College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 27, 2018
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Room 3504

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 13, 2018	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** BSS: Plans to introduce new digital marketing certificate. Working on converting non-transcriptable certificates. Working on new SOC 45 course in Gender & Sexuality. Fine Arts: Working on certificates. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Bio Health: Attended guided pathways meeting. Biology dept. starting to look at possible certificates—some possibilities are STEM service learning; allied health certificates. Counseling: Working to clean up curriculum, and check for overlap in course content. SRC: Continuing to update courses, and develop courses for community-based program. PSME: CS dept. working on cloud computing and web development certificate. Language Arts: No updates to report. Library: No updates to report.

3. Announcements
  a. Notification of Proposed Requisites
 	
  b. Spring Registration Dates
	Speakers: Ben Armerding
	New corequisite for ENGL 246A, new course for 2019-20. Please share with your constituents.
	
	Mary Vanatta collecting information from each division about how to handle math requisites/Advisory statements. Would like all changes made by Feb. 28th, ahead of spring registration. CCC will follow up on this topic next quarter, before the deadline.

4. Stand Alone Approval Request: ENGL 246A	**Speaker: Ben Armerding** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ENGL 246A. Designed for AB 705 compliance. Language Arts reps highlighted that by allowing students to take this corequisite with ENGL 1AH we are providing opportunity to more students, as well as removing barriers to the honors program. Counseling rep noted concerns about errors in students' writing for college applications, as well as UC concerns in counseling bulletin—some UCs have questioned how grades can be high if the quality of writing does not meet standards. Counseling reps suggested caution about allowing students to enroll in ENGL 1AH. Language Arts division in process of setting up guided self-placement for all students, cannot restrict ESL students from using it; English dept. can no longer rely on placement exams.

	Language Arts rep noted that guided self-placement might not be effective for placing international students. Division will work with Honors Institute to address concerns and continue to communicate expectations of a course with transparency to students.
	Many division reps noted that an important goal for the college is for students to be able to communicate effectively. Fong remarked that norming across ENGL sections, in addition to communication across different disciplines, are conversations worth continuing. Many reps agreed that quality of writing is a shared responsibility among disciplines.
	Counseling rep highlighted that their division always encourages students to take MATH and ENGL courses first, to set up students for success in subsequent courses.
	Motion to approve **M/S** (Venkataraman, Thomas). **Approved.**
5. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCEL 405	**Speaker: Ben Armerding** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCEL 405. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Thomas, Gilstrap). **Approved.**
6. Program Creation Process Revision	**Speaker: Ben Armerding** Continuation of discussion from previous meeting, and first read of New Program Proposal form. Existing program creation process and documents (e.g., sign-off form, flowchart) do not work, due to new governance structure. CCC exploring possibility of creating a new flowchart; mindful that the conversation must include groups and perspectives from across campus. Many reps agreed that New Program Proposal form could help facilitate the gathering of as much feedback as possible from relevant groups elsewhere on campus. PSME rep commented that the form would give everyone more concrete information that should be communicated across different divisions. Armerding proposed adding boxes for feedback from different committees (e.g., Equity and Education) but not necessarily approval—this feedback could help authors with writing the new program narrative. Many reps agreed that the form should be shared out at an early stage to not waste anyone's time; agreed that its function is communication, not approval. Armerding highlighted that the form encourages faculty to answer questions to related to resources, and the program's relation to college goals. Language Arts rep mentioned it would be helpful to know the rationale for the program. Other reps suggested adding "transfer/workforce" selection. Bio Health rep noted value of knowing the purpose of program. Starer stressed need to be mindful of involving different stakeholders in new program creation process, especially those related to resources. Much discussion occurred regarding identifying resources, especially from a curriculum lens. Pennington stated would like to see examples of such resources, including classification (e.g., classroom space, new faculty, etc.). Fong noted hope that program and necessary resources would be discussed with

	division dean and faculty early in process. Many in group wondered how New Program Proposal form fits in with Program Review process, and anticipating what resources might be needed. Group agreed that it would be beneficial to align process with resource request form. Starer suggested consultation with Program Review Task Force; noted that it might not be necessary to consider Program Review, as that process is specific to existing programs, not new programs. Discussion regarding the workflow of the form. Group agreed the form should first come to CCC; however, Starer noted that if a program comes to CCC it should be discussed between division faculty and deans, and CCC might not be best venue to discuss resource allocation. Armerding proposed that decisions about curriculum be made at CCC, with other committees invited to put in expertise or interest. Language Arts rep suggested, for a new program addressing equity, important to consult Dean of Equity, or Equity and Education committee. BSS rep asked where Articulation Officer fits within process, and whether it's the purview of all these committees to comment on new programs. PSME rep noted possibility that new committees might not want the extra work. Starer noted that the more committees the form goes through, the more time it will take. Noted that the Academic Senate President should bring the form to Academic and Professional Matters (APM), since program creation is faculty purview. Armerding agreed it's important to meet with the chairs of the new committees to decide where they fit in the process. Suggested some of the committee work would be info only, will advocate CCC be the final approval step before a new program goes to the board. A few lingering questions include: Whether The Council has ability to determine program approval and discontinuance; How the distribution of resources would be evaluated, since that is not under the purview of CCC; Determining the right balance of feedback and information from the different governance committees. Discussion will continue at next meeting.
7. Credit by Exam Policy	**Speaker: Ben Armerding** Topic moved to next meeting, due to time constraint.
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	**3:33 PM**

Attendees: Ben Armerding (Faculty Co-Chair), Jeff Bissell (KA), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Stephanie Chan (LA), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Kimberly Escamilla (LA), Valerie Fong (Interim Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Rosa Nguyen (PSME), Simon Pennington (Dean, FA & KA), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ben Schwartzman (SRC), Lety Serna (CNSL), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Mary Thomas (Library), Anand Venkataraman (PSME), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: R. Nguyen