

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 17, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 3, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus. Approved.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Request to add an additional agenda item: First-year online instruction for a group of international students. Kimberlee Messina will speak. No objections.
a. New Course Proposals	<p>The following proposals were presented: C S 3M; MDIA 8A; MUS 3D, 47A, 47B, 47C, 47D, 48B, 48C; PHOT 70R/71R/72R/73R. Please share with your constituents.</p> <p>Question regarding PHOT Independent Study courses—recollection that, a few years back, there was a push to eliminate IS courses and “X/Y/Z” courses. Hueg noted that the current IS format replaced the “X/Y/Z” courses and that many departments, across campus, offer IS. IS courses are at the discretion of the faculty member to work with the student.</p> <p>MUS 3D being developed to meet requirements for Music ADT; specifically, the Theory component.</p>
b. Honors Curriculum	Speaker: Bernie Day Honors Institute devised a proposed schedule of honors courses for 2016-18, in response to students and counselors having reported difficulty in developing Ed Plans when they don’t know when courses will be scheduled. Day asked CCC Reps to share schedule with divisions and discuss with faculty, in the hope that honors courses may be regularly scheduled. Proposed schedule also contains list of desired honors courses frequently requested by students. Admission to four-year institutions has never been harder, and honors courses will help make students’ applications more competitive. Day noted that this quarter, Foothill offered 17 honors courses (the highest number ever), but De Anza offered over 60. Comment that some students do attend honors courses at De Anza specifically because Foothill does not offer them in certain disciplines (e.g., Math). Day encouraged faculty to reach out to Honors Inst. for assistance in developing new offerings. Question regarding whether courses are preferable to seminars—yes. Day noted that seminars are not UC transferable (only to CSU) and encouraged faculty to revise seminar CORs to apply for UC transferability. Day can provide guidelines and tools to assist faculty in creating honors version of an existing course. Question regarding whether honors sections are usually held in combination with non-honors sections, or separately. Day stated that most are held separately—for initial offering(s), faculty do sometimes offer simultaneously, and split students within classroom. Noted that honors sections tend to fill more rapidly than non-honors. Concern expressed regarding awarding honors credit to students who simply complete an additional project/assignment, compared with non-honors students, in a mixed-class setting. Day encouraged faculty interested in developing honors courses to reach out to colleagues who teach honors—can provide contacts if requested.
c. Teacher Preparation Pathway	Speaker: Bernie Day Foothill does not currently offer a pathway for students interested in careers in teaching—multiple groups across campus are interested in

d. Curriculum System Status check-in	<p>developing. Counselors have reported demand from students. TMC for ADT in Elementary Teacher Education—Day noted Foothill status of courses listed. Day encouraged those interested in developing missing courses and/or working on ADT to contact her. Comment that it would be interesting to determine which colleges in the area offer program. Counseling noted that students interested in teaching are currently advised to choose a single subject to focus on, or childhood education with a focus on teacher prep, since we do not offer general teaching program. Please share with your constituents.</p> <p>Speaker: Andrew LaManque Ongoing discussion, begun last year, regarding C3MS system and the possibility of replacing it. Subcommittee has met and reviewed vendors; webmaster was tasked with enhancing C3MS, in the meantime. No progress made on enhancements, since LaManque's previous check-in. Next step is to consider looking at additional vendors in the fall.</p>
3. COR Review	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
4. AP Credit Policy check-in	<p>Speakers: Bernie Day & Isaac Escoto Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
5. Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Follow-up to previous meeting, regarding need for a policy to assist students who require academic adjustment due to a learning disability. Adjustments made to previous draft of policy; this is the first read of updated draft. Counseling clarified that a DRC representative is currently in place on Academic Council; agreed with proposed addition of discipline faculty to process. Please share with your constituents; voting will occur at next meeting, unless changes need to be made and brought back for a second read.</p>
6. Cross-listing Policy	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Escoto shared draft of policy via email. Now that we have devised a list of topics to consider when discussing cross-listing, the next step is to create policy. Draft includes topics to discuss, general information, and procedures/best practices. Submission form will be created, based on approved policy. Note that draft states that CCC will settle any disputes among faculty involved and will have final approval of cross-listed courses. Form would be submitted to curriculum coordinator for CCC review; need to determine timing, related to curriculum cycle. Question regarding how load would be handled—split between the two courses? Hueg noted that, within BSS, load placed on one of the courses, usually based on which discipline the faculty teaches in. Comment that splitting of WSCH and seat count should be discussed. Question regarding who responsible for SLOs, and which FSA would be assigned. LaManque noted that cross-listed courses have separate CORs, each with its own SLOs and FSA. Question regarding applying a cross-listed course for a degree requirement in the other discipline (e.g., if the student took PSYC but needs SOC, and the PSYC course is cross-listed with SOC, can it be used as SOC?). Comment regarding prerequisite issues; e.g., when one course has a prerequisite but the other does not.</p> <p>Hueg stressed that there should always be a genuine reason to cross-list and that cross-listed courses can be complex to maintain/manage, as well as problematic for students. Concern expressed that further creation of IDS courses could result in large number of cross-listings. LaManque noted rationale listed on draft and asked whether a stronger policy statement should be included regarding students' needs. Escoto noted that inclusion of such a statement could assist determination of whether or not a cross-listing is justified. Comment that cross-listed courses should be identified in catalog, so that the interdisciplinary</p>

	<p>nature of the courses is clear to students. Day noted advantage to students when able to use cross-listed courses to fulfill GE and major requirements simultaneously. Escoto encouraged group to differentiate between conversations that would happen behind the scenes and what should be included within policy. Please share with your constituents and bring any feedback to next meeting. Escoto will update draft based on today's conversation. First read will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>First-year online instruction for a group of international students</p>	<p>Speaker: Kimberlee Messina Foothill has been increasing online course offerings as response to student demand. International Student Program (ISP) contacted by school in China, which serves less-affluent students who would like to study internationally but may not have the resources to do so as our program is currently structured, due to expenses necessary to physically attend Foothill. ISP proposed packaging of GE courses to allow students to take first year online, then attend second year on campus. Students would still pay international fees but would not need to pay living fees for that first year. Messina held exploratory meeting with ISP, Judy Baker, Hueg, and others, to discuss potential issues, e.g., privacy/security, technical issues, assessment and placement services. If issues can be resolved, next step is to approach faculty who commonly teach target courses to discuss how courses could be offered online. Potential outcome of slight increase in international enrollment; would not necessarily decrease in-person enrollment, as these students are not necessarily able to attend in person.</p> <p>Question regarding whether these classes would be closed or open—would depend on number of students participating. Must offer two open sections for each closed section. Hueg noted that discussion included idea of model to assist students in China in taking classes online, similar to what we offer for High School students. Question regarding legal aspect of students taking classes online—immigration restricts international students' ability to take multiple courses online, but only when they are living in the US on a student Visa. Question regarding students' intent to transfer—students do intend to transfer; effort to work with students on ESL proficiency. For accreditation purposes, we must ensure that the program offers everything that we offer for students on campus (e.g., counseling, disability services).</p> <p>Messina noted interest in assisting students across the world who want to study internationally but cannot afford to travel. Would like to diversify international student population. Concern expressed regarding potential lack of immersion for students in proposed online program, and difficulty they may have in getting up to par with students who are living here. Question regarding potential for faculty to instruct students in their native (non-English) language—Title 5 states that courses cannot be taught in languages other than English, aside from Foreign Language instruction. Concern expressed that instruction in English to non-native speakers might not be as effective as instruction in students' native language. Messina noted that online program focused on GE courses centered on reading/writing. Noted that international students currently able to enroll in any online Foothill class; goal is for students to have higher level of support than they currently would taking online classes internationally. Counseling noted that students intending to transfer to UC are now being advised to begin major coursework during first year. Question regarding ESLL courses being taught online—department is exploring possibility of teaching ESLL online. Concern expressed that students might not be adequately prepared to enter US college community, and suggestion that students take a specific course to help them transition. Messina noted that discussions have included need for orientation. Day noted concern from UC regarding international students arriving unprepared,</p>

	in terms of communication and English language skills. Concern expressed that some ESL students are passing major courses successfully but told by ESLL faculty that they are not proficient in communication—conflicting message. Messina noted that pedagogy of course might help to explain, e.g., if coursework is primarily in writing, then spoken communication not being assessed.
7. Apprenticeship Curriculum Review	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</p> <p>Follow up to concern expressed at previous meetings, regarding proper place of Apprenticeship curriculum within Foothill CC system. Escoto shared via email document that outlines situation, with proposed options for moving forward. Document notes that Apprenticeship not unique with this concern, as other divisions house special subjects/departments. Option #1 is for Technical Review Team to be created, to review curriculum before it goes to BSS CC. Option #2 is to create separate Apprenticeship CC. Option #3 is to create Interdisciplinary division CC, which would include Apprenticeship and others (e.g., LINC, Fire Science). Option #4 is for Apprenticeship curriculum to be discussed/approved at CCC. Goal is to agree as a group on how to proceed, which will then be shared with Academic Senate. LaManque noted that agreed-upon option will need to be fully fleshed-out—document is meant as starting point. Note that Robbie Kunkel was recently hired to assist Apprenticeship faculty in working on curriculum. Note that many colleges have technical review committee, which could support Robbie in her work with faculty—would review curriculum (not for content, but for things like grammar) before BSS reviews.</p> <p>Suggestion to consider creation of separate CC for CTE curriculum, as Apprenticeship might have similar concerns/issues as other CTE programs. Comment that CTE curriculum is different than transfer, in many ways. Comment that “CTE” encompasses many diverse programs and that students in CTE programs do transfer—cannot easily consider all CTE to be similar. Concern expressed about creating separate CC for Apprenticeship and/or CTE, as it requires a high level of review and oversight. LaManque was in contact with Curriculum Chair at Santiago Canyon College, which has 400 Apprenticeship courses; curriculum reviewed/approved at college CC, and they must follow a rigid schedule of reviewing curriculum, due to the number of courses. Suggestion to revise option #4 to add Technical Review Team process. Concern expressed regarding option #2—Escoto noted that creation of a new CC would include steps to ensure that work is being done accurately and that all involved understand processes and best practices. Would need to determine who’s involved and what oversight would be needed. LaManque advocated for trial period of using Technical Review Team, with BSS continuing to review Apprenticeship, before making final decision. Please share with your constituents and bring back feedback.</p>
8. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All</p> <p>Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
9. Good of the Order	
10. Adjournment	3:34 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachele Campbell (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Brenda Hanning (BH), Robert Hartwell (FA), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction—guest), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta