

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 25, 2016
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: October 11, 2016	Minutes approved as written. <i>[note: the meeting location in the draft version was erroneously listed as President's Conference Room. The location has been changed to Conference Room 8330 in the approved version.]</i> Approved by consent.
2. Announcements a. Notification of Proposed Requisites b. IDS 406 Follow-up	Speaker: Isaac Escoto All are ongoing requisites, for which a Content Review form was not on file. Follow-up to discussion at previous meeting, regarding New Course Proposal form and request by the group for clarification on course description and possible similarity to existing courses. Course author Katie Ha explained that the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) currently offers two non-credit supplemental instruction courses for Language Arts, for which students do not enroll in the traditional way. Instead, they select the appropriate course on a computer screen when they enter the facility. This new course is modeled after these two existing courses, as well as courses at other colleges. Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) chosen as the department, instead of Non-credit Language Arts (NCLA), so that disciplines outside of LA can be listed on the COR; intent is to collect WSCH on tutoring happening outside of LA. Currently, TLC uses non-credit faculty tutors; with this course, students will be the tutors, supervised by a faculty member with discipline MQs. Note that course might change from IDS to a new department code, to be created. Question regarding students expressing concern about having a non-credit course listed on record—non-credit courses are listed on the unofficial transcript only (never on the official transcript). Ha mentioned the possibility of creating a non-credit certificate, to include this course and an additional new course. Question regarding LA division listed on COR for IDS 406—will probably not change, due to C3MS requirement that a division be listed, and Ha is LA faculty. Note that students will “register” for this new course in the same way they currently register for the two NCLA courses. Question regarding tutoring being considered a support service or a course—Ha noted that it is a support service but is related to instruction, and apportionment is collected on existing non-credit supplemental instruction courses. Question about the funding of tutoring courses—Escoto suggested further discussion at future CCC meeting.
c. Apprenticeship Update	Bruce McLeod is currently working with Apprenticeship faculty on COR updates in C3MS and has been meeting with faculty at their sites. The creation of Apprenticeship curriculum committee, and who will participate, is currently under discussion.
d. C-ID October 2016 Newsletter	Escoto noted table within newsletter outlining ongoing work regarding C-ID approvals. Day mentioned that a group of Articulation Officers is working with Escoto to submit a resolution for the ASCCC Fall Plenary regarding delayed C-ID approvals affecting the ability of colleges to submit ADTs to the state, as C-

<p>e. ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions</p>	<p>ID approval is required for courses listed on an ADT. Resolution will ask that courses be acceptable if they have been submitted for C-ID, even if they have not yet been approved. On October 31, De Anza and Foothill senates will meet together to discuss upcoming resolutions, including this; Escoto will forward draft of resolution to CCC.</p> <p>Escoto noted that this is not the final list, as resolutions may be submitted close to the date of the plenary session. Noted resolutions that may be of interest to group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Process for Local Curriculum Approval (9.01). Clarification requested, regarding single process at each college, or statewide—at the local level, not statewide. • Faculty Involvement in the Creation of Dual Enrollment Programs (9.02). Question regarding creation of such programs and whether one would go to PaRC for approval or would be developed in the manner of a regular course; question of where faculty voice would be heard regarding dual enrollment policy—Escoto noted that such discussion would happen at Academic and Professional Matters (APM). LaManque noted that an MOU for a particular high school would go to FHDA board for approval, but that any related courses are then scheduled following our normal process. Resolution states intent for colleges to engage in discussion sufficient to ensure such programs being developed not just for financial reasons, and to ensure such programs will not have adverse effects on local programs. Question regarding where to find a list of current dual enrollment programs at Foothill. LaManque noted that he can create a list but that this issue falls under Senate, rather than CCC. Concern expressed that some students are not receiving accurate information about outcomes of participating in such programs, possibly because expert faculty are not involved in creation or implementation of program. Counseling noted confusion from students, who expected one outcome and experienced another. • California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report (15.01). <p>Please feel free to provide feedback to Escoto and Carolyn Holcroft, via email, prior to FHDA joint senate discussion on October 31. Question regarding when colleges receive list of resolutions—first packet was distributed to senators at Area meeting, two weeks ago; second packet distributed last week, which was then shared by Holcroft. Concern expressed that there is not much time for regular faculty members to read, discuss, and provide feedback, given timeframe of when resolutions are distributed.</p>
<p>f. Division CC Meeting Minutes</p>	<p>For those new CCC reps, as well as a reminder to those returning, please forward the minutes from your division CC meetings to Vanatta. The minutes will then be uploaded to the CCC website. Reps are free to use whatever format they desire; attachment is a suggested template, but its use is not required. Due to our structure of division curriculum committees, reporting of division CC minutes is essential.</p>
<p>3. Course Repeatability</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Clarification regarding different situations that arise when we think of course repeatability: 1. If a course is designated as repeatable, a student may retake it, and all instances appear on the transcript;</p>

	<p>2. If a student receives a "substandard" grade (e.g., D) the student may retake the course for a total of three attempts. Attachment outlines the types of courses that can be designated as repeatable, per Title 5, and if the course does not meet these guidelines, it cannot be repeatable.</p> <p>Clarification requested regarding language on attachment: what would be considered "required by the CSU or UC to be repeated for a major"—for example, in the case of a course with a recency requirement, a student may need to retake it due to having taken it too long ago (according to specific program requirements). Question regarding possible repeatability of 54H courses (Honors Institute Seminar), in which the topic might change depending on who is teaching course—Escoto noted that using different courses and different SLOs would be the model, and that it is difficult to argue that the same course could have different SLOs each time it is offered. Comment regarding programs in which competency must be maintained; for example, a student who has completed three quarters of a seven-quarter program before failing out cannot re-start program due to repeatability issue. However, due to safety issues around program content, the student cannot simply re-enter program at the quarter in which they failed out. This situation is mostly unique to Allied Health programs. Suggestion to add recency exemption to situation—Bio Health noted that even a year gap can create a safety issue for students in certain programs, which are competency-based. PSME noted similar situation in Chemistry courses that are part of a sequence; suggested that in future discussions of recency, repeatability should be discussed and considered.</p>
<p>4. New Department Code: PARA</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Bio Health has approved changing the department code for Paramedic Program courses, from EMTP to PARA. This code will go into effect for the 2017-18 catalog.</p>
<p>5. New Program Application: Instructional Design & Technology Certificate of Achievement.</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto First read of new Instructional Design & Technology (IDT) certificate of achievement. Gay Krause and Steve McGriff, from KCI, present for discussion. Question from PSME regarding possible science or math content being developed in the future, related to this program. McGriff noted that program is focused on practice of instructional design and does not involve any "cross-over" courses into science or math disciplines. Question regarding changing the department code for courses in this program to something other than LINC—has not yet been requested, but possibly.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto As mentioned at previous meeting, Stand Alone course approvals will now happen at the local level and no longer by the state. CCCCO has not yet released any specific guidelines on new process; in the meantime, we need to ensure clarity regarding our local process. Our current SA form is clear and thorough, and we can continue to use it without need for modification. Prior to this change, SA forms were approved on the Consent Calendar; going forward, process should change to a first and second read, to ensure appropriate level of discussion and consideration. Important to show that we're following a solid process of approving such courses. No objections from the group—SA courses will now appear at CCC as first/second reads, for individual approval.</p>

<p>7. Cross-Listed Course Approval Request Form</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto First read of document. Last year, CCC developed and approved a cross-listing policy, which we did not previously have. Policy includes requirement of a form to be submitted/approved for any new cross-listed course(s). Attachment is draft of form, which includes information/questions from policy. Question regarding whether course units should be listed—note that both courses must have same COR and units. Group agreed to addition of course units to form. Please share with your constituents and report back with feedback. Current cross-listed courses are grandfathered-in and will not need to complete form.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Curriculum Sheet Review Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Need to discuss division processes of reviewing curriculum sheets. Errors have occurred, such as deactivated courses continuing to show up on sheets. Formal discussion will begin at next meeting, so please come prepared to share your division's process. Comment regarding timing of curriculum sheet updates being "off," which makes it difficult to ensure thorough updating. PSME keeps list of curriculum changes and reviews/updates sheets at division CC. Counseling noted difficulty of referring to sheets listing courses that are rarely, or never, offered, when counseling students; suggested including information regarding when a course might be offered. Escoto noted need to discuss courses being taught infrequently during review of curriculum sheets, and mentioned course deactivation policy. BSS noted recent action within division to deactivate courses that haven't been taught.</p> <p>Comment regarding inflexibility of ADT course listings, and question regarding ability to add or remove courses from sheet. Day noted that it depends on the specific TMC, and that changes can be made but must meet TMC requirements (and courses must have C-ID approval). Day noted this as difference between ADTs and local degrees. Day available to work with faculty to update ADTs. Question regarding listing on ADT a course that is no longer being taught, but including note that the course is taught at a different college—Day noted that the course should be removed from sheet if no longer being taught at Foothill, and that a student can transfer the course over if they take it elsewhere (assuming it meets necessary requirements). Escoto noted that guidelines for collaborative programs, in which the program includes courses from multiple colleges, still being developed at the state level and will hopefully be available in January. Comment that curriculum sheets still go through C3MS process, and question regarding what specifics Escoto hopes to include in CCC discussion. Discussion should include who is involved in the review of each sheet, and how accurate information is being ensured—how can we better ensure that thorough and accurate review is occurring? BSS noted that division has already begun curriculum sheet review for 2017-18, even though sheets aren't due until February; current process is for sheet owner to make updates and submit for review at division CC meeting.</p>
<p>9. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p>Speaker: All BSS: Humanities certificate of achievement in development; went to PaRC for discussion. Hueg noted that certificate is tied to a grant, and that discussion at PaRC was tabled due to focus on grant and funding. Escoto noted that certificate doesn't qualify for</p>

	<p>financial aid, due to low unit count, which was one of the concerns at PaRC. Vanatta noted that we have very few state-approved certificates that fall within the lower unit count <i>[note: these are certificates with unit counts between 18-26, and we currently have two on the books]</i>. BSS also discussing Gerontology curriculum and possibility of deactivating courses and/or moving some into other disciplines, such as Psychology/Sociology or Health. Courses have not been offered in some time. Question regarding Foothill having ever offered a Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) program, or if any local colleges do, and whether Gerontology could tie into such a program. Courses were previously in Adaptive Learning division and were moved to BSS when AL division was dissolved. Day noted that the faculty who developed the courses teach at Stanford and SF State, and the idea was to provide a path for Foothill students to transfer into SF State Gerontology program. However, there was a problem with the courses being three units, which does not work for transfer to a semester school. Last year, faculty updated courses in C3MS to four units and Day received UC transfer and IGETC approvals; however, courses have not yet completed full C3MS process. Comment that with these courses changing to four units, as well as GE transfer approved, enrollment numbers might be more positive than in previous years.</p>
10. Good of the Order	
11. Adjournment	3:22 PM

Attendees: Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Elizabeth Brumbaugh (guest—KCI), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Milissa Carey (FA), Sara Cooper (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Leticia Delgado (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Katie Ha (guest—LA), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Kay Jones (LIBR), Gay Krause (guest—KCI), Andrew LaManque (Interim VP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Don MacNeil (KA), Steve McGriff (guest—KCI), Gillian Schultz (BH), Lety Serna (CNSL), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta