

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

| Item | Discussion |
|--|---|
| 1. Minutes: January 19, 2016 | Minutes approved as written <i>M/S</i> (Day, Hanning) Approved. |
| 2. Announcements | Speaker: Isaac Escoto |
| a. New Course Proposals | The following proposals were presented: MATH 67, PHED 41D. Please share with your constituents. Question regarding prerequisite for MATH 67—none noted on proposal. Is there a minimum requirement for CSU transfer for Math? Day noted that it could be approved as an elective (non-GE) without requiring a prerequisite. |
| b. Senate & CCC Representation Structure | Moving forward, Academic Senate will be discussing representation, voting structure, and related topics. This includes CCC, as we are a subcommittee of Senate. Please send any feedback to Patrick Morris (secretary of Senate). Escoto will bring any relevant information back to CCC. |
| c. Division Guidelines for Online Learning | The Senate resolution referring to these guidelines asks for division rep(s) or designee to submit guidelines for their division this month. Division submissions will be discussed at Senate meeting on Feb. 22 nd . Kurt Hueg sent an email in November to clarify that guidelines are not meant to be used as evaluation or to replace anything on J1. Purpose of guidelines is to assist faculty teaching online. Please forward your division's guidelines to your Senator, being mindful of the Feb. 22 nd meeting date. |
| d. Update on Course Management System | Subcommittee met on Jan. 12 th to discuss progress; still working on decision regarding future of CMS. Webmaster currently working on improvements to current CMS (C3MS), including uploading/attaching required documents to COR (e.g., Content Review forms), and a tool to compare current COR content to edits made when updating COR. As a reminder, these are improvements that CCC agreed were priorities. Going forward, the long-term proposal is to move to a third-party vendor, but much conversation still needs to occur. In the short-term, improvements will be made in C3MS while we continue to explore third-party options. |
| e. Courses not Taught in 4 Years | Speaker: Mary Vanatta Last year, CCC approved the Policy on Course Currency, which addresses the need to ensure that courses listed in the course catalog are offered on a regular basis. Before the next CCC meeting, Vanatta will send, via email, a list of courses that have not been taught in four years. Per policy, these courses will be deactivated for 2016-17 unless approved by CCC to remain active. The division must file a petition to CCC for each course it wishes to keep active. |
| 3. Consent Calendar | Speaker: Isaac Escoto |
| a. Stand Alone Forms | The following Stand Alone forms were presented: L A 61A, 61B. Motion to approve <i>M/S</i> (Starer, Evans) Approved. No |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>4. Transfer GE Review—IGETC & CSU GE</p> | <p>comments.</p> <p>Speaker: Bernie Day Before we continue conversation about our local GE pattern, it is important to understand IGETC and CSU GE. Three ways for a student to fulfill GE for transfer: 1. satisfy transfer university’s local requirements, 2. complete CSU GE-Breadth (honored at any CSU campus), 3. complete IGETC (honored at any CSU or UC campus). ASSIST.org may be used to see which Foothill courses fulfill GE requirements at universities.</p> <p>Executive Order 1100 outlines CSU GE requirements and is a good resource for faculty when developing course outlines. The IGETC Standards, Policies, and Procedures document is the resource to use for IGETC. Both documents were attached to this meeting’s agenda. Day shared examples of requirements for both CSU GE and IGETC, and approved courses at Foothill that meet those requirements.</p> <p>The deadline to submit for CSU GE or IGETC is always December 1st; for IGETC, the course must already have UC transfer approval. When a student applies for transfer, an evaluator certifies each course on the student’s transcript; courses taken at other schools are reviewed as “pass-along” (note that International courses cannot be considered for pass-along, unless from a US regionally accredited institution). July 15th is the (strict) deadline for a student to apply for CSU GE/IGETC certification, which can become problematic for Foothill students due to our quarter system calendar.</p> <p>Escoto passed out CSU GE and IGETC worksheets used by Counseling.</p> |
| <p>5. C-ID Descriptors & Articulation</p> | <p>Speaker: Bernie Day Topic brought up at CCC previously. Day presented the different levels of articulation. Basic level is CSU-transferable; UC-transferable is trickier, as they have specific minimum standards. However, Day noted that our success rate with UC is quite high—some years, every course we submit for articulation is accepted.</p> <p>For C-ID, we submit courses that are reviewed by a panel of CCC and CSU reviewers (note that UC does not currently accept C-ID approval for articulation, and some CSUs do not automatically accept C-ID approved courses). Day noted that every course that we submit for an ADT degree must have C-ID approval (unless the TMC does not specify a specific C-ID course). Day also noted that, although C-ID may guarantee a course will transfer for admissions purposes, that course might not count toward the student’s graduation requirements at the university. It’s always important to check directly with the intended transfer institution for major course content transfer purposes.</p> <p>Course-to-course articulation is when the articulation office submits a course for review to an individual university. Note that not all universities have this option. There is also the option to articulate a course that is commonly taught as upper division at the receiving</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>university; students are able to transfer the lower division course and then make up units to meet upper division coursework.</p> <p>Escoto noted that we must ensure that we're very clear with students when discussing GE, as there are many nuances to consider. Encouraged group to direct students to Counseling with any GE questions.</p> |
| <p>6. Credit for Upper Division Coursework</p> | <p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Topic was discussed previously. Currently, nothing precludes Foothill from granting credit for upper division courses taken at other schools. Important to create clear policy; Escoto drafted a resolution, "Credit for Upper Division Coursework," which states that we will use our existing course review process and course substitution process when considering such courses. Question regarding how to handle courses for which Foothill does not have an equivalent or similar course—Escoto noted that this is usually meant for courses with similar content, to meet degree requirements. Question as to whether student would receive units for the course—Escoto noted that one point of the resolution is to clarify this, and has written resolution to state that the student would receive units. Escoto previously discussed topic with VPI Kimberlee Messina and drafted resolution based on that discussion.</p> <p>Will revisit next meeting and possibly move for approval.</p> |
| <p>7. Cross-listing Policy</p> | <p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Beginning of larger conversation; this was a topic selected last year for discussion at this year's CCC. Goal is to determine policy regarding cross-listing, while taking into consideration student impact, faculty workload, transfer consideration. Day noted that she has not run into issues with articulation regarding cross-listed courses, as articulation officers generally look at content for each course individually. Escoto will bring conversation to Senate.</p> <p>PSME gave example of Discrete Mathematics class—C S 18 & MATH 22; some universities want to see it taught as MATH and some as C S. Mention that in the past, cross-listing has sometimes been the case of faculty wanting to teach similar courses, but it is important to consider how students are affected most of all. Escoto noted that when discussing cross-listing, we must determine what it means for something to "be helpful to students." Question about who can teach cross-listed course—Disciplines listed on COR and Minimum Quals are a reference. Please share topic with your constituents and bring feedback to CCC for discussion.</p> |
| <p>8. Report Out from Division Reps</p> | <p>Speaker: All L A: A few course proposals being drafted, one is World Literature to Film, another is Visual Literacy; could benefit from discussions with Fine Arts faculty. Preliminary discussions about developing Journalism program. Working on updating English ADT. BSS: Planning to submit a few GE courses to additional GE areas. Escoto asked the group if it would be helpful for CCC to share prompts or suggested topics for Division Report Out, in case reps are unsure of what topics to share.</p> |

Approved February 16, 2016

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | Suggestion that topics come from division minutes. Reminder from Escoto that, when filling out local GE applications, faculty must ensure that all information entered is clearly reflected on COR. |
| 9. Good of the Order | |
| 10. Adjournment | 3:22 PM |

Attendees: Rachelle Campbell (BH), 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), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Don MacNeil (KA), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Rachel Solvason (Articulation Program Assistant—guest), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta