

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 11, 2016
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Conference Room 8330**

Item	Discussion
1. CCC Orientation	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Welcome to the first CCC meeting of 2016-17. Thank you to continuing reps for another year of service, and a special welcome to new reps. Introductions by all present.</p> <p>Escoto shared presentation to provide overview of the role of CCC and its importance. Faculty "own" curriculum, but a course is not owned by one person—curriculum is a collaborative effort, and CCC provides an overarching view of college curriculum. A college curriculum committee is mandated by Title 5, and meetings are open to all. Voting occurs to approve minutes, new policies and resolutions, new programs, Stand Alone courses, various aspects of courses, etc. CCC collaborates with Academic Senate to establish practices and processes for curriculum development.</p> <p>CCC does not approve new courses, which occurs at the division curriculum committees. Escoto clarified that this does not mean that it is unimportant to discuss new courses at CCC—on the contrary, discussion is important for reasons such as preventing unnecessary duplication of curriculum.</p> <p>CCC reps have an important job, serving as a resource to constituents, navigating Foothill's curriculum development and approval process, establishing guidelines for local GE patterns, and reviewing course outlines of record (CORs). Escoto noted that Foothill is unique in using division CCs, which were established here in 1992. Strong division CCs are imperative, in order for CCC to continue to focus on campus-wide issues.</p> <p>Outline of the C3MS COR review/approval steps provided. Escoto noted that, although the CCC website is currently in the process of being updated, C3MS will remain the same. The possibility of replacing C3MS with a different system is an ongoing discussion. Escoto shared the CCC website and noted the "CCC Responsibilities" document, which can further clarify the roles of CCC and the division CCs.</p>
2. Minutes: June 14, 2016	<p>Comment regarding list of CCC reps for 2016-17, which has changed for some divisions since the previous meeting [<i>note: a clarifying note has been added to the June 14, 2016 minutes</i>].</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Cooper, Anderson). Approved.</p>
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following proposals were presented: GID 55, IDS 406 (within the division of Language Arts), MTEC 84D. Escoto noted that, although courses are not approved at CCC, it is important for all to be aware of what new courses are being developed. Discussion is encouraged.</p> <p>Comment regarding IDS 406 and its resemblance to PSE 61A, Tutor Training. PSE 61A used to be specifically for students in</p>

	<p>Pass the Torch program but is now open to all students. Language Arts division noted that IDS 406 will be broader, to train students in disciplines other than English and Math (which are the focus of L A/PSE 61A); belief is that, although there is some overlap, it is a broader course. Note that the state requires students who will be tutoring to go through training. Day noted the difference in PSE 61A being CSU transferable and IDS 406 being non-credit; mentioned the importance of specifying on the COR what is required, to distinguish between the two types of courses and clarify why one is degree-applicable and transferable, whereas the other is not. Suggestion that the course description be expanded to note that the course does not focus on only English/Math. Comment that course is being developed to try to ensure that tutors receive more robust training; note from faculty who previously had a student tutor—student had done Pass the Torch training and found that, while helpful, it was not as applicable to imbedded tutoring as had hoped. Comment that, even if course focus is on imbedded training, course cannot explicitly state that it is only for students in that program, as it must be open to all. Concern expressed that description is unclear—Escoto will follow up with faculty author for clarification.</p>
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	<p>Prerequisites and co-requisites for new CHEM, RSPT, and R T courses for 2017-18; also listed are ongoing requisites, for which a Content Review form was not on file. Escoto noted importance of sharing this document, to inform the campus of new or changing requisites. Please share with your constituents, so that any concerns or questions can be brought back to the group for discussion. Vanatta noted difference between new and ongoing requisites, which is noted on document—ongoing means that the prereq/coreq is already listed on the course but the Instruction Office does not have a copy of the Content Review form on file, and has asked the division to submit a new copy.</p>
	<p>Language Arts division inquired about coreq of "ENGL 209 or ESLL 25" on CHEM 1AH & 1BH. PSME division noted need to ensure that students have a certain level of English to safely take the course. Note that non-honors versions (CHEM 1A & 1B) list this coreq as an Advisory and not a required requisite. Comment that ESLL 249 might be more appropriate course to list. Farooq noted that, as honors courses, students will need to be enrolled in the Honors program to take the course, and that the Honors program itself has an English proficiency requirement, thus making this coreq moot. PSME reps will follow up with COR owner.</p>
c. GE Course Applications	<p>Faculty can begin to turn in Foothill GE applications. Division CCs approve applications, which are then forwarded to the GE subcommittees (via Vanatta), and then on to CCC for final approval. Escoto encouraged group to serve on a GE subcommittee and spread the invitation to serve to constituents. Many current members have been serving for multiple years. Francisco noted that Simon Pennington, now dean, can no longer serve on Communications & Analytical Thinking subcommittee. Anderson volunteered to serve on Humanities subcommittee. Comment that expertise in a discipline is helpful when serving; Escoto agreed but also noted that it can also be beneficial for those outside of a discipline to provide input. Question regarding whether part-time faculty can serve—yes. Question regarding time</p>

<p>d. CCC Priorities for 2016-17</p>	<p>commitment—depends on number of proposals, but usually small. Escoto will send out list of current subcommittee members. Day noted helpfulness of complementing subcommittee with member(s) outside of the area of expertise, to provide a broad view of subject; noted that the IGETC and CSU GE committees include members outside of area.</p> <p>List was developed in June, to help the CCC Team determine topics to focus on for 2016-17. CCC selected priorities: student preparedness (e.g., can a prereq time out?, what can we do to assist students who come to a course unprepared?); equity across our curriculum (e.g., looking at syllabi and other documents sent to students); academic integrity. Escoto noted that Academic Senate has a group focused on academic integrity, with which CCC would work closely.</p> <p>Counseling division noted the importance, especially for counselors, of knowing when courses are going to be offered and how often. Suggestion of adding coding in course catalog to note anticipated quarter(s) course will be offered.</p>
<p>4. New Stand Alone Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto A Stand Alone course is one that is not part of a state-approved degree or certificate, or the Foothill GE pattern. The Board of Governors recently approved a change to the current process, so that Stand Alone courses will now be approved at the local level, and simply sent to the state to be entered into their inventory system (but will not need to be separately approved by the state). Our current Stand Alone form is already comprehensive; Escoto will work with Andrew LaManque to review the language and discuss the need for changes/clarification to current process and form. Clarification that if a new course is intended to be added to an already-approved program, it does not need Stand Alone approval.</p>
<p>5. ADT Creation Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto When ADTs were introduced, legislation mandated colleges create an ADT when a local associate degree existed with the same TOP code. We have a local program creation process that is used for new degrees and certificates, but we have not required those mandated ADTs to follow the local process. Now that we are developing ADTs that are not mandated by the state, we need to clarify that our local program creation process must be followed. Note need to adjust our current program creation documents, to note the difference between the process for a state-mandated ADT and one that we are not required to create. Question regarding who serves on Transfer Work Group. Current tri-chairs are Lan Truong, Kent McGee, and Cleve Freeman; group also includes staff and faculty across campus.</p>
<p>6. Report on Degrees Awarded</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Note that the data listed is free from context that might affect changes, year over year, in number of students completing certain programs. Consider possibility of outside factors when reviewing the numbers. Day noted that number of ADTs has increased, but that number of certificates of achievement for transfer (IGETC & CSU GE) has decreased, even though those students completing an ADT (with a few exceptions) automatically receive the corresponding certificate. Day followed up to discover that certificate numbers listed on the report are one year behind numbers for degrees, which explains the disconnect.</p>

<p>7. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p>Speaker: All Escoto noted curriculum deadlines listed on CCC agenda. Question regarding 12/1 deadlines and whose deadline those are—Vanatta will clarify on agendas, going forward, that 12/1 deadlines are for Articulation Officer. Question regarding need for early curriculum deadline, in June, and its being tied to the printed catalog. Escoto noted that, in prior discussion of the curriculum review cycle and the decision to move the deadline from December to June, that the printed catalog was not the only consideration. Question regarding why new courses cannot be offered immediately, upon state approval. Comment that the difference between substantial and non-substantial changes be included in discussion, as well as the possibility of accepting certain types of changes on a rolling basis. Escoto shared attachment of COR issues for 2017-18; Vanatta noted that CORs are not always "ready to go" when submitted to her. Suggestion for faculty training on CORs—Escoto noted training in previous years and will attempt to work in small training at CCC throughout the year, on areas of the most interest.</p> <p>BSS: Work on Social Justice ADT—at the beginning of the program creation process. Global Studies ADT also in development—SOSC 1 & 2 are new courses created to offer degree.</p> <p>LA: ESLL department will be discussing ESLL 26 in the fall and whether or not to continue to offer course. No longer getting same level of enrollment as in the past. Encouraged others to share information and let division know of any concerns.</p>
<p>8. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>9. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:33 PM</p>

Attendees: Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Kyle Brumbaugh (guest—KCI), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Milissa Carey (FA), Sara Cooper (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Leticia Delgado (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC Representative), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Kay Jones (LIBR), Thuy Nguyen (guest—Foothill College President), Lety Serna (CNSL), Barbara Shewfelt (KA), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Lori Silverman (Interim Dean, PSME), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta