

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 19, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: December 1, 2020	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p> <p>Bio Health: Subramaniam explained reps both have scheduling conflict w/ CCC this quarter, due to teaching schedules—he will provide updates. No updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: Working on new certificates; planning to deactivate some courses; creating new Cultural Psychology course.</p> <p>Counseling: New CNSL 3 course being finalized for next year.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Received feedback from faculty re: CourseLeaf notifications.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Physical Education dept. working on new cert. in Sports Medicine—currently in feedback process.</p> <p>Language Arts: Focused on Ethnic Studies curriculum; new author for Native American Studies course, Michael Wilcox. Applying for new CSU Area F for some literature courses. Working on Distance Learning forms for spring. Planning Language Arts curriculum retreat, with focus on equity lens to use for all division courses.</p> <p>Library: No updates to report; rep reminded the group to use Virtual Resources for Faculty tab on Library webpage if faculty need assistance.</p> <p>PSME: Math dept. considering pursuing noncredit option for MATH 48A coreq support course.</p> <p>Articulation: Total of 56 courses submitted for IGETC and 64 for CSU GE in December. ETHN 51, 52, 53 & 55 will be submitted for new CSU GE Area F; Gilstrap asked Language Arts rep for details re: literature courses for Area F—division CC will approve soon and send list to Gilstrap. D. Lee asked if literature courses need to be cross-listed w/ Ethnic Studies dept. to meet Area F criteria—per Gilstrap, yes, CSU has stated that any course submitted for Area F must either use Ethnic Studies prefix or be cross-listed w/ Ethnic Studies course. Can still try to submit, but will likely be rejected. Language Arts rep thanked Gilstrap and Lee; will follow up.</p> <p>Vanatta noted the discussion about adding dept. notification in CourseLeaf will continue at next CCC meeting; asked reps to bring feedback from faculty so informed decision can be made. Also mentioned next batch of new Distance Learning Addendum submissions due soon (for spring quarter)—refer to her email from Friday for details.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Ong reminded the group about upcoming summit on Credit for Prior Learning—very first planning meeting, with hope to gather group. Please reach out to Ong if you haven't received invitation and would like to attend.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p>Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: ANTH 8H; D A 65, 66, 200L.</p>

<p>b. Notification of Proposed Requisites</p> <p>c. Credit for Prior Learning</p>	<p>Please share with your constituents. PSME rep asked for clarification re: Stand Alone status for D A 200L; proposal notes it is a prereq for a program, but not listed as a program requirement—Vanatta confirmed program prereqs are considered Stand Alone.</p> <p>Ongoing requisite for CRWR 39A, for which a Content Review form was not on file. No comments.</p> <p>Ong mentioned summit; Hueg hopes faculty from as many relevant areas will attend—for example, Accounting, Veterans. Would like to build stronger knowledge on campus of what CPL is and of what has changed at the state level. Ong mentioned language courses, which already allow for credit by exam but could consider prior military experience. Hueg noted changes at state level also related to registration and transcript processes. Kuehnl noted that CPL is not currently a discussion item on CCC agendas but believes important to continue discussion at CCC to ensure buy-in, in order to be successful and go beyond just creation of board policy.</p>
<p>5. Consent Calendar</p> <p>a. GE Applications</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl The following GE applications were presented: Area I—ENGL 27G, ETHN 51, 52, 53, 55; Area IV—POLI 4. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Venkataraman, Cembellin/Murphy). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Approval Request: BIOL 70R series</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for BIOL Independent Study course series (70R, 71R, 72R, 73R). Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Approval Requests: CHLD 80A, 80B, 80C</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for CHLD 80A, 80B, 80C. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in upcoming certificate of achievement in Nanny Education. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: C S 70R series</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for C S Independent Study course series (70R, 71R, 72R, 73R). 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 Requests: LINC 68G, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for LINC 68G, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417. Will be temporarily Stand Alone—68G included in upcoming certificate of achievement in Education Technology Specialist, and 411-417 included in upcoming noncredit certificate in G Suite Tools. PSME rep mentioned temporary Stand Alone selected for courses to be included in cert. of completion, and asked if this type of cert. is state-approved—yes, per Vanatta, one of two types of noncredit certs., both of which must be approved by state.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCEL 410</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCEL 410. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>11. Stand Alone Approval Requests: PHED 401, 402, 403, 404, 405,</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for PHED 401, 402, 403, 404,</p>

<p>406, 407, 408</p>	<p>405, 406, 407, 408. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>12. Stand Alone Approval Requests: THTR 22, 24</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for THTR 22, 24. Will be permanently Stand Alone. PSME rep mentioned that in the past faculty discouraged from offering transferable courses as Stand Alone; asked if there has been some sort of policy change. Would like clarification on the college's position. Lisle responded that this topic has never been brought forward to her; trusts faculty to use their judgment and expertise when determining which courses should be offered as Stand Alone. Not aware of previous situation, of Stand Alone being discouraged. PSME rep recalled at one point college offered many Stand Alone courses, but feedback from the state caused us to react quickly to cut down that number, for fear of some sort of audit.</p> <p>Vanatta noted she attends annual Curriculum Institute conference, held by ASCCC and the state, and can't recall any guidance from state authorities re: Stand Alone offerings, either way. Noted that over the past few years the state has gradually taken a more hands-off approach and put more trust back in the colleges. Hueg recalled our catalog being quite bloated in the past, which may have caused the issue mentioned by PSME rep.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>13. Equity in our Curriculum</p>	<p>Speaker: Jeff Schinske Continuing discussion from previous meetings, of general topic of equity in our curriculum. Kuehnl mentioned survey of reps at end of fall quarter, on how to move topic forward and make progress on reviewing courses with equity lens. Noted that many faculty suggested Schinske as guest speaker.</p> <p>Schinske introduced himself: Biology dept. chair and faculty; biology education researcher, as well as state-wide lead for C-ID in biology, which provides added insight. Noted many problems in science fields, with highly talented students from minoritized backgrounds not performing as well. Mentioned equity work within Biology dept., including new microbiology course being created with equity considerations throughout COR.</p> <p>First aspect to consider: prerequisites. Asked the group to think about the prereqs enforced in their dept. and their utility. Shared research paper, noting studies re: pre-med students who abandon that track, and connection to poor performance in prereqs. Prereqs may be entirely responsible for underrepresentation of minoritized students. Paper focuses on chemistry, but Schinske noted this is not just a chemistry problem. Usual argument for prereqs is that students need them in order to be successful; noted studies have shown that students tend to remember and use very little from prereq courses. Noted disconcerting trend that prereqs not accomplishing intended benefit but instead causing troubling effects for certain students. Data may show that students who pass prereqs perform better, but if that performance is not related to knowledge retained from the prereqs, what is the reason for this performance gap? Suggested discussion of how we could change the "rules" around setting prereqs.</p> <p>Asked the group to think about course content lists on their CORs—how do you decide what and how much is included? Used his own Anatomy & Physiology (A&P) courses as examples; teaching society did nation-wide study of course content to determine what year-long A&P sequence should include. Shared spreadsheet of society's recommended list of what to include—over 1000 rows! The only way to succeed in a course like this is to memorize and forget; trends show that students who "know" this skill are</p>

the ones who can pass, but those who don't (and may truly be trying to retain info) end up struggling. Noted that this may be an extreme example, but important to consider what really needs to be included in content list. Acknowledged it can be hard to know what students need to learn from a course. Working w/ De Anza to survey nursing students to find out what knowledge they have retained and consider useful from A&P courses. So far, have found students don't consider much of the content to have been important. Noted encouraging aspect that faculty have a lot of power and freedom to make changes; even re: C-ID and articulation, still have a good amount of power (example of recent C-ID change to remove prereqs).

Believes these two aspects, prereqs and course content, could have strong impact on equity and inclusion. PSME rep mentioned study on math education in the US from a while back; noted that rep's experience w/ C-ID has been the opposite of Schinske's, in that CORs must follow a specific example to the letter and faculty don't have much freedom to suggest changes. Schinske noted buy-in from UC & CSU faculty (re: prereqs and C-ID) very helpful, and suggested finding such allies. Mentioned recent discussions about institutional/structural racism and need to realize that some of what we're doing is included; can be seen in data, which shows our current methods favor white students' achievement. This is a heady topic, but it needs to be directly addressed.

Language Arts rep agreed w/ PSME rep, and noted faculty must consider continuum when creating curriculum (e.g., where the course fits within a sequence), as well as articulation. Suggested more conversations with high school instructional colleagues, noting example of elimination of developmental courses in response to AB 705. Mentioned literature courses, which don't have ENGL 1A prereq—example of successful student who took 1A after a lit course, wondered if student would've done as well in 1A had they taken it first. Also mentioned example of group of students placed into support course, who felt ostracized. Schinske agreed that support courses are well-intentioned and can be helpful, but in some situations could lead to further disadvantage if not the right fit for a specific student, or just adding more time to student's already packed schedule.

Schinske clarified he's not saying prereqs or content list shouldn't exist, but that faculty should move from simply looking at data without disaggregation to diving deeper into what the data shows. Fine Arts rep noted Art dept. had prereqs for many years, and since removing prereqs a few years ago has noticed increased success of students of color, even enrolling in higher-level courses based on portfolio review and being successful. Language Arts rep mentioned need to ensure including part-time faculty; Schinske noted professional dev'l work w/ Biology faculty across Bay Area—has received feedback from part-time faculty re: pressure to adhere to the COR.

Other Language Arts rep mentioned example of removing items from COR due to equity concerns (e.g., handbook/anthology texts) and losing transfer approval due to that change, then having to add items back on. Schinske reiterated opportunity for Foothill to be a leader and push the issue, noting that transfer students have higher success rate in certain disciplines, at UCs & CSUs. Believes community colleges can be a leader, even after we receive push-back from UC/CSU. Acknowledged need to pick our battles, but encouraged individual depts. to push back on issues of student equity.

Kuehnl thanked Schinske for attending and sharing his experience and expertise. Schinske encouraged reps and other faculty to reach out with any questions. Language Arts rep asked what Schinske recommends for next steps—getting involved w/ C-ID, especially for disciplines where there

Approved, February 2, 2021

	seem to be few venues for discussing curriculum with colleagues at UC/CSU. Hueg mentioned important to create space at CCC for discussions like this.
14. Ad Hoc Groups	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Continuing discussion from previous meeting, and second read of updated Proposal to Create New Ad Hoc Committee: Curriculum Best Practices. Based on comments at previous meeting, proposal has been updated to change timeframe from winter 2021 to spring 2021, and to add language regarding equity and training of new reps.</p> <p>Kuehnl also mentioned that Foothill GE ad hoc committee ready to be launched.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Meneses). Approved.</p>
15. Good of the Order	
16. Adjournment	3:25 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Zach Cembellin (PSME), Owen Flannery (KA), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Kurt Hueg (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee (CNSL), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean, FA & KA), Laurence Lew (BSS), Kristy Lisle (VP Instruction), Don Mac Neal (KA), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Ron Painter (PSME), Kas Pereira (BSS), Jeff Schinske (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Priya Vasu (ASFC), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta