College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 21, 2017
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: February 7, 2017	**Approved by consensus**.
2. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	**Speaker: Isaac Escoto** The following proposal was presented: MATH 19. Combines current Statway courses (MATH 217 & 17) into one course, with fewer total units (10 vs. 15). Day shared concern regarding likelihood of course being approved for UC transferability, due to high units. Counseling rep shared concern regarding high units; has heard from students who have had trouble completing MATH 108 (also 10 units). PSME rep noted that some students who register for MATH 108 might not be ready for that level of course. Day mentioned prerequisite of MATH 217 as an influence on MATH 17 being approved for UC transfer; this new course would not have the same prerequisite, adding to the challenge of getting UC transfer approval, as well as ability to include on ADTs. Please share with your constituents. PSME rep asked for suggestions to bring back to faculty, regarding options for non-science students—mention of PSYC 7 as Statistics option.
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Prerequisite for new THTR course for 2017-18; also listed are ongoing requisites, for which a Content Review form was not on file. Please share with your constituents.
c. Public Health Science ADT Approval	The CCCCO has approved the Public Health Science ADT.
d. COR Review Cycle	Follow-up to question, at previous meeting, regarding our five-year review cycle vs. state's requirement of review every six years. Escoto noted that UCs and CSUs like to see a textbook publication date (on the COR) within the past five years, which might explain our five-year cycle.
3. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 400B	**Speaker: Isaac Escoto** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 400B. Course will be permanently Stand Alone. Comment regarding Criteria A section and how course fits within mission—specifically, disconnect between "seniors" and "workforce development." Counseling rep clarified that some students who take the course are aids to those who need lip-reading assistance, such as seniors. LaManque noted that current form was developed for credit courses and format does not translate well for use with noncredit courses. CCC Team will draft updates to form, to better address noncredit courses. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
4. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 400D	**Speaker: Isaac Escoto** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 400D. Course will be permanently Stand Alone. *[Note: see item 3 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.

| 5. Stand Alone Approval Request: IDS 406 | **Speaker: Isaac Escoto**
First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for IDS 406. Course will be permanently Stand Alone. Concern regarding potential overlap with Supplemental Instruction courses, e.g., NCBS 405. Question regarding Criteria B section—comment that answer quotes Title 5 regarding how apportionment is collected, and does not necessarily address need. LaManque noted that course covers different category of tutoring than Supplemental Instruction, and different credentials are required. Concern that an auditor might take issue with a student enrolled in both Supplemental Instruction and this course. Language Arts rep noted that course is interdisciplinary across divisions (unlike Supplemental Instruction courses), and that the STEM center is interested in using it. Plan to create a new subject code and move course to new code, instead of using IDS. LaManque clarified that course is not embedded tutoring—a student would be referred to this course. Clarified that course is not related to Pass the Torch. Vanatta noted that the discipline listed on the COR attachment is not yet settled. Question regarding who will be doing the tutoring, faculty or students—unclear. Additional questions regarding the difference between this course and Supplemental Instruction courses. Escoto will invite Katie Ha to attend CCC for second read.

Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting. |
| 6. Non-transcriptable Certificates | **Speaker: Isaac Escoto**
Concerns were voiced at previous meeting, including the lack of college-wide processes for conferring and tracking non-transcriptable certificates. Foothill's 2016-17 catalog lists 59 non-transcriptable certificate offerings. Escoto suggested reps check in with departments/division for details on how students receive such certificates and how they are produced and tracked. LaManque would like to follow-up with Lourdes Parent (research analyst) to see if it's possible to track these as a college and report to the state. Noted suggested IEPI target indicator regarding low-unit certificates—important to determine if it is a college priority to set a goal regarding the number of low-unit certificates granted. Noted one of our Quality Focus Essays (for accreditation) is on topic of pathways—these certificates could be part of the discussion. Both IEPI and QFE would entail parallel discussion with Academic Senate.

Question regarding ability to list these certificates on student transcripts—Escoto will follow up. LaManque noted that no CCCCO approval or review is involved in these (except the two noncredit certificates). Bio Health rep noted existence of certificates that are not listed on attachment (e.g., mammography, venipuncture, EMT). Hueg expressed desire for centralized process of conferring non-transcriptable certificates. Fine Arts rep noted that division does keep track of theirs; agreed with Hueg regarding desire for college-wide process. Clarification regarding state review of certificates—CCCCO only reviews certificates of achievement, completion, and competency. Day noted that some of the non-transcriptable certificates are within the unit count for a lower-unit certificate of achievement, and could be submitted for CCCCO approval. LaManque noted that certificates of achievement under 27 units are not eligible for financial aid. Noted that, some years back, the CCCCO changed the categories for certificates, which resulted in many certificates being moved from |

	transcriptable to non-transcriptable—unsure why some were submitted as certificates of achievement and others were not. Noted that, even among certificates of achievement, many of our active programs are not conferred every year (or few students receive each year), although some are very popular. BSS rep noted faculty support for non-transcriptable certificates—students value the achievement. Escoto would like to continue conversation by first understanding how each division handles such certificates, and then moving on to possibly developing college-wide process. LaManque noted need to include institutional guidance in process. Fine Arts rep noted that, in previous years, new non-transcriptable certificates were simply added to curriculum sheet, without CCC review. Day asked how pass-along courses are evaluated for non-transcriptable certificate requirements—some reps stated that they evaluate students' transcripts. Comment that CCC should be approving new non-transcriptable certificates, not just division CC. Bio Health rep noted that individual program directors handle their own non-transcriptable certificates—these are specialized programs, required by state bodies to prove the student has completed specific courses/requirements, and somewhat different than the programs in other departments/divisions. Suggestion for reps to share list with division to find out if it is complete, and for divisions to provide numbers, if possible, of how many students have received non-transcriptable certificates. Escoto will invite Nazy Galoyan (A&R) to upcoming meeting, to address possibility of listing these on transcripts.
7. ESLL 26	**Speaker: Isaac Escoto** Language Arts rep shared possibility of deactivating ESLL 26 during report out at previous meeting; Escoto wanted to create a space for campus-wide discussion. Language Arts rep stated that ESLL department would like feedback regarding how course is used in other departments, as well as feedback from students. Division received data from IR regarding student completion of ESLL 26 vs. ENGL 1A. If student places into (and completes) ESLL 25 & 249, they can then take ENGL 1A or ESLL 26; however, if they take ESLL 26, they cannot then take ENGL 1A because ESLL 26 is not listed as a prerequisite (they can take ENGL 1B, but it's not recommended). Question regarding easier way to allow students who take ESLL 26 to then take ENGL 1A—department could add it to prerequisite list for ENGL 1A. Comment regarding different placement tests for ENGL & ESLL, which affect student placement. ESLL department considering deactivating ESLL 26 and creating similar course of ESLL 126 (which would then replace ESLL 25 & 249 as prerequisite for ENGL 1A). Counseling noted importance of students having option of ESLL 26; has seen students go from ESLL 26 to ENGL 1B for CSU transfer. Language Arts rep encouraged counselors to attend discussion with ESLL department. Noted that data suggests many students taking both ESLL 26 & ENGL 1A (note that currently-available data reflects only students who have completed a program). Suggestion to keep ESLL 26 active and add ESLL 126 as an option for those who aren't planning to transfer. Bio Health rep asked if students would still be able to use ESLL 26 as a graduation requirement (those who take it prior to it being deactivated)—Escoto noted that

	CCC previously passed a resolution, regarding local GE, stating that students may use a course for graduation if the course was applicable to the local GE pattern when they took it. Day noted philosophical issue of Foothill desiring to offer English composition for second language learners, and whether or not this is an equity issue—for example, are there specific programs that will be disproportionately affected (currently-available data does not specify programs)? Noted that many students take ESLL 26 because it meets CSU GE requirement for written communication but then take ENGL 1A because they change path and decide to transfer to UC. Question regarding success rates of students who go from ESLL 26 to ENGL 1B—Language Arts rep noted very small group of students, but good success rates. Please share issue with your constituents, especially regarding potential impact to programs and specific populations.
8. Honors Courses	**Speaker: Isaac Escoto** Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.
9. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** BSS: Hoping to approve Global Studies ADT at upcoming meeting. Counseling: March 1st deadline for students to submit graduation petition for ADTs.
10. Good of the Order	
11. Adjournment	**3:24 PM**

Attendees: Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Milissa Carey (FA), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (Interim VP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Beth Morrison (guest), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Lety Serna (CNSL)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta