

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, March 17, 2020  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

| Item   | Discussion   |
|--|--|
| 1. Minutes: March 3, 2020  | <b>Approved by consensus.</b>  |
| 2. Report Out from Division Reps   | <p><b>Speaker: All</b><br/>                     Articulation: Provided update related to COVID-19 and UC schools. UC campuses will be as flexible as possible re: admission requirements/selection criteria, but will vary by campus/school/major. Some might be more stringent than others. UCOP transfer team consulting with UC campuses re: lab science courses; Gilstrap should receive an update today. Has contacted CSU Chancellor’s Office re: lab science courses but hasn’t received a response yet.</p> <p>Counseling: Providing phone and Zoom appointments to students; all forms are now fillable to be sent electronically to students.</p> <p>SRC: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>BSS: Working to support faculty to move classes online, particularly labs. Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>PSME: Already have been working on Title 5 updates. Division has mostly suspended regular operations to deal with current move to online classes.</p> <p>Library: Working hard to support move to online classes; important, most current information on library’s website. Had planned to remain open but is now closed. Working to help faculty digitize course materials.</p> <p>Language Arts: New noncredit certificate on today’s agenda. Working on streamlining literature offerings. Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: One rep is volunteering to help faculty who are new to teaching online (e.g., moving content to Canvas). Has found students to be open-minded about classes being moved online.</p> <p>Bio Health: Working to figure out labs and clinics for spring quarter. Working on Title 5 updates. Working on new certificate.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: Working to get faculty at training centers on Canvas. Working on new certificates.</p> |
| 3. Announcements<br>a. CORs for Update 2021-22 (Title 5 list)<br><br>b. Spring Plenary Resolutions | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>                     Vanatta compiled list of courses that need to be reviewed/updated for the 2021-22 catalog; list was emailed to reps and deans on March 11th. The deadline for the 2021-22 catalog, including Title 5 courses, will be June 19th.</p> <p>Draft of resolutions to be considered at ASCCC Spring Plenary. Kuehnl unsure what the plan is for Plenary—assumes will be moved to virtual meeting. Reach out to Kuehnl, Isaac Escoto, or Robert Cormia with feedback or questions.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>c. Veterinary Assisting Certificate Approval</p>          | <p>The CCCCCO has approved the Veterinary Assisting Certificate of Achievement!</p>   |
| <p>4. Consent Calendar<br/>a. GE Applications</p>            | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>The following GE applications were presented: Area VII—KINS 16A, 16B, 16C. Library rep noted response to L5 for KINS 16A, re: information competency—most KINS courses have a research component, but this application doesn't list one. Fine Arts rep on GE subcommittee and noted that applications were originally insufficient and needed to be resubmitted; subcommittee felt that resubmitted forms were sufficient enough to move forward to CCC. Library rep clarified that other two applications provide sufficient response to L5—just KINS 16A does not. Kinesiology rep will follow-up with faculty to address and resubmit application to CCC.</p> <p>Group agreed to pull application for KINS 16A from Consent Calendar.</p> <p>Motion to approve applications for KINS 16B, 16C <b>M/S</b> (Serna, Stanley). <b>Approved.</b></p>   |
| <p>5. Course Deactivation Exemption Requests</p>             | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>List of courses not taught in four years was distributed via email on Feb. 5th; divisions submitted requests to exempt courses, per Policy on Course Currency. Requests for the following courses were reviewed individually and voted on as a group, with the option to pull any course for an individual vote: APPT 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128; APSM 130, 134; ART 5C; CHLD 72; EMS 120, 200; ESLL 246; GEOG 11, 12; MATH 42; MTEC 70E, 72C; NCEL 403B; THTR 12A.</p> <p>Counseling rep mentioned APPT requests, noting that, on some forms, response to division's plan for regular offering does not match response to next quarter course will be scheduled (e.g., fall vs. spring). Allen explained that new program being created with these courses; plan is to offer all of the courses within the next few years—specific quarter that each course will be offered depends on when a cohort begins the program.</p> <p>No discussion occurred regarding any other requests.</p> <p>Group declined to pull any courses to not include in vote. Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Schultheis, Francisco). <b>Approved.</b></p>   |
| <p>6. New Program Application: Environmental Science ADT</p> | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>Second read of new Environmental Science ADT. PSME rep made a general comment, expressing the need for substantive discussions regarding the push to create new ADTs. Acknowledged that when ADTs first created there was a legitimate push to offer as many as possible, but situation is different now that enrollment is declining. When a new ADT is created we are locked in to offering the listed courses—this might take away from offering courses needed by a larger group of students (e.g., ENGL 1A). Believes this would be a worthwhile conversation for CCC to have. Lee agreed and mentioned Guided Pathways, temporarily on hiatus; when a new ADT is created, need to consider if we can guarantee courses will run and if we have the resources. Kuehnl agreed with importance of conversation and big picture considerations. Subramaniam echoed need for conversation. Fine Arts rep suggested using a rubric, incorporating data, when discussing new ADTs. PSME rep agreed that reviewing data important; suggested also including process to determine whether or not a program is successful. Language Arts rep stressed value in creating pathways for students to incorporate all of the courses they're already taking.</p> <p>Kuehnl will bring topic for discussion in the spring. BSS rep suggested administrative guidance included in discussions, as budget considerations</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>and financial goals will likely influence. Bio Health rep noted that this particular ADT does fall into category of a new program that includes only courses that are already being offered. Gilstrap noted that courses listed on ADTs are mandated by the TMC template; agreed with the importance of these conversations, since program creation process is mostly decentralized. PSME rep suggested topic of marketing be included in conversations, as that process is not necessarily visible to faculty (e.g., how new programs are marketed to students); Kuehnl suggested AVP of Marketing Simon Pennington attend. Lee noted difference in marketing between CTE and non-CTE programs—CTE programs are also promoted by other groups, outside of Foothill.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Gilstrap, Serna). <b>Approved.</b></p>   |
| <p>7. Sunsetting the Streamlined Certificate Process</p>                                 | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>                 Second read of updated Temporary Process to Streamline Certificates of Achievement, to set final deadline of June 19, 2020, for divisions to submit converted certificates using this process. Following deadline, if a division wishes to convert a certificate they would need to follow our regular program creation process. Lee mentioned the importance of communicating with De Anza when converting these certificates, as well as creating any new certificate. Noted recent issue of De Anza asking for better/earlier notice when we're creating a new certificate.</p> <p>Vanatta will email updated Division Certificate Report to each division that still offers non-transcriptable certificates.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Francisco, Subramaniam). <b>Approved.</b></p>   |
| <p>8. New Program Application: Bridge to College Level English Noncredit Certificate</p> | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>                 First read of new Bridge to College Level English Certificate of Competency. Language Arts rep noted that program has been in development for about a year. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>   |
| <p>9. Ad Hoc Groups</p>  | <p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b><br/>                 First read of three Proposals to Create New Ad Hoc Committees: Curriculum Best Practices, Foothill General Education Process, Honors Institute Course Prerequisite. Kuehnl emailed drafts to reps on March 3rd to solicit suggestions.</p> <p>Honors proposal: Kuehnl has incorporated feedback from Honors Institute staff. Re: Process section, Gilstrap suggested comparing previous requirements for students to enter Honors Program with current requirements, since changes have been made. Also suggested looking at what other CCs in our region are doing, to get insight. Suggested getting input from UCLA TAP and UCI Honors Program. Counseling rep agreed with these suggestions; Kuehnl agreed.</p> <p>Gilstrap suggested ensuring discussions include opinions from both sides of the situation—Kuehnl believes Process point A is general enough to ensure all sides are considered. Has made clear to Honors staff that discussions must include those who are in agreement and not. Noted that Structure section includes Articulation Officer, as well as faculty currently teaching honors courses (instead of all faculty). Counseling faculty suggested including honors counselors. Language Arts rep asked what “currently” means—Kuehnl says either are teaching or have a history of teaching honors courses; will change to “all honors faculty.” Gilstrap suggested adding Honors Program directors—Kuehnl agreed. Gilstrap asked if there will be a set number of people in group—no. Language Arts rep asked if proposal should specify the need to include faculty from across</p> |

disciplines—Gilstrap agreed; Counseling rep agreed. Kuehnl suggested a minimum of one person from each division; Gilstrap agreed but unsure of how many faculty interested. Counseling rep mentioned important to include both faculty who have taught honors for years and those new to teaching honors. Vanatta suggested adding language to suggest ideal faculty makeup—Kuehnl agreed to include as suggestion; he will help to ensure the faculty makeup is diverse. Bio Health rep asked if adjunct faculty may be included—yes.

Re: Time Frame section, Kuehnl noted end date of June 16th, the last CCC meeting of this year. Although this is a tight time frame, believes that it is possible, and does not want it to have to extend into the fall.

Curriculum Best Practices proposal: Result of discussion at CCC to gauge interest in moving to a centralized curriculum model; no interest in changing model, but need was identified to better support division reps, including the creation of a handbook. Kuehnl noted that time frame is open-ended; hope for a recommendation to come in fall. Re: Process section, Fine Arts rep noted that a handbook does exist, but is not Foothill-specific; division has been using info from it and accumulating institutional knowledge on a Canvas site for future reps to use. Kuehnl noted resources at the state level can be adapted for our use. Suggested ad hoc group speak with longtime CCC reps for suggestions and to gather best practices. BSS rep noted old Foothill handbook exists in paper form, which can be used as starting point. Language Arts rep asked if proposal should specify type of tools/documentation that will be developed; Kuehnl said could specify (e.g., Canvas site) or simply suggest different methodologies. Fine Arts rep noted importance of gathering Canvas sites and/or resources used by divisions as a starting point; Kuehnl agreed. Language Arts rep strongly suggested not creating hard copy handbook; instead, use existing dynamic infrastructure and technological tools, such as Canvas; Kuehnl agreed. Rep asked if proposal should specify looking at divisions' processes or general college process—Kuehnl agreed should suggest surveying reps to create best practices. Doesn't believe handbook should present one as definitive approach, but rather list suggestions. Could also include section regarding college processes. Fine Arts rep suggested including CCC Orientation presentation. Language Arts rep mentioned the new program creation process being developed, asking if ad hoc group would contribute to that work—Kuehnl responded that this group will be creating best practices for how divisions might work within approved college processes, but would not be developing college processes (such as new program creation).

Foothill GE proposal: Kuehnl noted goal is not to change the structure of the subcommittees, but rather to determine a process for bringing GE applications to CCC in cases where subcommittee is overloaded or does not have any members. Fine Arts rep noted the need for more people to serve on GE subcommittees, and is currently on a subcommittee that has one member on PDL; Kuehnl hoping ad hoc group will devise a recommendation on how to handle such situations. Noted this year was particularly challenging in regards to getting volunteers to serve. Re: Process section: Language Arts rep suggested adding consideration of procedure in case of overload, as well as consideration of procedure in case of lack of subcommittee members; Kuehnl agreed, noting that perhaps two processes would end up being the same. Fine Arts rep asked about course substitution forms submitted by students, noting that there are a lot of problems with the review process; Kuehnl agreed and noted will mention forms on proposal. Fine Arts rep suggested including counselors in Structure section, as they are involved in substitution process for substitution forms. Counseling rep noted those forms also go through

Approved, April 21, 2020

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>Evaluations dept., so ad hoc group should consult with that dept. even if they are not members. Re: Time Frame section: Kuehnl noted goal of presenting at the final CCC meeting of this year.</p> <p>Language Arts rep asked when names of ad hoc group members should be gathered and if they would be listed on these proposals. Kuehnl's thought is that once the proposals are approved, chairpersons will be named and would be in charge of recruiting other members.</p> <p>All three proposals will be updated for second read.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p> |
| 10. Good of the Order |  |
| 11. Adjournment       | <b>3:37 PM</b>   |

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Stephanie Chan (LA), Mark Ferrer (SRC), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Marc Knobel (PSME), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean, FA & KA), Dokesha Meacham (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Ron Painter (PSME), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Lety Serna (CNSL), Matt Stanley (KA), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta