

College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, March 1, 2016  
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.  
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: February 16, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus. <b>Approved.</b>
2. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following proposal was presented: D H 356. Please share with your constituents.</p> <p>LaManque commented on course title, noting that it is not related to Dental Hygiene. Course is intended as upper division GE, in addition to the three courses already approved by CCC. Specifically intended for students in completion track of BS degree. Note that education is presented as one career option for students who receive BS degree. Escoto noted that Dental Hygiene had an info night for the completion track of BS degree, last week, with many in attendance. Day noted that she's begun to receive articulation requests for our new upper division D H courses from other community colleges, with Foothill as the receiving institution. Hanning commented that Respiratory Therapy was involved in conversations regarding aligning curriculum across the state for potential BS degree.</p>
b. CSU GE Social Sciences	<p>Slight modification to the CSU GE requirements, specifically Area D: Social Sciences. Currently, Area D contains different sections, but going forward Area D will be a single list of courses. Additionally, the current form used by counselors to advise students on CSU GE contains note regarding CSU graduation requirements; form will be revised to state that these courses are suggested/ encouraged but are not required to complete CSU GE for transfer. Specific wording still to be determined. Counselors have reported confusion among students, who believe they're required to take those courses for transfer. However, counselors always emphasize the value in meeting the American Institutions requirement prior to CSU transfer. Area D change also related to cross-listed courses, as Area D will now require students take courses from different disciplines—if a course is cross-listed, it could "count" for multiple disciplines. This will be included on list of discussion topics for general cross-listing discussion, shared with the next CCC agenda. Day noted that enrollment might be impacted for some courses, since students no longer required to select courses from different sections.</p>
c. Stand Alone Course Procedure	<p>Follow-up to previous meeting; document created to clarify procedure for Stand Alone form. No changes to current form or procedure. Will be uploaded to CCC website soon.</p>
3. Consent Calendar a. GE Applications	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following GE applications were presented: Area I - CRWR 6, 39A, 41A, MUS 11E; Area IV - PSYC 49.</p> <p>Consent Calendar approved by consensus. <b>Approved. No</b></p>

<p>4. AP Credit for ADT</p>	<p>comments.</p> <p><b>Speakers: Bernie Day, Isaac Escoto</b>            Increasing number of students wanting an ADT, as well as increasing number of students with AP scores. We have existing local policy/process for accepting AP scores but no specific policy/process regarding applying AP credit to ADTs. Day has been researching how AP scores are accepted at UCs/CSUs; noted that 31% of students graduating high school in CA have AP credit, some for multiple courses. Our current local policy varies a lot with UCs/CSUs. Expressed hope that this specific conversation will be primarily about assisting students in transferring and not about the philosophy of accepting AP scores. Day noted that Academic Senate reciprocity statement directs community colleges to allow credit via exams (including AP), which includes ADTs. CA legislature bill has been proposed that would require CA community colleges to each adopt a uniform AP credit policy. Two examples of Day's research shared with agenda. 1) Psychology: current Foothill policy grants credit for AP score of 5; virtually all CSUs grant credit for score of 3 or above—note that there are differences between granting AP credit for GE and for major. 2) Comparative Government: Foothill currently does not grant AP credit, even though our course has the same C-ID approval as those at CSUs that do grant AP credit.</p> <p>Day will be sharing results of her research with divisions; divisions should work with faculty to review current policy for each AP subject and revise, if necessary. Hope is that work can be done by the end of winter quarter, so that 2016-17 catalog will include any updated policy. Escoto noted the importance of sharing nuances with faculty when discussing, so that faculty understand the various potential impacts to students. Once divisions have determined their own policies, Day will create charts for counselors to use when advising students regarding transferring AP credit. Note that current conversation relative to major coursework. PSME reported that some institutions will not accept certain science course series if full series was not taken at single college—will this rule apply when AP credit is combined with coursework at a college? Day noted that this rule is applied differently regarding GE vs. major coursework and that counselors will use her new charts to work with students in all situations. Clarification requested regarding setting new policy—may the applicable department determine or should division approval be required, as well? Co-chairs agreed that changes to policy be documented at Division CC and if differences arise between department and division, we can address. Escoto requested divisions check in at next CCC meeting, on 3/15, regarding any potential changes.</p>
<p>5. Process for Determining Lower Division Course Credit</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>            Escoto revised document based on discussion at previous CCC meeting to clarify that categories of coursework may include upper division or graduate level. Noted that this process does not state that coursework will automatically be accepted for lower division credit. Also clarified that document does not allow for upper division credit to be granted for lower division coursework.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Francisco, Serna). <b>Approved.</b></p>

6. Local General Education - Area I

**Speaker: Isaac Escoto**

Ongoing conversation regarding our local GE pattern. Escoto shared application form for Area I - Humanities. Like all local GE application forms, it outlines local GE breadth criteria, as well as area-specific depth criteria. Comment regarding difficulty for certain foreign language courses meeting GE requirements due to lack of analytical reading—not possible when course content is to teach students the language. Follow-up question from previous meeting, regarding whether or not a course could automatically be accepted for local GE if already accepted for IGETC and/or CSU GE. Escoto reiterated that we need a process for measuring learning outcomes, and that simply stating that a course is acceptable for local GE because it's on the IGETC/CSU GE list may not suffice. Escoto noted that if we determine that our process is too cumbersome, we could discuss revising it. Comment that we don't currently have the same definitions for GE as IGETC/CSU GE so, unless we change ours, we should not automatically accept courses for local GE without an additional process.

Escoto noted that guidelines for corresponding CSU GE area are more general than ours, but expressed concern that members of GE subcommittees may have difficulty reviewing courses if guidelines are not robust enough. LaManque asked for clarification on what process we would use to implement possible changes. Escoto would first like to ensure that we're all clear on current process and guidelines—conversation only. Once that has occurred, possible creation of subcommittee to determine changes. Comment that our current process and guidelines were a reaction to our previous process, which was considered by GE subcommittee members to be too vague and difficult to use when reviewing courses. Suggestion that we invite faculty teaching in content areas to participate in discussions and assist in determining changes. Question regarding where most concerns arise—Escoto believes Area I, but is not privy to all discussions between subcommittee members and faculty. Suggestion to engage faculty early in the discussions, in order to get general feedback, e.g. regarding desire to align better with IGETC/CSU GE. Escoto noted that we would still need to determine how to revise our process of reviewing learning outcomes.

Escoto shared corresponding CSU GE area criteria; asked group how they would feel if this language were the guidelines by which they would be reviewing GE courses, if on a subcommittee. Escoto noted that we do not necessarily need to follow the same criteria—we are free to determine our own, for local GE. Comment by GE subcommittee member that guidelines are certainly useful when reviewing courses but that they could be less restrictive, if necessary. Concern that revising process for specific reason of making it “easier” for students to complete GE could undermine local GE. Note that some courses don't meet GE criteria even though we allow them to be used as major coursework. Comment regarding depth criterion H6 on Area I form and difficulty in explaining how course will help students understand “ambiguities, vagaries.” Concern expressed regarding certain courses not included on Area I list; Escoto noted that exclusion of a

	<p>course does not mean that course was denied—may have never been submitted. Comment that Humanities faculty work to draft any changes; Escoto noted that this is important but that discussion should also include faculty across campus. Noted that we may not even decide to implement sweeping changes—simply making minor changes to forms is certainly an option. Comment by GE subcommittee member that bullet points are more helpful than CSU GE criteria format—may be helpful to put CSU GE criteria into bullet points and compare to our own. Please share topic of discussion with your constituents.</p>
<p>7. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p><b>Speaker: All</b>          BSS: Discussion regarding Division Guidelines for Online Learning; met with reticence by faculty, worried that guidelines will be used to assess faculty. Considering implementing mentorship program for new hires and/or those who would like assistance when developing/teaching online courses. Note that BSS has already developed guidelines, and that this discussion regarded how to ensure guidelines are followed. This would be done on a voluntary basis and not for faculty review purposes, in keeping with spirit of guidelines. Hueg stressed that J1 review process remains the same and that guidelines are not in any way meant to be used to review faculty. Escoto noted that Senate perspective is over concern that when new faculty hired, there are no guidelines for them to teach online courses, which were likely developed by different faculty. Guidelines should assist faculty in teaching online courses. Noted that not following guidelines could have negative implications for J1 and that the point of guidelines is to ensure that online courses being taught as expected in division. Other divisions noted that process of discussing online teaching methods was positive and resulted in the sharing of good information and strategies. Hueg noted that the next big development in online learning is to ensure that courses accessible to students with disabilities.          CNSL: Counseling division has been working with Articulation to determine possibility of adding CNSL 5 to CSU GE and local GE Area E.          FA: Working on deactivation exemption request forms.          KA: State recently approved Personal Trainer Certificate of Achievement.          BH: Ongoing work on Dental Hygiene BS degree. Also discussing the online learning guidelines and working on deactivation exemption requests. Noted that some courses on deactivation list were recently reactivated to be taught—Vanatta and LaManque will work to remove courses in that situation from future lists.</p>
<p>8. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p><b>3:33 PM</b></p>

**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), Rachel Solvason (Articulation Program Assistant—guest), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta