolling in California*
11 *Community Colleges and is a transfer obstacle for many pupils.*

12 ~~SECTION 1.~~

13 *SEC. 2. Article 9 (commencing with Section 79500) is added*
14 *to Chapter 9 of Part 48 of Division 7 of Title 3 of the Education*
15 *Code, to read:*

16
17 Article 9. Advanced Placement Credit

18
19 ~~79500. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature to establish a~~
20 ~~uniform Advanced Placement (AP) credit policy within the~~
21 ~~California Community Colleges.~~

22 ~~(b) Studies consistently find that pupils who earn AP Exam~~
23 ~~scores of three and higher are likely to demonstrate multiple~~
24 ~~measures of college success.~~

25 ~~(c) The lack of a uniform AP credit policy often serves as an~~
26 ~~academic and financial barrier for students enrolling in California~~
27 ~~Community Colleges and is a transfer obstacle for many pupils.~~

28 ~~79501.~~

29 *79500. The office of the Chancellor of the California*
30 *Community Colleges shall shall, in collaboration with the*
31 *Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, develop,*

1 and each community college district shall adopt, a uniform policy
2 to award a pupil who passes an Advanced Placement exam with
3 a *minimum* score of three or higher course credit for a California
4 Intersegmental General Education Transfer—Curriculum
5 Curriculum, California State University General Education
6 Breadth, or local community college general education
7 requirements, as appropriate for the pupil's needs, in a course
8 with subject matter similar to that of the Advanced Placement
9 exam.

10 ~~SEC. 2.~~

11 SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that
12 this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to
13 local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made
14 pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division
15 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

Policy and Procedures for Providing Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities

POLICY

Students with verified disabilities have the right to receive reasonable academic adjustments in order to create an educational environment where they have equal access to instruction. The District is thus responsible to make modifications to academic requirements and practices as necessary-without any fundamental alternation of academic standards, courses, educational programs or degrees-to ensure that it does not discriminate against qualified students with disabilities. In addition, each district is required to have a policy and procedure for responding to students with verified disabilities who request academic adjustments.

Background

This policy is based on federal and state legislation, which requires community college districts receiving funding to establish programmatic access as well as physical access to its academic offerings. Two of these regulations are: **34 Code of Federal Regulations 104.44 implementing Section 504 of 1973 Rehabilitation Act:**

“(a)Academic requirements. A recipient to this subpart applies shall make such modifications to its academic requirements as are necessary to ensure that such requirements do not discriminate or have the effect of discriminating, on the basis of handicap, against a qualified handicapped applicant or student. Academic requirements that the recipient can demonstrate are essential to the program of instruction being pursued by such student or to any directly related licensing requirement will not be regarded as discriminatory within the meaning of this section. Modifications may include changes in the length of time permitted for the completion of degree requirements, substitution of specific courses required for the completion of degree requirements, and adaptation of the manner in which specific courses are conducted.”

5 California Code of Regulations 56027:

“Each community college district receiving funding pursuant to this subchapter shall... establish a policy and procedure for responding, in a timely manner, to accommodation requests involving academic adjustment. This procedure shall provide for an individualized review of each request. The procedure shall also permit the Section 504 Coordinator, or other designated district official with knowledge of accommodation requirements, to make an interim decision pending a final resolution.”

Accommodations

Accommodations of two levels are available. Accommodations may be made 1) in the manner of presentation of the course to permit the student to complete the required course; 2) by substitutions of another course for the required course.

Academic requirements that the college can demonstrate are essential to the program of instruction being pursued by the student or directly related to licensing requirements will not be regarded as discriminatory.^{34 C.F.R. 104.44}

Level I Special Course Accommodations:

Foothill- De Anza Community College District intends all of its graduates to master the competencies required by Title 5 of the California Education Code. The course requirements are established to meet that requirement and students should, where possible, complete courses required for graduation. The District recognizes that most disabilities that preclude a student from completing a course can be overcome by altering the method of course delivery and providing a combination of appropriate accommodations, e.g., facilitation of tutorial assistance, in-class support services, auxiliary aids, test accommodations, a slower paced version of the course, advisement to complete lower level or developmental courses in a sequence. Therefore, for most students with disabilities, the first level of accommodation will involve an attempt to complete the course with additional or altered means of delivery.

Level II Course Substitution:

Course substitution will be considered for those students with a verified disability in two circumstances:

1. When the student has attempted and exhausted Level I accommodations and for whom Level I accommodations are not adequate to enable them to complete the course; and
2. When the student can show that his/her disability is of a type or magnitude that any attempt at completing the course would be futile.

Any course substitution granted by Foothill College is for the purpose of the College's requirements only, and may not be recognized by a subsequent educational institution and/or licensing board.

Procedure

Note: By law, a student is not required to go through DRC to receive academic adjustments and auxiliary aids. Separate procedures are noted below for students exercising this option at Level I, II. Recent verification of the disability and special education limitations is required whether or not a student chooses to use DRC services.

Verification of the Disability

1. Where the nature or extent of the disability is not apparent, the student bears the responsibility of presenting recent professional documentation of specific educational limitations to the college before an academic accommodation will be granted.
2. If the student does not have appropriate verification of a disability, the student may request an assessment from Disability Resource Center (DRC) to determine and document the disability if it is within the scope of services provided by DRC. Where possible, DRC may provide referrals for assessment or documentation of those disabilities beyond the scope of services provided by the college.

For Students Using DRC Services

Level I Course Accommodation Procedures

1. Requests for course accommodation should be presented to the DRC specialist.
2. The student, in collaboration with the DRC professional staff, will determine a reasonable and appropriate accommodation(s) based upon his/her educational limitation(s). The student will submit to his/her instructors the accommodations authorization forms completed by the DRC professional.
3. If the student disagrees with the academic accommodations authorized by the DRC professional staff, he/she should discuss his/her concern with the professional recommending the adjustment. If the student's concern continues to be unresolved, the student should discuss his/her concern with the appropriate immediate supervisor of DRC. Every attempt should be made to resolve the disagreement with the immediate supervisor. If the disagreement continues to be unresolved, the student's next step is to contact the 504 Coordinator as outlined below.
4. If the instructor has questions about an accommodation requested by a student with verified disability, the instructor should promptly contact the DRC professional who authorized the accommodation(s).
5. Meetings and discussions among the instructor, Division Dean or designee, the student, the appropriate members of DRC and/or other appropriate members of the college community are essential at the outset, and will be completed within five (5) instructional days following the request for the accommodation.
6. If no resolution can be found within five (5) working days and the accommodation is not allowed, the DRC professional, student or the instructor will refer the matter to the 504 Coordinator as soon as possible for review. The 504 Coordinator will make a decision regarding the accommodation within five (5) instructional days of having received the matter.

7. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the decision by the 504 Coordinator, either of them needs to notify the 504 Coordinator in writing within ten (10) instructional days. The 504 Coordinator will then proceed to the next level administrator or committee.
8. The accommodation originally authorized by DRC will be allowed for a maximum of three (3) instructional weeks during which time a resolution will be achieved. If the reviewing administrator's decision is that the accommodation is not reasonable, then the accommodation will either be modified or rescinded.

Level II - Course Substitution

1. Requests for Course substitution shall be submitted by the student to the director of DRC. Course substitutions shall be determined by the Academic Council. The Academic Council shall review cases under any of the following conditions:
 - a. The student, having made a good-faith effort to complete the required course in question by availing themselves of the accommodations recommended by DRC professional staff, has been unable to satisfactorily complete the required course.
 - b. The student and the DRC professional staff member agree that, due to the nature of the disability, even beginning the course with Level I accommodations is futile.
 - c. The student desires to appeal a DRC professional staff member's assessment that the educational implications of their disability is not sufficient to warrant a substitution.
2. First the Academic Council will form a committee consisting of the following members:
 - a. Members of the Academic Council
 - b. DRC professional staff member
 - c. Faculty representative from the student's declared major course of study

- d. Faculty representative from the student's course substitution request (can't think of a better way to say this); ie: if the student wishes to substitute a course in mathematics, then a member from the mathematics department shall be present.
3. All parties shall be given an opportunity to defend their positions. The committee shall make its decision based on a majority vote with the following guidelines:
 - a. The Committee will determine if the required course is essential to the student's individual course of study. If the Committee decides the course is essential, the substitution request shall be denied in order to protect the integrity of the program of study and to protect the student's best interest in pursuing that program.
 - b. If the course in question is found to be non-essential to the student's plan of study, the Committee shall seek to provide an appropriate course substitution.
4. The Committee will forward its decision, in writing, to the student and the Director of DRC within ten (10) instructional days.
5. An exception to the above timeline will be made should the Chair of the Academic Council receive the petition so late in the semester that the Committee would not be able to complete its process while classes are in session. In such a case, the Chair will convene the committee at the earliest possible time during the next session. The timeline for the Committee's decision (within 10 instructional days of receipt) will then apply in the subsequent session.

Appeal Process

1. If the student is dissatisfied, he or she may appeal to the Vice President of Instruction within ten (10) instructional days of receiving a decision at Level I, II or III.
2. During this appeal process, the 504 Coordinator may make an interim decision on an accommodation pending the final resolution. This decision remains in place while the final determination is being made.
3. If the Vice President of Instruction rejects the appeal, the student has ten (10) instructional days from the time of notification to request the appeal be forwarded to the President.
4. If the President rejects the appeal, the student may pursue the Section 504/Americans with Disabilities Act Complaint Policy or, ultimately, file a complaint with the Office of Civil Rights.

504 Campus Coordinator:

Pat Hyland, Dean of Student Affairs

Level I Course Accommodation Procedures for students not using DRC services

1. Requests for course accommodation should be presented to the instructor of the course. The instructor is encouraged to consult with a DRC counselor/specialist regarding the procedure for verifying the disability.
2. The student, in collaboration with the instructor will determine a reasonable and appropriate accommodation(s) based upon his/her educational limitation(s). The instructor is encouraged to consult with a DRC counselor/specialist regarding ways in which to implement academic adjustments and/or auxiliary aids.
3. If the student disagrees with the academic accommodations authorized by the instructor or the instructor does not allow an accommodation, the student or instructor should contact the 504 Coordinator.
4. The 504 Coordinator will make a decision regarding the accommodation within five (5) instructional days of having received the matter.
5. If either the instructor or the student disagrees with the decision by the 504 Coordinator, either of them needs to notify the 504 Coordinator in

writing within ten (10) instructional days. The 504 Coordinator will then proceed to the next level administrator or committee.

6. The accommodation originally requested will be allowed for a maximum of three (3) instructional weeks during which time a resolution will be achieved. If the reviewing administrator's decision is that the accommodation is not reasonable, then the accommodation will either be modified or rescinded.

Level II -Course Substitution for Students Not Using DRC Services

1. Requests for Course substitution shall be submitted by the student to the Academic Council. The Academic Council shall review cases under any of the following conditions:
 - a. The student, having made a good-faith effort to complete the required course in question by availing themselves of accommodations has been unable to satisfactorily complete the required course.
 - b. The student and the 504 Coordinator agree that, due to the nature of the educational implications of their disability, even beginning the course with Level I accommodations is futile.
 - c. The student desires to appeal the 504 Coordinator's assessment that the educational implications of their disability is not sufficient to warrant a substitution.
6. First the Academic Council will form a committee consisting of the following members:
 - a. Members of the Academic Council
 - b. 504 Campus Coordinator
 - c. Faculty representative from the student's declared major course of study
 - d. Faculty representative from the student's course substitution request (can't think of a better way to say this); ie: if the student wishes to substitute a course in mathematics, then a member from the mathematics department shall be present.

7. All parties shall be given an opportunity to defend their positions. The committee shall make its decision based on a unanimous vote with the following guidelines:
 - a. The Committee will determine if the required course is essential to the student's individual course of study. If the Committee decides the course is essential, the substitution request shall be denied in order to protect the integrity of the program of study and to protect the student's best interest in pursuing that program.
 - b. If the course in question is found to be non-essential to the student's plan of study, the Committee shall seek to provide an appropriate course substitution.
8. The Committee will forward its decision, in writing, to the student and the Director of DRC within ten (10) instructional days.
9. An exception to the above timeline will be made should the Chair of the Academic Council receive the petition so late in the semester that the Committee would not be able to complete its process while classes are in session. In such a case, the Chair will convene the committee at the earliest possible time during the next session. The timeline for the Committee's decision (within 10 instructional days of receipt) will then apply in the subsequent session.

Appeal Process

1. If the student is dissatisfied, he or she may appeal to the Vice President of Instruction within ten (10) instructional days of receiving a decision at Level I, II or III.
2. During this appeal process, the 504 Coordinator may make an interim decision on an accommodation pending the final resolution. This decision remains on an accommodation pending the final resolution. This decision remains in place while the final determination is being made.

3. If the Vice President of Instruction rejects the appeal, the student has ten (10) instructional days from the time of notification to request the appeal be forwarded to the President.
4. If the President rejects the appeal, the student may pursue the Section 504/Americans with Disabilities Act Complaint Policy or, ultimately, file a complaint with the Office of Civil Rights.