

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 16, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl CCC approved Resolution Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings Pursuant to Brown Act Provisions Included in AB 361 at Oct. 5th meeting. At that time, the group intended resolution to apply to the entirety of fall quarter, we are required to reaffirm it every 30 days.</p> <p>Motion to reaffirm resolution M/S (Herman, Venkataraman). Approved. 1 abstention</p>
2. Minutes: November 2, 2021	Approved by consensus.
3. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All PSME: No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Working on updating ESL mirrored courses; reapplying for Foothill GE Area II for ESLL 26; working on ideas for Journalism and other English activities.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Two new certificates on today's agenda; starting on self-evaluation.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Questions and concerns re: Guided Pathways (do Programs Maps go through division CC? are approved Maps available for students to see?)— contacted the GP team and received a response but wondering if others have similar questions/concerns. Hoping for clarity when topic discussed later today. Requested CCC discuss AB 928, which mentions Guided Pathways. Kuehnl noted that last year CCC decided that division CCs will approve completed Maps, but no process has been created for ongoing review—will need to be determined.</p> <p>SRC: Ran into some issues re: Title 5 courses which prompted questions, so still wrapping up that work.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: Working on new certificates—trying to determine process, since governance groups no longer exist. Have been told to skip Feedback Form step, at this time. Kuehnl noted that the interim council is not going to be able to review new programs during the two-week window—not necessarily skipping Feedback Form step but it's sort of a formality, at this time.</p> <p>Bio Health: No updates to report.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap reported he's currently working on Computer Science ADT and Business Administration 2.0 ADT. Mentioned that AB 928, which creates a single transfer GE pattern, is currently in the very early stages. Technically, we already have one transfer GE pattern (IGETC), but there are concerns (mostly re: CSU GE allowing things that IGETC does not). Is part of group</p>

	<p>of Articulation Officers which has sent a letter to ICAS to voice concerns re: fairness and equity for students. Reminded the group about the upcoming Dec. 1st deadline for new submissions for CSU GE and IGETC.</p> <p>Hueg reported that the Interim AVP Instruction position will be posted soon. Is part of group that met today to discuss reactivating SLO process; hoping that it will be not a compliance exercise but a valuable process to increase focus on teaching and learning.</p> <p>Vanatta thanked the group for their hard work on getting most Title 5 courses in before the deadline. Would like to have discussion about how things went with having two COR deadlines, which was unique for this year.</p>
<p>4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>Lee asked if there are actions we can take early to prepare for some of the possibilities that may happen re: changes to IGETC related to Ethnic Studies; for example, proactively submitting ETHN courses for Areas 3 & 4. Gilstrap believes IGETC will create new Area 7 but will not add additional units to full GE pattern—is not involved, but has heard about conversations. Does believe students will be able to double-count (use ETHN course for two different Areas). Plans to submit ETHN courses for Area 4; if faculty want to submit them for Area 3, please reach out to him.</p>
<p>5. Announcements a. ASCCC Fall Plenary Update b. GE Subcommittees & Ad Hoc Groups</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team Packet of adopted resolutions was attached as info item. Reach out to Kuehnl with any questions.</p> <p>GE subcommittees looking pretty good—Kuehnl thanked everyone who stepped up. Could still use help in Areas 3 & 5 (each has only one member), so please reach out if you'd like to join. Also, a few faculty have reached out to him about being involved in Equity Action Plan group—please reach out if you're interested in that group and/or the one for Faculty and Student Curriculum Primers (goal is to start work in January). Also moving forward with finalizing new program creation process, and still looking for folks to participate in ad hoc group to review Foothill GE process—reach out to him if interested in either of these, as well.</p>
<p>6. Cross-List Request: HUMN 11 & MDIA 11</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Cross-listed Course Approval Request for HUMN 11 (new course for 2022-23) & MDIA 11 (existing course). No comments.</p> <p><i>See item 9 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>7. Cross-List Request: HUMN 11H & MDIA 11H</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Cross-listed Course Approval Request for HUMN 11H (new course for 2022-23) & MDIA 11H (existing course). No comments.</p> <p><i>See item 9 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>8. Cross-List Request: HUMN 12 & MDIA 12</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Cross-listed Course Approval Request for HUMN 12 (new course for 2022-23) & MDIA 12 (existing course). No comments.</p> <p><i>See item 9 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>9. Cross-List Request: HUMN 13 & MDIA 13</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Cross-listed Course Approval Request for HUMN 13 (new course for 2022-23) & MDIA 13 (existing course). No comments.</p> <p>Group agreed to vote on items 6-9 as one motion. Motion to approve Items 6-9 M/S (Armstrong, Gomes). Approved.</p>
<p>10. New Program Application: Introduction to Sports Medicine CA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Introduction to Sports Medicine Certificate of Achievement. No specific comments (<i>see item 11 for related comments</i>).</p>

<p>11. New Program Application: Advanced Sports Medicine CA</p>	<p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p> <p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Advanced Sports Medicine Certificate of Achievement. Ong noted concerns about how student completes program; tried to map it out, and concerned there are too many permutations. Wonders how many students will actually take KINS 62C/D/E, since enrollment numbers are so low. Wonders if the program should be tightened up some. Kuehnl asked if KINS 62 courses are stacked—Lee responded that they are, but agreed that Ong's point is important (re: enrollment), as well as frequency of offerings. Ong compared program with those at other colleges, which have fewer units required for internship. Hueg noted similar concerns re: ITRN courses, which are supposed to be used for paid internship work; noted that ITRN courses can be used for any discipline. Vanatta mentioned email conversation w/ Warren Voyce, which explained that KINS 62 courses intended to be used for Foothill's Athletic Treatment Center, and ITRN courses used for local clinics, outside of Foothill. Students may take units from both KINS 62 courses and ITRN courses, if they wish to do both (but would not use ITRN courses for Athletic Treatment Center).</p> <p>PSME rep commented on master's degree requirement mentioned in LMI—Lee responded that to become an athletic trainer, education requirements recently changed from needing a bachelor degree to needing a master degree. Rep asked how this corresponds to an increased demand for the program—Ong responded that this change did somewhat diminish the need for athletic training program pathways to CSUs. Unsure how much this was discussed within the dept., but has been brought up at regional meetings.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>12. New Program Application: Plumbing & Pipefitting Apprenticeship AS</p>	<p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p> <p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Plumbing & Pipefitting Apprenticeship AS degree. Gilstrap commented on two pathways, which have different units—Allen responded that each pathway corresponds to a training program at a specific site. Gilstrap noted narrative states 24 students will be able to obtain AS degree and asked if these students have completed GE requirements—Allen responded that this number refers to the current class, who would have the ability to move forward with completing the degree if it is approved.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>13. Planning for Winter CCC Meetings</p>	<p>Speakers: Kurt Hueg & Eric Kuehnl Starting in winter quarter, CCC will need to have a quorum meeting in person. Need to determine if we will be able to regularly achieve a quorum—first meeting is Jan. 18th. BSS rep asked if there has been any discussion of setting up rooms on campus in order to have effective, equitable hybrid meetings; has prior experience in COOL Committee of trying to hold hybrid meetings, but found that folks attending online were unable to effectively participate. Need a fairly high-tech room with multiple screens and mics. Kuehnl mentioned tentative plans for CCC to use a room in the KCI; Academic Senate (AS) will be holding a trial run of a meeting in this room, which is supposedly ideally suited for a hybrid meeting. PSME rep asked if this room is available to be used for regular meetings—Kuehnl unsure. Hueg noted deans met with Bill Matsumoto, from ETS, to create list of meeting rooms and classrooms which are top priority, including this room in the KCI. High priorities are Toyon Room and President's Conference Room, where CCC usually meets; then rooms in PSEC. Believes KCI room may be used to schedule regular meetings. Mentioned supply chain issues, since many companies/schools also trying to beef up meeting room setups to accommodate hybrid meetings. Acknowledged that it is very frustrating to hold hybrid meetings, which the deans have been doing using the Library conference room. Has asked Matsumoto to help find interim solutions, to</p>

	<p>use rooms more effectively until we can get the new hardware.</p> <p>Bio Health rep noted that she and other rep unable to attend CCC meetings during winter quarters, because of their schedules, which will impact CCC's ability to reach a quorum; asked if other members of division CC could attend on their behalf. PSME rep asked if participating virtually counts as being in the quorum—Kuehnl cautioned that there are a lot of requirements, including being within the service area, and posting the agenda at the place you're meeting from (even if it's your home). Hoping to avoid that by being able to have a quorum on campus. Fine Arts rep suggested polling attendees to see who might be able to attend—looks close. Kuehnl asked if anyone who doesn't think they can make it to campus lives within the service area. BSS rep noted Wejoinin sheets and Microsoft Teams, which could be used for members to sign up beforehand, to help ensure quorum—Kuehl agreed this is a good idea. Vanatta also cautioned against using virtual attendees for quorum, noting that attendee's meeting place must be posted on agenda, and would need to allow members of public to enter if they wish to attend (even if it's your home). Apprenticeship rep noted he may not be able to attend all meetings; agreed that sign-up is a good idea, for planning ahead. Bio Health rep asked for clarification, if a replacement faculty member attending would count toward quorum—Kuehnl noted there is a proxy option, but will need to look into it. Believes rep can designate a substitute to act as proxy, without that person having to be formally approved as a rep. But might make sense for someone else to step up as a rep during winter quarter.</p> <p>SRC rep noted he will be on campus but will need to leave early to teach at 3:30, and asked if this affects the quorum—Kuehnl believes should be fine, but will need to ensure any committee business happens before rep leaves (if his leaving affects quorum). Subramaniam noted that being on the cusp of having quorum will mean no flexibility, re: emergency situations or anything preventing folks from being unable to attend, in person, at the last minute. Cautioned against being on the cusp of a quorum.</p> <p>Kuehnl noted these Brown Act rules will affect division CC meetings, as well: publishing agenda 72 hours in advance, having a quorum attend in person, having a student rep on each division CC. Kuehnl has reached out to ASFC (re: student reps) but hasn't made progress, yet. PSME rep asked about if mandatory for student to attend every meeting—Kuehnl responded that student reps should be appointed by CCC and it's then up to them to attend the meetings. There should be a confirmed student rep for each division CC, and their attendance does affect quorum. Fine Arts rep asked if student needs to be from within their division, and if the student will be voting—Kuehnl believes they are a voting member. Vanatta noted her attendance sheet lists student rep as non-voting member, so should confirm; Kuehnl noted AS's student rep is voting member. BSS rep asked what constitutes a quorum—Kuehnl responded 50% + 1. Rep asked if division CC meetings need to be in a public place or if reps can use their offices—Hueg responded that the purpose of the Brown Act is to enable public to attend meetings. Rep asked if divisions will need to schedule meeting room to allow for hybrid meetings—Kuehnl responded if division believes folks will attend virtually, then yes. Rep asked for guidance from AS regarding how divisions should hold these meetings. Kuehnl noted that some divisions use division conference rooms for division CC meetings.</p>
<p>14. Program Mapper Demo</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Guest presenters: Isaac Escoto, Natalie Latteri, Amy Leonard—all involved in Guided Pathways (GP). First read of GP Proposal to CCC to Recommend Foothill College's Purchase, Implementation, and Maintenance of Program Pathways Mapper. CCC being asked to approve</p>

	<p>proposal, so college can move forward with adopting Program Pathways Mapper technology. Hueg noted decision has not yet been made regarding whether or not to buy software; has been in discussions about resources, including staffing, and hopes to have a decision in the next few weeks. Latteri shared link to software, but would like to first address questions and concerns about Program Maps.</p> <p>Escoto reminded the group that Maps are used to help students see a path, especially if they're overwhelmed by all of the options they're seeing, or are feeling lost. Last year, Maps reviewed by dept. chairs, who had time to share with their colleagues; GP team worked with Gilstrap on articulation-related details. Policy approved by CCC in June mentions need to create additional policy for ongoing review of Maps. Acknowledged some faculty have felt left out, during the GP process, but others are very excited about GP and Maps. Noted that link on GP webpage to last year's Maps is to grant access to folks who want it (primarily counselors), but is not being widely marketed/shared. Leonard shared link to Canvas page, which is not student-facing; mentioned requests to create Canvas shell that is available to students, and suggested reps share Canvas link. Those who have concerns can reach out to Leonard, Escoto, Latteri. Echoed importance of drafting process for ongoing review of Maps.</p> <p>Lee noted that process is to submit Maps to division CCs for approval, but hasn't seen Maps mentioned in division CC minutes from last year. Also asked if following steps listed in process occurred last year: conversation w/ faculty outside of division (for Maps that include courses from outside the division); Maps being sent to CCC as info items. Leonard explained that process for new Maps was approved after last year's Maps were created. Lee asked what the process would be for faculty who want to update their Maps—Leonard responded that faculty should contact division reps if updates need to be made, who may then reach out to Leonard with any questions. Fine Arts rep recalled that process for updating Maps hasn't been created—Kuehnl noted that new and updated Maps will go through division CCs, but specific process/steps for updating Maps have not been determined. PSME rep asked if Maps will be integrated with DegreeWorks—Escoto responded that DegreeWorks has a different use than Program Pathways Mapper. DegreeWorks is a degree audit system, but it doesn't create a path for students. Program Pathways Mapper is intended to complement DegreeWorks. Latteri added it is intended for students to see different program paths before they're even enrolled in school.</p> <p>Latteri shared example of Map from Bakersfield College, which shows specific requirements that expand to show multiple course options—better than static PDF Maps. Noted that GP team not only researched other schools but did outreach to many students and faculty, and received a lot of positive feedback about Program Pathways Mapper.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
15. Good of the Order	
16. Adjournment	3:32 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean—APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Isaac Escoto (CNSL), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Kurt Hueg (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Amy Leonard (De Anza), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean—FA & KA), Dixie Macias (KA), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Tim Myres (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Dean—BH & PSME), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta