

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 6, 2018
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 23, 2018	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Campbell noted creation of Canvas websites for curriculum rep use, mentioned in agenda email. Please reach out to her for creation of customized site for your division.</p> <p>Language Arts: ENGL dept. changing some prerequisites to meet C-ID requirements.</p> <p>Library: Division CC recently discussed change in how academic librarians think about information literacy; Association of College & Research Libraries recently updated its standards to what they now call a “framework.” Librarians considering how framework might be implemented at Foothill.</p> <p>Bio Health: New HORT proposals coming through. HLTH and HORT submitting changes for Feb. 20th deadline.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Working on ideas for new curriculum.</p> <p>PSME: Starting to work on Title 5 updates for 2019-20. MATH dept. starting to work on updates related to AB 705—changes could be significant. Faculty attending conference on Friday; some colleges have already implemented changes. LaManque noted state task force will be meeting to provide guidance.</p> <p>Fine Arts: No update.</p> <p>Counseling: Discussed CLEP at in-service—division is in favor of local CLEP policy. Agreed that each division should determine its own CLEP policy; such policies would be helpful for counselors.</p> <p>BSS: Recent focus mainly on curriculum sheets. Still working on figuring out best way to attract faculty to division CC meetings.</p>
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposal b. Notification of Proposed Requisites c. ESLL 26 Deactivation	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell The following proposal was presented: NCEL 405. No comments.</p> <p>New requisites for APAV 54B, 56, 81 (all effective 2018-19); also listed are ongoing requisites, for which a Content Review form was not on file.</p> <p>Language Arts rep presented memo from division, which outlines rationale for deactivating ESLL 26. Noted data showing 83% of students who complete ESLL 125 & 249 go on to pass ENGL 1A. Beginning summer 2018, students who would have previously placed into ESLL 26 will instead place into ESLL 125 & 249 (and be eligible for ENGL 1A after successful completion of ESLL 125 & 249). Vanatta will remove ESLL 26 from curriculum sheets and any CORs where it is listed as a requisite or Advisory. Campbell noted concern that ESLL 26 is listed on applications for some</p>

<p>d. Update on Curriculum Process Redesign</p>	<p>Allied Health programs and asked how its deactivation will affect students who previously completed course—catalog rights will remain in place for students who previously completed.</p> <p>LaManque provided update. Recent third-party vendor demonstration of curriculum and catalog software; at first glance more advanced than what was available when we last looked at third-party offerings, a few years ago. Drafting Request for Proposal (RFP) for vendors to present their products. Note that De Anza also looking for a new system but not quite ready to begin reviewing options. Idea is for district to adopt a new system to be used by both colleges. PSME rep asked if vendors provide guest login for test-driving the system—plan to request such from vendors who respond to RFP. Campbell noted that, from the faculty perspective, system recently demoed is much more transparent than C3MS. Any new system will be a huge shift; will require plan for the roll-out, and reaching out to users for training.</p> <p>Campbell shared Canvas site she created for Bio Health division curriculum use. Site lists detailed steps and instructions for certain tasks (e.g., new course proposal form, COR creation); includes links to CCC website to download forms and will be updated to include examples of completed forms. Site can be customized for each division. Possibility of hosting a general version on Academic Senate website. Campbell brainstormed digital content ideas (e.g., videos) with Judy Baker, Dean of Online Learning.</p>
<p>4. New Subject Code: APAV</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Apprenticeship has approved the creation of a new subject code of APAV (Apprenticeship Veterinary Assisting). This code will go into effect for the 2018-19 catalog. Campbell noted that these courses are not the same as the existing V T courses; APAV courses fall in-between existing Veterinary Assisting and Veterinary Technology programs.</p>
<p>5. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 400A</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 400A. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Kuehnl, Armerding). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 400C</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 400C. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Venkataraman). Approved.</p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 400E</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 400E. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Armerding). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 22A</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 22A. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Venkataraman, Thomas). Approved.</p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 22B</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 22B. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>

<p>10. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 60</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 60. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>
<p>11. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 61</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 61. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>
<p>12. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 62</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 62. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Armerding). Approved.</p>
<p>13. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 64</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 64. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Kuehnl, Thomas). Approved.</p>
<p>14. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRNL 70R series</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRNL 70R independent study series (also includes 71R, 72R, 73R). No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>
<p>15. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 77</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 77. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>
<p>16. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 84A</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 84A. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Hanning). Approved.</p>
<p>17. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 84B</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 84B. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Ziegenhorn). Approved.</p>
<p>18. Proposed Exception Process for Starting Courses Prior to Catalog Publication</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell Second read of proposed process. Document has been updated since first read, based on suggestions, to expand process instructions. Campbell asked the group for feedback. Apprenticeship rep noted faculty is very much in favor. No additional feedback shared. Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Cembellin). Approved.</p>
<p>19–32. Stand Alone Approval Requests: APAV 50A, 50B, 50C, 51, 53A, 53B, 54A, 54B, 55, 56, 60, 75A, 75B, 81</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APAV courses (discussion pertains to group of courses, as they all make up one program). Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a forthcoming Apprenticeship Veterinary Assisting program. Campbell spoke with faculty Lisa Eshman to confirm these courses are at a higher level than their existing counterparts in V T. Students who complete APAV versions will have option to join Veterinary Technology AS degree program in second year. Noted</p>

	<p>APAV math course will be taught in second year of apprenticeship program and will provide built-in support for students. Counseling rep requested clarification regarding prerequisites for existing Veterinary Technology program, for APAV students who wish to transition over—plan is for additional prerequisites to be attached to a course that such students would take during their second year. Campbell noted APAV apprenticeship located in San Francisco, so might not be much student interest in transitioning into AS degree program here at Foothill. Apprenticeship rep noted transition plan is still under discussion. PSME rep noted distance between Foothill and San Francisco and asked if regional consortium still exists to discuss such topics—LaManque noted group does exist but apprenticeship not always discussed there. Noted that apprenticeship body is regional and includes such far away locations as Monterey. Language Arts rep noted recent discussion with student who has Veterinary Technology degree from 10 years ago and can no longer afford to live in the area; wondered if APAV apprenticeship addresses need for higher paying jobs. Campbell noted apprenticeship essentially creating a new level of jobs in veterinary offices; LaManque noted apprenticeship students are paid.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>33—38. Stand Alone Approval Requests: APCA 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APCA courses (discussion pertains to group of courses, as they all make up one program). Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a forthcoming Apprenticeship Culinary Arts program. Apprenticeship rep noted location in San Jose, through Job Corps Center. Noted curriculum creation has slowed since courses first proposed, due to faculty changes at center.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>39. Draft Update to Foothill GE Application</p>	<p>Speaker: Rachelle Campbell First read of updates to current Foothill General Education Application form (draft example is form for Area I - Humanities, but approved updates will apply to forms used for all GE areas). Based on comments at previous meeting, section of form used by GE subcommittee has been edited to add selections for recommended/not recommended, as well as instructions for the comments box. Campbell noted that old versions of forms might still be linked in C3MS; Vanatta will check in with system administrator to address.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>40. Credit by Exam Process</p>	<p>Speakers: Bernie Day & Nazy Galoyan Day noted that current process created by CCC in 2011. Title 5 states colleges are allowed to charge a fee up to the cost of enrollment for a course, but the student should not actually register for the course. Title 5 states transcript must clearly note when a student has received credit by exam. Language for catalog drafted by CCC was never incorporated into catalog; current catalog language is outdated. Also at issue is SPAN dept. advertising credit by exam but their courses not on the list published in catalog. ASCCC drafted paper on best practices for awarding credit by exam—Campbell will email link to group. Day noted requirement that a student must have completed 15 units at Foothill to be eligible for credit by exam, and that units received via credit by exam cannot be used to determine residency—both</p>

	<p>stated in district board policy.</p> <p>Galoyan noted our current process violates Title 5—students should not be registering for the actual courses and we should not be receiving apportionment. Need to determine list of courses approved for credit by exam, language to list on student's transcript, fee to charge. Fine Arts rep asked what happens if student has already passed course—not eligible for credit by exam.</p> <p>LaManque asked about benefits to credit by exam. Day noted cases (e.g., in C S) in which the student is more advanced than entry courses used as prerequisites for advanced levels. However, cautioned regarding transferability of credit by exam. Noted that students are looking for ways to save time. Galoyan noted students in Spanish program, who enter at intermediate/advanced level but still need the units for program completion. Noted we cannot grant credit by exam for a course not offered by Foothill; exam used for credit by exam cannot mimic exams used during the course itself and must address all objectives listed on the COR. PSME rep asked what happens if a student receives credit by exam and then cannot transfer units, may they take regular version of course at Foothill—Galoyan needs to do more research but believes that this may be a local decision. Reiterated that the opposite is not allowed. Day noted students may petition Academic Council. Galoyan noted we would not claim apportionment for credit by exam, so not an issue in that sense. BSS rep asked if there is a difference between credit by exam and AP credit—Day stated that AP credit is in many cases aligned with specific course within a major, and a more universal process.</p> <p>Campbell noted need to rewrite current credit by exam policy/process, determine list of courses, determine potential fee, ensure faculty know they will not receive compensation for credit by exam. CCC Team will draft update to policy and bring to a future meeting. Apprenticeship rep asked if each department will be allowed to determine its own list of courses—Day noted current policy states the faculty member and the dean. PSME rep asked what happens if dean cannot find faculty to administer exam when requested—will need to be included in discussion. Campbell noted that a department's decision to include a course is a commitment by the department to administer the exam. LaManque noted will bring topic to VP of Instruction Kristy Lisle and the deans for discussion, as this is a commitment to the student that credit by exam will be offered. Counseling rep asked if De Anza has credit by exam—Day looked but could not find anything.</p> <p>Campbell asked the group to bring topic to their faculty for discussion and feedback to bring to future meeting.</p>
41. Good of the Order	
42. Adjournment	3:18 PM

Attendees: Ben Armerding (LA), Rachelle Campbell (Faculty Co-Chair), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Nazy Galyoan (guest—Dean of Enrollment Services), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Brenda Hanning (BH), Joy Holland (guest—F A), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Andrew LaManque (AVP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Don MacNeil (guest—K A), Bruce McLeod (Apprenticeship), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Katy Ripp (KA), Ben Schwartzman (SRC), Lety Serna (CNSL), Mary Thomas (LIBR), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta