College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 4, 2020
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 21, 2020	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** BSS: Working on curriculum sheets. Language Arts: Working on curriculum sheets; renewing focus on noncredit certificate and noncredit coreqs re: AB 705, and guided pathways. PSME: Working on curriculum sheets; working on new web development certificate in C S dept. Bio Health: Working on curriculum sheets. Counseling: No updates to report. Fine Arts: Working on Content Review forms. SRC: Working on COR updates. Articulation: No updates to report. Library: No updates to report.
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** The following proposal was presented: C S 70R series. Please share with your constituents. No comments.
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Listed are new requisites for V T 88A. Please share with your constituents. No comments.
c. Digital Marketing Certificate Approval	The CCCCO has approved the Digital Marketing Certificate of Achievement! Because it includes new courses for 2020-21, the certificate will be added to the Business Administration curriculum sheet effective summer 2020.
d. LMI for New CTE Programs	Teresa Ong, AVP of Workforce, has found that the LMI usually gathered by faculty when creating new CTE programs is not sufficient for review by BACCC, which requests LMI from a specific group (Center of Excellence). Program creation templates will be updated with guidance from Ong, to guide faculty to request LMI from Center of Excellence from the start of the creation process. Lee noted importance of faculty determining viability of program at the very beginning of the process, in general; Vanatta noted that faculty likely begin conversation with dean/division when creating a new program, so helpful for dean/reps to mention LMI to faculty from the start. Bio Health rep asked how to handle programs currently going through creation process—Kuehnl suggested to request LMI as soon as possible. Language Arts rep asked about implications re: Program Review—Kuehnl unsure; noted that LMI usually gathered only for CTE programs.
4. Consent Calendar a. Web Design Certificate of Achievement—updated	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** The following certificate application was presented: Web Design (Fine Arts). This program was approved by CCC in fall quarter, but the division has decided to make some updates before submitting it to the CCCCO (removing some courses); thus, it needs re-approval. Vanatta noted that

	program was part of the streamlined process, which is why it's on the Consent Calendar. Bio Health rep noted that Narrative states there are no comparable programs in the area, but LMI lists programs in the Bay Area. Kuehnl explained difficulty of determining what should be considered local to our district; noted that LMI includes entire Bay Region. Determination of "local" can depend on the discipline, as well as online instruction. Fine Arts rep noted that program has yet to receive BACCC approval, so there is the possibility that one of those other colleges objects during that process. Motion to approve **M/S** (Schultheis, Venkataraman). **Approved.**
5. New Program Application: Film, Television, and Electronic Media Certificate of Achievement	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of new Film, Television, and Electronic Media Certificate of Achievement. Feedback received from governance groups is positive. PSME rep asked if there is a repository of program documents that faculty can refer to when creating a new program—Vanatta said there is not, but she has archives and is happy to send examples to faculty, on request. Language Arts rep asked about SFSU being mentioned primarily in Narrative, but SJSU also mentioned in Item 7—Fine Arts rep believes program is primarily associated with SFSU. Kuehnl noted that info listed in Item 7 is supposed to list competing programs; PSME rep agrees. Fine Arts rep will follow up with faculty. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
6. Program Deactivation: Nanoscience	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of deactivation of the Nanoscience program (AS degree). Memo notes deactivation is due to insufficient demand. PSME rep noted that NANO courses haven't been taught for a few years and that nanoscience, in general, has become less popular than when the program was created. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
7. Courses not Taught in Four Years	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Vanatta has prepared this year's list; noted courses on the list that were approved for an extension last year, but the term indicated on their form has yet to occur (e.g., spring 2020). Group needs to determine if such courses should be granted carryover approval or required to resubmit. BSS rep noted some courses are cross-listed—for administrative purposes, only one version is ever taught; for articulation purposes, need to keep both on the books. Vanatta noted that CCC could vote to grant blanket exceptions for cross-listed courses (similar to what happened with Independent Study courses last year). Reps engaged in discussion regarding different methods of offering cross-listed courses. Motion to grant carryover approval to courses approved for an extension last year, which listed a term on their form that has yet to occur **M/S** (Francisco, Schultheis). **Approved.** Vanatta will email the list with instructions/deadline tomorrow.
8. Ad Hoc Groups	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Related to recent discussions regarding GE subcommittees, honors course prerequisite, and our curriculum model. Kuehnl discussed topics with Isaac Escoto, AS President, and with CCC Team; resulted in the suggestion of creating an ad hoc group for each topic. PSME rep asked what the charge would be for each group (particular task, timeline, etc.)—Kuehnl would like CCC to discuss and determine; for example, GE subcommittee ad hoc group could draft a document outlining discussions that have happened at CCC and suggest a solution to the current issue. Acknowledged that the topic of honors prereq is weightier and should include involvement of people outside of CCC. Gilstrap added that issue with honors prereq speaks to how decisions are made on campus; noted that there is a lot of ambiguity around

whether or not the prereq has been removed yet. Fine Arts rep supports creation of ad hoc group to discuss GE subcommittees; believes there is not enough training for those serving on the subcommittees. Mentioned that the course substitution forms submitted by students are difficult to review and that training would be helpful for those. Language Arts rep mentioned the equity aspect of the honors course prereq topic and that including equity in ad hoc group would be valuable.

Kuehnl suggested that the ad hoc group for the curriculum model topic involve the creation of a handbook and/or Canvas site for division reps. SRC rep agreed that Canvas could be a good way to provide training; noted that other colleges do this. Kuehnl would like ad hoc group to go deeper than just a handbook and consider drafting best practices for divisions to follow. Noted inconsistencies between different divisions' practices, as well as from year-to-year within a single division due to turnover of reps. Language Arts rep suggested that curriculum model group include discussion of training for new reps. Kuehnl noted that Canvas site could include examples of forms for reps to use as reference.

Gilstrap suggested that honors prereq group include program directors, honors counselors and faculty, students, himself. Kuehnl suggested not necessarily asking current GE subcommittee members to serve on that ad hoc group, due to the workload they already have for the subcommittees. Language Arts rep asked if there is an issue with having people outside of CCC serve on ad hoc groups and if they would need to become CCC members—Kuehnl doesn't think so; noted that GE subcommittee members don't have to be CCC reps. Lee agreed that it's good to have people outside of CCC be involved in ad hoc groups.

Kuehnl suggested that a formal process at CCC to approve mandate for groups should occur before groups are launched. Kuehnl will begin drafting such a process, to include timelines and specifics for each ad hoc group. Will follow up with Escoto to see if AS approval needed. Kuehnl will email reps to initiate creation of groups.

9. Loads and Seat Counts	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Anthropology dept. faculty, Kathy Perino from FA, Escoto, and others engaged in discussions in the fall, prompted by request of Anthropology faculty to appeal seat counts for certain courses. Currently, no appeals process exists. Attachments to agenda are from discussions at other colleges, which Escoto got from ASCCC. Topic concerns how pedagogy is considered when determining seat counts, as well as reviewing seat counts that historically have been low, which Kuehnl acknowledged is a sensitive topic. Additional concerns are productivity and how to find a balance between divisions. BSS rep noted discrepancy between seat counts for ANTH labs at De Anza and Foothill, even though they're the same course—this prompted the discussion and involves equity across the district. Fine Arts rep also noted discrepancy between seat counts at DA and FH; mentioned that room capacity plays a part. Also noted examples of seat counts remaining the same after a course moved to online delivery. Language Arts rep noted recent discussions re: AB 705 and seat counts for coreqs; expressed desire for transparency, consistency, and opportunity to change seat counts in some cases. Kuehnl noted that rubric used by other college (on attachment) resulted in some seat counts increasing. Bio Health rep mentioned load task force from a few years ago, which did address many inconsistencies in loads between DA and FH. Kathryn Maurer, Anthropology faculty, joined the discussion; noted that Perino explained that the load task force had a specific target of looking at DA and FH inconsistencies, and that they still have ongoing discussions and clean-up.

| | Noted their acknowledgement that seat counts are an issue and their suggestion that the discussions be handled by CCC. Kuehnl noted that Escoto stated this issue is within purview of CCC, specifically. Noted that different disciplines have different workloads, which has been discussed; agreed with issue of seat counts not changing when course moved to online delivery (e.g., course that had small seat count due to room capacity not increased when taught online). Kuehnl displayed rubric and example of class size calculator (on attachment)—rubric is a starting point, and calculator is a more complex process. Kuehnl emphasized that using such a process will likely raise some seat counts; not everyone's will go down.

Fine Arts rep asked how stacked classes would be affected—Kuehnl unsure but believes total number of students would be balanced between the sections. Kuehnl noted he teaches stacked classes and acknowledged that he doesn't always pay attention to keeping them balanced. Fine Arts rep noted example of stacked classes becoming over-filled; Kuehnl suggested this is a discussion that faculty should have with their dean, if it's becoming an issue. Fine Arts rep noted that some faculty have voiced concern that those who teach online are sometimes expected to teach more students in a section than those who teach on campus. Maurer noted she has found it helpful to differentiate between seat count (# of students in class) and enrollment cap (max # that can enroll in a class)—helps to keep things clear during discussions. Noted that most of documents, including faculty contract, state that online classes must have same enrollment cap as on-campus; was told by Perino that this is because colleges were likely to set higher cap for online than on-campus, with no consideration being given to workload for faculty teaching online. Maurer mentioned recent statewide discussions regarding online workload, with some colleges starting to set lower caps for online offerings because workload for instructors is actually higher.

Maurer mentioned "load creep"—increasing unit count on a course, which increases the load, with no good rationale for doing so. This impacts depts. that didn't raise units, because those faculty need to teach more classes per year to meet load. Lee mentioned impact on part-time faculty, who have a maximum load of .666 for the year. Fine Arts rep noted ensuring equity in engaging with each student during class time, and how seat counts can affect this. BSS rep suggested that rubric on attachment is a good model; Kuehnl agreed that it could be used as a starting point, but that additional considerations would need to be taken. Language Arts rep agreed with value in assessing model suggested on attachment to see if it's something we can use. Fine Arts rep suggested considering the difference between experiential and theory-based courses. Other Fine Arts rep suggested reviewing student success data from colleges that have implemented rubric, to see if seat count changes have had any impact on students.

Conversation will continue at a future meeting. |
|---|---|
| 10. Good of the Order | |
| 11. Adjournment | **3:38 PM** |

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (guest—Dean, APPR), Stephanie Chan (LA), Mark Ferrer (SRC), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Marc Knobel (PSME), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Debbie Lee (guest—Acting Dean, FA & KA), Kathryn Maurer (guest—BSS), Dokesha Meacham (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Ron Painter (PSME), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta