

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 3, 2015
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: October 20, 2015	Minutes approved as written M/S (Armstrong, Jones) Approved , 0 abstentions.
2. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following proposals were presented: BIOL 300, C S 3B, HLTH 300, HORT 54L, Interdisciplinary Studies 300, MDIA 4 & MDIA 7.</p> <p>Proposals include three upper-division courses for baccalaureate degree. Interdisciplinary Studies not yet offered at Foothill—will need further discussion around creating that discipline. Concern expressed regarding upper-division GE that may be interesting to students outside of program but not accessible to them. Hueg stated that upper-division GE will not be open access; handbook will be released which includes details about baccalaureate pilot program in relation to Title 5. Topics related to upper-division courses will be discussed at Plenary later this week, and state will draft guidelines following that. Mention of these upper-division courses possibly being applicable to students in future Allied Health baccalaureate degrees, if that is the direction the state heads. Campbell noted that there was not unanimous approval of BIOL and HLTH courses within Division. Escoto noted need to ensure that faculty who intend to teach these courses meet minimum qualifications.</p> <p>Question about HORT 54L proposal being intended as UC transferable, but having course number above 50; that was a typo by Vanatta, will fix.</p> <p>Please share with your constituents.</p>
3. Consent Calendar a. GE Applications b. Stand Alone Form	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following GE applications were presented: Area I - HUMN 5, HUMN 6, HUMN 7, MDIA 1, MDIA 2A, MDIA 2B; Area V - COMM 60. The following Stand Alone form was presented: SPAN 192.</p> <p>Question about SPAN 192 and how it is consistent with one (or more) of the missions (Criteria A); concern that information on form is insufficient. The committee pulled the item from the Consent Calendar and asked for follow up from LA Division.</p> <p>Request to discuss Stand Alone form, in general, at future meeting, especially in regard to courses that are permanently Stand Alone—request for guidance and clarification on how to fill out form.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Evans) Approved.</p> <p>Discussion occurred regarding when a Stand Alone form needs to be submitted—language on the form suggests that</p>

	<p>if a course is part of an existing program it does not need Stand Alone approval. Request that new courses being added to state-approved degrees not require Stand Alone approval. Topic will be discussed at future CCC meeting, and pending requests for Stand Alone forms for courses that will be added to an approved program will be put on hold.</p> <p>Request for clarification regarding Math requirement in local GE for associate degrees. Foothill requires Math proficiency, but not actual course requirement. Suggestion that when the topic of GE is revisited, we discuss this issue to better align ourselves with CSU-GE and IGETC. Counseling noted that many students opt not to transfer and those who intend to are encouraged to use CSU-GE or IGETC instead of local GE; counselors also encourage students (when appropriate) to consider taking a transferable-level Math course in case they decide to transfer in the future. Escoto noted that Title 5 allows students at community colleges to demonstrate Math proficiency via testing. Topic will be revisited at a later meeting.</p>
4. Baccalaureate Degree Proposal for Course Numbering	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Need to determine which numbers to use for upper-division courses, keeping in mind the need to ensure clarity for students and on transcripts. Decision must be made ahead of 2016-17 catalog being published. One proposal is to use 300s; another idea is to set aside 300s and 400s. Currently, 300s and 400s are being used, and those courses would need to be renumbered. LaManque noted that there is no consistent rule across the state, but generally 300s/400s used for upper-division, especially at the CSUs. 300s would be sufficient, but would we like to differentiate between junior and senior level courses? Escoto suggested speaking with De Anza to ensure alignment, as they might offer baccalaureate in the future. Suggestion that upper-division be far-removed from the numbering convention of regular courses (e.g., 900s), in order to avoid students assuming that the numbering suggests a specific sequence. BH noted that using 300s/400s would affect students in existing programs (e.g., EMT) by renumbering their courses. LaManque cautioned that higher numbers could cause confusion on transcripts. Banner system prevents use of 4-digit numbers (e.g., 1000s). Document shared of courses numbered in 300s/400s; LaManque noted that many of the 300s in Performing Arts aren't currently offered. Suggestion to use 500s/600s. LaManque will return with written proposal at a later meeting. We have asked state for guidance but haven't received any; have been informed that we should choose what works best for school. Phyllis Spragge proposed use of 300s. BH requested involving Dave Huseman in EMT if 300s used. Please share topic with your constituents and report back any feedback.</p>
5. Upper Division GE Approval Process	<p>Speaker: Andrew LaManque GE is a college-wide approval process, which is why GE courses are approved at CCC (recommendations from CCC GE subcommittees). We will soon need to start approving upper-division GE; as of now, the only body we have to approve is CCC. Discussion will eventually include</p>

	<p>determining guidelines for reviewing and approving applications, but immediate need is to determine process. Mention that discussion of approval guidelines more urgent than discussing process. Note that different programs will require different GE, so perhaps same criteria can be used for upper-division as used currently, and language added to current forms in existing areas. Current criteria for GE areas were set by faculty a few years ago. Starer suggested we see what other schools are using, as a starting-off point. Kurt Hueg noted that the state suggests we use our existing approval process for upper-division courses; Escoto noted that even if we use similar process to approve courses, we will need to determine who will be approving upper-division GE. Need to determine if upper-level GE fit within our existing pattern, with proper adjustments made.</p> <p>Spragge noted that although we don't currently offer Interdisciplinary Studies, it's a way for faculty from different disciplines to work together on a course. Echoed Hueg's note from the state about using current process for baccalaureate degree courses. There are a number of four-year Dental Hygiene programs across the US that we can look at as models.</p> <p>Escoto mentioned tight timeframe and the need to provide guidance to current subcommittee members if they will be reviewing upper-division courses. Mention about using IGETC standards as option to review upper-division GE. Group was asked for thoughts; they included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use existing GE subcommittees. • Perhaps a subcommittee could meet with colleagues at Chancellor's Office who work with CSU-GE and IGETC to get some guidance around their process. • Concern that it is a big responsibility for current subcommittees to review upper-division, as our current GE subcommittees are composed of two to four people. <p>Topic will be revisited at next CCC meeting for decision. Please share with your constituents and report back any feedback. Escoto will send email outlining nuances.</p>
<p>6. Division Guidelines for Online Learning</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</p> <p>Escoto shared proposal for BSS Division standards. Noted that not all specifics from resolution have been touched by BSS document. Question about timeline of review of courses and concern about evaluating faculty. Escoto clarified that the spirit of the resolution is regarding courses. Question about how a course would be reviewed, as same COR used for online and non-online. Escoto stated that review of courses will address communication with students and other aspects specific to online courses. Concern expressed of overlap with faculty evaluation (J1). Starer noted that the spirit of the resolution is for faculty to come together in a collegial way and not involve Deans; desire is to have a peer review process and not just strict guidelines of contract. Concern expressed that faculty's job is not to review one another but to ensure that a course is a good course; shouldn't Distance Learning</p>

	<p>application address this sufficiently? Concern expressed that peer review could cause disharmony. Escoto clarified that the resolution is meant to be about discussion and not seen as faculty policing each other. Belief expressed that process should be separated from curriculum and presented in a different way, such as professional development—would be better received by faculty. Ong noted that BSS document has been useful in working with new faculty who are teaching online. Escoto will follow up with Carolyn Holcroft and/or COOL regarding wording; clarified what should be included in guidelines (read from resolution). Goal is to report directly to Senate in February; will continue to revisit topic at CCC.</p>
<p>7. ADT Update</p>	<p>Speaker: Bernie Day Agricultural Plant Sciences: We are not required to create this ADT, but we do have the curriculum. Biology: In progress; not yet submitted to the state. Nutrition and Dietetics: Holcroft working on template. Public Health Science: Shirley Treanor working on it; new courses have received C-ID approval. Child & Adolescent Development: Available for us to apply starting 2/1/16. Elementary Teacher Education: Would require development of four new courses, in BH and PSME. Global Studies: Day met with interested faculty last week; Brian Evans and Michelle Palma will be developing. Social Justice Studies: Some in equity workgroup have discussed. Chemistry: We are mandated to create this ADT; new course created to meet unit requirement has been submitted to the state. Film, TV & Electronic Media: Kristin Tripp-Caldwell has expressed interest. Music: Productive meeting last week with Robert Hartwell and Paul Davies; would require creation of at least 13 new courses. Petitioned to C-ID oversight committee; statewide leadership will meet with Music department to discuss. Model Curricula (MC): Essentially, these are like ADTs but do not fit within unit requirement and are currently not guaranteed for transfer; we can create local AA or AS degrees within. One example is Nursing. Others are Engineering and Information Technology, which the state just finalized.</p> <p>LaManque asked what process we will be following, going forward, with ADT creation. Previously had fast-tracked, but should new ADTs follow normal program approval process? Day suggested keeping approval process the same for the time being. Starer asked if the state has sped up program approval process; LaManque noted that Personal Trainer certificate submitted in August has not yet been approved. Starer asked if we can continue to offer an existing degree while it is under review with state for changes (e.g., courses added). Agreement that it makes sense to continue to offer the degree as previously approved, until/unless a change is made at the Chancellor's Office. Counseling asked about AP courses and their usage as ADT major course work; Day said that state</p>

Approved November 17, 2015

	has suggested using local AP policy, but there is concern that transfer school may not honor—suggestion that the student contact transfer school for their policy.
8. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All LA: Request for guidance when assigning FSA codes to courses. PSME looks at codes on existing courses for guidance. Escoto suggested collaborating with De Anza, if similar course offered. Note that FSAs are district-derived, and district list exists. Frequently, the discipline and FSA match, but not always (e.g., non-credit). BSS: Konnilyn Feig announced retirement at the end of this quarter. BSS will follow process to request to fill the position.
9. Good of the Order	
10. Adjournment	3:35 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction—guest), Kay Jones (LIBR), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Barbara Shewfelt (KA), Phyllis Spragge (D H faculty—guest), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Suzanne Weller (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta