

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

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: December 1, 2015	Minutes approved as written <b>M/S</b> (Starer, Hanning) <b>Approved</b> , 2 abstentions (Fong, Knobel).
2. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following proposals were presented: BUSI 87; HLTH 22, 23; HORT 91C; HUMN 9; MTEC 62C, 70G; PHT 101, 102, 103. Please share with your constituents.  Mention of "pharmaceutical calculations" in curriculum for PHT courses. Suggestion that the department consider minimum Math qualifications (e.g. Math My Way) to ensure proficiency, instead of teaching Math within courses. Clarification that this is a pre-program series for High School students; what minimum level of Math should be required? Example given of an advisory for MATH 220 or equivalent. PSME encourages PHT faculty to connect with Math department to discuss.  Note regarding HUMN 9—Day suggested faculty connect with Language Arts to ensure no crossover. LA stated that they have discussed.
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Please share with your constituents.
3. Consent Calendar a. Stand Alone Forms	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following Stand Alone forms were presented: LINC 75A, 75B, 75C, 82A, 82B, 82C, 91A, 91B, 91C, 92; PHT 101, 102, 103.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Jones, Evans) <b>Approved</b> . No comments.
4. Upper Division GE Criteria for Approval	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Concern that approval of policy will become "set in stone" for any future baccalaureate degrees. Escoto noted that the goal is to continue with further discussion for future degrees and that current conversation is specifically for the Dental Hygiene program.  Want to keep guidelines somewhat general, since these will be the first upper division GE courses offered. Proposal was crafted by reviewing criteria used by other schools and recommendations made by ASCCC; Escoto also reviewed draft of CCCC baccalaureate degree handbook to ensure that proposal does not conflict. LaManque noted that handbook adopted ASCCC recommendations and will be voted for approval by the Board of Governors.  Procedurally, we will approve criteria before reviewing upper division GE courses for Dental Hygiene program. Escoto stressed that this criteria will be used solely for the three courses currently under review, and upper division GE conversation will be resumed in the future, before considering any additional upper division GE courses.  Question about critical thinking component—not on

	<p>proposal but noted in draft handbook in “Definition of Upper Division” section. Not specifically in the GE section of handbook, but important to consider when reviewing GE. Group agreed to add to proposal—Escoto made update.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Serna, Emanuel) <b>Approved.</b></p>
5. Upper Division GE Courses for Approval	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>  Courses were developed with close eyes on ASCCC recommendations and upper division GE course guidelines at CSUs. Question from LaManque regarding which course best fits critical thinking component. IDS 300 mentions "critical evaluation" and "critical thinking skills" in description. Escoto noted that courses are designed to build on coursework taught earlier in the program. Question regarding when courses will be taught—program begins in fall 2016.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Serna, Hanning) <b>Approved.</b></p>
6. Dental Hygiene Baccalaureate Program for Approval	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>  Note that Phyllis Spragge forwarded new version of attachments, which Escoto emailed to the group this morning. Very minor changes to the sheets, including correction from Associate to Bachelor degree (cannot note BS in C3MS yet).</p> <p>LaManque clarified that the program is one degree with two different cohorts. Question regarding program prerequisite courses being double-counted. Clarification that prerequisite courses may also count for IGETC/CSU GE purposes. Escoto noted that much of the course content for the Dental Hygiene courses has not changed—Spragge has communicated that the courses have always been upper division equivalent, but we had not yet had the ability to categorize courses as upper division. Question regarding ESLL 26. LA stated ESLL 26 would no longer be used as prerequisite for ENGL 1B. Dental Hygiene program sheet does not state that ESLL 26 may be used as prerequisite for ENGL 1B, but clarification should be made. Follow-up necessary to make sure this change to the ENGL 1B prerequisite is planned/implemented through our curricular process.</p> <p>Escoto noted that we cannot use local Foothill GE pattern for baccalaureate degree—only CSU-GE or IGETC may be used. Note that small adjustments to program sheets (e.g. ESLL issue) may still be made after program is approved. Next step in process is for program to be presented at PARC for approval, then FHDA Board.</p> <p>Question regarding how equivalents are determined for program prerequisites. Counseling already uses established process and will use that process for this program, as well. Note that a few courses listed do not allow for an equivalent. Question as to why English courses do not allow for equivalent and suggestion for that to be added. Suggestion that certain prerequisite courses be noted as “must be taken at Foothill College,” if that is expected. Escoto noted that Spragge has created suggested/example Ed Plan sheets with expanded information; suggestion that, for continuity, the program sheets match that information as much as possible.</p>

	<p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Francisco, Evans) <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>7. Course Numbering System Proposal for Approval</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>  New language for 2016-17 catalog. Previously discussed language in earlier meetings, especially around “degree-applicable” term. Curriculum team researched Title 5 when crafting proposal. Biggest adjustment is to 300 series—changing to upper division courses and will move current 300s to other numbers. Some discussion has occurred for EMT courses but no new numbers settled yet. Question regarding transferability of upper division courses, as proposal states that courses numbered 100 and above are not transferable. Comment that transferability is relative to the given institution choosing to accept the content/units. Suggestion that statement be changed to, “Courses numbered 100 and above are typically not transferable” as to allow for the possibility of a situation when transfer credit were to be granted for upper division Dental Hygiene courses. Question regarding standard use of 300 numbering across CA Community Colleges—note that there is no standard, but the draft baccalaureate degree handbook does recommend 300s for upper division.</p> <p>Note that “usually,” “generally,” and “typically” are all used, and request for consistency. Group consensus on “typically”—Escoto made update. Escoto changed “designated” to “numbered.” Question regarding note on courses numbered 1-49, cautioning students to consult with a counselor regarding transferability—Escoto believes it should remain, although rarely an issue. Suggestion to move statement to bottom of numbering system as footnote—Escoto made update.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Evans, Serna) <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>8. Review of Lower Division GE</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>  This will be a big conversation, spanning multiple meetings. Escoto passed out “Foothill College General Education Requirements for A.A./A.S. Degree Advising Worksheet” and noted that there have been some concerns about how our local GE pattern relates to CSU-GE or IGETC and how students determine which to follow. Is our pattern best serving our students?</p> <p>Advising Worksheet lists graduation requirements; minimum proficiency requirements for English and Math (note that Math is not a specific GE area due to Math proficiency requirement); GE Areas I-VII, noting number of courses required per area and listing current GE courses per area. Note that certain areas required by Title 5 and a few added by Foothill because we determined that they are important enough to be included in GE. <i>Reference Title 5 §55063.</i></p> <p>As a campus, we agreed on the criteria for each GE area; subcommittees review applications to determine whether or not a course fits within the area. Escoto stressed the need for CCC members to review and understand criteria for each GE area ahead of larger discussion of GE as a whole.</p> <p>Counseling noted that students may have confusion</p>

	<p>regarding courses listed as, for example, Humanities for CSU-GE or IGETC but not as Humanities for Foothill GE. Escoto noted that one cause of this may be a focus on the incorrect/inappropriate pattern for the goal. Question as to whether or not this may be resolved by simply adding course to Foothill GE; Escoto noted that, sometimes, there is also a curriculum change that must be made, which delays process. Note that when GE area criteria was updated, all courses needed to re apply for GE consideration.</p> <p>Concern that, in the past, some courses were submitted for GE in order to ensure enrollment and that departments wouldn't recommend new courses for GE if they had a good number listed. Suggestion that Area VII (Lifelong Learning) is such a long list because it's the "easiest" criteria to match. Question of how closely Lifelong Learning matches up with our current college mission statement.</p> <p>Question regarding who is the best person to contact if one believes a course should be listed as GE. CCC Rep(s) for that division; Starer suggested contacting faculty and Dean for courses that are listed as GE but are not scheduled very frequently. Question regarding students' ability to petition for local GE for a course that is not listed; Escoto noted that if a course counted for GE when it was taken, or during any catalog year to which the student has catalog rights, we can use it for local GE purposes. We cannot petition a course that was not in a local GE area to count for a local GE area. This stems from the idea that all students must have the same options for each GE area, appropriate to their catalog rights, not just those who petition for it.</p> <p>Question as to whether we should allow a student to retain GE for a course when changing from CSU-GE or IGETC to Foothill GE (for courses listed on CSU-GE/IGETC but not on Foothill GE)—Escoto stated that this is the sort of topic that should be part of the larger GE discussion. Noted that there are many nuances that need to be taken into consideration when revisiting GE, including discussing need for local GE pattern, in general.</p>
9. Report Out from Division Reps	<b>Speaker: All</b> Nothing to report.
10. Good of the Order	
11. Adjournment	<b>3:33 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Owen Flannery (KA), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction—guest), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta