

**College Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, March 7, 2023**  
**2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**  
**Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

| <b>Item</b>  | <b>Discussion</b>  |
|--|--|
| 1. Minutes: February 21, 2023  | Ben Kaupp filling in for Eric Kuehnl as Faculty Co-Chair and facilitator of today's meeting.<br><br><b>Approved by consensus.</b>  |
| 2. Report Out from Division Reps   | <b>Speaker: All</b><br>Apprenticeship: No updates to report.<br><br>BSS: No updates to report.<br><br>Counseling: No updates to report.<br><br>HSH: No updates to report.<br><br>Fine Arts: No updates to report.<br><br>Kinesiology: No updates to report.<br><br>Language Arts: Sarver shared Spanish dept. working on new course; mentioned division retreat is tomorrow!<br><br>LRC: No updates to report.<br><br>SRC: No updates to report.<br><br>STEM: Painter shared division CC met today to discuss deactivation exemption requests and curriculum sheet updates.<br><br>Vanatta shared CourseLeaf CAT should be ready tomorrow for faculty to begin working on curriculum sheets; currently working with CourseLeaf support to address an issue. Also mentioned will soon create Outlook events for spring quarter CCC meetings, and asked if any changes being made to curriculum reps for spring quarter. |
| 3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda   | No comments.   |
| 4. Addition to Course Family—Fine Arts & Communication                           | <b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b><br>Fine Arts & Communication is adding the following new course to an existing family, eff. 2023-24: ART 19G Outdoor Landscape Painting. No comments.<br><br>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (St. Onge-Cole, Gough). <b>Approved.</b>   |
| 5. New Certificate Proposal: Non-Destructive Testing                             | <b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b><br>Proposal for new Non-Destructive Testing Certificate of Achievement. No comments.<br><br>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Morriss, Bissell). <b>Approved.</b>  |
| 6. New Certificate Application: Research, Design and Development for Global Good | <b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b><br>Third read of new Research, Design and Development for Global Good Certificate of Achievement. Vanatta noted narrative has been updated since second read. Pereira (cert. author) met with Parikh to discuss concerns about similarities between cert. and ENGR 10 course; cert. is   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>more asynchronous, whereas ENGR 10 is very collaborative. Parikh noted ENGR 10 involves more teamwork and communication than cert. Parikh still concerned that LMI suggests cert. could help students progress toward an engineering position. Vanatta noted LMI is not created by Foothill; we must use LMI supplied by a specific group, which is required for submission to BACCC. Asked if AVP Workforce Teresa Ong has requested updated LMI—Parikh unsure. Pereira noted new LMI requests take 3-6 months; Vanatta noted cert. would need to be resubmitted to BACCC if new LMI requested. Pereira believes it is role of BACCC to review LMI. Jenkins asked what happens if BACCC has concerns re: LMI for cert.—Pereira responded, BACCC has option to not approve, noting they have already approved cert w/ this LMI. Subramaniam agreed that if BACCC found any issues with viability of cert. they would not approve. Meezan asked if LMI gets submitted with cert. to CCCC—yes. Kaupp asked what would be the more appropriate job/role to include on LMI—Parikh would like to see LMI include jobs directly related to this cert. Discussion occurred about types of jobs included (and not included) on current LMI.</p> <p>Subramaniam asked for clarification re: cert. intended for dual-enrollment students, not necessarily for students with goal of transfer—Pereira and Parikh agreed, cert. has different audience than ENGR 10. Discussion occurred about other situations in which certain courses (e.g., introductory, support) might not directly relate to LMI created for full program. Parikh concerned LMI doesn't relate to intended audience for cert. and asked for clarification on CCC's role in evaluating LMI. Morriss believes unlikely an interested high school student would find this LMI and read it; possibly a high school counselor might see it. Discussion occurred about why LMI is required for new certs.; Vanatta shared it's required by CCCC for degrees/certs. with vocational/CTE TOP Codes. Gough asked if any consequences, down the line, if cert. approved using this LMI (e.g., could it be deactivated for LMI not matching)—Subramaniam responded, no. Pereira noted courses in cert. already active and being offered; cert. packages them into award for students to earn and have listed on their transcript. Discussion occurred about folks' previous experiences with LMI.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Meezan, St. Onge-Cole). <b>Approved.</b></p> |
| <p>7. Degree Deactivation: Business Administration ADT</p>  | <p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b><br/>Second read of deactivation of Business Administration ADT, which has been replaced by new 2.0 version. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Lee, Bissell). <b>Approved.</b></p>   |
| <p>8. Addition to Credit by Examination List: APPT 143A</p> | <p><b>Speaker: Mary Vanatta</b><br/>Apprenticeship has approved this new course as available for credit by examination; the course will be included in the spring 2023 catalog addendum.</p>   |
| <p>9. Equity in the COR</p>                                 | <p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b><br/>First read of Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document. Vanatta noted updates to document since previous meeting: Introduction section—added link to Strategic Vision for Equity underneath quotation in red text, language quoted from Equity Action Plan (EAP) formatted in bold and footnote reference numbers added (to refer to EAP info at end of document); Course Content section—added bullet; Representative Texts/Materials section—updated/added Library-related details, per suggestion from rep.</p> <p>Vanatta mentioned bullet in Methods of Evaluation section highlighted in red, due to concern brought by a rep after previous meeting.</p>   |

Subramaniam noted make-up exams and revisions fall under umbrella of academic freedom and suggested this bullet not be included in document; more appropriate for syllabus. Morriss mentioned Foothill Owl Scholars group studied two policies associated with racially-predictable failure, one of which was students not having opportunity to recover from grading setback. Parikh suggested listing that students are “given multiple opportunities to demonstrate competencies.” Gomes noted support for existing bullet but proposed removing “make-up,” which could suggest late work is accepted; allowing students to revise work is the norm in many disciplines. Sarver suggested “revise and/or resubmit” (and agreed with removing “make-up”). Both Gomes and Sarver agreed this info might be more appropriate for syllabus vs. COR.

Meezan agreed students should have opportunity to revise work, but unsure if info appropriate for the COR; suggested perhaps a companion document be created to provide guidelines for syllabus. Kaupp recalled discussion at previous meeting about intent of this document, to serve as guide for faculty (vs. requirement). St. Onge-Cole believes info could be appropriate, as it may prompt faculty to consider allowing revisions for their sections. Meezan noted that if item listed on COR all faculty teaching the course required to use it—a few folks responded, this is not the case; items not required, but a list of suggested options. Sarver noted allowing revisions very applicable to Language Arts courses and believes could be appropriate to include on COR. Murphy suggested “does the syllabus reflect the opportunity to revise work.” Jenkins re-emphasized Methods of Evaluation and Methods of Instruction list possibilities for faculty teaching the course, and are not required/ prescriptive; need to ensure all faculty clear about this, across campus. Morriss noted the word “make-up” can be a trigger/roadblock and suggested removing it; agreed with Sarver’s language suggestion. Parikh believes mentioning syllabus on document could be confusing.

Vanatta clarified bullet will be updated to “Are students given the opportunity to revise and resubmit work?”—yes.

Parikh mentioned email to Kuehnl with changes to Types/Examples of ... Assignments section (Vanatta noted Kuehnl didn’t share w/ CCC Team, so not reflected in updated draft). Suggested changes: one new bullet and rearrangement of some existing bullets. Gomes extremely supportive of adding new bullet and mentioned a similar idea came up in recent discussion of SLOs. Believes new bullet is very student-centered. Kaupp commented on “Are students asked” language— Parikh believes important to encourage faculty to ask students where they’re coming from (vs. making assumptions). Subramaniam sees value in new bullet and wants to make sure it’s included in the correct section of document, thinking perhaps this question would be asked at the start of the term—Parikh believes this is the correct section because it implies that knowledge in class comes from the students.

Subramaniam mentioned Definitions section, which is unchanged from previous draft and mostly copied from Glendale CC document. Ideally, definitions would be more specific to Foothill; CCC Team has reached out to Office of Equity, who plan to provide revisions. Revisions won’t be ready for second read but will be applied to document before it goes to Academic Senate for final approval. Kaupp asked if CCC will have opportunity to see revised definitions—yes.

Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>10. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs</p> | <p><b>Speaker: Ram Subramaniam</b><br/>                 Now that document in final stages of approval, need to discuss how it will be used across campus; we have yet to come up with a process. Kaupp commented against using a checkbox (e.g., accessibility question on DL Addendum). Gomes noted C3MS included help menu examples for each COR section, which were very helpful. Suggested reps share document with faculty when sending out Title 5 lists. Vanatta mentioned CourseLeaf has similar help pop-ups for almost every field on COR; could add details from document. Cautioned that adding too many details to pop-ups could result in “wall of text;” on the other hand, simply adding a link to full document in pop-up might not be sufficient and would require faculty to locate related info on document each time. Discussion occurred about other ways to mention/link to document in CourseLeaf. Vanatta happy to explore CourseLeaf-related ideas and work w/ others to determine how to best incorporate info on COR form.</p> <p>Subramaniam agreed with Gomes’ suggestion to distribute document during Title 5 process. St. Onge-Cole suggested topic/document be part of Opening Day event; suggested forcing pop-up on COR form in CourseLeaf to force faculty to certify they’ve reviewed COR with equity in mind each time COR is updated—Vanatta responded, actual pop-up alert not possible in CourseLeaf, but could add required checkbox at bottom of form which would “refresh” each time COR is submitted (meaning previously checked box would be cleared out).</p> <p>Parikh agreed with suggestion to include equity review as part of Title 5 process; Subramaniam believes this is exactly the time for faculty to be applying these principles, but need to determine who will be ensuring equity work on CORs is being done (e.g., CCC, division CC, some sort of subcommittee). Noted about 500 CORs edited/created each year, which needs to be considered when figuring out a process.</p> <p>Sarver unsure we need a system to enforce such work, as document meant to be guiding principles and not hard requirements for faculty. Agreed checkbox not ideal but could be helpful and prompt faculty to use guidelines. Gough supported idea of featuring document as a campus-wide part of Opening Day (vs. just a breakout session); cautioned against putting onus on reps to interpret equity updates on CORs. Gomes mentioned GE application form and suggested similar type of form be used for faculty to demonstrate COR is equity-minded. Strongly suggested equity review be done early in COR approval workflow, as many faculty wait until last minute to submit CORs; reps are final approval step, so could be big issue if they have to send CORs back to faculty at the last minute.</p> <p>Subramaniam asked group to bring topic back to constituents to discuss and gather feedback/suggestions, to discuss at next meeting.</p> |
| <p>11. Good of the Order</p>                               | <p>The group thanked Kaupp for filling in for Kuehn!</p>   |
| <p>12. Adjournment</p>                                     | <p><b>3:17 PM</b></p>  |

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LRC), Jeff Bissell\* (KA), Hilary Gomes (FA), Tom Gough\* (FA), Julie Jenkins\* (BSS), Ben Kaupp\* (SRC), Gay Krause\* (KCI), Andy Lee\* (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan\* (BSS), Patrick Morriss\* (STEM), Brian Murphy (APPR), Tim Myres (APPR), Ron Painter\* (STEM), Sarah Parikh\* (STEM), Chrissy Penate\* (LRC), Kas Pereira\* (BSS), Amy Sarver (LA), JP Schumacher (Dean, SRC), Shaelyn St. Onge-Cole\* (HSH), Ram Subramaniam\* (Administrator Co-Chair), Mary Vanatta\* (Curriculum Coordinator)

\* Indicates in-person attendance

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta