

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 5, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom

Item	Discussion
1. Remote Meetings Resolution	<p>Speaker: Kuehnl First read of Resolution Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings Pursuant to Brown Act Provisions included in AB 361. At the top of today's agenda, since it pertains to CCC's ability to continue to meet via Zoom. CCC needs to determine whether we continue to meet virtually or return to in-person meetings on campus; if/when we do return to in-person, we'll need to have a quorum of voting members (50% + 1) present in person. Resolution mentions 90-day time period, so if approved CCC will need to revisit situation for winter quarter meetings.</p> <p>Resolution is more formal than usual; adapted from FHDA board's resolution, which they did not pass. BSS rep asked if resolution is for CCC only or if it applies to division CCs, as well—will discuss division CC situation later in today's meeting, but resolution is for CCC only. Division CCs may continue to meet virtually for fall quarter, regardless of outcome of resolution. Kathryn Maurer noted that resolution includes requirement of reaffirmation every 30 days, which reflects legal language; also believes that if resolution not passed today, CCC may not take action on any items during today's meeting. Ong noted resolution mentions need to declare threat to safety—Maurer responded that local state of emergency covers this (still in effect). Ong expressed hesitation about the need to continue to meet virtually and wondered if CCC can find a way to safely meet in person, echoing comments during FHDA board meeting about contradictory messaging to students (offering classes on campus but holding committee meetings virtually). Language Arts rep asked if CCC may vote on resolution today—Kuehnl responded that committee rule requiring two reads could be waived. CCC has done this before, in emergency situations; however, noted that only action item on today's agenda is approving the minutes. Bio Health rep responded to Ong's comments, and asked how many CCC participants are currently on campus (not many hands raised). Kuehnl mentioned he'd surveyed the group, and response indicated under 50% of folks working on campus this quarter (but not everyone responded). Noted that Academic Senate likely to meet virtually for fall quarter.</p> <p>Maurer responded to Ong's comments, agreeing that there are mixed messages and people are unsure of what we "should" be doing, but noted that many district employees still worried about the threat of COVID, not only to themselves but also to family members. Still voluntary for faculty to return to campus. Believes campus not well-equipped for successful participation in hybrid meetings, in terms of technology. PSME rep also mentioned faculty given the choice to return to campus; believes it makes sense to continue virtual meetings. Suggested CCC move to a vote, if everyone feels they've had enough time to consider the resolution.</p> <p>Motion to waive committee rule requiring two reads, and vote on resolution today M/S (Armstrong, Armerding). Kuehnl noted likelihood of returning to in-person meetings in January, due to people's children probably being vaccinated by that time. Hueg commented on intent of law, which is that by voting to hold meetings virtually we are stating that there is an imminent threat; doesn't believe this is the case and thinks we have the infrastructure</p>

	<p>to hold in-person meetings safely. Doesn't believe intent is to vote based on personal choice. Maurer responded and stressed that the message is not for people to vote based on personal choice. Approved.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Mac Neil, Svetich). Approved.</p> <p>Fall quarter meetings will continue to be held on Zoom; CCC will reassess situation later in the quarter, regarding winter meetings.</p>
<p>2. CCC Orientation</p>	<p>Speakers: Gilstrap & Kuehnl Kuehnl shared PowerPoint presentation, overview of processes and responsibilities pertaining to CCC rep role. Kinesiology rep asked how voting works, as each division gets one vote but most divisions have multiple reps. Kuehnl and Vanatta can't recall a situation in which reps (in same division) disagreed on a vote in a way that affected outcome of the full vote, but it could happen. Kuehnl suggested division reps discuss approval items ahead of CCC meeting. LRC rep asked what the makeup of a division CC is—historically, CCC reps are typically division CC chairs. PSME rep asked how division CCs should be handling agendas, in terms of publishing re: Brown Act—CCC will need to determine where these can be posted on the CCC website. Might also need to physically post agendas, once in-person meetings begin again. Hueg agreed with need to determine how division CCs can meet Brown Act requirements—Kuehnl explained that plan is for compliance beginning winter quarter. Advised reps to continue operating as they have been, for fall quarter (how they distribute agendas, etc.). Maurer commented that the reason Brown Act applies is so that members of the public (i.e., those who aren't part of CCC) have the opportunity to know what curriculum and related issues are coming up for discussion and approval, and have the opportunity to be involved in the discussion. Also noted importance of student involvement in division CCs. Kuehnl noted topic of Brown Act will continue to be discussed this quarter, so processes for division CCs will be in place starting winter quarter. Kuehnl will schedule a separate meeting for new reps and any returning reps who would like to attend, during which certain topics will be covered in more depth (e.g., COR review process).</p> <p>Gilstrap shared PowerPoint presentation, overview of articulation.</p>
<p>3. Minutes: June 15, 2021</p>	<p>Approved by consensus.</p>
<p>4. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Just had first division CC meeting, no updates to report.</p> <p>Bio Health: Update to DMS program discontinuation situation, discussed at CCC in June—continued discussions with administration and hopeful that division will be able to save the program and offer it again.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Will start holding division CC meetings more regularly, continuing to use Canvas site, meeting on off-weeks from CCC. Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Some restructuring taking place, related to new LRC division. Working on consistency of language across courses.</p> <p>LRC: Library division is now LRC, with a new dean; still figuring out reps and division CC.</p>

	<p>PSME: Many faculty are back on campus.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap reported update on CSU GE approvals for Ethnic Studies courses—all are now approved for both Area D & Area F. IGETC will be changing to accommodate Area F; likely won't go into effect until fall 2023, but we should know by summer 2022 what the changes will be so that we can plan accordingly.</p> <p>Kuehnl noted that CCC doesn't have any ASFC reps for 2021-22, yet.</p>
5. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Topic skipped, due to time constraint.
6. Announcements a. GE Subcommittee Membership b. Nov. 5th COR Deadline Reminder: Title 5 & Foothill GE c. CCC Priorities for 2021-22 d. New Course Proposals e. ASCCC Area B Meeting & Fall Plenary f. New Program Approvals by CCCCO: Noncredit ESL Certificates, Biochemistry AS Degree, Data Analytics CA, Cybersecurity CA	<p>Speakers: CCC Team</p> <p>Announcements delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
7. New Program Creation Feedback Form Process Change	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
8. Distance Learning for Winter 2022 Quarter	<p>Speaker: Kurt Hueg</p> <p>Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
9. Brown Act Update	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Topic covered during CCC Orientation discussion (item 2).</p>
10. OER Resolution	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>First read of Resolution to Explore Options to Leverage College Curriculum Processes to Support Faculty to Explore and Adopt OER. Created in conjunction with Academic Senate during spring quarter; before they approve the resolution, Senate would like CCC to weigh in due to connection to curriculum. Please note that passing resolution will not result in any requirement for faculty to use OER; intent is to raise awareness and hopefully increase use of OER across campus. Also hope to make it easier for faculty to find OER resources. Reach out to Kuehnl with any questions. Hueg noted still working on data collection for schedule, re: which classes use OER resources; will have info out for faculty soon, for winter quarter.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
11. Good of the Order	
12. Adjournment	3:31 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Kurt Hueg (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Dixie Macias (KA), Don Mac Neil (KA), Kathryn Maurer (AS President), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Lisa Schultheis (BH), JP Schumacher (Dean—SRC), Ram Subramaniam (Dean—BH & PSME), Kella Svetich (LA), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta