

**College Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, January 18, 2022**  
**2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**  
**Meeting held virtually via Zoom**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> CCC approved Resolution Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings Pursuant to Brown Act Provisions Included in AB 361 at Oct. 5th meeting and reaffirmed at Nov. 16th meeting. If we wish to continue to meet virtually, we are required to reaffirm it every 30 days. Academic Senate (AS) decided to stay virtual, likely through end of March, so CCC may follow suit. PSME rep expressed ambivalence and noted the language in the resolution suggests it's not safe to meet in person, which doesn't align with what the county has stated. Kuehnl acknowledged resolution might be more formal than needed. Unsure if any other governance groups wrote a resolution; many simply documented intention to meet virtually in meeting minutes. Agreed that meeting in person may not be as dangerous as language makes it seem, but as CCC is subcommittee of AS we're following their lead. Noted that achieving in-person quorum was going to be tough, and recent allowance for faculty to change classes to hybrid/online would exacerbate that.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep mentioned issue of achieving in-person quorum at their division CC meetings, noting that some faculty have COVID. Asked if division CCs may remain virtual even after CCC returns to campus—Kuehnl responded that division CCs also must follow Brown Act, so cannot stay virtual-only forever. BSS rep reported similar issues—surveyed faculty, and only two (in addition to the reps) willing to attend in-person meetings; noted high level of involvement at virtual division CC meetings and hopes the group can discuss how to keep this momentum going once in-person meetings resume. Kuehnl noted virtual option will still exist, as long as in-person quorum achieved; added that division CCs have freedom to establish their own definition of a quorum. BSS reps concerned that defining quorum as a smaller group puts pressure on those folks to make curriculum decisions. Fine Arts rep noted same conversation in their division (re: size of quorum); asked for info about posting agendas. Kuehnl working with Vanatta on plan to post agendas on CCC website, noting must be posted 72 hours in advance. Once we return to in-person meetings, will need to discuss requirements for posting physical copies of division CC agendas on campus. Kuehnl also reported unable to get ASFC reps lined up for division CCs right now, but will be addressed later on.</p> <p>Motion to reaffirm resolution <b>M/S</b> (Armerding, Venkataraman). <b>Approved.</b> 1 abstention</p>
2. Minutes: November 30, 2021	<b>Approved by consensus.</b>
3. Report Out from Division Reps	<p><b>Speaker: All</b> Apprenticeship: New partnership with American Aerospace Technical Academy (related to new AATA subject code).</p> <p>Bio Health: Respiratory Therapy dept. working on process to create bachelor degree, with other Allied Health depts. planning to follow suit. Kuehnl noted local program creation process will occur in tandem with CCCCO's super compressed submission timeline.</p> <p>BSS: Working on new Child Development dept. certs. Trying to determine</p>

	<p>who is on BSS division CC, noting that majority of respondents to survey believe all division faculty should be included.</p> <p>Counseling: Created small division curriculum subcommittee in fall quarter. Noted that if faculty/depts. planning changes to programs for upcoming year, please let them know so counselors can be given a heads up.</p> <p>SRC: Creating new courses and finalizing COR updates.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Decided to invite all adjuncts and full-time faculty to upcoming division CC meeting, noting that a number of adjuncts plan to attend.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Working on DL addendum submissions.</p> <p>Language Arts: Working on finalizing ESLL &amp; NCEL COR changes; Ethnic Studies dept. working on new courses in Chicano Studies &amp; Pacific Islander Studies. Upcoming joint retreat with LRC.</p> <p>LRC: Focusing on course changes that may trigger a response for tutoring support. Possibly creating new tutoring courses. Library open again for in-person services Mon-Thurs, plus online-only reference support Fridays—please remind students that campus COVID protocols will be followed. Encouraged faculty to reach out when creating new courses, to ensure Library resources available to support students when they take the courses.</p> <p>PSME: Faculty pretty focused on trying to deal with COVID surge (e.g., student absences).</p> <p>Hueg noted update re: Foothill President search timeline extended. Excited for Subramaniam's new role as Interim AVP Instruction, but noted downstream issue of leadership for STEM division. Also mentioned staffing shortage in Institutional Research dept. Working with folks on next steps for software for SLO assessments (i.e., staying w/ TracDat vs. changing).</p> <p>Vanatta has no updates but mentioned timeline for finalizing CORs for upcoming catalog is rapidly closing; sending follow-up emails to faculty re: outstanding issues.</p> <p>Gilstrap reported that C-ID has made changes to descriptors for Film, TV, Electronic Media—reached out to faculty to get changes submitted. New TMC template for that ADT will be available Feb. 1st. TMC templates for Sociology ADT and Chemistry ADT being updated, as well. Working w/ Chemistry dept. on solutions for meeting Chemistry ADT requirements, as we're currently over by just one unit.</p>
<p>4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>Fine Arts rep reported issue experienced during years on GE Area subcommittee—believes instructions on application unclear for faculty when filling out the form; has to keep sending forms back for faculty to make corrections and would like to get instructions updated. Kuehnl noted we have a GE Ad Hoc group which could discuss this issue.</p>
<p>5. Announcements</p> <p>a. New Course Proposal</p> <p>b. Notification of Proposed Requisites</p> <p>c. Ad Hoc Groups</p>	<p><b>Speakers: CCC Team</b></p> <p>The following proposal was presented: ALCB 470Y. Please share with your constituents. No comments.</p> <p>New prerequisite for C S 77B (eff. 2022-23); ongoing requisites for PHYS 2AM, 2BM, 2CM, for which Content Review forms were not on file. Gilstrap noticed typo on attachment—Target Course of C S 77A should be 77B.</p> <p>Ad hoc groups for program creation process and Foothill GE process each met once before winter break; Kuehnl has been working with a few folks on</p>

	Equity Action Plan group but needs more representation. AS President Kathryn Maurer has requested each group have representation from each division, which could be difficult. Please reach out to Kuehnl if interested.
6. New Subject Code: AATA	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Apprenticeship has approved the creation of a new subject code of AATA (Apprenticeship: Aerospace). No comments.
7. Consent Calendar a. GE Application	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> The following GE application was presented: Area IV—PSYC 2. Hueg asked if course part of ADT pathway—Gilstrap responded can be added to Psychology ADT if dept. faculty wish.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Armstrong, Armerding). <b>Approved.</b>
8. New Program Application: Advanced Sports Medicine CA	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Third read of new Advanced Sports Medicine Certificate of Achievement. Narrative has been updated since second read. PSME rep mentioned comments at previous meeting, re: LMI not supporting the program, but wants to clarify if this aspect appropriate for CCC to discuss. Kuehnl responded that CCC welcome to consider such aspects when evaluating a new program. Vanatta added that LMI document is the version required for program's submission to regional consortium (BACCC), following CCC approval. PSME rep mentioned LMI states increased need is for bachelor-level jobs, and not necessarily something community colleges can address. Voyce (who drafted program) responded that community college programs fit into larger pathway for students, in terms of what LMI reflects; acknowledged it's not always clear how a college's program directly connects to LMI. Students could use this program as stepping stone for application to a more professional program, or use it as an intermediary to get a job while they continue to advance their education. Believes completion of program could help students stand out in future applications (to physical therapy school, etc.).  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Mac Neil, Murphy). <b>Approved.</b>
9. Request to Update AA/AS Degree Minimum Proficiency List for English	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of request by Language Arts division to update the list of courses meeting minimum proficiency in English, for Foothill AA/AS degrees. If approved, updated list will be, "ENGL 1A or ENGL 1AH or ENGL 1S and ENGL 1T or ESLL 26." Would go into effect for the 2022-23 catalog. Vanatta noted that ESLL 26 being reactivated, prompting this change (course was previously included in this list).  Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
10. Stand Alone Approval Requests: APCA 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APCA 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Vanatta noted courses originally approved as temporary and being changed to permanent. Bio Health rep noted two matching Course Objectives on APCA 100 COR—Vanatta will fix.  Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
11. Stand Alone Approval Requests: C S 77A, 77B	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for C S 77A, 77B. Will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in upcoming certificates of achievement in Web Application Development and Advanced Web Application Development. No comments.  Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
12. Stand Alone Approval Request: D A 67	<b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for D A 67. Will be permanently

	<p>Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
13. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCBS 449	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCBS 449. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
14. Stand Alone Approval Requests: NCEL 401B, 401C	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCBS 401B, 401C. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
15. Stand Alone Approval Request: SPAN 51	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for SPAN 51. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Vanatta noted course originally approved as temporary and being changed to permanent. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
16. AB 705 Improvement Plan Requirements	<p><b>Speakers: Doreen Finkelstein &amp; Kennedy Bui</b> Finkelstein presented slideshow outlining CCCCCO changes to AB 705. Improvement Plan form must be submitted by March 11, 2022, with changes to math and English curriculum made eff. fall 2022. CCCCCO has determined students more likely to achieve throughput when placed and enroll in transfer-level coursework—big change is that we now must ensure students enrolling in transfer-level coursework (not just being placed). Throughput = % of students who successfully complete transfer-level course within one year (three quarters) of first course in the subject area. Pre-transfer-level and stretch math &amp; English courses may no longer be offered unless they maximize throughput—our local data do not support this (MATH 105, 180, 217/17; ENGL 1S/1T). New requirements apply to all high school graduates, even those students who don't have a goal of transfer. Only exception is if degree/cert. requirements cannot be met by a transfer-level math or English course. New requirements strongly recommended for dual enrollment students, but colleges may discuss special dual enrollment circumstances w/ CCCCCO.</p> <p>Improvement Plan form includes questions re: communication/advising to students, placement, transfer-level course availability, support practices (e.g., coreqs). We may argue for keeping pre-transfer-level and stretch courses, but our data must show that enrollment maximizes throughput; unfortunately, our data do not. (Finkelstein shared data for ENGL 1S/1T, MATH 105 &amp; 180, MATH 217; noted that students who take MATH 105 or 180 don't necessarily then attempt a transfer-level course. Data for MATH 217 show good throughput for certain GPA categories, but not the lowest one, which CCCCCO is most concerned with.)</p> <p>Next steps: disseminate info among faculty, determine implementation plans (curriculum changes, counseling/advising changes), designate who will submit the form. Institutional Research and Assessment depts. are not leading the process but are providing support.</p> <p>Language Arts rep wonders if data might not support our continuing to offer ENGL 1A coreqs, as throughput lower than for students taking course w/o coreq. Asked if enrollment fraud (recently a big issue) could be affecting data—Finkelstein responded that data reflect students who completed the course and received a grade, so fraudulent enrollment shouldn't be captured. Noted throughput issues for ENGL 1S/1T have occurred for years (not a recent change). Re: ENGL 1A coreqs, even if not performing as well</p>

as we'd hoped, CCCC unlikely to push back on our continuing to offer. Subramaniam noted state-level data show coreqs are helping students, in general. PSME rep asked if data available on students who place into lower-level courses, to see if there's any difference between those who then take the lower-level course vs. those who skip it and take the transfer-level course. Also noted that a different group of students would be taking ENGL 1A, anyway (without considering lower-level in the first place). Finkelstein responded that GPA categories (high school GPA) should reflect these different groups of students. Starer believes data show that poorly-prepared students tend to perform poorly, and CCCC does a good job of telling colleges what we can or can't do but doesn't tell us how to do better. Added that ENGL 1S/1T have resulted in significant improvement in throughput vs. lower-level courses (ENGL 209 & 110). Hueg suggested CCCC's changes related to certain political movements. Starer concerned that if we don't offer lower-level or stretch courses, students who want them may become discouraged and leave college, in general. LRC rep asked how new rules apply to DRC students—Finkelstein responded the same rules apply, and we'll need to determine support systems for DRC students.

Gilstrap mentioned that these changes will have big impact on articulation; will reach out to fellow Articulation Officers to see how other colleges plan to handle. Timeline of fall 2022 doesn't give us much time, especially re: UC transfer. Menendez asked how throughput measured for ENGL 1S/1T—Finkelstein responded it's students who finished 1T, as it's a transfer-level course. Menendez suggested data could be affected by change to virtual classes due to COVID—Finkelstein noted that data during those quarters not much different than pre-COVID. Menendez asked how many ENGL 1S/1T sections offered vs. ENGL 1A—Finkelstein doesn't have specific figures but noted that fewer sections of 1S/1T offered vs. 1A.

Lewis agreed with Starer re: poorly-prepared students' performance; also suggested data fail to capture students' "life problems," and students who take lower-level/stretch courses tend to have more problems outside of school vs. those who don't take such courses. Wondered how data could capture such socio-economic issues, and stated this is an equity problem. Many faculty who teach such courses can attest that students tend to just disappear due to these types of issues. Finkelstein agreed that the data do not capture this aspect; Kuo believes this is why CCCC making this push, because if students enroll in transfer-level courses to begin with, they have a better chance of making it through before life problems pop up. Bui noted Improvement Plan form asks us to indicate additional services and support the college is providing to students (via Student Services division, etc.). Echoed Kuo's comment that CCCC hopes students will be more likely to complete one transfer-level course vs. stretch course which spans multiple terms.

Finkelstein addressed question in chat re: how Foothill compares to other colleges—unsure, but believes that only a few colleges already placing students in transfer-level courses (vast majority in our shoes). Addressed question re: what happened to students who didn't achieve throughput—some keep trying, some drop out, really any possible path you can think of, a student has taken it. Starer asked if data can be run to determine how students who took ENGL 1T performed in next transfer-level course vs. those who placed themselves into ENGL 1A, to see if difference in learning affected students' performance in next course taken—Finkelstein can do this analysis but noted that in terms of making argument to CCCC it won't matter, as we're being judged solely by throughput. Starer would still like to see such data. Fong mentioned that 1S/1T designed as two separate courses because at the time we were told we cannot term-span (must have

	<p>a hard quarter-end stop/break), and wonders if courses could be redesigned to not have a break in span and if that would affect the data (and possibly be considered a single course). Subramaniam noted still could lose students in between terms (could withdraw). Finkelstein noted that language in memo is "multi-term transfer-level" courses not allowed, and unsure if this change would count as such—we'd need to ask CCCC.</p> <p>Fernandez echoed Lewis' concerns re: real-world issues, especially while teaching during COVID. Already has help from DRC and dedicated Puente counselor and wonders what more can be added (social workers, for example). Believes inequitable to move to a "drive thru" method for students just because the focus is being put on throughput. Would like to see additional data and to talk with students to try to inform the situation in an equitable way. Believes serious conversations need to occur, not just looking at data and cutting out courses.</p> <p>Hueg suggested working with faculty and deans to continue conversation. Thanks to Finkelstein, Kuo, and Bui, for their work and presentation.</p>
17. Good of the Order	
18. Adjournment	<b>3:45 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean—APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Kennedy Bui (Assessment), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Hilda Fernandez (LA), Doreen Finkelstein (IR), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Kurt Hueg (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Elaine Kuo (IR), Andy Lee (CNSL), Brian Lewis (LA), Don Mac Neil (KA), Michelle McNeary (LA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Natalia Menendez (LA), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Paul Starer (LA), Ram Subramaniam (Dean—BH & PSME), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME), Warren Voyce (KA)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta