

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 19, 2019
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 5, 2019	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Language Arts: No updates to report.</p> <p>Bio Health: Per Subramaniam, no updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: Considering reducing Introduction to Online Learning [<i>note: CNSL 90</i>] from 1.5 units to 1 unit—connecting with Lené Whitley-Putz (Dean of Online Learning) to discuss.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report.</p> <p>PSME: Starting to work on curriculum sheet updates.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Division decided to not move forward with creation of GID 32A/B cross-listings (on previous CCC agenda). Reps are working on ways of improving communication with faculty regarding curriculum.</p> <p>Library: No updates to report. Announcement that there will be a new library catalog system starting winter quarter. More information to come, but might impact links/images in Canvas, for example. Liaisons will be able to provide help regarding any necessary Canvas edits. Starer asked about timing—there may be a little overlap with current system at the end of fall quarter, but new system will take over in winter.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p>
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl The following proposals were presented: ATHL 34, 34A, 34B; CNSL 3, 3H; RSPT 56, 57; R T 75. Please share with your constituents. PSME rep asked how the 5-unit CNSL courses articulate to 3-semester-unit courses (instead of 4.5 quarter units)—Counseling rep will follow up with faculty. No other comments.</p>
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	<p>New prereq for JRYM 106, effective summer 2020 quarter. Please share with your constituents. No comments.</p>
c. ASCCC Fall Plenary Update	<p>Kuehnl attended plenary with Isaac Escoto; received list of voting outcomes after agenda was distributed—will forward to reps. Mentioned resolution re: recommendation to remove “pilot” designation from bachelor degrees—passed. Attended breakout session on bachelor programs; noted that Foothill stands out among the group, in regard to program success!</p>
d. Acting Certificate Approval	<p>The CCCCO has approved the Acting Certificate of Achievement!</p>
4. Stand Alone Approval Request: BUSI 12	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for BUSI 12. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Armerding). Approved.</p>

<p>5. Stand Alone Approval Request: C S 48A</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for C S 48A. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Armerding). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Approval Request: ESLL 201A</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ESLL 201A. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Armerding). Approved.</p>
<p>7. New Program Application: Digital Marketing Certificate of Achievement</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Digital Marketing Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Painter). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRYM 105</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRYM 105. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Approval Request: JRYM 106</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for JRYM 106. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. Requisite Recency</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Continuing discussion from a previous meeting. PSME reps reached out to depts. in PSME, as well as Biology dept. (no feedback yet from Biology due to timing of their meetings). Chemistry dept. said five years is reasonable for their courses; faculty concerned about safety issues in lab setting. C S dept. also has labs, but different format, so no safety concerns; against any sort of recency requirement, as they believe most of their students won't need it; C S courses tend to not have prerequisites unless required for articulation. Physics dept. more concerned with math prereqs, and not safety; have seen students return with diminished math skills, which can prohibit success; supports recency requirement for this reason. PSME division determined it would be best for each dept. to be able to set their own recency requirement, since lab courses across campus are very different and may have different reasons for setting a requirement. Rep acknowledged that allowing each dept. to set its own requirement could become complex. Other PSME rep noted Dental Hygiene dept., which recommends that students take all prereqs within six years of beginning their program. Gilstrap noted that Dental Hygiene currently does require students to have completed BIOL prereqs before entering program, but no requirement for other prereqs.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep mentioned safety issues in certain labs in division, especially ART courses. Has not discussed topic with Graphic Design dept. yet, but could be an issue due to software changes over the years. Counseling rep asked if reps know how many students might be affected in a given year, as well as what safety training is like. PSME rep responded that CHEM labs have safety training on the first day of class, and expectation that students have some familiarity with safety techniques/protocols from prior courses; don't retrain students on techniques they learned in prior courses; unsure how many students affected per year. Other PSME rep noted one faculty member in Physics dept. has experienced a number of students affected, which prompted them to bring the issue to the reps. Fine Arts rep brought up the issue to their dean, who recommended adding guidelines to syllabus regarding how situation would be handled if student does not have recent</p>

	<p>enough prereq knowledge (e.g., student would need to drop the course). PSME rep expressed concern about stress on learning environment, in general, if student is present in class setting who might pose a safety risk—does not believe that suggestion to add guidelines to syllabus sufficiently addresses the full issue, and believes faculty should not be placed in dangerous environment. Fine Arts rep noted that certain ART labs have safety risk similar to CHEM labs, due to solvents and chemicals used (e.g., printmaking courses).</p> <p>Language Arts rep asked if actual policy is necessary or if recency requirements could be included on the COR; noted that Title 5 allows for recency requirement (Kuehnl noted that Title 5 states it must be 36+ months). Kuehnl wondered if other solutions possible, rather than blocking student registration; for example, safety training. Fine Arts rep noted that faculty teaching certain labs must undergo safety training annually; open to something similar for students. Kuehnl agreed that college-wide policy might not be necessary. Starer expressed concern that students aren't fully trained in labs every quarter; asked reps if training is so onerous/time consuming that it can't be repeated every quarter; could it be separate from lab hours? Would rather address safety issue than set up prereq barrier. Subramaniam noted that two-year CHEM sequence is basically one long sequence, so some students might be required to re-take multiple CHEM courses under a recency requirement. Noted concern that faculty might not be up-to-date on certain types of lab safety training. Gilstrap noted some effects on students of being required to re-take a course, related to grades and transferring credits. Fine Arts rep noted issue of students using courses from other colleges as prereqs, which makes it hard to know what level of safety training they were given. Suggested using a quiz during first week of class (following in-class training) to ensure students understand safety processes, and require students pass the quiz to remain in the class.</p> <p>PSME rep asked about legality of requiring a student to take a separate training class that doesn't carry credit and how logistics would work, e.g., how often it would be held, and how we would handle faculty pay. Starer believes we can require necessary safety training, legally. PSME rep unsure it makes sense for faculty to have to cover so many basic safety training processes for all students; believes it a better idea to require it only for students who need it. Language Arts rep suggested noncredit coreq that could be required for certain students, similar to coreqs created for AB 705. Vanatta unsure which noncredit category the course could fall under. Fine Arts rep suggested using hybrid teaching format to provide online training/quiz for students. BSS rep asked if there could be funding for an instructional designer to tailor training/quiz to each individual discipline; suggested holding quiz first, so students who pass do not have to watch training portion. Starer noted possibility of funding; agreed that idea is worth exploring with Online Learning dept. Cautioned that implementing the coreq model suggested by Language Arts rep creates a lot of issues in Banner; AB 705 coreqs require a lot of work/intervention from A&R because they cannot be implemented in a streamlined way.</p> <p>Kuehnl reiterated that group agrees that issue should be handled separately by each dept.—group agreed. PSME rep will bring coreq suggestion back to Chemistry and Physics depts. to discuss. Starer will follow-up with Online Learning dept. re: creation of online training/quiz; reiterated that we are empowered to handle this issue locally. PSME rep asked if De Anza would need to become involved—no, per Starer; local issue, not district-wide.</p>
<p>11. Centralized Curriculum Model</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl At previous meeting, during discussion about division CC processes and practices, group discussed pros and cons of our decentralized model vs. a</p>

centralized one. Per request of group, topic agenda'd as a discussion item. Fine Arts rep reported discussed at recent division CC meeting; received feedback that holding division-level meetings fostered communication and collaboration within division, and faculty felt more confident in curriculum being reviewed at division before going to CCC. Any negative comments related to feelings of mistrust in the past, possibly 15+ years ago. Language Arts rep received strong opposition from all but one in division who sent feedback; concern that faculty in other depts./divisions could hold strong bias against content of courses, and liked having a buffer and felt they have more freedom. PSME rep noted their division has historically been strongly opposed to centralized model; faculty in division have felt personally attacked by/at CCC throughout the years, concern that politics influence certain actions taken against their division. Stated that if we change to centralized model, division will still hold division CC meetings and operate the same way they currently are.

Subramaniam responded to concerns that faculty will be shut down by others with differing opinions, saying that faculty shouldn't be deterred by such comments; noted that articulation highly influences our curriculum in many cases, and faculty should hold strong. Language Arts rep and BSS rep noted examples of new courses being stopped due to influence from outside dept./division, and examples of conflicts wherein multiple depts. believed they had sole right to teach certain content. BSS rep agreed with PSME rep regarding political issues causing conflict. Starer noted that not all divisions operate at the same level of robustness, when it comes to thoroughly preparing for CCC meetings, etc. Clarified that part of the reason is that the reps trust their colleagues in other depts. to write appropriate curriculum; however, he believes reps should be aware of what is being developed across campus and what they're approving. Stressed that any discussion about this topic will involve politics, and that politics will always be present in curriculum discussions, whether at division or CCC level.

Language Arts rep recalled experience discussing curriculum models at conferences/meetings—those who have centralized models experience all of the same issues as we do. Expressed need for handbook for reps, to guide reps on how to hold meetings and handle issues; also suggested professional development as a solution. Does not believe that centralization, in and of itself, will solve issues. PSME rep responded to Starer's comments about divisions operating at different levels, and noted feeling that PSME is being penalized for doing a good job, because other divisions are not doing as well. Fine Arts rep recalled experience on Humanities GE subcommittee, noting decline in participation on GE subcommittees, in general—suggested bringing GE approval directly to CCC. Noted not enough faculty attending division CC meetings, which does not enable robust participation and can result in miscommunication (e.g., recent issue with GID cross-listings). BSS rep worried about larger college-wide culture shift of faculty not taking as much of an involvement in the college, in terms of volunteering for committees, sincere participation when on committees, etc. Asked Starer to bring issue to administration level—Starer will bring it up but unsure that it is strictly an administration issue. BSS rep stated belief that change in culture reflects a change in administration culture, student engagement, faculty living farther away from campus.

Subramaniam explained his reason for promoting centralized model: worried about long-term sustainability of workload for reps without compensation (in decentralized model); regarding influence of outside depts., believes it's okay to have influence regarding things like hours/units, in terms of equity in workload—these issues aren't as transparent under our decentralized model. Kuehnl noted current discussions (outside of CCC)

	<p>regarding seat counts. Agreed with Language Arts rep about importance of brainstorming how to address issues outside of changing to centralized model. Fine Arts rep noted issue of faculty who teach only online, who rarely come to campus for division CC meetings, unless their own curriculum being discussed; concerned this will become a bigger issue as more courses move online. Gilstrap agreed that training for reps is important; noted that freedom for division CCs to have different processes can create confusion. Starer expressed concern regarding lack of GE subcommittee participation; noted we may need to bring GE approval back to CCC. Language Arts asked for clarification regarding GE subcommittees and how they relate to CCC—Starer gave background, noting that GE review/approval has gone back-and-forth from subcommittee(s) to CCC.</p> <p>Kuehnl acknowledged that the group does not seem interested in changing to centralized model, but stressed the need to address issues to make things work better in current model. Language Arts rep suggested looking at other colleges' handbooks for foundation to create our own. Kuehnl expressed need to figure out how to best pass on knowledge to incoming reps, as well as how to keep workload level reasonable for reps. Fine Arts rep suggested online handbook; noted that each division has unique issues, so one handbook might not be applicable to every division, but a good starting point. Kuehnl suggested each division created brief guidelines, to address unique aspects of that division. Starer thanked the reps for engaging in a valuable discussion; believes it's good to discuss centralized model every once in a while, to determine current level of interest. Conversation will continue at a future meeting, framed around how to better support/train reps and address issues within current model.</p>
12. Good of the Order	
13. Adjournment	3:30 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (guest—Dean, APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Stephanie Chan (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), 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), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta