



<p>d. Academic Calendar Exploration and Feasibility Analysis (ACEFA)</p>	<p>and system adjustments/improvements. Two CCC reps helping with testing. Starer pointed out that because CourseLeaf will integrate with Banner, we will be using (on CORs) the same numbering scheme that we currently use in Banner (leading “F” in course numbers). Edits to information on COR are clearly displayed, including red strike-through for deleted text, and green for new text. Supplemental forms, such as Content Review, will be built-in to the COR form; we are working with Leepfrog to figure out the best way to implement this, as it could make the COR form very text-heavy.</p> <p>Hueg asked about exporting data to the web for marketing and other uses—after we implement the curriculum module (CIM) we will implement the catalog module (CAT). Vanatta added that Foothill’s webmaster, Bradley Creamer, is part of implementation team and is working with Leepfrog to get the tools needed to export CIM data for use on Foothill webpages outside of CourseLeaf. Starer continued presentation: text boxes on COR form are similar to MS Word, with formatting options; note that certain imported data will need to be cleaned up (e.g., numbered lists). Hueg asked if there will be a final import of data from C3MS to CourseLeaf—yes, at some future date we will need to halt COR changes in C3MS. Will hold training sessions for all users. Starer continued presentation: clear info on COR re: Workflow (i.e., where it is in the process); system will email users when review/approval is needed. Starer stressed that there will be a learning curve, as CourseLeaf is very different, but believes it will be a significant improvement on C3MS. More info to come as we get closer to go-live!</p> <p>Gilstrap presented announcement. He is on the ACEFA taskforce, comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students from both Foothill and De Anza; taskforce will survey constituents (likely in winter quarter) on topic of changing to a semester system. First meeting has occurred. BSS rep asked what initiated the taskforce—many CSUs converting to semester, and some data suggests that semester schedules are better for students. Hueg is also on taskforce; noted it is an exploratory committee and involves many individuals. Believes it emanated from those at the district recognizing that there has been talk, over the years, about considering this change. Noted our academic calendar is the longest in the CA community college system. BSS rep noted some students target FHDA due to the quarter system. Fine Arts rep suggested contacting schools that have switched from quarter to semester to gain insight from their experiences. Gilstrap noted that switching would result in years of work on articulation agreements; Hueg agreed that impact on workload of faculty and staff would be heavy. Starer noted the economic benefit of a 32-week year vs. 36 weeks (if FTES remains steady) would need to be weighed against the amount of work necessary to convert all courses and programs. Hueg noted it is too early for feedback outside of the taskforce, at this stage. BSS rep asked about impacts to athletic programs—Kinesiology rep said would be a huge benefit to switch, for coaches; believes we would attract and retain better faculty as a result.</p>
<p>4. Stand Alone Approval Request: HORT 400A</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for HORT 400A. Criteria B section of form has been updated, to address concerns at previous meeting. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Meacham). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>5. Stand Alone Approval Request: HORT 400B</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for HORT 400B. Criteria B section of form has been updated, to address concerns at previous meeting. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Meacham). <b>Approved.</b></p>

<p>6. Stand Alone Approval Request: HORT 400C</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for HORT 400C. Criteria B section of form has been updated, to address concerns at previous meeting. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Meacham). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Approval Requests: ITSC 101, 105, 106, 110, 113, 114, 115, 123, 125, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 134</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for ITSC 101, 105, 106, 110, 113, 114, 115, 123, 125, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132 &amp; 134. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Hueg, Tuttle). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: BUSI 12</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for BUSI 12. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and added to the certificate of achievement in Data Analytics, currently in development. Hueg noted course being fast-tracked for winter quarter.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Approval Request: C S 48A</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for C S 48A. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and added to the certificate of achievement in Data Analytics, currently in development. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. Stand Alone Approval Request: ESLL 201A</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ESLL 201A. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>11. New Program Application: Digital Marketing Certificate of Achievement</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Digital Marketing Certificate of Achievement. Hueg noted program includes several new courses; working with a company called Pathstream as an intermediary between us and Facebook. Many courses will be offered as distance ed, so should be able to reach a broad group.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>12. Division Curriculum Committee Practices and Processes Round Table</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> During our orientation meeting for new reps last week, there was some discussion of best practices and processes used by division CCs; as there were few returning reps in attendance, we're bringing the topic to the wider group. Kuehnl asked the group if any division CCs have an official document of CC rules—no. PSME rep noted they have “unwritten rules.” Kuehnl noted issues caused by no overlap in reps from year-to-year—no knowledge passed down. Fine Arts rep mentioned topic of part-time faculty involvement in curriculum/CORs; issue of a part-timer creating/owning a course but leaving the college, and full-time faculty having no knowledge of the course. Other Fine Arts rep noted issue of communication between part-time and full-time faculty; communication re: New Course Proposals and how to ensure that everyone in a dept. is made aware of one before it goes to division CC. Hope is to draft guidelines to be passed to new reps in the future. Fine Arts rep noted additional issue of communicating with faculty who teach fully online and aren't present on campus, and including them in division CC meetings. BSS rep noted most depts. in their division have 1-3 full-time faculty (some have none); there is a disconnect between discipline expertise and curriculum expertise—trying to stress that faculty are responsible for COR content. Created Canvas shell for CC and Academic Senate discussions, incl. form approvals (e.g., Stand Alone). Kuehnl asked</p>

	<p>who writes Program Review in a dept. with no full-time faculty—Hueg acknowledged the challenge, also re: interdisciplinary programs, such as General Studies Social Science; BSS discussed topic at division meeting on opening day.</p> <p>Kuehnl asked the group for thoughts on part-time faculty owning CORs. PSME rep said in C S dept. it hasn't occurred yet but believes it would be a big issue. Kuehnl noted many faculty recently retired in Fine Arts, resulting in CORs being assigned to others (incl. himself) who are unfamiliar with the course content. Noted cases in which the proposer/creator of a course left Foothill before course even became active in the catalog. Subramaniam expressed caution around part-time faculty creating curriculum; has created issues in the past with programs having to be deactivated due to part-time faculty leaving. Introduced topic of moving from our division CC structure to a central curriculum committee, like most (if not all) other CA community colleges. Starer mentioned that, in his experience (incl. as faculty and dean), there has never been an appetite to discuss our model and perhaps change it. Starer open to discussion and believes it could resolve such issues as GE subcommittee representation; more than happy to agendize specific discussion at CCC, but noted that faculty primacy is key and if there is no faculty interest he will not push from an administrative standpoint. Kuehnl asked how curriculum moves through system without division CCs—Subramaniam noted that at De Anza, course goes from the dean to the CCC (instead of dean → div CC); each division has two reps on the CCC. Hueg noted that most colleges provide reassign time to a few faculty members who are reviewing a large volume of curriculum. Subramaniam noted that De Anza's CCC meets every week for 1.5 hours.</p> <p>Hueg believes a lack of trust resulted in our division CC model; stressed that this will need to be addressed if we begin the discussion of possibly moving to a central model. Kuehnl wondered if move to central model could result in loss of innovation; Subramaniam noted that during his time on the De Anza CCC any course brought to CCC for approval was approved. Starer mentioned current issue of identifying a new division rep for SRC, as current faculty there do not feel comfortable/confident in representing the curriculum at CCC. In our current model, SRC's curriculum development will halt if no rep steps up. Subramaniam mentioned that at De Anza faculty are held to a higher level of responsibility, generally speaking, to ensure that their curriculum is being regularly updated (vs. here where reps are heavily involved). Starer asked group if would like to agendize specific discussion at future CCC meeting—yes.</p>
13. Good of the Order	
14. Adjournment	<b>3:28 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (guest—Dean, APPR), Stephanie Chan (LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Dokesha Meacham (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Ron Painter (PSME), Matt Stanley (KA), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta