

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

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 15, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus. Approved. 4 abstentions.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following proposals were presented: CHEM 12AL, 12BL, 12CL, 13AH, 13BH, 13CH; ENGL 34C; SOSC 1, 2. Please share with your constituents.
a. New Course Proposals	Chemistry previously submitted proposals for CHEM 13AH/BH/CH series, related to creation of the Chemistry ADT. Department has received word that the TMC for the Chemistry ADT might be pulled, making their previously proposed changes no longer necessary. Department still wishes to de-couple labs from lecture courses for Organic Chemistry; also creating Honors versions of labs (no Honors version of lectures). Articulation Officer not in attendance to comment—will follow up at future meeting. Media Studies expressed interest in adding ENGL 34C as elective to MS degree, in development. SOSC courses related to the Global Studies ADT, in development.
b. CORs for Update 2017-18 (Title 5 list)	Vanatta compiled list of courses that need to be reviewed/updated for the 2017-18 catalog, per Title 5. Will follow-up with email to Curriculum Reps and Deans. Note that these required updates are subject to our regular curriculum deadline for 2017-18, which will be June 17th.
c. Draft Foothill GE list for 2016-17	Foothill General Education requirements for 2016-17. Newly approved GE courses have been added, and deactivated courses have been removed. In some cases, Honors versions have been added that were not previously listed. As a reminder, for those deactivated courses being removed from the lists, if a student took the course in a previous year, the course will count for GE (as long as it was listed as GE when taken). Please share with your constituents.
d. Apprenticeship Requests—outcome	CCC allowed Apprenticeship department to resubmit their Course Deactivation Exemption Request forms, for consideration by CCC instead of BSS Division. Voting was done electronically; all courses approved to remain active for 2016-17.
e. Spring Plenary Resolutions	ASCCC conducts a Plenary Session every Fall and Spring, to vote on resolutions written by the body. Escoto noted that resolutions shared with CCC agenda will be discussed at upcoming session and have not yet been adopted; furthermore, additional resolutions and amendments may still be drafted. Comment that previous CCC co-chair had practice of highlighting relevant resolutions—question as to which current resolutions may be relevant to group. Escoto noted "Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses" (9.07 S16) as relevant to recent CCC discussions. Also noted "Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment" (18.01 S16), as relevant to Assessment Task Force. Comment regarding "Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter" (9.06 S16)—question as to whether this could result in CCC review of SLOs. Escoto noted that resolution is related to

	<p>clarifying that SLOs are relevant to senate work and that local boards work in consultation with local senates regarding SLOs. Question regarding new or noteworthy changes to Disciplines list—Escoto did not make note of any. Comment regarding "Explore Changes to Minimum Qualifications" (10.02 S16), related to recent brown bag session and discussion around MQs for CTE faculty. Question regarding how to access list of CTE programs at Foothill—LaManque noted that CTE program status denoted by TOP Code. Vanatta can supply list of programs with CTE Top Codes. Escoto acknowledged need to appoint specific point-person on campus for state-wide CTE matters, and conversations continue as to how that would work.</p>
3. COR Review part 1	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto In previous years, separate COR trainings were offered but often resulted in low attendance. New plan is to offer short COR training sessions during CCC, to spend a few minutes focused on specific portion of COR. Escoto asked for suggestions regarding which parts of COR to focus on. Suggestions made: Need/Justification field; Hours fields in general; Out of Class Hours field specifically; Representative Texts field (specific question regarding texts being required vs. recommended—must textbooks be used if listed?); incorporation of OER materials in Texts. Escoto noted need for more people, outside of CCC, to be trained on CORs—hope is that Reps will share-out with others who review/create CORs. Comment that Dental Hygiene department recently revised every D H COR for BS degree creation; noted some difficulty regarding Types and/or Examples of Required Reading, Writing and Outside of Class Assignments field—balance of specific and general information. Question regarding SLOs not being in C3MS (currently entered in TracDat), and whether Course Objectives may be used as SLOs. Suggestion that SLOs be incorporated as field in COR, as it would streamline process. Escoto noted need for SLO training, in general. Suggestion to create walk-through video training for C3MS, specifically logging into system and accessing CORs—would be great help to those who only use system a few times each year (TracDat, as well). Mention of COR Title 5 Compliance Check List being helpful (note: available on CCC webpage). Escoto thanked group for suggestions—will review and revisit in future meetings.</p>
4. Checklist of Topics for Cross-listed Courses	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Follow-up to previous meeting. Based on previous discussion, Escoto drafted checklist of suggested topics to discuss when faculty come together to propose/create cross-listed courses. Plan is for the checklist to be a CCC document and provide specific recommendations and information. Intent is to look at courses from both sides: most importantly, how they provide benefit to students, but also consider potential for negative effects. Comment that C-ID should be taken into consideration—how would cross-listed course affect C-ID, as well as ADTs?</p> <p>Comment regarding GE applicability and how cross-listed courses would count in multiple GE areas. Clarification that whether or not a course is cross-listed, it's a matter of individual course content, in regard to where on a GE sheet a course would count. Escoto reminded the group that the Social Sciences area of CSU GE will no longer be divided by section; instead, students will select courses in different disciplines, from a single list—example of how cross-listed courses could assist students in taking courses in multiple disciplines. Comment that cross-listed courses could potentially also require FSA discussions. Please share with your constituents and bring any feedback to next CCC meeting.</p>
5. AP Credit Policy	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Ongoing discussion regarding granting of AP credit for local area content, including number of units to grant to student. Escoto shared</p>

	<p>example of recent memo sent out by Articulation Office, following extensive research done to determine how UCs/CSUs grant AP credit. Memo sent to Curriculum Reps and Deans, with information for AP exam(s) relevant to their division—for each AP exam, memo lists every UC and CSU, and how each grants credit. Some grant credit for a specific course, some only award units. Comment that current Foothill policy can create discrepancy for students who wish to receive associate degree as well as transfer—Foothill might not grant credit for a specific course, whereas UC/CSU might. Comment about ASCCC's view of AP credit as local curricular matter, and importance of considering students' needs first (resolution 18.03 S16 on Plenary document).</p> <p>Escoto noted that a student can take AP test without taking corresponding class, but that this rarely occurs. Concern expressed that student could end up at a disadvantage when skipping a course and applying AP credit, then changing major and finding oneself behind in coursework. Counseling noted preference of referring student to discipline faculty over automatically requiring student to retake course for which student has AP credit. Concern expressed regarding science lab courses—belief shared that High School lab experience generally not at same level as college, putting student at disadvantage. Comment that College Board requires student to provide lab notebook for AP Physics, to prove rigor of lab. Escoto noted that Articulation Office memos provide recommendation for change to current AP policy, but divisions may decide if they would like to adopt. Question regarding history and creation of current local AP policies. Escoto wasn't able to provide history on current AP policy as a whole, but noted that climate of CCC changes over the years, which is why topics such as this should be revisited. Question regarding who specifically sets requirements at UC/CSU—institution as a whole, or program? Note that GE policy set at institutional level; majors policy set per department, per institution. LaManque noted that we could adopt institutional policy for GE, similarly. Escoto noted that, last year, CCC approved a motion to adopt a resolution, recommended by ASCCC, regarding AP credit for GE courses. Noted that a single course may be used by many different majors, which should be taken into consideration when creating policies. Please discuss at division level; next step at CCC is to bring back feedback and/or decisions to discuss as group. Articulation Officer requested deadline of May 20 for policy decisions by divisions.</p>
<p>6. Program Review Update on Curricular Issues</p>	<p>Speaker: Andrew LaManque</p> <p>Update from Program Review Committee. Will be bringing recommendations to PaRC tomorrow for first read. PRC focused on providing feedback, as well as commendations for good work being done across campus. Many departments continue to struggle with Program Level Assessments—important to take into consideration, as issue will likely be raised at next accreditation visit. LaManque shared examples of commendations to be presented, including those related to SLO assessment. Shared examples of recommendations to departments. Escoto mentioned SLO Advisory Committee, which is meant to provide assistance to departments—reach out to SLOAC division member for support. SLOAC plans to review GE learning outcomes in the near future. Question regarding SLO requirements—how often must they be reviewed, what are standards? LaManque noted that Academic Senate passed resolution, last year, which included standards. Divisions may adopt 3-year cycle, ensuring that SLOs for every course be reviewed within 3-year period. All program outcomes should also be reviewed within 3-year period. Comment that part-time faculty being compensated for SLOs, and question regarding any expectation that all faculty work on SLOs every year.</p>

	<p>LaManque noted that there is no requirement, but it is suggested as best practice. Question regarding how non-instructional units are reviewed. LaManque noted that programs clearly defined as degree/certificate or pathway, but other departments (e.g., student services) are harder to define. Department provided example of their process: every winter quarter, faculty review SLOs for every course, and meet in spring to discuss. Escoto will follow up and provide AS resolution/standards to group.</p>
7. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All BSS: Working on ADT in Social Justice Studies; contact John Fox if you have a course in gender, ethnicity, and related studies you'd like to include. Discussion regarding separation of Apprenticeship from BSS division—LaManque noted that topic of representation on Academic Senate agenda. Escoto noted that curricular structure might not necessarily mirror senate structure. One option is that Apprenticeship fall under CCC at large. BSS noted that faculty have no affinity for topics of Apprenticeship courses—suggested CTE umbrella for representation. LaManque noted Apprenticeship working on new degrees/certificates. Escoto noted need for more robust conversation around topic of representation. Proposal may be submitted to senate regarding change in representation; Escoto will follow up with senate and report back. Question regarding why Apprenticeship doesn't qualify to be its own division, considering number of courses. Concern from faculty that difficulty exists when attempting to evaluate or measure standards of Apprenticeship courses or programs, considering the specialized nature of work involved. Comment that need for vocational degrees is important, and perhaps a new Administrator be hired to oversee Apprenticeship division under separate entity. Escoto noted that role of faculty when reviewing curriculum isn't limited to knowledge of course content, but also providing procedural guidance and big picture discussion guidance. Comment that faculty are normally on campus and accessible, for Curriculum Reps to easily contact when necessary, but Apprenticeship faculty are offsite. Note that BSS Dean cannot necessarily compel Apprenticeship faculty/staff to attend meetings, as they do not report to BSS Dean. Concern expressed that when Apprenticeship asks to, for example, double course units, or offer multiple courses in one subject, BSS faculty have a difficult time knowing if these are reasonable requests. LaManque noted that programs are offered by each location/center, resulting in new programs being created that mirror existing programs but are offered in a different location and not directly aligned. Comment that trade unions also involved in approval process for courses/programs. Suggestion to propose to house Apprenticeship under CCC—Escoto will continue discussions with senate and the Office of Instruction. PSME: Computer Science writing series of Big Data courses, pursuing trend. LaManque asked if all divisions had provided Online Standards—Escoto will follow up.</p>
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	3:28 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta