

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, December 1, 2015  
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.  
President's Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 17, 2015	Minutes approved as written <i>M/S</i> (Starer, Campbell) <b>Approved</b> , 0 abstentions.
2. Announcements a. Notification of Proposed Requisites  b. New Course Proposals  c. Course Numbering System—Proposal to Change Wording in the Course Catalog	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Please share with your constituents. Suggestion to add column to the document that indicates if a requisite is new or ongoing—Vanatta will update the document to include.</p> <p>The following proposals were presented: ART 65, C S 71A, C S 71B, C S 71C, C S 71D, PSE 56.</p> <p>No comments. Please share with your constituents.</p> <p>As a group, we agreed to use 300s for upper division, and we have been in contact with those who teach current 300s. Will move forward with using those numbers. We will need to update course numbering language for 300s in the catalog and think it is a good opportunity to update the language for the entire numbering system. Current language shared with group. LaManque noted current language indicating 1-99 courses considered “baccalaureate in nature,” which may be confusing when courses for the Dental Hygiene baccalaureate degree are added to the catalog.</p> <p>Proposal for new course numbering language shared with the group. Escoto pointed out the term “degree-applicable”—that may need to change due to baccalaureate degree offered. Mention that “degree-applicable” in catalog differs from the way that term is used in C3MS and in other curriculum aspects. Suggestion that language be used from Title 5, or we include a link to an explanation. Escoto clarified that “degree-applicable” used for courses that can count toward total 90 units needed for degree but are not necessarily on any program sheet or GE pattern. Question about term being used to differentiate between basic skills and non-basic skills. Comment about it meaning “college level.” Suggestion to check board policy.</p> <p>Question about the purpose of the catalog language—is it mainly meant to explain and communicate to the students, and are there accreditation concerns with using certain language? Escoto stated that Title 5 often gives minimum standards but we can choose to use different wording; main point of catalog is to serve students. Counseling noted that students often ask if a course “counts”—the answer can vary, as there are different ways a course can “count” (e.g., transferable [UC, CSU], GE applicable, count towards 90 units).</p> <p>Question as to whether or not the upper division courses will be transferable. Will need to follow up and possibly change language. Escoto will send proposal to the group.</p>

<p>3. Consent Calendar a. Stand Alone Form</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following Stand Alone form was presented: EMR 400.</p> <p>Motion to approve <i>M/S</i> (Francisco, Campbell) <b>Approved.</b> No comments.</p>
<p>4. Curriculum Sheet Review</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Counseling encounters situations in which a student needs to take a course that is not being offered on a regular basis; becoming more problematic with ADTs. Escoto wanted to bring up topic to discuss how often Divisions review curriculum (program) sheets. We need to ensure that sheets are being reviewed frequently, so that division may know, on an updated basis, how often a course may need to be offered. Day has been in contact with divisions when students have trouble finding required courses for ADTs. Though CCC approved a course deactivation policy last year, we try to follow process of offering each course in our catalog at least once every two years.</p> <p>Escoto presented a sheet to use as an example. Suggested that divisions review their sheets and consider whether there are any courses listed that may be tough to offer in the near future. Question as to how often divisions include notes regarding how often/when a course is offered—topic has been discussed at CCC in the past but has never taken hold; notation could be useful but would not necessarily be a guarantee that a course will be offered. Mention that new equivalent courses in other divisions not always added when sheets are being reviewed.</p> <p>Question regarding UC/CSU articulation of courses, as it relates to C-ID descriptors. Escoto noted that Academic Senate understands articulation. Will check with Day and follow up at a future meeting. Mention of UC Pathways and ADTs—ADTs are not a guarantee for admission to the UC system. Note that many ADT courses are already UC transferable.</p>
<p>5. Upper Division GE Criteria</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Need to determine criteria to use when considering courses for upper division GE. Day shared documents with the group via email. First document is CSU Upper Division General Education Definitions and Practices. Mentions writing intensive, building on lower division GE, research and ending up with work samples, college-level writing, critical thinking, problem solving. Escoto noted that SJSU requires a prerequisite of passing their English Writing Skills test—we could require a similar requisite for English (ENGL 1A). We are following Academic Senate’s resolution to require 9 units of upper division GE outside the major program; many CSU schools have similar requirement. SFSU mentions one Cultural, Ethnic, or Social Diversity course.</p> <p>Escoto shared document with the group, comprised of references from CSU document, including English/writing prerequisite, writing intensive capstone course, building on skills developed in lower division courses. LaManque noted that discussion regarding what our upper division GE patterns should be is larger and should be considered in the future, but the immediate need is to nail down what to look for in general. Campbell noted that GE courses developed for Dental Hygiene baccalaureate were created</p>

	<p>with the program in mind, as opposed to lower division GE, which is much more general in nature.</p> <p>Suggestion to consider the following keywords: integrative, outside discipline, writing component. Assurance by division that the three upper division GE courses proposed are already outside the Dental Hygiene discipline, even if they are within the same division. Note that GE can be applicable to the students in the program and relevant—does not need to be completely outside the realm of Dental Hygiene. Mention that courses developed outside of a division could still be applicable/relevant to students in a different division. Note by Escoto that the courses written already follow Senate resolution. LaManque noted that GE criteria not necessarily about a course being applicable to the major. Need to determine the lens from which we look at the courses, as a group, to be able to decide if courses meet GE criteria. Conversation will continue in January.</p> <p>Phyllis Spragge shared document from CSU regarding upper division GE. Noted that requirements vary from campus to campus and that GE is, at times, waived for high unit allied health programs.</p>
<p>6. Dental Hygiene Program Overview</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Phyllis Spragge</b>          Escoto shared documents with the group via email, on behalf of Spragge. First document outlines full baccalaureate degree path, totaling 194 quarter units over four years. Includes upper division GE courses. Program should help prepare students not only for clinical careers but also for Masters degree programs and in public health settings. Question regarding team-taught research methods course—Spragge has been working with faculty to develop course. Library Science portion will be taught by Library faculty; research portion will be taught by faculty outside of major. Second document outlines Bachelors completion degree, for licensed dental hygienists who have already graduated from an accredited two-year program. West LA will also offer a completion program, and Spragge has collaborated with them in developing program. Spragge has heard a lot of interest/demand for this program, as Associates degree limits career options. Students will need to meet prerequisites to enter program, including Registered Dental Hygienist license and GPA requirement. 24 units will need to be completed at Foothill in residency.</p> <p>Question as to how students will be selected for baccalaureate program. Spragge noted that minimum qualifications for students have been outlined, and grades are part of the review process. State working on handbook that will provide guidance as to how students may be selected. Question as to recency requirement regarding completion program—Spragge notes that the licensing requirement will take care of that.</p>
<p>7. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p><b>Speaker: All</b>          FA: ESL department considering adding speaking and listening requirement. Survey was sent out asking for feedback regarding speaking and listening skills for ESL students in classroom.          PSME: Starting in winter, any student who is a third time repeater of MATH 105 will be offered one-on-one weekly tutoring (50 minutes) for the whole quarter</p>

Approved January 19, 2016

	from the STEM center. If successful, may offer to students taking MATH 105 for the second time. Note that students who place into MATH 105 are more successful than those who enter via Math My Way (40% higher success rate).
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	<b>3:27 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), 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), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta