



	<p>that the four proposed families are quite distinct; recalled that the state has given the districts local control over course families. LaManque noted that we don't seek CCCC approval of course families but it is something on which we could be audited. Question regarding potential consequences of an audit— LaManque noted that other colleges have been asked to pay back money, related to an audit of course families.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Francisco, Anderson). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>4. Addition to Course Family: Individual Sports (Kinesiology)</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Kinesiology is adding three new courses, PHED 15A, 15B &amp; 15C, to the Individual Sports family, effective 2017-18. Question regarding if Foothill has the option to offer PE or other courses for community members. Fine Arts rep noted that Performance courses (P A) are offered as non-degree-applicable.</p>
<p>5. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCP 400C</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCP 400C. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Armstrong, Serna). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCP 401A</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCP 401A. Question regarding potential overlap of this and other new NCP courses with Child Development courses—BSS rep noted that courses have been brought to attention of that department, and they did not have any concerns.</p> <p><b>Approved by consensus.</b></p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCP 402A</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCP 402A. No comments.</p> <p><b>Approved by consensus.</b></p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCP 402B</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCP 402B. No comments.</p> <p><b>Approved by consensus.</b></p>
<p>9. Adding a Course Discipline</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Draft of update to New Course Proposal form, based on suggestion, at previous meeting, to require a signature when another department/division involved in the selection of course discipline(s), to help ensure that all involved parties will be included in discussion of disciplines. Suggestion to add link to Minimum Qualifications handbook (on CCC webpage)—Vanatta will update form. Discussion to brainstorm ways to ensure that faculty use current version of CCC forms, and how best to enforce. Suggestions: reps send new versions to division faculty as email attachments, perhaps with Division CC meeting agendas; reps create a shared Office 365 folder; add current academic year to the top forms, to better ensure faculty using the current form; add link to CCC webpage at the top of forms, with note requesting faculty to first check the webpage to ensure current version of form being used.</p> <p>Escoto and Vanatta will work together to add wording and link to all CCC forms, and Vanatta will upload new version to CCC webpage.</p>

	<p><b>Approved by consensus.</b></p>
<p>10. COR Review Checklist for Curriculum Reps</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>          Checklist was developed in response to recent ongoing discussions related to possibility of shortening curriculum review timeline. CCC Team has spent hours discussing possible solutions, and all brainstorming sessions have come back to the issue of COR quality—Vanatta spends a lot of time working with faculty and reps to finalize CORs, often requiring multiple email conversations. First step to possibly shortening the timeline will be for CORs to be in better shape when submitted to Vanatta. Checklist was created based on frequent COR issues for 2017-18 catalog (list of issues was shared with CCC during fall quarter)—intent is for reps to use checklist when reviewing CORs, before submitting.</p> <p>Comment regarding Content Review form for new requisites—request that checklist also mention requisites that aren't new, as many courses going through Title 5 review do not have form on file. Vanatta will update wording on checklist. Question related to submitting Content Review form during Title 5 review (for courses with established requisite(s), for which form is not on file), and if faculty should list requisite as new or ongoing on form—Vanatta has seen both; in either case, ensure form explains that requisite was previously approved.</p> <p>Day encouraged reps to provide constructive feedback to colleagues when reviewing outlines, as CORs are public documents and represent Foothill and our curriculum; offered to work with reps on developing good CORs, if requested.</p> <p>Question regarding textbook requirement of five years—Escoto and Vanatta recalled that it is a Title 5 requirement, and will check. Suggestion that checklist be made electronic; suggestion to add links to download various forms—top of checklist has link to CCC webpage, to download all forms. Vanatta will upload checklist to CCC webpage.</p>
<p>11. Grade Requirement for Major Courses</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>          Wording on all curriculum sheets states, "...a GPA of 2.0 or higher is required in all core and support courses for the degree or certificate." Counseling has experienced confusion among students, regarding this wording—some take it to mean the GPA for all courses as a group; however, the requirement actually applies to each course individually. Question regarding scenario in which a student receives a D in a support course but then uses a different support course for the program and receives a C or better—should wording clarify this? Counseling rep noted that a counselor would likely encourage the student to repeat the course for a better grade. Escoto stated that the wording needs to reflect the minimum requirements for the major. Question regarding courses taken Pass/No Pass—current wording states, "All courses pertaining to the major must be taken for a letter grade." Bio Health rep mentioned separate requirements for program prerequisites on some curriculum sheets. Day noted that ADTs allow students to take courses Pass/No Pass—ADT sheets do use different language and do not state that courses must be taken for a letter grade.</p> <p>Group developed new language: "A grade of C or better is</p>

	<p>required for all core and support courses used for the degree or certificate.” Vanatta will update language on all curriculum sheets (non-ADTs), and course catalog for 2017-18 will be updated to reflect this new language.</p>
<p>12. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p><b>Speaker: All</b>  Vanatta reminded the group of the Feb. 15<sup>th</sup> GE deadline.</p> <p>PSME: Chemistry department trying to market Chemistry of Cooking class (CHEM 9). CHEM 25 currently has two different audiences: those using it for GE and those using it for major prep. Hoping to get CHEM 9 &amp; 20 (Green Chemistry) on more curriculum sheets, to encourage students to take different Chemistry course than CHEM 25. Bio Health reps will share with departments.</p> <p>Articulation: Question regarding new Bio Health course in Cannabis Production. Bio Health rep noted that Foothill receives federal funding, so unsure if division will approve the course.</p> <p>BSS: Recent discussion regarding non-transcriptable certificates— faculty want to keep them, but impression is that college administration does not seem as interested. Hoping for wider discussion regarding the usefulness of non-transcriptable certificates. Escoto suggested adding topic to a future CCC agenda. PSME rep noted that topic has recently been discussed in division and agrees that a wider discussion is useful; could be tied with discussion of moving non-transcriptable certificates to transcriptable. Hueg expressed his concerns, related to the actual printing of the non-transcriptable certificate, usually by the division assistant—no standardization and does not best represent the college. Also expressed concern with offering programs for which financial aid is not offered, and conferring an academic credential that is not listed on the transcript. Counseling rep stated that they are helpful for students who are trying to improve their resume. Hueg noted problems related to tracking and verification. LaManque agreed with problems related to tracking and verification but noted that administration is not precluding departments from offering. Escoto will schedule a wider discussion at a future meeting.</p>
<p>13. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>14. Adjournment</p>	<p><b>3:31 PM</b></p>

**Attendees:** Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Milissa Carey (FA), Sara Cooper (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (Interim VP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Katy Ripp (KA), Lety Serna (CNSL), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta