Draft Minutes, June 19, 2012

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 19, 2012
2:06 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
Toyon Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: June 5, 2012	Minutes approved as written. **M/S/C** (Armstrong, Murray)
2. Announcements: a. New Course Proposals   b. Consent Calendar

	Move to approve the application with one correction. (Day, Ziegenhorn) **Unanimously approved**.
5. English AA-T Application	**Speaker: Kella Svetich** This application has also been vetted by faculty, Day and Nunez. Svetich asked that the committee suspend the rules to take action. **Motion to suspend** (Hartwell, Armstrong) **Unanimously approved**. **Move** to approve with one correction (specify CSU rather than "four year universities") (Hartwell, Villanueva) **Unanimously approved**.

6. Prerequisites/Content Review	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft**
	PP presentation.
	• Review of Rostrum Article about prereq implementation. SSTF recommendations direct students to address basic skills needs in their first year. Some legislators/LAO have suggested that Title 5 be modified to <u>require</u> this, but the ASCCC is attempting to negotiate a compromise where the community colleges utilize implementation of appropriate prerequisite to satisfy the requirement instead. Some concerns about adding prerqs to courses are that some students might "shop" for courses that do not require prerequisites. Concern about C-ID status if we have a prereq that's not in C-ID descriptor. Concern about having a prereq on a Foothill course that the CSUs don't have a prereq. Holcroft promised to follow up with state curriculum committee/ASCCC to answer these questions. Important to remember ultimate goal of promoting student success.
	• Preview of proposed strategy to begin prereq implementation next year.
	  o Francisco & Knobel worked on the Math Content Review form. We still need to work on the English and Non-Communication prereqs Content Review forms. Holcroft suggested we consider how these references can most effectively be used by faculty, and that we might also want to build in a consultation/collaboration step between interdisciplinary faculty rather than asking discipline faculty to try to interpret the content review forms on their own.
	  o Title 5 wording requires us to have a District-wide policy. The FHDA District has passed the responsibility for developing processes/procedures to each college.
	  o Proposed beginning process by working with Elaine Kuo, FH Researcher, to determine how we can best monitor for disproportionate impact. Potentially invite Kuo to the next CCC Meeting for discussion. We do not want to block students from taking courses but at the same time, make requisites appropriate to ensure student success. Discussion will continue in the Fall.

7. District-wide Course Equivalent Feedback	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** There were many questions and concerns about this list and the term "equivalency". Armstrong pointed out an example in her area that's problematic: FH Math 1A, 1B and 1C as a series is equivalent to the Math series at DA but the courses do not match one-to-one. How are we

	going to identify true equivalent courses? It was further discussed that perhaps the "equivalent" status should refer to equivalency in theory rather than match 100% content. It was suggested that the Academic Senate should consider a resolution to promote faculty working together to reach agreement, perhaps not perfectly matching courses but to agree in theory to reach decisions. Further discussion in Fall.
8. Stanford Human Rights Symposium Debriefing	**Speakers: Scott Lankford, Patrick Morriss, Jennifer Sinclair, Hilda Fernandez** Faculty attended this symposium at Stanford and gave their enthusiastic impressions of the materials and ideas that were presented. The students were there to present their projects, which were all based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights document. The students were asked to select one article in this document that spoke to them and create a project around it. Faculty were very impressed with the creativity of the presentations and projects the students developed. The biggest surprise was that all the topics and projects came from the students and this generated strong student engagement. Lankford distributed information and a possible timeline for a FH version, please review and contact Lankford if you are interested in being involved.

Attendees: K. Armstrong, J. Baker, F. Cammin, R. Campbell, B. Cashmore, B. Day I. Escoto, B. Hanning, R. Hartwell, C. Holcroft, K. Jones, K. Jordahl, M. Knobel, D. MacNeil, P. Murray, P. Starer, K. Svetich, B. Ziegenhorn.
Minutes Recorded by: C. Nuñez