

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 6, 2023
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 23, 2023	Morriss thanked Vanatta for keeping detailed and informative minutes. Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All STEM: Finishing up curriculum approvals. LRC: No updates to report. Language Arts: Working on Title 5 updates and Program Maps. Svetich shared hoping to create new pathways in Creative Writing and Technical Writing. Kinesiology: Working on Title 5 updates. HSH: Working on Title 5 updates. Fine Arts: Working on Title 5 updates. Gough noted BA degree on today's agenda. SRC: Working on Title 5 updates. Counseling: No updates to report. BSS: Working on Title 5 updates. Apprenticeship: No updates to report.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. Cal-GETC Update	Speakers: CCC Team Gilstrap highlighted specifics from recently-released standards. Area A1 English Composition: still has requirement of 5000 words, but 4000 of those must be in final revised draft form; standards specify may be across multiple major assignments. Area 1C Oral Communication: no ENGL 1A prereq required, but we will need to resubmit our courses. Gough asked when resubmission will occur—Gilstrap responded, COR edits should be made during 2023-24 year, for June 2024 resubmission to UC TCA and Dec. 2024 submission for Cal-GETC (Cal-GETC begins fall 2025). Area 2 Mathematics: patterned after IGETC, so Math for Elementary Teachers courses won't be accepted. Area 3B Humanities: elementary languages other than English won't be accepted. Cal-GETC will require grade of "C" or higher in all areas (some CSU GE areas allow for "D" grade as long as total GPA is 2.0 or higher). Additionally, Cal-GETC will not allow for partial certification—Gilstrap wonders if this will result in fewer students completing ADTs; perhaps students will complete major prep courses but not the full ADT. Area 6 Ethnic Studies: Gilstrap has seen conflicting info re: whether we may use Ethnic Studies subject code; our ETHN courses currently approved for IGETC will be grandfathered in, even if we end up needing to change subject codes. Discussion occurred re: variety of minimum

<p>b. Division Reps for 2023-24</p>	<p>qualifications (AKA disciplines) listed on ETHN courses, even though same subject code is used. Parikh wondered if there's a similar plan for Engineering, as many different types of engineering currently housed within one umbrella term and discipline. Gilstrap also mentioned as of fall 2024 Ethnic Studies is a graduation requirement; over this summer, Board of Governors will determine if it will be a specific local GE area.</p> <p>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. Mitchener asked if each division should have two reps—Kuehnl responded, two is common, but not a requirement; each division has one vote regardless of number of reps. Lee asked if CCC holding hybrid meetings next year—Kuehnl responded, unknown and somewhat depends on Brown Act; will still need on-campus quorum. Each body allowed to determine quorum; CCC has adopted 50% + 1 of divisions present (not of total members, just of divisions).</p>
<p>5. New Degree Application: Industrial Technology and Building Construction Management BS</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Industrial Technology and Building Construction Management BS Degree. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Kaupp, Svetich). Approved.</p>
<p>6. New Degree Application: Audio Technology and Product Management BA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Audio Technology and Product Management BA Degree. CCC previously approved a version of degree but after consultation w/ CSUs and industry, changes have been made. Previous version was more focused on creative production, which overlapped w/ some local CSUs. Additionally, industry in local area not focused on music production, it's more focused on products/technology. Local industry seeing lack of product design/management skills in students graduating from other Music Technology programs. Updated version of degree has more technical focus.</p> <p>None of the courses offered at local CSUs, and all local CSUs are supportive, some enthusiastically! Upper division GE courses same as previous version; Kuehnl collaborated w/ faculty in other disciplines on GE courses, hoping they can be also used for future bachelor degrees. Gough noted that courses all above level of associate degree; Kuehnl noted this would be a two-year program, and students can come from different types of associate degree programs. Gilstrap mentioned state's proposal of GE pattern for BDP students, for lower division GE.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Applications: APPR 140A, 140B</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APPR 140A & 140B. Each will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of text field to add to COR form in CourseLeaf, as part of campus-wide implementation of Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document. Vanatta noted mock-up has been updated based on discussion at previous meeting (moved location on COR form and updated field question/text wording). Kaupp suggested change to second sentence of wording: "Please describe how principles of equity have been incorporated in this COR". Believes this is more inclusive (removal of "you" suggests collaborative process) and ends less abruptly. Morriss concerned this moves from active voice to passive voice, which could diffuse responsibility; Kaupp agreed somewhat but noted it also includes faculty involved in process during previous edits.</p>

Kaupp mentioned the group needs to determine whether field response will be cleared out for each edit, and believes important to acknowledge good equity-minded updates made during previous editing cycles.

Parikh suggested: "Please describe how your team has incorporated principles of equity in this COR." Believes this helps to imply work shouldn't be done by just one person. Kuehnl unsure if work typically done by a team; others noted should be a collaborative process and not taken on by just one faculty. Kaupp appreciates Morriss' feedback re: passive voice, noting mainly wants to avoid abrupt ending. Svetich noted "you" can be plural and believes adding "in this COR" to end of current wording is redundant. Agreed w/ Morriss' feedback, but believes clarity is most important when drafting wording. Vanatta suggested: "Please describe how you have incorporated principles of equity during this review cycle (or editing cycle)." Believes this avoids redundancy and acknowledges previous work done.

Kuehnl asked the group for their thoughts re: field response being cleared out each time faculty initiates edit. Parikh believes maintaining previous response allows faculty updating COR to review that info and not only add their own entry but also take action based on what which COR section(s) previously targeted. Faculty could date their entries, for example. Agyare mentioned COR can be updated at any time, outside of a specific Title 5 cycle, and suggested avoiding "cycle" in wording, which could suggest equity work not needed if COR being updated independent of Title 5 list. Agyare suggested: "Please describe how you have incorporated principles of equity during this revision"—group agreed with this new wording.

Discussion occurred re: field response clearing out, with general consensus for responses to be retained with each edit. Vanatta noted that not clearing out response could result in faculty's ability to ignore field (intentionally or not); even if field is required, if a previous response exists the "required field" error message won't be triggered, and there is no way to require new response if previous response exists. Gough suggested perhaps separate checkbox is needed, to clear out with each edit, with the text field response retained.

Kuehnl mentioned need to determine wording for checkbox if adding one. Kaupp noted others will be reviewing COR once submitted, which will help ensure work being done. On the other hand, Kaupp and Vanatta both noted not unusual for some faculty to skip certain steps or fields if not required by system; Vanatta added, in some years faculty may have dozens of Title 5 courses to update and if they procrastinate they might easily breeze through and not notice the field. Further discussion occurred re: spirit of process and hope that equity updates will become a habit and not something faculty will ignore. Vanatta clarified that checkbox would be completely separate field and can be cleared out even if text field not cleared out.

Morriss recalled discussion at previous meetings not in favor of checkbox—Kuehnl recalled concern was that having checkbox only (without text field) could result in less impact, whereas current idea is that checkbox helps alert faculty to text field and equity work. Parikh suggested: "Have you considered equity in the edits you've made?" or similar for checkbox. Discussion occurred re: COR updates made outside of Title 5 list and whether equity work should be included in such updates, with some arguing that any update to COR should be done with equity in mind.

	<p>The group agreed on the following updates to the mock-up, for the second read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New wording for second sentence of text field: “Please describe how you have incorporated principles of equity during this revision.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Text field responses will be retained with each edit • Add checkbox underneath text field, with the following wording: “I have added my comments with the current date to the field above.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Checkbox will clear out with each edit <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. CCC Priorities for 2023-24</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team</p> <p>Kuehnl mentioned, in previous years has used survey to see which topics the group would like to discuss or tackle during the upcoming year, in order to determine priorities. Academic Senate also sets priorities for CCC. Noted that CCC has recently accomplished some priorities which have been on the list for many years. Asked the group to suggest topics.</p> <p>Gilstrap suggested topic of revising or rethinking our local GE pattern, especially considering updates to statewide requirements for local GE (e.g., possible new Ethnic Studies area). Discussion should include whether or not to keep Lifelong Learning area, which is not state requirement. Also suggested topic of changing the start of our curriculum year from summer to fall, noting that everything related to articulation starts with fall, and De Anza’s year starts with fall. Gough asked what this change would entail—Gilstrap responded, will need to research and figure out why we start with summer. Parikh believes switch (from fall start to summer) happened in 2015 and was related to budgeting.</p> <p>Kuehnl mentioned Academic Senate wants CCC to create bylaws or constitution, has been on our to-do list for few years.</p>
<p>10. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:32 PM</p>

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Kelly Edwards (KA), Valerie Fong* (Dean, LA), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Tom Gough* (FA), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Ana Maravilla* (CNSL), Tiffany Mitchener* (HSH), Patrick Morriss* (STEM), Brian Murphy (APPR), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Chrissy Penate* (LRC), JP Schumacher* (Dean, SRC), Ram Subramaniam* (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich* (LA), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta