

College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, June 1, 2010  
2:05 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.  
Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes, May 18, 2010	Minutes approved as written. M/S/C (O'neal, Schultz). 2 abstentions. Introduced Judy Baker to CCC as a replacement for Tim Woods.
2. Consent Calendar	<b>Speaker: Holcroft</b> Consent Calendar approved as written M/S/C (Franco/Villanueva).
3. SLOs on syllabi and CORs	<b>Speaker: Murray</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion re: SLO's being on the CORs.</li><li>• Peter Murray spoke to this item. He pointed out that this appears to be in our best interests for a variety of reasons. He's received outlines from other colleges that are providing this on their CORs. It keeps the students as well as the new faculty informed as what is expected in each course. He recognizes that it is faculty purview but on behalf of the deans, he strongly urges faculty to consider this.</li><li>• Cashmore related that the FA is strongly opposed to this being mandated by administration. It was made clear that the recommendation is based on the Accreditation standards and is not a mandate.</li><li>• As a point of interest, Cammin said that De Anza is not putting SLOs on their outlines. Holcroft said that DA currently has a very different take on SLOs and some faculty and administrators there have advocated used them for faculty evaluation and to punish those not participating in SLOAC; therefore, she advocated that FH faculty make SLO decisions independently of De Anza.</li><li>• Cammin recommended that we wait to hear FA's position about SLOs on syllabi and CORs before making any decisions</li><li>• Schulz and Holcroft noted here is still a great deal of confusion about how SLOs differ from and course objectives.</li><li>• Schultz has been working with CSU East Bay on articulation issues has had the opportunity to speak directly with faculty from other CCs who have recently gone through accreditation, and has been told that have been hammered in their accreditation re:SLOs.</li><li>• If we do decide to advocate putting SLOs on syllabi and CORs, O'Neal would also like to see this info put in the Faculty Handbook.</li><li>• Connell suggested that the CCC make a recommendation to FA to give them our opinion, and therefore give them something to work with rather than FA having a cold discussion.</li><li>• Holcroft said that she is meeting with FA on Thursday 6/3 about this and will report back at the next CCC meeting.</li></ul>
4. SLO resolution	<b>Speaker: Holcroft</b> The Academic Senate has tasked the CCC with writing a resolution to articulate the FH faculty position on SLOs.

	Holcroft, Schultz and O'Neal will collaborate, and bring a proposed resolution back for a first read at the next CCC meeting.
5. Challenges w/Humanities GE Applications	<p><b>Speakers: Day, Ragey &amp; Connell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After reviewing applications, there are some courses that the committee doesn't feel meet the new standards. Joe sat down with some of the faculty authors of these applications, and said some faculty are recognizing that some of the courses that were on the previous GE list will not meet the new guidelines. He said faculty seem to be willing to rewrite the CORs to meet CSU/UC GE but not necessarily for the FH criteria.</li> <li>Day suggested that the FH Humanities criteria are very rigid and don't allow for some courses that most faculty would instinctively consider as a Hum area course. It also disallows several courses for inclusion in the FH GE pattern that are included in the humanities area of CSU breadth and IGETC</li> <li>Thomas spoke to the group re: the LLL area and they are having similar issues.</li> <li>CH is very well aware of the incredible number of hours that went into the building the new pattern. She strongly advocates honoring the work of the faculty who developed the criteria and that we NOT consider revising the criteria again at this time, but that we might consider revising the application process. We now see that it is not working as smoothly as we thought it would. Perhaps change the review process or modifying the document to eliminate some of the redundancies. Francisco suggests that we wait until the entire process for a year to review the docs. Holcroft suggested that those working on the eval process make suggestions for revision to the docs. In conclusion, we will continue as we have been and make a list of those things we might change.</li> </ul>
6. Timing for inclusion of new GE courses	<p><b>Speaker: Holcroft</b></p> <p>Holcroft said that a couple faculty have asked why we can only approve new courses for inclusion on the GE list once a year. Ideally the GE list would update online at the beginning of each quarter; however, this is logistically extremely problematic. It is already difficult to keep track of catalog rights from year to year, even though we currently use the printed catalog, which is only printed annually. If we had a new version of the GE list every quarter, it would be too onerous to keep track of catalog rights. Ideally, sometime in the future technology will develop to a point that it would be more realistic to do this.</p>
7. CCC structure	<b>Speaker: deferred until next meeting</b>
8. GE Petition Process Feedback	<b>Speaker: deferred until next meeting</b>
9. Transfer Bill Update (SB 1440)	<b>Speaker: deferred until next meeting</b>
Articulation agreements w/High Schools	<p><b>Speaker: Denise Swett</b></p> <p>General information regarding high school articulation, handout provided. Some courses have credit by exam but others don't. Some of the CTE programs already have individual agreements with local high schools. Title 5 mandates that faculty must develop policies and procedures for high school articulation. Denise is working</p>

Approved 6/15/10

	with Day and Holcroft, and the goal is to develop a proposal this summer, which will come back to the CCC in the fall. Fyi-Geriatric program is going well.
--	---

Attendees: Cori can you fill in? ☺