

College Curriculum Committee

Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, December 2, 2008

1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
1. Draft Minutes: November 4, 2008 & November 18, 2008	Action	#12/2/08-1 #12/2/08-2	Holcroft-Burns
2. Survey Draft Update	Discussion		Graham
3. Advance Placement: Review Process	Discussion		Day
4. Stand Alone Process Feedback from CCC Reps	Discussion		CCC Reps
5. Distance Education	Discussion		Graham
6. Division Curr Rep Reports	Information		CCC Reps
7. GE Area: Natural Science		#12/2/08-3	Francisco

Attachment List:

#12/2/08-1 Draft Minutes, November 4, 2008

#12/2/08-2 Draft Minutes, November 18, 2008

#12/2/08-3 Natural Science GE Draft #6

Distribution: R. Arca, L. Balducci, E. Barkley, B. Cashmore, S. Connell, B. Day, T. de la Cruz, K. Duncan, M. Francisco, S. Franco, D. Graham, C. Holcroft-Burns, M. Knobel, P. Murray, V. O'Neal, S. Pennington, D. Perez, K. Ripp, L. Rodriguez, L. Serna, B. Shewfelt, P. Spragge, K. Svetich, M. Thomas, C. Thunen, D. Uyeda, T. Woods, B. Ziegenhorn

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 4, 2008
1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Toyon Room**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: October 21, 2008	Approved with the following revisions: 1. PSME reported that MATH 103 and 104 are being deactivated this curriculum cycle. 2. Regular and Effective Contact: strike "Academic Senate is starting a committee to discuss this topic in detail." ALSO strike sentence "The CCC reps were instructed to take the draft back to constituents..." 3. In embedded hours section, add sentence "Judy Miner stated that faculty should make decisions regarding the embedded hours based on good pedagogy, and there would be no lash back at faculty who choose to remove the embedded hours from their course(s)."
2. Announcement: Message from the Foothill Academic Senate	Speaker: Dolores Davison Academic Senate Thanks for all your work on the GE pattern from the Academic Senate (AS). AS passed the four GE areas already forwarded to them, and are in support of sustaining the moratorium until all areas of the GE pattern are completed. By second meeting of Winter Quarter, if possible, please let Senate know when remaining three areas will be completed. It's imperative that these be forwarded to the Senate in a timely manner for discussion and passage before the end of the academic year.
3. Division Curriculum Reports	BHS: new class BTEC 10, reviewing embedded hours, Allied Health some embedded hours will stay but most will be removed. Horticulture and others have new curriculum. Counseling: Development of certificates of achievement for UC and CSU (see Bernie/Lety)—GE or IGETC (?) certification Fine Arts: all quiet, quite a few classes being modified. Nothing new PSME: see last mtg notes. PE: nothing new, 2 courses waiting for new GE pattern CTIS: 24 non-credit courses (runway courses) approved. Full-timers mentoring part-timers in curriculum development. Working on getting courses leading to Apple certification. Build connections with LINC faculty. Adaptive Learning: nothing to report. Language Arts: ENGL 31 has a title change to Latino Literature. BSS: nothing to report.
3. Follow-up FAQ's	Discussed FAQ answers sheet.
4. Convocation Follow-up	Resources Handout for SLOs given
5. Viability of Online Labs	Rather than speaking before the CCC, Tracy Ruscetti will be prepare a written report and will disseminate it to faculty upon completion.
6. Articulation Primer	Speaker: Bernie Day

Lots of layers to the question "Is this course transferable?" Considerations are ---transferrable to where? (See handout)

1. Is your course at baccalaureate level ? (courses #1-99)
2. CSU transferable? ---see guidelines. (generally evidence needed of writing and critical thinking.)
3. UC initiates the agreement rather than the CC.

Criteria must be specific and they change year by year. Requires a course to be offered at least ONE UC campus for our course to be articulated. Use OSCAR for application. (course # 1-49)

4. Course transferable for a major at a CSU, and these requirements are specific. See requirements. Must be submitted for approval at December 1 (not notified of approval until April)

And then there's IGETC (sp) and those specific requirements.

5. Course to course articulation: like course to like course at different colleges for comparable courses transfer.

6. Lower division articulation of a course for the major.
7. See handouts for more levels of articulation----(LDTP and out of state, private and independent universities, high school to college pathway)

QUESTIONS:

1. RE AP courses, etc What's the difference between comparable for pre-requisite waiver AND comparable for transfer to 4-year school?
2. AND often this brings up problems for hs students who don't do well in a course that then is part of their *college* transcript.
3. Pending issues: AP course credit policies, IB credit (international baccalaureate)
4. Transparency of articulation processes at all levels would be valuable. (within FH processes)
5. Articulation criteria for denial are in the packet given by Bernie Day as well as the process for articulation of a course.
6. Duncan urges all faculty to enjoin Bernie early in the course development process for possible transferability.
7. Bernie went over the Assist Course search and approval process. It's a fun new tool! Just ask Bernie!
8. If language is out dated the lead-in paragraph needs to be rewritten-does it have to through the whole process? Good Question! Bernie creates an annual report that shows substantive changes to universities- If Bernie knows that it just a language change tell her and she'll let the colleges know.

Course articulation summary-shows Foothill College pick this term, pick a course, and the website will produce a list of approved courses and what areas it is approved for i.e. CAN, IGETC, which universities accept it.

	<p>If it states no comparable course it means they are offering it as an upper division course.</p> <p>Private schools asking for course outlines-do we want to develop articulation with these schools? Bernie says-sure send it to Bernie. Check out our articulation webpage.</p> <p>That course may go into their database and not necessarily</p> <p>Reading and writing examples for Course outlines. PSME is summarizing the types of Rob to get back to us about decide as a college. It never happened, so PSME decided to summarize.</p> <p>We seem to be moving towards using the summary approach because of academic freedom. There is one value to standardizing this area for new faculty new members getting up to speed on curriculum issues.</p>
<p>7. GE Review</p>	<p>Touching base on</p> <p>Natural Sciences - Marnie, CCC voted down sent back to committee require a natural science lab, lab had to be conducted face to face. This is a political issue. Not everyone attended the first meeting, but meeting went well moving in a positive direction that is a good compromise, new life and thought to the process. Kathy Armstrong brought language from the Natural Science Foundation to be lifted into our document. Reminder that these are sensitive issues with hurt feelings, so the pace is measured and thoughtful and respectful that all voices are heard. CHB reminded that faculty feel strongly about what is best for our students - do not take it personally. It is for our students.</p> <p>The next meeting will have all stakeholders there so the expectation is that a good conversation/compromise may be reached.</p> <p>Life Long Understanding- Met once minus one person. Did not make decision without feedback from faculty. Establishing a common language in the introduction ??? NO-remain individual freedom.</p> <p>Historical: why is it a problem area-but not sure why. It is unclear what it means to math faculty-must do.</p> <p>YOU could not meet the criteria with only one criteria-you had to meet several. Now it is a catch-all. What is the connection between all of the courses? Learning that will take you throughout life. Conceptually is it a valuable area? Criteria needs to be more rigorous-and more than one - it may be the</p>

touchiest one. Need for more than two criteria. Life skills-soft skills how to interact in the world. Identify the specific areas. Divided into two areas- psychology/behavior/ health/ technical competency. What do we think?? Two areas? P.E. class teaches a specific skill-how does that teach me life long learning? Computer competency and PE classes were taken off the G.E. pattern, repackaging- left graduation requirements were so high and rigid, we came back to Title 5 to set up a package that left some important classes out. That should be there. Life Long understanding needs to get back to the original goal.

Idea-Mark bridging subject areas -three or 4 track and students are required to complete some from each-bridging those track. L5, L7 are unique to some divisions, but not all. It needs a broader spectrum-

L7 specifically -mandatory computer class. Develop a BSS class that requires technology to complete.

Library classes would fit into this category. Keep this broad, but not a catch-all.

Neophyte question-? This is for G.E. or not transfer?

Answer: NO! CSU has life long learning. Many students start as a transfer, then change to both tracks. We want students do both.

It is easy to forget when working on these -it is a document that is to help faculty develop curriculum, that is useful in that development. These documents have a dual purpose. Guidance to faculty and students.

Tracks may be a good approach.

What if the whole category was restructured as a mini broad category, with sub categories, from 4 or 5 and choose 3 of them, physical health fitness, information competency, economics person finance, etc. In that category Give flexibility to student to what they are interested in yet including important topics that there a lot of variety-Look at general studies- social science-for instance.

American Cultures???

Simon - discussion spirited, passionate, exciting almost life changing-this is an understatement! Very strong opinions that were expressed. The need for more input to go forward. Decided to contact more individuals with other contributions for a more comprehensive discussion.

Difficult -what is the nature of culture? Does American culture just mean ethnicity and disabilities and sexual orientation does not fit-others disagree.

	<p>Culture vs. community? What do we want for our students-what about a global perspective. Deaf culture? It is a culture. Same with discrimination-should we be studying ??? If it not an American cultural components that are here. There is lack of understanding of what is here. Without going global. What is America?? North, Central, South? All included? Should be the U.S. cultures.</p> <p>Lety- Berkeley's American Culture is a pretty good model.</p> <p>Gay and Lesbian culture? US culture, BEA-do you want representation for APL? Yes.</p> <p>Anthropology studies role action playing culture, online action culture. It's that diversity that everyone gets back to.</p> <p>How specific do we want to get -gay and lesbian Latino studies?</p> <p>How many cultures should be included? It's a melting pot. That's where we ended up -Sam</p> <p>Different perspectives for students-how to define a culture-is it based on discrimination?</p> <p>December 2 report back. Natural Sciences will have a near complete document-Marnie. American Cultures - us too.</p> <p>Last year, it seemed that we could only focus on one area per meeting. We still have the breadth issue.</p> <p>Can we have a sub committee to look at the breadth issue? Good idea to begin this before last three GE areas are done. Carolyn will continue to solicit volunteers to work on this. Mary Thomas-it's all part of a puzzle to fit together.</p>
8. Other Items	

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
College Curriculum Committee
Minutes
Tuesday, November 18, 2008
1:30– 4:00 p.m.

Attending: Rosemary Arca, Lauren Balducci, Bea Cashmore, Bernie Day, Kathleen Duncan, Marnie Francisco, Carolyn Holcroft-Burns, Marc Knobel, Peter Murray, Verley O’Neal, Simon Pennington, Barbara Shewfelt, Mary Thomas, Diane Uyeda, Bill Ziegenhorn, Larry Miller, Elizabeth Barkley, Theresa de la Cruz, Leti Serna, Duncan Graham, Kella Svetich, Phyllis Spargge, Kate Jordahl

Minutes Recorded by: Bill Ziegenhorn

1. Minutes:

Approval of minutes from November 4, 2008 meeting delayed until December 2 meeting

2. CSU LDTP Standards Announcement:

Carolyn Holcroft-Burns distributed a copy of an email memo from Gary Reichard and John Tarjan, the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Senate and Chief Academic Officer of California State University. The main message of the memo is that LDTP “be an additional transfer pathway, not the only pathway to transfer.” Bernie cautioned that this email was not necessarily the definitive position of CSU regarding LDTP. The topic of LDTP will be revisited at a future meeting.

3. Effective Online Contact Survey Update:

Kate Jordahl presented the results of the survey to date regarding effective online contact. Of the 300 Global Access users and additional faculty contacted via their CCC reps, 86 responded. Virtually all respondents either already uses or reaffirmed the value of each means of contact listed. A majority of respondents felt that 3, 4 or 5 days a week of teacher-student contact was optimal for an online course. 97% of respondents felt that there needed to be flexibility in required response times from faculty to students.

Carolyn Holcroft-Burns reasserted that the goal here is collecting and recommending best practices rather than mandating a specific type of contact. However, she reminded that we are state-mandated to document regular and effective contact in our separate approval process for distance learning courses.

At the suggestion of the chair, the CCC voted to close the online survey (Duncan moved/Thomas seconded: yea-unanimous /nay-0 /abstain-0)

Kate Jordahl and Duncan Graham volunteered to draft a document outlining best practices for regular and effective contact in distance ed courses based upon survey feedback. Carolyn has also opened an ETUDES project site for further discussion of the survey results and best practices. All CCC members will be active on the site as well as any other faculty interested in joining. Interested faculty should send ETUDES ID or email address to Carolyn. The site is titled FH PRJ CC CH.

4. Distance Education Approval Process:

Duncan Graham passed out an addendum sheet used by Long Beach CCD for their Distance Approval Process as a sample of what we might consider as a template for documentation of our separate approval process for distance ed courses. Discussion ensued over whether or not distance learning approval would be indicated on the course outline of record (CoR) and if so, where and how. There were conflicting concerns over distance learning being grounds for disarticulation of a course versus transparency of methods of instruction and delivery. Kate Jordahl and Duncan Graham offered to develop a list of the different options available, for future consideration at an upcoming meeting. These include (but are not limited to) a separate addendum for distance learning approval (i.e. NOT part of the course outline of record), a section on the course outline of record detailing online methods of instruction, and a box indicating that a college-wide distance learning standard (see item 3, above) has been met. This box may or may not be reflected on the printed version of the CoR, or it might appear only within the confines of the C3MS.

5. Non-Credit Curriculum Committee Update:

Carolyn noted the list of member on this committee and noted that four non-credit courses are coming forward as action items at the next noncredit curriculum committee meeting on November 25: in Parenting, NCP 400 Strong Start for Children, NCP 401 Nurturing Healthy Choices, NCP 402 Children and Family Resources, and in Tutoring, NCP 400 Rosetta Stone. In addition, many CTIS non-credit courses are being developed and proposed by the CTIS division faculty.

- Kathleen Duncan asked for confirmation that hiring preferences for non-credit and credit instructors is separate.
- Marnie Francisco requested notification of the agenda and minutes of non-credit committee meetings.
- Peter Murray voiced concern over the minimum qualifications for instructors teaching non-credit basic skills math courses.

6. Stand Alone Course Approval Process:

In anticipation that there will soon be a flood of courses requiring stand-alone approval, Carolyn asked the committee for feedback about what documentation

they would like to see (in addition to the course outline of record) when a course is brought for approval. In reviewing the document from the system office which outlined specific examples of courses that have previously been rejected for stand-alone approval, a recurring theme was failure to adhere to the college mission. Accordingly, Holcroft-Burns proposed that the committee might like to see a cover sheet attached to the CoR which would specifically address how that course serves the community college mission. CCC members were asked to deliberate about this and other information they think would be useful to have during the approval process.

7. Course Outline Information:

Bernie distributed several attachments giving many examples of types of assignments that have been accepted in other colleges' course outlines of record.

8. GE Breadth Requirements:

Carolyn agreed to chair a subcommittee to look at reviewing Foothill's GE Breadth requirements. The subcommittee would begin meeting in winter quarter. Kathleen and Leti Serna volunteered to participate. CCC reps were asked to solicit their constituents for more volunteers to serve on this subcommittee.

9. Division Curriculum Reports:

Each division discussed its curriculum review and approval process and relevant course changes.

Leti Serna and Kathleen Duncan discussed some potential advantages for students of offering an Associate's degree in Allied Health.

Graham responded to concerns over LINK courses by stressing that they would be brought into the CTIS curriculum process.

10. Advanced Placement Courses – Introduction:

Bernie noted the increased enrollment of high school students in Advanced Placement courses – 21% of students. Bernie also noted that successful AP exam scores count in various colleges and universities for units of credit, GE requirements, or course equivalency in a very erratic manner, and that the California Community College State Academic Senate has requested that colleges work to develop more consistent guidelines for awarding AP credit. She said that the CCC must develop a policy regarding approval of Advanced Placement exams for any of these areas. Each division will need to review its particular requirements for acceptance of Advanced Placement exam scores.

NATURAL SCIENCES

Natural science courses deal with the physical universe, the testable principles that govern its operations, its life forms, and its natural, measurable phenomena. One primary purpose of these courses is to promote an awareness of the methods of scientific inquiry and the power of scientific inquiry to describe the natural world. Emphasis is on understanding and applying the scientific method, which promotes a sense of discovery, fosters critical analysis, and encourages an understanding of the relationships between science and other human activities. A GE natural science course should exhibit the same methods and skills used by scientists when seeking an understanding of the uncertainty and complexity of the natural world.

A successful GE natural science course **must** promote in students:

- N1. an understanding of the scientific method, including its attributes and limitations.
- N2. the ability to make judgments regarding the validity of scientific evidence.
- N3. an understanding of the relationship between hypothesis, experiment, fact, theory and law.
- N4. the ability to use inductive and deductive reasoning.
- N5. the practice of thinking critically, including evaluating ideas and contrasting opinions.
- N6. the ability to evaluate, use and communicate scientific data.
- N7. an introduction to current scientific theories within the field of study.
- N8. experience with laboratory activities using lab techniques consistent with those employed within the discipline.
- N9. experience applying recognized scientific methodology in laboratory activities.*

Additional criterion thought to enhance a natural science course include any of the following:

- N10. an appreciation of the contributions of science to modern life.
- N11. an appreciation of the contributions to science of diverse people and cultures.
- N12. an understanding of the interdependence of humans and their environment.
- N13. a recognition of how human behavior has altered the environment.
- N14. a sense of the history of science and the ideas and experiments that have led to our present understanding.

Be advised that the following criteria for a GE lab is consistent with a definition provided by the National Research Council, 2005

Laboratory experiences provide opportunities for students to interact directly with the material world (or with data drawn from the material world), using the tools, data collection techniques, models, and theories of science. This definition includes student interaction with astronomical databases, genome databases, databases of climatic events over long time periods, and other large data sets derived directly from the material world. It does not include student manipulation or analysis of data created by a teacher to simulate direct interaction with the material world. For example, if a physics teacher presented students with a constructed data set on the weight and required pulling force for boxes pulled across desks with different surfaces and asked them to analyze these data, the students' problem-solving activity would not constitute a laboratory experience in the committee's definition.

* To accomplish these goals a laboratory course **must** emphasize the methods of scientific inquiry by engaging **students** in:

- NL1. Observation and collection of data through direct interaction with the material world.
- NL2. Use of tools, data collection techniques, models and theories of science most prevalent in relevant research laboratories.
- NL3. Data may be from large data sets derived directly from the material world, but may not rely exclusively on student manipulation or analysis of data created by a teacher to simulate direct interaction with the material world.
- NL4. Analysis and interpretation of data.
- NL5. Formulation and testing of hypotheses.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

11/14/2008

Attending: Chris, Kathy A., Kathleen D., Karen, Gillian, Marc, Marnie, Frank, Allison

NL6. Communicating effectively through oral and/or written work.

NL7. A minimum of one collaborative activity.

NL8. A minimum of one lab unit or the equivalent of 33 hours of laboratory instruction per quarter.

* Additional criterion thought to enhance a natural science lab include any of the following:

NL9. Keep accurate and complete experimental records.

NL10. Perform quantitative and qualitative measurements.

NL11. Interpret experimental results and draw reasonable conclusions.

NL12. Analyze data statistically and assess the reliability of results.

NL13. Critically evaluate the design of an experiment.

NL14. Design experiments to test hypotheses.

NL15. Work effectively in small groups and teams.