

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 31, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Room 4501; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl <i>Item skipped—in-person quorum achieved, so resolution not needed.</i>
2. Minutes: May 17, 2022	Approved by consensus.
3. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All The following divisions/members provided a report: Gilstrap announced the CSU GE & IGETC results have been received! Sent email out today. Noted that if a course which was previously approved has been denied, two-year phase-out period allows course to remain on the list while we reapply. During June, will be submitting courses for UC transferability. Vanatta announced the 2022-23 catalog likely to be published this week; archive version of 2021-22 catalog will be posted at the same time. Expect to receive email announcement from Marketing dept. LRC: Library will have extended hours (until 7:00 PM) the week before finals. Mentioned trial of the MLA Style guide online—email survey was sent to faculty, to gauge interest in subscribing to the guide. PSME rep asked if Library extended hours includes Friday—no, just Mon.-Thurs.
4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
5. Announcements a. New Course Proposals b. Division Reps for 2022-23 c. Reminder: Curriculum Institute Conference (July 6-9— more info here)	Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: MDIA 6A; PHOT 404A, 404B, 405, 472, 474A, 474B; SOC 12A, 12B. Please share with your constituents. No comments. Kuehnl asked the reps to please check in with their division to identify who the reps will be for next year—will report out at next meeting. Reminder that the Curriculum Institute conference coming up in July, which includes virtual option. Reach out to Kuehnl with any questions.
6. Consent Calendar a. GE Application	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl The following GE application was presented: Area V—MATH 80. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Schultheis, Meezan). Approved.
7. Stand Alone Approval Requests: C S 78A/B/C/D	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for C S 78A, 78B, 78C, 78D. Courses will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in upcoming Certificate of Achievement in Computer Science Languages. No comments. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
8. New Program Application: Music Technology BA Degree	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Music Technology BA degree. Note that submission to CCCCO is unique for bachelor degree programs, using an online form; attachment is a draft of this application. Three new upper division GE

	<p>courses being created, which will then be available for all future bachelor degree programs to use.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
9. New Program Application: Bookkeeping CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Bookkeeping Certificate of Achievement. Bio Health rep asked if any of these new Accounting certs. currently offered as non-transcriptable certs. (being converted)—Hueg responded dept. planning to remove all non-transcriptable certs. Vanatta noted dept. planning to create nine certs. in total, so some are brand new (dept. currently offers five non-transcriptable certs.). Rep asked if students who take these can then apply courses to associate degree—Hueg responded that some courses on certs. also listed on associate degree.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
10. New Program Application: CPA Exam Preparation - Audit CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new CPA Exam Preparation - Audit Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 9 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
11. New Program Application: CPA Exam Preparation - Business Environment and Concepts CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new CPA Exam Preparation - Business Environment and Concepts Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 9 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
12. New Program Application: CPA Exam Preparation - Regulations CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new CPA Exam Preparation - Regulations Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 9 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
13. New Program Application: Financial Accounting CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Financial Accounting Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 9 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
14. New Program Application: Payroll Preparation CA	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Payroll Preparation Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 9 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
15. New Degree or Certificate Creation Process	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Degree or Certificate Creation Process. Draft is the result of workgroup, which has been meeting this year. Note that “program” being defined as degrees or certificates, for this process.</p> <p>Step One of process (“Elevator Pitch”): proposing faculty completes new deg./cert. proposal form, similar to existing new course proposal form. Subramaniam suggested adding to the form a question about how the deg./cert. related to (or aligned with) Foothill’s Strategic Vision for Equity. PSME rep asked which step of the process addresses if the college has resources to support the new deg./cert.; knows it’s part of narrative document but doesn’t see it listed on proposal form. Believes important to ensure we have necessary resources, incl. human resources. BSS rep noted frequently receives feedback from faculty re: the number of various required forms; could be helpful to add purpose of each step to the process, to frame why form/step is necessary. Also asked that forms be Smartsheets or other type of online form—Vanatta</p>

responded that the plan is for process to eventually be in CourseLeaf; in the meantime, form/process will be online, using Smartsheet or some other software/app.

PSME rep agreed w/ BSS rep's suggestion to add context to each step and reiterated the need to ensure resources available for new deg./cert. Kuehnl clarified that proposal form is simply a short form and the idea is that conversations re: resources, etc., would be happening with the relevant people (list in Step One). Idea is for program to be vetted by stakeholders early on, so it doesn't get too far in the process before aspects such as resourcing are discussed. PSME rep reiterated need to call out resource discussion in process, either in Step One or Two. Bio Health rep was on workgroup, and noted the idea behind proposal form is to ensure the new deg./cert. not getting too far in the process before important discussions occur. Also noted workgroup discussed potential involvement of new Mission (I'm) Possible Council (MIP-C), but received feedback from Acting President Fong that MIP-C not an appropriate venue for new degs./certs.

Hueg believes discussion re: resources should occur w/ dean at onset of entire process; in the rare event a deg./cert. gets all the way to CCC without dean's buy-in re: resources, issue should be resolved not with MIP-C but with VP Instruction and at CCC. PSME rep noted that human resources aspect difficult because it's not always clear. Hueg believes any conflict around resources (e.g., between dean and dept.) should be discussed at CCC. Bio Health rep suggested providing faculty with guidance re: what is meant by "resources," because not all faculty understand how to address that aspect. Also asked if process will be required for faculty who are "re-packaging" courses to offer in a new cert. (similar to today's Accounting certs.)—Kuehnl responded this process meant to be required for any new deg./cert.; previous streamlined process (for non-transcriptable certs.) no longer used.

Kuehnl noted proposal form meant to not bog down faculty (e.g., burden them w/ resource component) but to let them quickly propose new deg./cert. to bring to groups listed in Step Two. Point is to prevent faculty from doing substantial work only to find out that new deg./cert. not viable.

Bio Health rep asked for clarification re: non-transcriptable credit certs. (mentioned on proposal form)—Vanatta responded these certs. are listed in the catalog but don't appear on students' transcripts, and are awarded by the divisions. Kuehnl mentioned various reasons for continuing to offer non-transcriptable certs.; Hueg mentioned burden placed on division assistants in having to award them.

Step Two: approval/feedback of proposal form: division CC approves, CCC approves, Academic & Professional Matters (APM) discusses but doesn't approve. Kuehnl noted possibility of APM discussion contingent on De Anza's modifying their process to add APM discussion. Subramaniam asked for clarification re: CCC approval, for example, if division CC approves proposal, CCC can reject it—Kuehnl responded, yes. Also asked if division CC can reject proposal—yes. Counseling rep asked if discussion re: resources would be included in division CC discussion during Step Two—Kuehnl responded the idea is that faculty consult w/ stakeholders during Step One, before proposal goes to division CC. Believes resources aspect could be critical part of CCC discussion during Step Two, adding that CCC should be asking these types of questions.

Step Three: faculty completes state-required narrative document, similar to current process. Step Four: approval of narrative and supporting documentation: division CC, CCC, and FHDA board. Kuehnl has been in contact w/ Teresa Ong re: timing of requesting LMI; needs to happen as early as possible (will update process for second read). Subramaniam suggested updating note underneath Workforce/CTE Program question (on proposal form), to remove “recommended” language since LMI is required—will update. Maravilla suggested adding “Step One” to proposal form, to help uncomplicate process for faculty.

Vanatta asked if narrative will be required for non-transcriptable certs., since they’re included on proposal form, and asked for clarification re: process for them after proposal form approved. Currently, they don’t follow our formal process. Kuehnl asked the group for their thoughts. PSME rep recalled discussion at CCC, years ago, re: possibly doing away w/ non-transcriptable certs., and wondered if by not requiring them to go through full formal process we’d be encouraging depts. to create non-transcriptable vs. state-approved. Hueg wondered what the benefit of non-transcriptable certs. is to students—SRC rep responded w/ example from TTW program, and Kuehnl mentioned Anthropology dept. fieldwork. Other Bio Health rep mentioned some Allied Health programs have legal requirement to offer certs. which don’t meet the unit threshold required by the state—Hueg responded that these examples aren’t quite the same as those offered by Anthro. dept., etc. Kuehnl suggested the division CC approve non-transcriptable certs. Subramaniam asked why division CC should be involved w/ non-transcriptable certs. Vanatta noted that current process to add/modify/delete non-transcriptable cert. is to simply make changes to the curriculum sheet, which must be approved by division CC.

PSME rep suggested “waiver” of process for certain situations, such as creation of non-transcriptable certs. Vanatta noted that any deg./cert. we’re submitting to the state must go through our local process, so could waive it only for non-transcriptable certs.; wondered if they should even be included in process. Subramaniam wondered why non-transcriptable certs. even need to be included on curriculum sheets—Vanatta responded they must be in order to be listed in the catalog. Discussion occurred re: whether we’re required to list non-transcriptable certs. in the catalog. Other Bio Health rep believes important to clarify vocabulary re: the types of certs. awarded by Allied Health programs and other depts., which aren’t listed in catalog at all (even as non-transcriptable certs.). Kuehnl suggested non-transcriptable certs. not need to go to CCC, just to division CC (i.e., continuing current process). Bio Health rep recalled workgroup’s discussion of non-transcriptable certs., which were included in process for a reason; believes worthwhile for them to come to CCC during Step One/Two, even just for the purpose of awareness.

Other Bio Health rep explained process of awarding non-transcriptable certs. to their program’s students (certs. which aren’t listed in catalog). Kuehnl asked if group agrees with suggestion that non-transcriptable certs. stop at Step Two B (CCC approval)—PSME rep opposed, and again suggested we shouldn’t make it easier for faculty to create non-transcriptable certs. (vs. state-approved). Vanatta noted it’s currently rare for new non-transcriptable certs. to be created; for 2022-23 catalog just one was created. Bio Health rep noted opportunity of them coming to CCC, which could spark discussion of encouraging creation of state-

	<p>approved cert. Kuehnl will update process, for second read, to have non-transcriptable certs. stop at Step Two B—can discuss further at next meeting, if necessary.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting. Kuehnl asked the reps to please share and discuss with their constituents, so we can have a productive second read.</p>
<p>16. Equity in the COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Continuation of discussion from previous meetings. Today’s breakout groups will discuss the Course Content section of the COR, to come up with ideas related to imbuing equity into this specific section. Kuehnl pointed out attachment from Glendale CC, which folks may find helpful.</p> <p>CCC members broke out into small groups of 3-5 (online and in person) for 20 minutes. The full group then reconvened and shared out ideas from their small groups.</p> <p>Bio Health rep shared that depending on the course, this section doesn’t allow for a lot of wiggle-room, especially for Allied Health courses, which have outside accreditation boards. Suggested looking at how course as a whole is being put together, instead of prescribing things to specific sections. Suggested CCC create guide listing various considerations which could be made depending on how much flexibility faculty has over certain sections of the COR.</p> <p>PSME rep shared that this section doesn’t always lend itself to ideas of equity, but group came up with some ideas. For example, when updating a science course, faculty could engage in explicit discussion of how science is evolving/iterative, to really evaluate whether current content is timely; could address things which have been “incorrectly understood” in STEM or other disciplines. Also, in the context of incorporating cultural perspective, faculty could create opportunities for students to engage with topic in a unique way, giving students a sense of ownership over their learning. Similar to Bio Health rep’s suggestion, mentioned creating a guide for faculty which could apply to the COR as a whole (vs. section-specific guidance).</p> <p>Language Arts rep shared their group looked at Glendale CC attachment and used ENGL 43 series course as example – looked at ways to move away from purely “canonical” texts and include, for example, slave narratives. Mentioned importance of talking to Articulation Officer to ensure edits won’t potentially create issues for articulation. Agreed with other groups that certain points will be more applicable to some disciplines/courses than others. Kuehnl agreed with recommendation to stress discussion w/ AO in whatever prompt/guidelines CCC may create.</p> <p>Next breakout session at next/final CCC meeting. Hope is to move forward with creation of document/guidelines by end of fall quarter.</p>
<p>17. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>18. Adjournment</p>	<p>4:06 PM</p>

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Kathy Armstrong* (PSME), Jeff Bissell* (KA), Rachelle Campbell* (BH), Roosevelt Charles* (Dean—CNSL), Valerie Fong* (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Kurt Hueg* (Interim VP Instruction), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee (CNSL), Ana Maravilla (SRC), Allison Meezan (BSS), Tim Myres (APPR), Lisa Schultheis* (BH), Ram Subramaniam* (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich (LA), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta