

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 19, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
<p>1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl 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, Jan. 18th, Feb. 15th & Mar. 15th meetings. If we wish to continue to meet virtually, we are required to reaffirm it every 30 days. Following the lead of Academic Senate (AS), of which CCC is a subcommittee, which is continuing to hold virtual meetings. PSME rep asked for rationale—safety issue. Bio Health rep challenged notion that CCC cannot safely meet in person, as many in-person classes being held. Kuehnl reiterated that AS continuing to hold virtual meetings; noted legal counsel has OK'd virtual meetings. Fine Arts rep noted many faculty scheduled spring classes online due to concerns about Omicron, which does cut down on-campus availability of faculty. Other Fine Arts rep noted that folks' health risks vary from person-to-person and cautioned against assuming everyone's risk factor is the same within the group. PSME rep agreed there are folks at risk and concerned; believes Foothill has been generous in allowing faculty to continue to schedule online, but objects with CCC stating that meeting in person is a risk. Noted that, per its language, approval of this resolution means CCC claims there is "imminent risk" in meeting in person. Kuehnl believes the county is still considered to be under a state of emergency; trying to remain neutral and is following the lead of AS.</p> <p>Other PSME rep supported fellow rep's comments; believes CCC should meet in the way that is best for meetings to function—Kuehnl responded that Brown Act doesn't necessarily allow the group to make this decision. Kuehnl suggested this be the last time CCC approves this resolution and that CCC begins to hold hybrid meetings, if this is what the group wants to do. Bio Health rep believes important to model behavior for our students that it is safe to be on campus. Vanatta mentioned need to ensure access to a room which will allow for effective hybrid meetings.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Campbell, Kaupp). Approved. 1 abstention</p>
<p>2. Minutes: March 15, 2022</p>	<p>Approved by consensus.</p>
<p>3. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p>Speaker: All Kuehnl asked for a brief discussion about format of report out, noting that CCC Team recently discussed that the item frequently takes longer than time allotted. Suggested that, instead of asking each individual division for a report, the group as a whole is asked for updates and those who have news may share. Pros/cons to either approach, incl. possibility that some folks might not be inclined to share if not specifically called on. PSME rep believes current format is fine and can be just as efficient. Other PSME rep believes could do away with the roll call method but must ensure enough time is given for folks to speak up. Fine Arts rep agreed with experiment of making report out voluntary, adding they personally feel some pressure to mention something at every meeting. Kuehnl does like hearing from everyone and worries some folks might not speak at all, otherwise. Other Fine Arts rep likes roll call method, noting that even when other divisions report mundane things (e.g., working on Title 5 updates) can serve as a reminder about such tasks. Bio Health rep suggested drafting guidelines re:</p>

	<p>the types of updates which should be shared. Counseling rep asked for clarification re: CCC Team feeling like report out is taking too long—Kuehnl responded that normally 5 minutes allocated, but item generally takes longer, perhaps exacerbated by Zoom. Fine Arts rep suggested rethinking sequence of report out and perhaps moving it further down the agenda.</p> <p>Kuehnl suggested the group try new format today. The following divisions/members provided a report:</p> <p>Fine Arts: Most recent division CC meeting allotted 15 minutes to discuss equity in the COR; will continue this practice for the remainder of the AY, discussing one aspect of COR at each meeting. Most recently discussed course title, which resulted in a great conversation.</p> <p>BSS: Anthropology dept. planning to add new non-transcriptable cert. to curriculum sheet; rep asked if those are still allowable. Kuehnl noted that because of the new funding formula (SCFF) we had converted many to certificates of achievement, but confirmed that non-transcriptable certs. may still be created/offered. Noted that some faculty like the agility/flexibility of non-transcriptable certs. Other BSS rep mentioned recent email from Acting Pres. Fong which stressed importance of focusing on all types of skills for students; new Anthropology cert. will enable students to get field school experience, which employers find helpful.</p>
<p>4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>No comments.</p>
<p>5. Announcements</p> <p>a. New Course Proposals</p> <p>b. CORs for Update 2023-24 (Title 5 list)</p> <p>c. Foothill GE List for 2022-23</p> <p>d. Spring Plenary Update</p> <p>e. AP/IB/CLEP Policy Changes</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team</p> <p>The following proposals were presented: ALCB 452Y, ART 19G, ENGL 10B. Please share with your constituents. No comments.</p> <p>Vanatta compiled list of courses that need to be reviewed/updated for the 2023-24 catalog; list was emailed to reps and deans on March 17th. The COR deadline for the 2023-24 catalog, including Title 5 courses, will be June 17th (noted change from original deadline of June 16th, due to Juneteenth holiday changing).</p> <p>Vanatta shared Foothill General Education requirements for 2022-23. Newly approved GE courses have been added, and deactivated courses have been removed. Please share with your constituents. Vanatta noted possible change to minimum proficiency language (on today’s agenda); will update in catalog, if approved.</p> <p>Kuehnl shared out resolutions adopted at recent plenary. Feel free to reach out with any questions or concerns about any of the resolutions.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared information about recent CCCCCO memo; we will need to update our policy in response, following implementation guidelines. Previous guidelines stated that for AP credit, colleges award 3 semester units; now states 3 semester/4 quarter—we currently award 4.5 units. Gilstrap will be reaching out to discipline faculty to discuss; clarified that 4 units is the minimum, so we may still award 4.5 units, but it will be faculty’s decision. Additionally, need to align course credit for AP exams; for example, for AP statistics we award 4.5 units for taking the exam, but we also offer course credit of MATH 10, which is a 5-unit course. Need to either align these to match or do away with the course credit piece.</p>
<p>6. New Program Application: Air Conditioning Mechanic AS Degree</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Second read of new Air Conditioning Mechanic AS degree. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armstrong, Mac Neil & Meneses). Approved.</p>

<p>7. New Program Application: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician AS Degree</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician AS degree. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Murphy, Armstrong). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Guided Pathways Mapping Approval Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Guided Pathways Program Mapping Process. Guests from the Guided Pathways (GP) Team: Isaac Escoto, Natalie Latteri. Bio Health rep asked for clarification re: wording of Step 4B, which ends with “prior to Division”—Escoto believes should state “prior to Division Curriculum Committee” and will update, assuming no concerns (none voiced).</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Lee, Murphy). Approved.</p> <p>Escoto mentioned that the GP Team in contact with depts./chairs whose Program Maps include MATH 180, to ensure updated Maps include only MATH courses which will be offered next year.</p>
<p>9. New Program Application: Infant and Toddler Development and Care CA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Infant and Toddler Development and Care certificate of achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. New Program Application: Nanny, Child, and Family Studies CA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Nanny, Child, and Family Studies certificate of achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>11. Request to Update AA/AS Degree Minimum Proficiency for Mathematics</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of request by PSME division to update list of courses meeting minimum proficiency in mathematics, for Foothill AA/AS degrees. If approved, explicit course numbers will no longer be listed, and updated language will be, “College level math course at or above the level of Intermediate Algebra.” Would go into effect for the 2022-23 catalog. PSME rep explained need for new language, as current language includes MATH 105, which we may no longer offer—could be confusing for students. New language maintains state-mandated requirement for Intermediate Algebra as minimum proficiency requirement for the associate degree.</p> <p>Counseling rep asked if any California community colleges will still be offering Intermediate Algebra and if the state may end up changing their minimum proficiency requirement. Gilstrap believes spring plenary resolution packet includes item re: ASCCC working with CCCC to update this language; noted that most (if not all) CA community colleges doing away with Intermediate Algebra because, like us, they’re no longer allowed to offer it. Suggested including new MATH 80 course in new proficiency language even though it’s still under development and/or adding “or any MATH course listed in Foothill GE Area V” to the new language. Concerned that, if MATH 80 doesn’t meet minimum proficiency, Allied Health students will be impacted. Noted we won’t know the full results of transfer GE applications for MATH 80 until 2023.</p> <p>Vanatta asked why MATH 80 wouldn’t be considered a college level course when it becomes active, even without transfer GE approval; also noted that MATH 80 COR incl. Foothill GE Area V application—has already contacted Area V subcommittee members to see if late review will be possible, so course could end up being approved for Area V when initially offered. Gilstrap responded—believes MATH 80 being created in part re: concerns from Allied Health programs; wants to ensure those students will be able to use MATH 80 to meet minimum proficiency for AA/AS degree. PSME rep</p>

	<p>noted current language mentions Area V GE; math dept. doesn't want to make this the explicit requirement because MATH 80 isn't guaranteed to be approved for Area V right away, and wants to ensure MATH 80 will meet requirement. Believes MATH 80 should be considered college level. Also mentioned new C-ID descriptor, which math faculty will be reviewing to see if MATH 80 could fit. Subramaniam also believes MATH 80 will be a college level course, considering it will be CSU transferable (unlike MATH 105 & 180). Gilstrap agreed and asked if MATH 80 needs to be specifically approved as meeting minimum proficiency requirement—Subramaniam responded no, as it should be captured under the new language. PSME rep noted that MATH 80 will have prereq of Intermediate Algebra, which meets the “at or above the level of Intermediate Algebra” portion of new language.</p> <p>Bio Health rep noted many Allied Health students have already taken MATH 105/180; concerned these students will now need to take a different math course to meet minimum proficiency and/or program prerequisites. Subramaniam mentioned catalog rights—rep responded these students don't necessarily carry catalog rights. PSME rep noted new language mentions Intermediate Algebra as being lower level of minimum proficiency, so students who have taken MATH 105 should be covered. Escoto agreed that catalog rights are important nuance; also noted that if a student takes MATH 80 before the course is approved for transfer GE the student will not be able to use it as transfer GE. Believes program prerequisites shouldn't be affected. Counseling rep asked for clarification re: MATH 80 meeting minimum proficiency within the new language—PSME rep responded yes, and Gilstrap agreed.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>12. Adding Equity Section to COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Kuehnl asked for the group's thoughts, to rekindle discussion from previous meeting. Mentioned Academic Senate's (AS) equity plan and noted that adding a component to the COR is not something CCC specifically being tasked with, but its consideration falls within CCC's purview and fits within the goal of anti-racism in our curriculum, which is part of the larger equity initiative.</p> <p>PSME rep asked if adding equity section to the COR would apply to every single COR—Kuehnl responded yes, it would be part of every COR. Rep responded by suggesting that, if this is the case, instead of adding equity section to the COR it should be part of Foothill's overarching mission to ensure that all our curriculum is equitable. Fine Arts rep agreed that perhaps adding equity section to the COR not the best option, noting that in their division's equity discussions they've discovered there's a lot of nuance, depending on the department/discipline. Bio Health rep suggested looking more at practices, as well as connection to overall program, and the equity-related impact of how we operate on a day-to-day basis. As a community college, we're hands-on with students, which impacts students' feeling like they belong. Other PSME rep agreed with need for actionable suggestions, and mentioned CCCCO memos re: AB 705 implementation as a good example of providing specific suggestions for taking action. Doesn't believe suggestions would need to be part of the COR, but generally available for faculty to consider with their specific courses in mind.</p> <p>Kuehnl noted the group seems to be trending away from adding to the COR. Fine Arts rep mentioned faculty generally update their CORs by themselves; could be helpful to have suggestions available in CourseLeaf. Mentioned examples from other colleges which Kuehnl shared at previous meeting. Other Fine Arts rep mentioned idea from previous meeting re: policy which supports faculty in taking risks to close equity gaps, including</p>

	<p>ensuring students feel included, which could apply to any course in any discipline across campus, including Apprenticeship. Noted seat count of classes and short length of quarter both impact faculty’s ability to connect with students. Mentioned being told that even when institutions have strategic equity plans, generally 25% actually gets done. Kuehnl noted that this is all part of Foothill’s equity action plan, which is aspirational. CCC has already addressed OER and created Ethnic Studies courses, which were two of the group’s three tasks, but the third one is huge—fighting structural racism through our curriculum processes. Encouraged the group to read the plan if they haven’t yet, noting that issue 6 specifically addresses curriculum.</p> <p>PSME rep cautioned that adding equity section to COR could result in faculty who are already teaching in an equity-minded seeing this as being told that they aren’t doing enough. Kuehnl shared goal from equity action plan, which states, “Course outlines in every discipline ... [highlight] the contributions of racially diverse scholars, and address the discipline’s ... racial equity issues”—unsure if goal is actually achievable. Kuehnl stressed that college administration is not pushing this action; colleagues in AS drafted this plan. Shared additional goal, “Curriculum policies and processes prioritize equity outcomes,” and noted Foothill not set up, as an institution, for faculty to tackle this quite yet, as we need to work more on outcomes in general.</p> <p>Other Fine Arts rep believes important for students to see themselves within the various fields/disciplines. Feels personally the need to improve ways to be proactive for students who tend to fall by the wayside by week 7 of the quarter, instead of being reactive once they already do. Kuehnl mentioned that for programs without cohorts can be difficult for faculty to even know which students are enrolled in the major. Thanked the group for the discussion; topic will remain on agendas for the rest of the quarter.</p>
13. Good of the Order	
14. Adjournment	3:34 PM

Attendees: Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachele Campbell (BH), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Isaac Escoto (CNSL), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Betsy Nikolchev (FEI—SRC), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich (LA), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta