

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, January 21, 2020  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
President's Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: December 3, 2019	<b>Approved by consensus.</b>
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<b>Speaker: All</b> Articulation: No updates to report.  SRC: New rep, Mark Ferrer. No updates to report.  Apprenticeship: Reactivating CWE courses related to Apprenticeship.  PSME: Working on curriculum sheets; plan to deactivate Nanoscience program.  Language Arts: No updates to report.  Library: Information Literacy modules in Canvas have been updated due to new OneSearch system; faculty will need to re-download modules in Canvas to use for their courses.  Fine Arts: Feedback from Ceramics dept. faculty regarding topic of requisite recency for their intermediate-level courses: prefer requirement of seven years, due to safety issues regarding glazes, clean-up, etc. Question regarding how this would affect courses within Families—would a student who has completed max of six courses within Family be able to repeat? Gilstrap said no. Update regarding Garment Printing certificate, which was part of streamlined process—was approved locally, but not moving forward with submission to BACCC because LMI data does not support the program. Vanatta explained cannot submit to CCCCO without BACCC approval; division may choose to continue offering as non-transcriptable or deactivate. Kuehn asked Starer about Foothill administration's opinion, if any, regarding offering non-transcriptable certificates—Starer noted that divisions are responsible for administering and tracking them; college does not receive funding from the state for non-transcriptable.  BSS: No updates to report.  Kinesiology: No updates to report.  Bio Health: Working on curriculum sheets; Biology dept. working on new certificate related to health equity and inclusion leadership.
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposals  b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehn</b> The following proposals were presented: APPT 113, 115, 118; ART 4J; PHED 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408. Please share with your constituents. Apprenticeship rep noted the new APPT courses will be replacing existing courses that will then be deactivated; content has changed enough to necessitate new courses. Fine Arts rep noted creation of ART 4J in response to popularity of figure drawing courses; hope is that sculpture version will also be popular.  Listed are ongoing requisites for D A, RSPT & SPAN courses, for which a Content Review form was not on file. Please share with your constituents.

	c. Web Browser Issues with C3MS  d. CourseLeaf Update  e. New PCAH	Vanatta presented announcement. A few reps have noticed issues with COR formatting when using Firefox. Sysadmin Bradley Creamer has informed that this is a known issue and advises all to use Chrome for best results with C3MS. Note that Firefox and others may still be used, but formatting might look messed up when viewing CORs.  Starer presented announcement. We are now finalizing implementation of the course management system portion of CourseLeaf. Hope to be able to begin using part of that system by the end of winter quarter. Next step is to implement the catalog portion; unclear if we need to wait until catalog is fully implemented before we can fully use the course management system.  Vanatta presented announcement. The CCCCO published the 7th edition of their Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) in fall; link on CCC website has been updated. Reviewed new edition and compared it to previous—only updates related to changes in Title 5 and other regulations that we already know about (e.g., unit values for certificates of achievement, removal of English/math test scores from competency requirements).
4. Consent Calendar a. GE Applications		<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> The following GE applications were presented: Area I—HUMN 1H, 5H; Area IV—SOC 45. No comments.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Meezan). <b>Approved.</b>
5. Stand Alone Approval Request: R T 75		<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for R T 75. No comments.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Subramaniam, Venkataraman). <b>Approved.</b>
6. Cross-List Request: R T 75 & DMS 51A		<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Cross-listed Course Approval Request for R T 75 (new course for 2020-21) & DMS 51A (existing course). No comments.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Chan, Murphy). <b>Approved.</b>
7. GE Subcommittees		<b>Speaker: Paul Starer</b> Process not going smoothly for some of the GE areas; continue to struggle to staff the subcommittees and some have just one member, which is unfair to both submitting faculty and sole serving subcommittee member. Would like to begin discussion on how to resolve this issue. Does not appear to be enough to simply ask faculty to volunteer. One option is to bring full GE review back to CCC.  PSME rep asked how many GE applications are reviewed in a given year—Starer noted it depends on the GE area. Kuehnl noted that subcommittees also handle GE course substitution applications from students, which the CCC Co-Chair (he) distributes; was a big issue this year, as some were delayed for months due to no one serving on some subcommittees. Also noted that this year had a low number of members continuing from the previous year. Fine Arts rep serves on Area I subcommittee, suggested CCC increase meeting time and fully review GE applications. PSME rep agreed. Kuehnl asked how much time it usually takes to review applications—Fine Arts rep noted Area I members review separately and then discuss via email; previously met in person, which the rep preferred. Also suggested that new eyes on applications, from a variety of disciplines, would be good. Other PSME has served on Area V subcommittee for years and was on central GE committee before that; noted that some applications take just 15 minutes but at times can take hours on a single application.  Starer noted if GE review brought to CCC would need to establish policies and procedures for review, including when to send back to faculty for revisions, etc. PSME rep provided history of GE review at CCC, making

	<p>note of decision that GE review would consume too much time at CCC and take time away from discussion of bigger picture topics. Agreed with Starer of need for process if GE review brought to CCC, including who would communicate issues with faculty. Another PSME rep noted that sometimes faculty reluctant to participate in “temporary” groups for fear that it will turn into long-term commitment; suggested review continue to be on a volunteer basis. BSS rep suggested faculty submitting GE application attend meeting at which application being discussed; PSME rep noted this was included in prior discussion, due to situation concerning a specific application, which resulted in current GE application forms requiring information come directly from COR. Noted concern that if faculty member attends meeting they would potentially provide information not directly from COR, which would be a change from current submission criteria. Language Arts rep suggested that faculty could attend but still keep requirement that information must come directly from COR. PSME rep expressed need to determine ahead of time and be clear whether or not additional information would be allowed, outside of the COR.</p> <p>Kuehnl noted concern that faculty attending CCC meeting during review could affect robustness of review. Fine Arts rep suggested consideration of automatically adding to Foothill GE list courses that have been approved for transfer GE (CSU GE, IGETC); noted this has been suggested in the past. PSME rep noted that students may choose to complete transfer GE pattern instead of Foothill GE; Gilstrap confirmed no requirement for student to complete Foothill GE, may use CSU GE or IGETC. PSME rep mentioned discussion at CCC a few years ago regarding eliminating Foothill GE pattern. Subramaniam and Gilstrap noted that transfer GE patterns require more courses, so Foothill GE does appeal to some students.</p> <p>Kuenhl asked if anything prohibits bringing applications to CCC if a subcommittee has no members; could be a stopgap if this occurs again. Starer suggested this would need to be concrete decision, discussed first with Academic Senate, as CCC is a subcommittee of Senate. PSME rep agreed; stated it is the responsibility of CCC to set clear processes for faculty to follow and to be transparent with campus regarding any changes in process. Fine Arts rep noted that GE course substitution forms are often submitted on paper (not electronically) and can take time to review; must ensure that enough time would be devoted to GE review and not take away from other CCC business. Starer noted that CCC could make clear on agenda when applications are being reviewed and how much time devoted to such review. Bio Health rep mentioned prerequisite waiver forms, and asked if similar process could be used for GE course substitution forms (reviewed by division/discipline faculty, instead of GE subcommittee). Gilstrap noted that prereq clearance forms used by students not to receive credit but to clear a prereq and be allowed to enroll in a course; GE course substitution forms result in credit being awarded, if approved. Kuenhl noted that GE course substitution forms don't necessarily articulate the course taken by the student to a specific course at Foothill (although some do); they are asking that the course be assessed for the GE area, in general.</p> <p>Starer asked if group would find it useful to see examples of GE course substitution forms, to aid in further discussion at future meeting. Kuehnl will speak with Isaac Escoto (Senate President) regarding topic.</p>
8. Honors Course Prerequisite	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b></p> <p>Continuing discussion from previous meeting, at which Honors Institute staff were guests. Starer noted follow-up conversation with Gilstrap regarding articulation implications; Gilstrap confirmed need to rearticulate any course on which prereq being removed. Gilstrap followed up with UC to ask if still need to resubmit if Foothill determined that honors prereqs were originally</p>

	<p>applied inappropriately—yes, we will. Additionally, if course approved for CSU GE, IGETC, or C-ID, need to resubmit for those once UC transfer reapproved. From articulation perspective, whenever a course needs to be rearticulated, it opens up the possibility that the reviewer might identify issues that the previous reviewer did not. Gilstrap asked group to take this into consideration in any discussions of removing the prereq. Noted annual deadlines regarding UC approval.</p> <p>Lee noted that Honors Institute staff still using process of manually clearing prereqs in Banner (two steps per student). Subramaniam asked if prereq could be listed on COR but not enforced in Banner. Gilstrap noted that honors program specifies that students must be Honors Institute participants in order to register; asked how to handle this if certain honors courses apply prereq and others do not. Starer noted concerns regarding an audit if we explicitly decide to not enforce prereq in Banner. Lee asked about possible implications from audit if we continue to enforce honors prereq that we cannot back up with data—Starer agreed that is an issue, but expressed concern with removing prereq from all honors courses en masse. Suggested would be better for each dept. to discuss and determine if prereq should be applied to their courses; should not be removed administratively. BSS rep noted some faculty in division expressed concerns regarding removal of prereq and would like to see data regarding success rates. Gilstrap suggested ad hoc group be convened to include various stakeholders around campus, to help guide the conversation. Starer in support; would like Kuehnl to discuss with Isaac Escoto.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep provided feedback from Communication dept. Feedback expressed belief that removing the prereq could harm the honors program; suggested either automation of registration processes for students (while keeping prereq in place) or removal of prereq in conjunction with priority registration for honors program students.</p>
9. Improving our Curriculum Model	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.
10. Good of the Order	
11. Adjournment	<b>3:25 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (guest—Dean, APPR), Stephanie Chan (LA), Mark Ferrer (SRC), Owen Flannery (KA), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Taylor Johnson (guest—PSME), Marc Knobel (PSME), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Debbie Lee (guest—Acting Dean, FA & KA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Ron Painter (PSME), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta