

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, June 1, 2021  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 18, 2021	<b>Approved by consensus.</b>
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p><b>Speaker: All</b> Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p> <p>Bio Health: Wrapping up Distance Learning Addendum submissions, Title 5 updates, Guided Pathways mapping, and a few other COR updates.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report; wrapping up FSAs.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Wrapping up Title 5 updates and DL Addendum submissions; waiting to review Program Maps until approval process finalized.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report; wrapping up Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Language Arts: Finishing up Title 5 updates and DL Addendum submissions.</p> <p>Library: No updates to report.</p> <p>PSME: Finishing up Title 5 updates and new courses. Finalizing new certificates from Computer Science dept.</p> <p>Articulation: Finally received CSU GE &amp; IGETC results; will be sending out info soon. ETHN 51 approved for Areas D &amp; F, and the other ETHN courses approved for Area D (denied for Area F). We can resubmit those ETHN courses for Area F for fall 2021; working with faculty right now. CSU has said they will respond to resubmissions by July 1st. If resubmissions not approved, we can then resubmit in December for fall 2022. Language Arts rep noted met with faculty this morning to discuss COR revisions for resubmission, and is optimistic. D. Lee asked Gilstrap if resubmitting CORs for Area F affects what was or will be submitted to UCs—Gilstrap noted that deadline for resubmissions for Area F is June 10th, and at that time he will also submit all ETHN courses for UC transferability. Also mentioned that if courses approved for UC transferability we can then move forward with submitting them for IGETC in December.</p> <p>Vanatta mentioned that Marketing is finalizing the 2021-22 catalog in CourseLeaf, which should go live very soon!</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p><b>Speakers: CCC Team</b> The following proposals were presented: C S 77A, 77B, 78W, 78X, 78Y, 78Z, 203A; ENGL 10A; NCBS 443A. Please share with your constituents. Gilstrap commented on C S 78W/X/Y/Z proposals' mention of the Computer Science ADT, noting that the current TMC will not allow for these to be added. Also noted that "W" usually used in section number on schedule to notate an online course, so using that letter in a course number could look confusing. Also asked about corequisite listed on C S 203A and NCBS</p>

<p>b. Division Reps for 2021-22</p> <p>c. Upcoming COR Deadline—June 18</p> <p>d. Curriculum Institute Virtual Conference (July 7-9)</p>	<p>443A proposals—PSME rep believes these new courses will be an optional coreq for C S 3A, for students who need additional assistance, similar to MATH 248A. D. Lee asked if intent of NCBS 443A is to offer a free version of C S 203A—Subramaniam confirmed. D. Lee asked how load will be affected—Subramaniam noted similar situation in EMS, in which the noncredit version does not carry load, only the credit version (students for both are together in one classroom).</p> <p>Reaching the end of this year, so we should start planning for next year's CCC reps, as well as GE subcommittee membership. Kuehnl asked reps to let him and/or Vanatta know who their division's reps will be for next year.</p> <p>Vanatta reminded the group of the upcoming deadline for CORs for all new courses and major changes to transferable courses.</p> <p>CCC Team will be attending, and Kuehnl encouraged the group to attend. Reach out to Kuehnl if you're interested.</p>
<p>5. New Program Application: Biochemistry AS</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of new Biochemistry AS degree. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Schultheis). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>6. New Program Application: Data Analytics CA</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of new Data Analytics Certificate of Achievement. D. Lee asked if application mentions Pathstream curriculum—BSS rep responded that Pathstream is mentioned in narrative, but narrative does not state that students must use it. Subramaniam doesn't believe this particular issue is a concern.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Venkataraman, Pereira). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>7. New Program Application: Network Computing CA</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Network Computing Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Guided Pathways Mapping Approval Process</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Second read of Guided Pathways Program Map Approval Process. Document has been updated, based on discussion during first read. PSME rep asked whether updated "Department faculty" language means that all dept. faculty must be involved in creation of Maps—Vanatta explained that during first read there was a suggestion to add dept. chairs to document, and clarification from Fatima Jinnah that Guided Pathways (GP) team works with chair (if dept. has one) as well as other dept. faculty, and Jinnah suggested that "Department faculty/chair" be used in document. Does not mean that all dept. faculty must participate.</p> <p>D. Lee concerned with use of the word "viability" (in Background section), noting word is loaded, and asked what our obligation is to students once a Map is published, re: offering classes. Kuehnl responded that process assumes dept. provides information about when and how often classes are being offered, and GP team brings such information from other depts./divisions (for any outside courses listed on Map). Noted that Maps will be updated annually, which can provide opportunity to clear up issues if courses listed aren't being offered frequently enough. Lisle cautioned that listing a course on a Map won't guarantee that it will end up being offered, noting she has seen some Maps that list courses that haven't been offered in a while (and in some cases would result in single-digit enrollment, if offered). Believes document should include process for reviewing Maps with a critical lens, and wonders if CCC or Academic Senate should be the venue for discussions about making tough decisions re: course offerings.</p>

	<p>Kuehnl noted that deans are bringing expertise re: frequency of offerings—Lisle worried that deans having to be the "bad guys" when it comes to scheduling courses. Very concerned about this particular part of the conversation and believes discussions are critical, but at the same time doesn't want to derail the momentum of moving forward with GP.</p> <p>Kuehnl understands and wonders if this is an issue of messaging vs. including in approval process. Fine Arts rep agreed with Lisle and D. Lee, noting their dept. considered every single course listed on their Map in terms of flexibility re: face-to-face vs. online, and providing options for students. Noted it would be a big issue to list a core course that isn't frequently offered or can't be substituted with a different course. Emphasized that flexibility and/or options for students should be a part of Map creation process.</p> <p>Kuehnl asked the group for thoughts on how to move forward with the document, considering this is a second read. D. Lee mentioned "viability" again, adding that CCC recently discussed the program creation process. Worried that GP process could be misconstrued as affecting program viability. Kuehnl agreed, noting that "program viability" terminology commonly used to discuss the possibility of discontinuing a program. PSME rep added that using the word "assure" (also in Background section) is problematic, as listing a course on a Map won't necessarily guarantee that the course will be offered for the student. Kuehnl suggested removing the language "... to assure the viability of the Program Map" from the document.</p> <p>Vanatta mentioned comments made by Kurt Hueg during first read, noting that this document is for formal approval of Maps that have already been created, and hope is that once we have worked with Maps for a year CCC (or a different body) can create process or instructions for creation of Maps. D. Lee asked for clarification, noting that Process section includes details about creation of Maps—Vanatta suggested that perhaps she and Kuehnl listed that info in the wrong section of the document and that it should be moved to the Background section. Clarified that this document is specific to approval of Maps that have already been finalized and are ready for formal approval. Kuehnl added that CCC was asked by Academic Senate to create a process for final approval of Maps that have already been created and finalized by the GP team and depts. Noted that perhaps document contains too many details, which has resulted in lack of clarity.</p> <p>Lisle mentioned need to determine process for discussing disagreements between faculty and/or dean, when Map is being created, noting that dean's input is critical re: scheduling of courses.</p> <p>Kuehnl will follow up outside of meeting and update document to bring back for third read, and possible action, at next meeting. Hope is for process to be approved by the end of the year, so that this year's Maps may be approved.</p>
<p>9. CCC Priorities for 2021-22</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b></p> <p>Kuehnl sent out survey to the group; received 11 responses. Shared results with the group: Formalize Program Creation Process voted highest, followed by Continue Load and Seat Count Discussion (Kuehnl noted need to follow up with Faculty Association [FA] on that topic), Continue Guided Pathways Discussion, Include Equity Affirmation in Title 5 Updates. List won't necessarily dictate what will be agendized, but helps CCC Team create agendas throughout the year. Vanatta asked for clarification re: Establish Curriculum Start Date topic—Gilstrap suggested topic, which would be a discussion of changing our academic year to begin in fall, instead of summer (which is how most colleges operate, including De</p>

	<p>Anza). Mentioned that starting our year in summer has articulation implications, but acknowledged that changing to fall would likely affect other operations, as well. D. Lee mentioned Continue Load and Seat Count Discussion topic, asking how CCC would be involved in discussion since those things are negotiated—Kuehnl believes CCC could discuss the topic and forward concerns to FA.</p>
<p>10. ASCCC Consultation Report Out</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b>          Kuehnl shared that the Curriculum Best Practices ad hoc group requested consultation with ASCCC regarding our local processes and to gain a neutral perspective, especially to determine the legality of our division CC structure. Formal meeting was last week; Kuehnl, Gilstrap, Kathryn Maurer, Svetich, Meneses met with consultants. Consultants feel strongly that our division CC structure is legal per Title 5 and other requirements, noting that as long as faculty are driving the structure and decision making within the structure, we are operating within Title 5.</p> <p>During consultation, took a deep dive into our structure, resulting in determination that individual division CCs must follow legal requirements of Brown Act, if we are going to continue to allow division CCs to have sole approval authority over certain aspects of curriculum. This will be a big change for some divisions, but might not affect others too greatly. In a nutshell, this means agenda must be published 72 hours in advance, two reads required for all action items, and student representation on division CCs. PSME rep asked if CCC meetings recorded and available publicly—no, but our minutes serve as public record of meetings. Fine Arts rep asked if Brown Act requires printed agendas/minutes to be posted publicly on campus (once we're back on campus), and asked for advice on how to recruit students. Vanatta mentioned she posted printed-out CCC agendas and minutes in breezeway of Admin building, until campus shutdown (now, those are posted only online), and expects to do so, again, once campus reopens. ASFC rep noted that ASFC would recruit students; Kuehnl suggested recruiting students specific to each division. Kuehnl hopeful that students will be interested to serve on division CCs, since discussions will be more relevant to their curricular interests (vs. CCC).</p> <p>Kuehnl emphasized that in order to continue with our decentralized model, division CCs must follow Brown Act; otherwise, we will have to change to a centralized model, with CCC serving as approval body for all curriculum. Believes that making this change will result in an improvement to our process. Fine Arts rep suggested division CC minutes be posted on CCC website—Vanatta clarified that they already are; any minutes forwarded to her by the division reps are posted. D. Lee asked for clarification re: specific requirement for agendas being sent out 72 hours in advance (e.g., does it need to be posted online or send to all faculty, etc.)—Kuehnl believes it must be posted. Kuehnl noted some divisions don't currently have formal meetings, and he needs to follow up with consultants to find out if formal meetings are required; will work with those divisions to ensure they're meeting requirements. ASFC rep asked how CCC plans to communicate to student govt. re: recruitment process of student reps—Kuehnl responded would go through Academic Senate, and believes that divisions will need to be involved. Library rep mentioned possible creation of new LRC division and how that may affect CCC.</p> <p>Kuehnl will work with division CCs to ensure we're following all requirements starting in fall quarter, for the upcoming year. Noted that the current allowance for online-only meetings is temporary, but believes they will continue to be allowed. Allen concerned about potential difficulty for Apprenticeship division, when working with their community partners—Kuehnl hopeful that changes won't be as severe as Allen might be thinking,</p>

Approved, June 15, 2021

	and will be happy to work with Apprenticeship division. D. Lee asked if division CC meetings considered "regular meetings," noting that Brown Act includes different types of meetings, with "regular meetings" occurring at regular intervals. Kuehnl believes that the expectation is for division CC meetings to occur with some sort of regularity—will need to follow up.  Kuehnl will be working with leadership team over the summer to ensure that the division CCs are ready to go in the fall.
11. Good of the Order	
12. Adjournment	<b>3:34 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Anthony Cervantes (Dean, Enrollment Services), Owen Flannery (KA), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee (CNSL), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean—FA & KA), Laurence Lew (BSS), Kristy Lisle (VP Instruction), Don Mac Neal (KA), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Ron Painter (PSME), Kas Pereira (BSS), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Kella Svetich (LA), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Priya Vasu (ASFC), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta