

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

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 19, 2016	Minutes approved by consensus; M/S (Armstrong/Jones). Approved.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto
a. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Co-requisites for new courses for 2017-18. Please share with your constituents.
b. New Course Proposals	<p>The following proposals were presented: EMT 50A, 51A. Please share with your constituents.</p> <p>Courses are co-requisite labs for existing EMT courses. Question regarding whether or not a student could repeat a course if they do not pass one of the co-requisite courses. Division noted that these labs demonstrate understanding of lecture content and must be taken concurrently with lecture. Suggestion to include language on COR regarding need to take concurrently, as well as language noting that student must pass both courses. General question regarding need for language on COR related to co-requisite or previous credit—is there a requirement to include language on COR to allow for previous credit to be used in lieu of co-requisite? Escoto suggested continuation of discussion when we review requisites section of COR.</p>
c. Curriculum Representation	CCC previously discussed concerns regarding Apprenticeship representation at CCC. Escoto shared concerns with Academic Senate; Patrick Morriss will be holding meeting to discuss—please let Escoto or Morriss know if you would like to be involved in discussion. Discussion will be open to include concerns related to other subjects or curriculum that may fall “outside” of regular division offerings—not just about Apprenticeship.
d. SLO Review Cycle	<p>Follow-up to previous meeting. Escoto shared, with agenda, excerpt from the Office of Instruction & Institutional Research Winter 2015 newsletter. Document states that divisions should follow comprehensive review cycle of assessing every SLO for every course, within a three-year period—divisions are free to maintain their own review cycle. Request for clarification regarding language in document, “Divisional curriculum representatives are asked to lead faculty discussions to determine the SLOAC timing ... for their division.” Comment that SLO coordinator(s) already working with faculty on SLOs; should Curriculum Reps be ensuring that course content taught in alignment with SLOs? Escoto clarified role of Reps in SLO process: conversation should occur between Reps and SLO coordinators to ensure review process is being followed, procedurally. No expectation for Reps to ensure SLO content is being taught in each course. LaManque clarified that context of language specific to review cycle of SLOs—when written, SLO committee was not meeting as regularly as they are now.</p> <p>Question regarding process to request exceptions to policy, for courses that are taught every quarter. LaManque clarified that SLO cycle is once within a three-year period, regardless of how frequently a course is taught. No restriction against updating more frequently, but not required. Question regarding SLO updates affecting curriculum review cycle in C3MS; clarification that SLO</p>

<p>e. ASCCC Spring Plenary Update</p>	<p>updates are separate from COR review in C3MS. Comment that there is no language requiring every instructor to contribute to SLO process—Escoto noted that it is a best practice for all to contribute but acknowledges that there is no language requiring such, nor are there proposed consequences for those who do not contribute. Worry expressed that some might not contribute if not required to do so, and that conversation will not be as robust as it should. LaManque noted that SLO committee plans to create SLO Handbook, to assist divisions throughout the process. Suggestion that SLOs be maintained in C3MS instead of TracDat, to streamline process; LaManque noted that this was considered when C3MS created but ultimate decision was to use TracDat. Comment that document does mention updating SLOs in C3MS—Escoto noted that, when written, process to incorporate SLOs on CORs had not been finalized. Clarified that there is no need for faculty to maintain SLOs in C3MS.</p> <p>Escoto noted that ASCCC had not yet published the final version of resolutions; document, shared with agenda, is report by Carolyn Holcroft and Patrick Morriss, with recommended action for each resolution. Escoto noted that recommended action will be taken, when applicable.</p> <p>Noted adoption by ASCCC of paper, regarding curriculum approval processes (9.01 S16)—will be discussed at future CCC meeting. Noted recommendation to review low-unit certificates (between 18-27 quarter units) to determine whether or not they should be submitted for state approval (9.03 S16). Noted separate, but related, resolution regarding expanding access to financial aid for 24-27 unit certificates (9.05 S16). Clarification requested regarding submission to state of certificates above 18 units; note that we don't automatically submit to state unless requested by division. Escoto will share the approved resolutions once he receives them.</p>
<p>3. Checklist of Topics for Cross-listed Courses</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Follow-up to previous meeting; Escoto updated document to incorporate suggestions made at previous CCC meeting. Desire is to craft list of topics for faculty to consider when discussing cross-listing courses or creating a new course with intention of cross-listing. Question regarding creation of actual policy—Escoto noted that CCC will first discuss what elements we'd like to include; then, campus-wide conversation, including Academic Senate; finally, drafting of policy and voting to adopt. De Anza has policy, which we can look at. Escoto noted that this checklist will be helpful, when creating policy. Clarification requested regarding how approval of checklist will affect cross-listed course creation process; Escoto clarified that checklist will simply be uploaded to CCC website as a resource, and will not result in any procedural change.</p> <p>Document approved by consensus. Approved.</p>
<p>4. AP Credit Policy</p>	<p>Speaker: Bernie Day Ongoing discussion regarding granting of AP credit for local area content, including number of units to grant to student. Day shared, with agenda, most recent version of CA Legislature Assembly Bill No. 1985, which addresses AP credit. Approval of the bill would require CA community colleges to adopt a uniform policy to award GE credit (local GE, CSU GE, or IGETC) to students who pass an AP exam with a minimum score of three.</p> <p>Day previously emailed documents to departments, with information for AP exam(s) relevant to their division, including any</p>

	<p>recommendations for changes to existing policy [please see CCC meeting minutes for 4/19/16, for further information]. Noted that, in many cases, recommendation was to award GE credit for relevant GE area, due to various complexities of awarding credit for a specific course, which include complications that may arise when a student transfers to another college or university. Hope is that these conversations will occur this quarter, so that new policies may be drafted for next year. Question regarding likelihood of bill being passed and how that might affect these conversations. Day noted that her recommendations are in alignment with changes requested by the bill. Clarification requested regarding language on bill, regarding specific course credit vs. GE credit. Day noted that others, outside of Foothill, requested clarification on this language, and bill was updated to include clear language (p. 3 of bill).</p> <p>Question regarding previous CCC discussion about ASCCC recommendation to use IGETC rubric. Escoto noted that we did approve to adopt grid but discussion did not include units. Day noted that discussion did not result in any changes to policy. Noted that she has heard from evaluators that they have little guidance on how we award credit for AP exams. Hope is to tie up loose ends. Suggestion that we include language regarding use of AP credit for certain majors, specifically sciences. Day noted importance of students meeting with counselors, for this and other reasons. Noted importance of taking Title 5 into consideration, related to pass-along courses. Day clarified that her recommendation is simply that, and encourages departments/divisions to engage in discussion and bring back to CCC. Sharing department/division discussions at CCC important, due to broader GE implication, as well as potential to help others when engaging in their own discussions. Day noted that Foothill engaged in a similar AP credit policy review 10+ years ago but did not include research into other colleges' policies; decisions made then might not be considered best policy now. Escoto noted that, regardless of policy, students should still consult with counselors due to complexities, but having a more robust policy will better assist counselors in advising students.</p>
5. COR Review	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
6. Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto There exists at Foothill the need for a policy to assist students who require academic adjustment due to a learning disability. This issue encompasses multiple situations and student populations. Hope is that blanket policy will be adopted, as opposed to separate policies for each department/subject area. Escoto shared, with agenda, draft of policy. Counseling noted that policy was inspired by those at other colleges. Ong noted one purpose of policy is to bring together different voices to assist students, which are not involved in the current process—content faculty (related to course in question) and major faculty. Current process includes Academic Council, which will remain involved under proposed new policy. Note that policy only applies to local AA/AS degrees. Plan is to keep Academic Senate informed, as the policy is discussed. Note that Title 5 does require colleges to make such accommodations for students who need them.</p> <p>Question regarding whether draft policy addresses the issue of prerequisites. Clarification that course substitution would not be granted for a course for which a prerequisite is required. Note that DRC will be involved in process, in most cases, and will ensure that</p>

	<p>courses with prerequisites would not be granted substitution. Ong noted language in policy related to course substitution only allowed for courses "found to be non-essential to the student's plan of study." Question regarding language stating that students are not required to go to DRC to request academic adjustment. Title 5 requires such language. Concern expressed that process could result in unreasonable accommodation being granted, if DRC not involved. Ong noted that policy needs to be revised, based on circumstances that occurred after written—she will rewrite. Noted that Title 5 allows student to work with ADA Coordinator instead of DRC. Policy is meant to address course substitutions specific to proficiencies, especially Math. Note that program prerequisites may not be substituted (e.g., ENGL 1A or MATH 105 for a Bio Health major). Note that student must make a case, and such cases typically involve student attempts and testing. Concern expressed regarding the possibility of an outside party becoming involved and affecting local policy. Note that many students test at high school and/or other outside agencies, so we already rely on certain information from outside parties. Ong doesn't anticipate a case of a student bringing in an outside party. Suggestion that policy address such a possibility. Note that for students who have never been tested, LD coordinator uses lengthy assessment process, including testing, to determine any disability. Note that IEPs from high schools can be used, if they specify learning disability in a specific area, but are not always sufficient. Escoto noted relevance across campus; please share with your constituents. Escoto will forward Ong's updated policy draft to share.</p>
7. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All BSS: Apprenticeship proposing seven degrees/certificates; coming to CCC hopefully before end of academic year. Articulation: Bio Health proposing ADT in Public Health at PaRC tomorrow; not mandated by state to offer this ADT. Day met with 14 students who were denied admission to UCLA or Berkeley—all have high GPA, many with 4.0. Inquired to schools, response was that they are so impacted that they are narrowing field to students who completed all of their major courses by fall term, which is especially hard on quarter system students. Important to look at lower division major courses and ensure we're offering on a regular basis; colleges expect that courses listed in our catalog are being offered regularly. Concern expressed for students in science majors, who do not have option to complete major courses early. Counseling noted that colleges did not publicize this criterion. Day noted that this issue related to AP credit pass-along, since freeing up GE will enable students to begin major coursework earlier. Counseling noted that many students under the impression that finishing up GE early is more important than beginning major coursework. Day also noted that colleges are taking note of Honors courses on students' transcripts.</p>
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	3:27 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (AVP, Instruction; Administrator Co-Chair), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), San Lu (Acting Dean, DRC—guest), Teresa Ong (Acting Dean, BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA), Bill Ziegenhorn (History faculty—guest)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta