

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 15, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 1, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus. Approved.
2. Announcements a. Change to course listing for GE Area I - Humanities b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Escoto encouraged group to attend open forums to meet candidates for Foothill College President. Currently, Area I of local GE pattern split into two sections: Arts & Letters. Students required to take only one course for Area I. Going forward, section designations will be removed, and Area I will be a single list of courses. Only affects local GE pattern. Suggestion that Area I name be changed to “Arts and Humanities,” to add clarity for students. Question as to whether arts is mentioned in Area I outcomes—yes, it is noted in depth criteria as part of the “multidisciplinary approach” a course must incorporate. Comment that renaming might be confusing, considering current depth criteria language. Consideration to rename can be included in ongoing discussion about local GE. Day noted that Title 5 language for this area is “Humanities.” Please share with your constituents.
3. Consent Calendar a. New Program Application: Biology ADT b. GE Applications	Speaker: Isaac Escoto ADTs included on Consent Calendar for sake of efficiency. Note that work has been ongoing by a number of individuals, and Biology ADT may be a popular program. The following GE applications were presented: Area III - CHEM 9; Area IV - PSYC 40; Area VII - PSYC 49, SOC 19, SOC 40. No comments. Consent Calendar approved by consensus. Approved.
4. Course Deactivation Exemption Requests	Speaker: Isaac Escoto List of courses not taught in four years was distributed via email on 2/11/16; divisions submitted requests to exempt courses, per Policy on Course Currency. Each request considered individually. This is the first year we’re going through this process. C S 83B: Department plans to offer course spring 2019. Note that this course was not on this year’s deactivation list, but it will be on next year’s list, and faculty would like assurance that he will be able to teach course. Computer Science is a dynamic area, and faculty work well in advance to develop courses. Some courses take at least two years to develop, as faculty create all original content (e.g., videos) for courses. Current course outline is “placeholder” for actual course content yet to be developed. C S 83A offered fall 2015 and was very popular—faculty believes 83B will be similarly popular. Going forward, division reps will instruct C S faculty to wait to create/develop courses until they are ready to be taught. Escoto noted that this is the function of the course catalog, to be a listing of current offerings, not placeholders. LaManque noted that pre-emptive approval of a course could set a precedent for others to submit petitions for courses not yet on deactivation list. Noted that it also sets up an administrative burden for tracking such pre-approvals. Escoto confirmed, per policy, that a course must be inactive for three

quarters before it may be re-activated; suggested revisiting this rule in light of new policy. Motion to suspend requirement of three inactive quarters before reactivation. **Approved.** No further action taken on course; will be discussed again when it appears on future deactivation list.

ENGL 7: Department plans to offer course fall 2016 or fall 2017. General question as to what reason a committee member might have to not approve a course if the request form is complete and lays out a good plan. Escoto and LaManque noted that there is no requirement for questioning of information on request forms. Question as to whether or not form should require explanation of why course has not been taught recently. Comment that process has helped departments strategize future offerings and marketing of courses. Suggestion to move approval of requests to Consent Calendar. Escoto noted that Consent Calendar is generally used for items that are not contentious and are likely to be approved. For this reason, Consent Calendar process might not be a best practice for these requests. Note that approval process can be revisited, in future years. Motion to approve ENGL 7 request. **Approved.**

ENGL 22: Department plans to offer course winter 2017. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

LINC 70B: Department plans to offer course summer 2016. Question regarding department's plan to regularly offer the course, specifically "academic year planning schedule" language. Unsure of what that means. Note that this is the first year faculty have filled out these forms, resulting in some questions about what information to include. Escoto noted that form can be revised for future years. Comment that department not providing specific information about plan to offer/market course going forward. Day noted that we don't require faculty to explain on new course proposal form when and how often course will be offered. LaManque clarified that request form created using standards in policy. Suggestion that form ask department to outline "plan for future success." Suggestion to add signature lines to form. Motion to approve LINC 70B request. **Approved.**

LINC 80A: Department plans to offer course summer 2016. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

MUS 7E: Department plans to offer course winter 2017. Department has been struggling to develop ADT, and this course might be included in program. Note by division that department experiencing shuffle in faculty. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

MUS 11C: Department plans to offer course spring 2017. Note that course on Music Technology degree sheet. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

MUS 41: Department plans to offer course fall 2016. Plans to include in ADT. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

PHIL 11: Department plans to offer course fall 2017. Note that this is over a year out, after next year's list will be run. Course is currently in Review status to be revised for 2017-18 catalog. Day noted that deactivating this course will trigger new submission process for IGETC, etc. More complicated process than would be required for C S 83B, for example. Motion to approve. **Approved.**

	<p>PHOT 68C: Department plans to offer course fall 2017—over a year out. Escoto asked group to consider how often such requests will be reviewed. Concern expressed that process to reactivate course is lengthy and that a plan to offer within two years should be acceptable. Note that for incoming students, course listed in catalog that will be taught within two years should work for students' needs. Question as to what the threshold should be for approving a course far in advance, especially in regard to C S 83B. Reminder that C S was asking for pre-approval, outside of regular process. Note that lack of student demand affects ability to offer PHOT 68C. Counseling suggested that departments closely look at program electives and potentially package similar courses to aid students in selecting “track.” Comment that faculty member (unrelated to PHOT 68C) was previously advised to remove “tracks” from program sheet because students felt as though they were being restricted. Suggestion to revise request form to include question regarding why course has not been offered. Motion to approve PHOT 68C. Approved.</p> <p>PHOT 68F: Department plans to offer course winter or spring 2017. Request form notes repeatability and class family issues—Escoto noted that currently there is no discussion regarding making changes to these regulations. Kurt Hueg noted concerns of accreditation and “time to a degree”—courses must be available to students. Note that this is a program elective, not a required core course. Question as to how approvals will be tracked for courses planning to not be taught until after next year’s deactivation list is run. Concern that C S 83B being judged by different standards; note that course was not up for deactivation and, thus, not being judged by same criteria. Motion to approve PHOT 68F. Approved.</p> <p>R T 71: Department plans to offer course during 2017-18 year. Explained that only licensed Radiologic Technologists may enroll; course allows for clinical education in MRI. Cannot be offered on a whim—requires contracts and securing clinical site. Faculty looking to work with CSU Northridge to spark enrollment in course. Motion to approve. Approved.</p> <p>SPAN 10A: Department plans to offer course winter 2017. Note that course on Spanish AA and ADT degrees. Motion to approve. Approved.</p> <p>SPAN 111: Department plans to offer course fall 2016. Motion to approve. Approved.</p>
<p>5. Apprenticeship Requests</p>	<p>Speakers: Isaac Escoto, Andrew LaManque David Ellis, program coordinator in Apprenticeship department, guest. Apprenticeship department submitted request forms to BSS division CC. BSS felt that forms were insufficient, especially when held to same standards as other BSS courses—did not approve Apprenticeship requests. Division wished to defer to general CCC for approval. Escoto clarified that Apprenticeship request forms do note an approval date but have not been approved. Apprenticeship department requesting extension to work with off-campus faculty and re-apply with division CC for certain courses, some of which are included in new programs approved summer 2015. Ellis noted that courses are all held off-campus and believes that they should be considered under different light. LaManque noted that Foothill College offers and</p>

	<p>confers Apprenticeship degrees/certificates, and courses are listed in our catalog, so they should be held to same standards. Ellis noted that request forms do specify plans for future course offerings.</p> <p>Ellis explained that students taking these courses required to work in the field while taking course, so there will be times during which a course cannot be offered due to timeline of students in workforce. Noted that it might not be possible to offer all courses every four years. Hueg asked for clarification on workforce reasoning. Ellis noted that, in particular, JRYM courses offered as need arises. LaManque noted that other Apprenticeship courses have robust enrollment, so perhaps the justification for keeping these courses on the books needs to be revisited. Hueg suggested faculty develop a summary justification for JRYM courses, since they all have the same rationale. Ellis noted that faculty hope to have courses become degree-applicable; Hueg noted that consistency and frequency of courses will need to improve if courses become degree-applicable (offered every 3-4 years). LaManque suggested that Stand Alone status of courses might explain lack of interest. Counseling noted similar issues with faculty in other departments who don't teach on-campus—sense of disconnection. Hueg noted that Apprenticeship faculty have been kept engaged and have attended BSS division CC meetings, and need to understand that if Foothill continues to offer courses, they must meet expectations.</p> <p>LaManque proposed that Apprenticeship be allowed to re-apply within one week to BSS division CC. Question as to voting procedure, due to upcoming catalog deadlines falling before next CCC meeting. Escoto suggested email. BSS expressed concern that division CC must be in charge of approval. LaManque noted that the current setup is that Apprenticeship falls under BSS and must follow same process as other departments. BSS noted that Apprenticeship workload can be overwhelming. Suggestion that BSS be allowed to defer decision to general CCC, in this instance. Consensus by group, in agreement to this request. Escoto will forward revised forms to CCC via email, for electronic vote. Suggestion that we connect with Santa Monica CC to see how they handle Apprenticeship curriculum.</p>
6. Checklist of Topics for Cross-listed Courses	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.
7. AP Credit Policy	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.
8. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.
9. Good of the Order	
10. Adjournment	3:34 PM

Attendees: Rachele Campbell (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), David Ellis (Program Coordinator, Apprenticeship—guest), 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), Mike Ji (ASFC), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta