

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, May 23, 2017  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 9, 2017	<b>Approved by consensus.</b>
2. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> The following proposals were presented: C S 30E; NCBS 403A, 403B; PHED 43. Please share with your constituents. Mention of comment on NCBS proposals regarding including placement exam in the course description (consensus among group that it should be included)—PSME rep noted that comment meant for division CC discussion, and placement exam information will be included in course description. Discussion regarding using “Frisbee” brand name in course title for PHED 43; suggestion that ® symbol be included next to brand name. Fine Arts rep noted that division has many brand names in course titles (e.g. Adobe Photoshop). Comment regarding websites where students upload exams, and question regarding authenticity of rumor that if exam includes a copyright symbol it cannot be uploaded—LaManque suggested forwarding question to Judy Baker (Online Learning department).
b. UC Transferability	Day reminded group of June 1 <sup>st</sup> deadline to submit courses for UC transfer for next year. Usually UC provides a grace period; however, this year a software change prohibits such. Question regarding courses in development for summer 2018—Day noted that courses may be submitted while under development for UC transfer and that she cannot submit for IGETC until UC transfer is approved; best to be proactive and submit ahead of schedule.
c. CCC Co-chair Announcement	Rachelle Campbell has been confirmed by Academic Senate as new VP and CCC Co-chair for next year!
3. New Program Application: Social Justice Studies ADT	<b>Speakers: Isaac Escoto &amp; John Fox</b> Second read of new Social Justice Studies ADT. Note that ENGL 40 has been added to the list of courses, since the first read.  Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Day, Armstrong). <b>Approved.</b>
4. Policy Update: Academic Adjustments for Students with Disabilities	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Second read of updated policy; document has been updated since first read. Counseling rep noted that discipline faculty related to course content being discussed are welcome to attend Academic Council meetings.  Third read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
5. New Program Application: Game Audio Certificate of Achievement	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> First read of new Game Audio Certificate of Achievement. Question regarding availability of jobs—Fine Arts rep noted that it’s the largest industry in CA, even larger than the movie industry, and that students are already being placed in jobs.  Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
6. Program Deactivation: Primary Care Associate Program	<b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> First read of deactivation of Primary Care Associate Program. Changes in the field have prompted this deactivation. Final cohort of students will graduate in 2018. LaManque noted that we don’t have a lot of

	<p>experience with program deactivation, so we're following the same steps we take to create a program. Bio Health rep noted that some in the division disagreed with having to vote to approve the deactivation, since the college has no choice in the matter in this situation. Escoto noted the special circumstances in this case and stated that following our process of approvals when programs are deactivated allows for constituency groups on campus to be updated. Question regarding nature of program, specifically around graduates' ability to write prescriptions without advanced degree—Bio Health and Counseling reps noted that Foothill program is one piece of the whole program and that students either had already received or would subsequently receive a higher degree (with licensure). Accreditation standards will now require students to graduate from a program that also offers a masters degree, which we cannot.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. Non-transcriptable Certificate Approval Process</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b>          Continuation of discussion from previous meeting. Need to create a clear policy/process for the creation of non-transcriptable certificates. CCC team discussed and is proposing a resolution to state that non-transcriptable certificates will follow the same process as transcriptable programs. Question regarding existing certificates and whether they would be grandfathered in—CCC will need to discuss. Comment that if policy/process is to confirm that certificates have a place in Foothill curriculum, those that already exist should be reviewed. Question regarding the outcome of a certificate's approval, and whether it will affect the current process of conferring/tracking—Escoto noted that this separate piece will need to be discussed further and settled; would like to first create approval policy/process. Bio Health rep suggested creating abbreviated process for existing certificates; noted that certain workforce certificates are required by outside bodies. Comment that requiring same process for non-transcriptable may preclude faculty from creating certificate due to time involved in process; some faculty create non-transcriptable because they do not have time to go through full process or view as onerous. Mention of suggestion from previous meeting regarding offering workshop for faculty who wish to go through (transcriptable) creation process. LaManque noted unit minimum for certificates of achievement (18).</p> <p>LaManque suggested dual approach of CCC reviewing existing certificates en masse, with future new programs following full process. Escoto noted that group would need to develop approval guidelines for existing certificates. Day suggested Office of Instruction offer tutorial sessions for faculty to develop a new program. Suggestion of possibility of existing workforce programs bypassing certain steps if program required by outside bodies. Bio Health rep noted example of EMT program—students must complete certain courses before they can sit for state licensure exam.</p> <p>Discussion regarding need to collect same data required for new non-transcriptable certificates as required for transcriptable programs, if resolution adopted—LaManque noted that resolution, if adopted, would require non-transcriptable certificates to follow same process, which includes collection of data for workforce programs. Noted that the governance handbook states “any new program or initiative” and does not distinguish between transcriptable and non. PSME rep noted steps in current process, of program being submitted to FHDA board and state for approval; question regarding whether non-transcriptable certificates will be submitted to the state—they cannot be. Suggestion that shortened version of new program process document be created for non-</p>

	<p>transcriptable certificates; Escoto suggested group determine whether process should be created, instead of passing proposed resolution. Suggestion that CCC first review existing certificates before creating policy/process, so that potential issues can be identified, which may inform approval criteria. LaManque noted importance of signaling college-wide review of such certificates, including existing, to ensure that institution has recognized approval. PSME rep suggested creation of review checklist first, and then evaluation of existing certificates against checklist, as guiding document. Escoto noted importance of applying same criteria to all certificates. Bio Health rep suggested first step of identifying owners of existing certificates and sending out survey to: 1. ask if still viable; 2. if 18+ units, ask owner about submitting for state approval. Survey responses could pare down list of existing certificates for CCC to review. PSME rep agreed that best to notify faculty owners of existing certificates before reviewing. Escoto suggested CCC develop review criteria before contacting owners, to ensure clear communication and transparency. PSME rep suggested involving faculty owners in creating guidelines.</p> <p>BSS rep noted importance of answering the question, “why should we offer these non-transcriptable certificates?” Noted answers given in division have been, “students want this” and “employers want this,” but not always with evidence to back-up. Bio Health rep agreed that reasoning is important but shouldn't be used as barrier to offering certificate; does not want begin evaluating faculty owner's reasoning for offering certificate.</p> <p>Group agreed that CCC should review existing non-transcriptable certificates. CCC team will draft survey to send out to faculty owners. Discussion will continue at future meeting.</p>
8. Equity Across Curriculum	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b></p> <p>Continuation of discussion from previous meeting; question was posed regarding how to evaluate COR for equity. Escoto shared example of MATH 22 COR (with faculty permission). Counseling rep noted Universal Design movement, which addresses equity; noted Method of Instruction and Methods of Evaluation as sections of COR that could address equity. Escoto suggested simply asking question of how certain sections of COR could address equity, during COR review at division CC; responsibility of CCC rep is not necessarily to have all answers but to foster discussion during COR review and/or with faculty. Concern expressed that division CC is not the best place to have deep discussions of pedagogical practice; suggestion that question of equity is more in the realm of professional development, rather than curriculum. Escoto clarified that discussion here at CCC to address how reps might be able to foster division discussions of equity. Concern expressed that discussions specific to COR might end up being merely superficial. Bio Health rep noted issue of multiple instructors teaching the same course, which makes difficult to address COR with equity lens—more important is how course is actually taught. Suggestion of SLOs, instead of COR, as place where equity can really be addressed.</p> <p>Escoto noted that every course discussed via regular cycle of COR review, which is why course review cycle could be used to spark discussion of equity; looking for suggestions on how to spark wider discussion. PSME rep noted that faculty, when developing COR, intend information on COR to guide other instructors on how course should be taught (e.g., noting short answer tests specifically if believe important to the course); however, information on COR might not necessarily reflect how course is actually taught. Concern expressed that equity lens could</p>

	<p>become meaningless if mentioned during development process of every COR.</p> <p>Comment that SLO process was implemented poorly on campus and, as a result, seen by faculty as secondary to development of course; concern that similar implementation of equity lens, from the top-down, could result in same. Suggestions for implementation: peer-based, professional development, opening day. Escoto reminded group that CCC created the responsibilities document, and that discussion is to address how best to ensure we're following the responsibilities we crafted; not being directed to do so by any body external to CCC. Comment that equity is important to Foothill mission and, thus, should be important in curriculum. Bio Health rep noted recent discussions at Student Equity Workgroup on how to best disseminate information and spark conversation around equity; have had difficulty trying to promote organically, via professional development. Agreed that important to discuss equity in terms of curriculum but unsure that COR best way to discuss. Language Arts rep noted process of creating division online course standards and share-out of such; division had good experience in discussing and developing those, and perhaps similar process can be used for this.</p> <p>BSS rep suggested questions to consider when discussing COR through equity lens: Are textbooks all written by males?; Is there an international perspective that can be considered? PSME rep recalled creation of responsibilities document and discussion of reps encouraging faculty to consider equity during initial development of a course, rather than reviewing a COR for equity.</p> <p>Discussion will continue at future meeting.</p>
<p>9. Student Preparedness</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Isaac Escoto</b> Moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.</p>
<p>10. Report Out from Division Reps</p>	<p><b>Speaker: All</b> LaManque provided update on accreditation. Academic Senate recently discussed standards. Division CCs and CCC will figure prominently in accreditation site visit. Encouraged group to review Standard II.A, to help prepare for site visit.</p> <p>Counseling: Daphne Small will be teaching new course in exploring leadership. Students do not need to be involved in Student Activities. Counselors and other Foothill staff/faculty attending NCORE (National Conference on Race and Ethnicity) this year; Serna attending talks on social change in education.</p> <p>Articulation: Day noted three new ADTs: Law, Public Policy and Society; Environmental Science; Social Work. All will become available in September, if we wish to apply. Most of the curriculum in place already, but a few new courses may need to be developed. Day has already heard from faculty interested in developing.</p>
<p>11. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>12. Adjournment</p>	<p><b>3:25 PM</b></p>

**Attendees:** Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Sara Cooper (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (guest—CNSL), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), Andrew LaManque (Interim VP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Bruce McLeod (Apprenticeship), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Katy Ripp (KA), Lety Serna (CNSL), Lori Silverman (Interim Dean, PSME), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta