College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 9, 2023
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 25, 2023	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** STEM: Working on Title 5 updates and CORs for new courses. LRC: No updates to report. Language Arts: No updates to report. Kinesiology: No updates to report. HSH: Working on Title 5 updates. Fine Arts: Working on Title 5 updates. SRC: Working on Title 5 updates. Counseling: Working on Title 5 updates. BSS: Working on Title 5 updates. Apprenticeship: No updates to report. Note that JP Schumacher acting as in-person proxy vote for Valerie Fong.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Sarver noted was unable to open/view some of the PDF attachments for this week's meeting and asked if others had the same issue. Bissell noted had to restart computer to be able to open them; no others reported issues. Vanatta asked folks to reach out if they ever have trouble opening attachments and reminded folks about direct links to CourseLeaf-specific items in agenda and email notifications.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	**Speakers: CCC Team** The following proposals were presented: APPR 140A, 140B; RSPT 307, 308. No comments.
b. Curriculum Institute Conference (July 12-15—more info here)	Kuehnl mentioned CCC Team usually attends; conference sets the tone for the upcoming year, especially re: articulation matters and curriculum process/procedures.
c. Spring Plenary Update	Packet of resolutions adopted at recent state-wide plenary. Kuehnl noted some are related to curriculum; reach out to Kuehnl or Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva with any questions.
d. Incoming Faculty Co-Chair!	Ben Kaupp will be Faculty Co-Chair of CCC starting in fall 2023 quarter!
5. New Certificate Application: Commercial Photography	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Commercial Photography Certificate of Achievement. No comments. *See item 9 for motion/approval details.*
6. New Certificate Application: Digital Photography Techniques	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Digital Photography Techniques Certificate of

	Achievement. No comments. *See item 9 for motion/approval details.*
7. New Certificate Application: Photography Criticism	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Photography Criticism Certificate of Achievement. No comments. *See item 9 for motion/approval details.*
8. New Certificate Application: Commercial Photography (noncredit)	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Commercial Photography Certificate of Completion (noncredit). No comments. *See item 9 for motion/approval details.*
9. New Certificate Application: Photography (noncredit)	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Photography Certificate of Completion (noncredit). No comments. Group agreed to vote on items 5-9 as one motion. Motion to approve items 5-9 **M/S** (Kaupp, Gough). **Approved.**
10. New Certificate Application: Educational Immersive Media	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Educational Immersive Media Certificate of Achievement. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Lee, Kaupp). **Approved.**
11. Degree Name Change: Inside Wireman	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Apprenticeship changing name of General Electrician AS degree to Inside Wireman; will go into effect for 2023-24 catalog. Allen noted name change aligns with the industry.
12. New Certificate Application: Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) Technician	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of new Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) Technician Certificate of Achievement. No comments. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
13. Curriculum Across the District—Poll	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Kuehnl and Subramaniam have been meeting w/ De Anza counterparts to discuss communication across the district re: curriculum; topic originated at Academic and Professional Matters (APM), which holds collegial meetings between faculty leadership, admin leadership, etc.—like a district-wide Academic Senate, but not subject to Brown Act. Topic has been discussed for the past few years, somewhat related to a few conflicts which have occurred regarding new CTE degrees/certs. No formal process in place for communication or notification of curriculum items between the two colleges. Gough asked if conflicts were related to overlap—Kuehnl responded, yes, generally. Kuehnl noted discussions have been driven by De Anza and APM; there's general agreement between folks at both colleges for cross-campus sharing about new degrees/certs. Our new degree/cert. creation process does include a "trigger" step for notification to De Anza about new degrees/certs. once they include similar step in their own process; they have not yet done so but are promising to do at some point. De Anza also requesting we consult with them about individual new course proposals. Historically, Foothill CCC has opposed this. One reason is expediency—we create new courses throughout the year, but they create them during the fall only; two very different processes, and De Anza's doesn't allow for as rapid a response as we'd likely need. Also a question as to why consultation is needed, as many overlapping courses already exist (e.g., English, math), which weren't questioned or

scrutinized. Kuehnl would like CCC to discuss, to see if position has changed; if we do want this sort of communication, both colleges will need to determine process, as well as how to handle conflicts.

Parikh concerned it's hard enough to get a new course started, and doesn't see how this add'l step would be helpful. Suggested the two colleges discuss overlapping courses (existing and new) to see if certain aspects could be better aligned, such as textbooks; sees benefit in alignment of overlapping courses, but unsure if this needs to extend to notification of every new course. Kuehnl noted there is already room for collegial consultation between disciplines at both colleges. Gough pointed out some disciplines don't have a counterpart at the sister college and wondered if these disciplines would be subject to the same level of communication/scrutiny as those which do overlap. Agreed that the process of creating a new course is already bureaucratically overloaded enough.

Subramaniam noted the creation of a new course is not a secret, as they eventually go to the FHDA Board for approval; anyone interested in details can look them up. He and Kuehnl agree that any sort of communication w/ De Anza should not delay creation of a new course; faculty purview means De Anza shouldn't have any sort of vote on our courses. Edwards agreed and wouldn't feel comfortable with Foothill having any vote on De Anza courses, either. Also noted differences in colleges' processes, which would likely need to align if we want to institute communication. Hueg reminded the group about the upcoming Common Course Numbering mandate, which will require a lot of communication between the two colleges; believes the future will trend toward more communication rather than less.

Jenkins serves on executive board of Faculty Association (FA), so has a lot of communication w/ De Anza colleagues (encouraged everyone to communicate with their counterparts). Noted FA working on creating space for cross-campus communication, and pointed out that many students take classes at both colleges. Doesn't believe De Anza should be allowed to vote on our courses, but agrees that communication between disciplines at both colleges is valuable. Kuehnl agreed with encouraging collaboration between disciplines on things like textbooks. Kaupp feels very uncomfortable with De Anza having any official say on our curriculum but does see value (re: collegiality) in making them aware of what we're doing. Believes CCC Team does a good job of communication via the communiqué and suggested De Anza CCC be CC'd. Kuehnl suggested CCC agendas more important, as they provide more advance notice. Subramaniam noted agenda and minutes are public on CCC website, for anyone to review.

Svetich mentioned English dept. had extensive meetings w/ De Anza about 10 years ago, with great attendance and collegial discussion; a lot of discussion was about the ways courses align, and there actually wasn't as much alignment as one might expect, perhaps due to cultural differences between the two programs. Kuehnl again noted that notification of new degrees/certs. ready on our side, whenever De Anza builds it in to their process. Once that's in place, any conflicts which cannot be resolved between the colleges would be discussed at APM.

Kuehnl reiterated the point of today's discussion was for him and Subramaniam to ensure their opinion expressed at APM still reflects CCC's general opinion, as they are representing the group. Group informally confirmed there is no support for requiring new courses be

	formally shared with De Anza as part of our new course creation process.
14. Program Discontinuance Process	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Degree or Certificate (Program) Discontinuance Process. Essentially mirrors formal steps for creating a new degree/cert. Kuehnl reiterated this does not include "political" part of the process; is the process used once decision has been made to discontinue a degree/cert. Pointed out note on document re: course deactivation. Hueg suggested notification to ACCJC be added and will send details to Vanatta. Re: Teach-Out section, Parikh asked if students declare a major for a certificate—Hueg responded, when a student declares a major, the certificate is part of the major. A student can be undeclared but still complete a cert. Parikh suggested current bullet (re: informing students completing certs.) might not capture all students, as some may simply be enrolled in cert. courses but have yet to actually complete any. For example, if student working toward a cert. which has only three courses and student has completed just one course, how would they be captured? Subramaniam agreed and suggested we look at this more carefully. Parikh suggested notifying students who have completed at least one course within the past 36 months, for certs. Noted some certs.' courses are offered just once per year. Group agreed with change to document. Kuehnl mentioned need to consult w/ Institutional Research dept. to find out which students to contact; Vanatta asked if this should be added to document—no. Parikh asked if Teach-Out bullets make more sense as numbered list—yes. Group agreed with change to document. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
15. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding need to determine how Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document will be used across campus. Kuehnl recapped previous discussion, which leaned toward adding a text field to COR form in CourseLeaf for faculty to explain how they have addressed equity in the COR. Still need to determine who will be responsible for reviewing such info and associated COR updates, likely to be division reps. Jenkins has been thinking about review being reps' responsibility, as well as previous concerns about involving non-tenure track faculty in difficult conversations, and doesn't believe it should be the reps' responsibility. Although reps lead their division CC, all division faculty vote on CORs; suggested responsibility be on all division faculty. Kuehnl clarified although division CC, as a whole, approves CORs, reps serve as formal approver of CORs. Agreed division CC would review text field as part of regular COR review; we should make clear in resolution/process that review not responsibility of reps alone. Parikh suggested division could appoint an interested person to be equity advocate—Kuehnl responded, nothing stopping division from setting up such a role but doesn't think it should be included in resolution/process. Parikh noted not every faculty in a given division attends/votes at all division CC meetings—group agreed. Subramaniam noted concern that adding checkbox to COR could result in the work itself losing value, turning this into a regulatory-type of mechanism. Suggested each dept. determine how they would like to handle process, which could lead to more meaningful change; perhaps each

	dept. determines specific courses to focus on each year. Believes work likely to evolve and change as process gets launched, faculty go through professional development (PD), emerging technologies come into play, etc. Doesn't believe formal process necessarily the right way to move forward. Kuehnl clarified not talking about just a checkbox but also a text field which would require faculty to describe how they have integrated equity into the COR, so reps would not need to scour COR to identify changes. Subramaniam worries will be too much burden on one or two people (reps) to be in charge of ensuring faculty are doing the work, even if text field is added. Parikh noted Academic Senate (AS) has tasked CCC with creating formal process; believes that without any sort of checkbox or text field some faculty will not believe/agree that the work is necessary. Jenkins mentioned Mentor Mindset Fellowship, noting that group's discussion about how to engage faculty members to have a "growth mindset" re: CORs, in general; need to consider how to faculty to engage with this process and understand how CORs are meaningful for students and faculty, as many faculty don't believe they're meaningful. Kuehnl agrees that things like PD are important but noted CCC not being tasked with figuring out how PD will be involved; our task is to come up with the process to implement the guidelines. AS and PD folks will be involved in other aspects. Jenkins mentioned recent discussion about the guidelines w/ colleagues who do not believe the document states why the work needs to be done. Svetich noted has not seen document, and asked if field-specific standard language included, for faculty to use on their CORs. Suggested standard language could make process easier for both faculty updating CORs and reviewers. Kuehnl responded, CCC decided to specifically not create standard language, in an effort to make process more meaningful. Kuehnl concedes we cannot force all faculty to put in the time to do the hard work, but need to nudge folks in the right direction. Reiterated that previous discussions leaned toward adding text field to COR form. Kaupp mentioned existing Need/Justification field, used to explain Stand Alone status; believes equity-related field can be viewed as somewhat similar, in that related courses may reasonably have similar info listed. Kaupp agreed with Jenkins' concerns and suggested once process is finalized the focus moves to figuring out how to engage faculty through PD, etc. Gough and Kuehnl mentioned plan to add details from guidelines to help pop-ups in CourseLeaf. Gough doesn't want to lose sight of hope for campus-wide session as part of Opening Day; Kuehnl agrees and will work with PD Coordinator Carolyn Holcroft. Gough asked about next step—Kuehnl would like to create mock-up to show how field(s) on COR would look; Vanatta will create mock-up for next meeting. Vanatta noted field(s) can be configured to clear out previous response, if group decides that's the best option.
16. Good of the Order	
17. Adjournment	**3:32 PM**

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Kelly Edwards (KA), Tom Gough* (FA), Kurt Hueg* (Interim VP Instruction), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Ana Maravilla* (CNSL), Tiffany Mitchener* (HSH), Ron Painter* (STEM), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Amy Sarver (LA), JP Schumacher* (Dean, SRC), Ram Subramaniam (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich* (LA), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Kristina Whalen* (Foothill President)
Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta