

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, May 18, 2010  
2:05 p.m. - 3:46 p.m.  
Toyon Room**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes, May 4, 2010	Minutes approved with clarification. <b>M/S/C (Serna, Schultz)</b> 2 abstentions (Holcroft, Day). a. Clarification regarding info from last mtg: there will be 2 SLO coordinators (rather than one) and Eloise plans to form an SLO committee to be composed of representatives from each division.
2. Announcements: a. GE Applications process  b. GE Seminar next year  c. Curriculum Institute  d. FSA reminder (June 1 <sup>st</sup> ) to Nuñez	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> a. GE apps should go to Nunez. She is tracking the apps. Please process the applications in a timely manner. We are getting inquiries from faculty that submitted applications but who have not yet heard back from their apps, approved/denied. b. GE Conference: March 3-5, 2011 in Chicago. Put it on your calendar and plan ahead if you're interested in attending. c. Reminder about the 2010 Curriculum Institute July 8-10 in Santa Clara. IF you are interested in attending let Dolores Davison know immediately. There is also a SLO conference the day before (July 7) and Eloise is willing to pick up the tab for that. d. FA is now interested in the FSA discussion. FA will meet with FH and DA Senate officers, and FA will determine whether they wish to come to speak to the CCC. In the meantime, continue to have conversations in your division/department re: what FSAs are, and how you think your courses best match with a FHDA approved FSA. The June 1 deadline will be postponed, and a new date proposed at the next CCC meeting.
3. Apprenticeship AS Degree Proposals	<b>Speaker: Richard Galope, Frank Cuneo, Javier Compo, Steve Lopez</b> The three proposed degrees were initiated by the CTIS division. About 300 employers are associated with the Apprenticeship programs and they would like to give the students a more competitive edge by giving them degrees. They are attempting to provide career pathways for these students. The degrees also help meet the increase in community need for green technology. It is anticipated that these degrees will lead well into the Technology College. From an employers perspective, the industry is beginning to understand the need for more articulate and educated workforce that has understanding of the tech required to produce the products they are using, how the technology should be integrated in their education. The programs that currently exist are more business oriented not with as much hands on depth. National Labor College: regional accredited 4-yr college. Suggested that perhaps the description should be modified to be include more specific info about each program as well as the general info about the trade. First read today. Vote on these three degree proposals will occur next meeting. CH distributed a handout "cheat sheet" to remind faculty

	<p>of their role in the degree review and approval process. Please remember that since we have decentralized Curriculum Committee, it's important to share this info with constituents.</p>
<p>4. SLO Presentation</p> <p>a. FH GE Patterns</p> <p>b. Standard II: Student Learning Programs &amp; Services</p> <p>c. LEAP</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft, Rosemary Arca, Eloise Orrell</b></p> <p>a. CH suggested that we review and modify the wording on the GE guidelines because the current wording refers explicitly to SLOs and as such, each individual criterion would need to go through the assessment/reflection process. Move to modify the wording to remove the SLO reference in those guidelines to clarify that the criteria are objectives rather than SLOs. M/S/C (Serna, Schultz). Language will be changed and will be brought back to the committee at the next meeting.</p> <p>b. Review of jargon: SLOs = Student Learning Outcomes, PLOs = Program Learning Outcomes and ILOs = Institutional Learning Outcomes. ILOs are the 4 C's that we've previously identified and for which we've written assessment rubrics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current issue: the accreditation standards clearly indicate that Foothill must also have General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs), though the standards do not specify how they must be crafted or assessed. Thus, we have many options.</li> <li>• One approach (1) that has been used by other CCs is to use the ILOs as GELOs. At this point, this is probably the most efficient plan because the C3MS has already been updated to allow selection of multiple ILOs for each course. Holcroft clarified that faculty would still have the option of selecting one or more ILOs as appropriate.</li> <li>• Another option (2) is to write new, unique GELOs related to but not identical to the ILOs. These would be broad and encompass the entire FH GE pattern. If we chose this option it would require us to form a committee to craft the GELOs and develop an assessment approach.</li> <li>• Yet another option (3) would be to develop 2-3 unique GELOs for each GE area e.g. 2-3 for humanities, 2-3 for natural sciences, etc. As with option 2, this would require a committee(s) to craft the GELOs and develop assessment mechanisms.</li> <li>• CH distributed several documents that show survey info (surveys sponsored by AAC&amp;U and part of the LEAP initiative) from employers that supports the movement toward outcome-based assessment. This movement across the nation is actually quite impressive and Foothill is relatively behind in our efforts, as many institutions have already clearly defined outcomes and are currently in the assessment stage. Option 4 would be to adopt the LEAP "Essential Learning Outcomes" as our GELOs, as there is already strong nationwide support for these. This course of action would require a committee to develop an assessment mechanism.</li> <li>• What is the will of the committee to do in answer the need for GELO's? Holcroft emphasized that we do not HAVE to make a decision today but reminded that we will be expected to have already gone through a complete cycle by the time of the accreditation visit. Orrell said that given the time constraints, she recommends option 1. Arca noted that since faculty are already currently working on</li> </ul>

d. Counseling Advising Sheet (deferred)	tying their courses to the ILOs in C3MS, it would be the most efficient option at this time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Move to adopt the ILO's as GE Learning Outcomes (GELOs). <b>M/S/C (Murray, Pennington)</b></li><li>• Reps were asked to inform their constituents about the decision, and further instruction about documentation via C3MS will be forthcoming.</li></ul>
5. GE Petition Process	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> <p>Faculty have requested discussion about the current GE course substitution petition form, as well as the process itself. Counselors would like to change the process to allow the counselors to make a judgment rather than continue with the current process that is very time consuming. Student completes petition, it goes to the counselor, then to CH, then to the appropriate div/dept, back to CH, then to Stephanie Franco. Approx time now is about one month. (Holcroft noted that there was a spring 2010 statewide Academic Senate CCC resolution in favor of blanket GE reciprocity between CA community colleges and of 97 colleges, Foothill was the only no vote.) Several faculty expressed concern about taking the decision out of the hands of faculty discipline experts. Holcroft also noted that she is pursuing moving the process online, rather than keeping it in hard copy circulation - this seems like it would make the process much more efficient. Serna stated that if counselors are not going to have the right to make the decision then they don't really need to be involved in the process at all. Reps were asked to bring the issue back to their constituents for discussion, and will revisit at an upcoming CCC meeting.</p>

Attendees: