

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 16, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: February 2, 2016	Minutes approved as written M/S (Hanning, LaManque) Approved. 1 abstention (Armstrong).
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto
a. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Please share with your constituents.
b. New Course Proposals	The following proposals were presented: CHEM 13A, 13AH, 13B, 13BH, 13C, 13CH. Please share with your constituents. The Chemistry department is continuing to work on the ADT, which has a strict maximum unit allowance. To address this, the department plans to de-couple the units per course in the 12A/B/C series from 6 units to 5 units lecture + 1 unit discussion. Department also plans to separate the lab from 12C—working on ensuring that doing so will still be okay with C-ID. Department noted that UC schools follow this scheduling method. Question as to when courses will be submitted for articulation with UC—these will be new for 2017-18, so will be submitted later this year. Day noted that although students will meet the “letter of the law” by taking 12C without the lab, they might run into trouble when applying for transfer if they do not complete the lab. Concern that it might be difficult for counselors to ensure that students understand that it is in their best interest to complete the lab. Suggestion that a chart noting students’ dependencies on Chemistry curriculum (across campus) may be helpful—similar chart recently provided to Math department. Day noted that many other colleges have had difficulty meeting 90 unit maximum for ADT. Department believes that offering ADT reinforces that Foothill has a strong science department.
c. Open Educational Resources	Current conversation at Academic Senate. Students have come to Senate, requesting help in keeping students’ costs down. Escoto noted that the intent is that discussions happen within divisions to support the idea of OER; no curriculum changes are being requested or required. Please contact your Senator, Escoto, Carolyn Holcroft, or Patrick Morris with any feedback.
d. Stand Alone Form	Follow-up to previous discussion, to clarify that a Stand Alone form is required for a new course if: 1) the course will be permanently Stand Alone, or 2) the course will be made part of a new program (that has not yet been approved by the state). New courses being added to an active, state-approved program do not require Stand Alone form. We will post on the CCC website a clarification on this policy. No changes will be made to the current form.
e. Courses not Taught in 4 Years	As noted in the Policy on Course Currency, a list of courses not taught in four years was sent to Curriculum Reps and Deans via email last Thursday, along with the form that faculty should complete for each course they wish to request to keep active. Forms will need to be discussed

	<p>and approved at the Division CC, and forms for division-approved courses should be forwarded to Vanatta by Curriculum Rep. Note that courses on the list that are not approved by CCC to keep active will automatically be made inactive. Deadline for forms to be submitted to Vanatta is March 10th. Counseling noticed courses on list that are ADT requirements; Day noted that if any of these become inactive a change will need to be submitted to the state for the ADT. Request that policy be posted to the CCC website; Vanatta is working on creating a new section of website to post CCC policies, and this will be included. Question as to the timing of departments demonstrating when course will be offered in the future, on petition form. Policy does not explicitly state, and Escoto noted that this will be part of the discussion at CCC when reviewing petitions. Note that the list will be run annually, so any approved course that is not then taught within the next year will be on the list for the following year. Please let us know if you see any course listed which you believe should not be, and please be mindful of courses listed that are ADT requirements.</p>
<p>3. Consent Calendar a. GE Application b. Stand Alone Forms</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following GE application was presented: Area VII - HLTH 20. The following Stand Alone forms were presented: ALTW 219, SPAN 192 (updated from previous submission).</p> <p>Motion to approve <i>M/S</i> (Serna, Evans) Approved. No comments.</p>
<p>4. Credit for Upper Division Coursework</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Escoto updated resolution from version shared at previous meeting, to be more inclusive. Changed reference to “upper division” to state, “course content across the curriculum of one college or university,” so that graduate level coursework may also be considered. Question as to how this relates to a student who may want to apply lower division coursework for the upper division GE courses for Dental Hygiene baccalaureate degree; agreement among group that the wording should explicitly state that credit is to be given for lower division coursework only. Escoto asked group if graduate level work should be considered for substitution, and noted that the decision to approve substitution will still be made by discipline faculty on a case-by-case basis. Suggestion to change wording to “higher/greater than lower division,” which broadens the wording and lessens confusion. Escoto will revise and continue discussion at future meeting.</p>
<p>5. Cross-listing Policy</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto De Anza’s policy shared by Escoto via email, separate from agenda. Policy states that courses must be considered interdisciplinary/multi-disciplinary and that a rationale must be provided for cross-listing. Departments must also provide information regarding minimum qualifications, shared teaching responsibilities, split of load, and shared seat counts.</p> <p>Escoto noted that even in a perfect situation, when all parties are in agreement, we have no policy that states how departments should handle scheduling of cross-listed courses. Asked group for feedback from their constituents and for their experiences when developing cross-listed courses. PSME noted that C S/MATH 18 is a standard course</p>

	<p>across colleges and that if the two courses were separate they could not both be offered due to low total enrollment. Day provided an example of cross-listed courses that incorporate requirements for students in both departments within the shared course outline. Escoto noted that policy should not create any barriers for those who wish to develop cross-listed courses, but that it should help prevent problem situations. Concern mentioned that, over time, faculty who develop cross-listings retire or otherwise stop teaching the course and newer faculty and/or administrators don't realize that courses are cross-listed. Suggestion for a mechanism in Banner or C3MS to alert staff when scheduling a cross-listed course. LaManque noted that we must consider the value to students when creating cross-listed courses.</p> <p>Escoto suggested first step of creating a document that lists everything that should be considered when developing a cross-listed course, and then moving forward with discussion about how such courses should be scheduled and maintained.</p>
<p>6. Local General Education</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</p> <p>Reminder that one of the topics for this year is whether or not we should better align our local GE pattern with the CSU-GE & IGETC transfer patterns. Escoto displayed local GE pattern, on which he had highlighted the courses that are also on the CSU-GE pattern; similarly, he displayed the CSU-GE pattern, on which he had highlighted courses that are also on our local GE pattern. Before we consider drastic changes for our local pattern, we should be clear on how much overlap there already is between our pattern and the transfer patterns. Just because a course isn't highlighted on the CSU-GE sheet (as also being local GE) doesn't mean that it cannot be a local GE course—could mean that it has not yet been submitted. Counseling asked if we should automatically add a course to our local GE pattern if it is already on a transfer GE pattern, without having to follow our local application process; Escoto noted that this is an important topic to consider in the broader discussion. Example of a course listed for CSU-GE that the division doesn't consider as having enough breadth to be on local GE pattern. Suggestion that the local application process be streamlined for those courses on transfer pattern, or at least faculty informed when a course is approved for CSU-GE/IGETC that is not on local GE, as at times faculty do not realize.</p> <p>Escoto noted that, for accreditation, we must demonstrate that we are evaluating the GE area learning outcomes for each area of our local GE pattern. We must show that we're specifically evaluating what students are supposed to learn for each area; if we adopted policy that transfer GE courses are okay for local GE, we must state how we are still evaluating learning criteria. Simply using the rationale that it was approved by UC/CSU for GE is probably insufficient. Mention that applying for GE can feel like a paperwork-heavy process, and conversation regarding the importance of demonstrating that courses are being thoroughly evaluated for use as general education. Escoto suggested that perhaps our local GE application process should be revisited; concerns shared</p>

	<p>that courses get hung up in the process, for various reasons, which causes frustration. Suggestion that, as a group, we read through all of our current local GE categories and determine whether those courses on CSU-GE list that are not on our local GE fit within them. Suggestion that we determine the differences between our local GE application and UC/CSU requirements and use that to assess courses which are approved for transfer GE but are not on our local GE list. Concern by Escoto that doing so could undermine our own process and result in our having to explain, in accreditation meetings, how courses were given local GE approval. Suggestion that perhaps our application and process is seen as untrusting and rigid; note that other colleges have a rigorous course approval process at the front-end, which allows for a less-rigid GE approval process. Note that before our applications were revised, the criteria were so general that GE subcommittee members had difficulty knowing how to assess courses, which resulted in current forms' explicit nature. Moving forward, CCC will revisit GE criteria and discuss whether or not changes need to be made to criteria and/or how criteria is applied to course applications.</p>
7. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	<p>3:38 PM</p>

Attendees: Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction—guest), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA), Suzanne Weller (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta