

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 20, 2012
2:04 p.m. - 3:19 p.m.
Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: March 6, 2012	Minutes approved as written. M/S/C (Hartwell, Armstrong)
2. Announcements: a. New Course Proposals (4) b. Division Reports c. Plenary Information	Speaker: Falk Cammin a. Four new courses were introduced. Cammin would like to pull HUMN 2 as she would like to have conversation with the PHIL faculty before proceeding. The overall intent of these courses is to give the Humanities major a stronger foundation. Ziegenhorn suggested that she speak to the faculty in PHIL, SOC and ANTH who have similar courses and they might want to collaborate. Hartwell commended Cammin for bringing these courses to us and noted that this conversation is exactly what we intended by creating this opportunity. b. No reports. c. ASCCC Spring plenary coming up in April. Several Thurs & Fri breakout sessions with curriculum focus. Holcroft stated that there is funding available from our local senate if someone is interested in attending. Request counselors review attachment #7, and all interested faculty review #8 (class caps paper) and provide feedback prior to plenary.
3. Consent Calendar: a. General Ed Applications b. Stand Alone Applications	Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft Holcroft called for any objections to adding PSYC/SOC 7 as a late item to the consent calendar. No objections, item was added. Consent Calendar was approved. M/S/C (Ragey, Starer). <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Humanities: MUS 1• Communication & Analytical Thinking: COMM 1A, 1B & 4, PSYC/SOC 7• Lifelong Learning: HLTH 21 & SPED 61 Francisco requested that CCC possibly discuss the intent of the wording “across disciplines” in the Area V criteria. From discussions that occurred when the language was drafted, it seemed that the intent was courses in this area would allow students to communicate and think critically across a broad range of disciplines, and current subcommittee did not feel that this intent was satisfied by comparing PSYC to SOC. However, they could understand that the faculty author could make a reasonable argument that this satisfies the intention as it is currently articulated in the pattern. She suggested that this topic be agendized at an upcoming CCC meeting.
4. CLEP Presentation	Speaker: Bernie Day <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CLEP is College Level Examination Programs. These are tests administered by the College Board and are intended to give students the opportunity to receive credit for life experience, military service and other non-traditionally-acquired knowledge. There is a nation-wide expectation that with so many GIs returning to college this will be requested more and more.• The available tests are very much aligned with most GE courses (i.e. most of the tests are lower-division and introductory in nature).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Important considerations:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ CSU accepts CLEP exams for GE credit.○ As of 2010, if a student gets their CSU-GE breadth certification from us (Foothill) we are obliged to count and “pass along” any CLEP exams that CSUs accept○ Students can already use the CSU-Breadth GE pattern to earn a Foothill College AA, AS, AA-T, AS-T, and/or the Certificate of Achievement in Transfer for CSU GE○ 2010 ASCCC had a resolution urging UC to consider CLEP for IGETC. (Some UCs, but not all, award credit for CLEP on an individual basis). (See attachment 17)○ In 2011 ASCCC passed a resolution encouraging local community college senates/curriculum committees to adopt the CCC-GE CLEP Exam score equivalency list (see attachment 17)• The College Board has found that the students taking these tests usually have higher GPAs, are more persistent in college and complete their degrees at a higher rate than students who do not earn CLEP credit (data available on College Board web site)• Test descriptions and examples are also available on the College Board web site.• Our message to students regarding whether we accept CLEP for credit is not clear. We should have a clear directive but every place that Day looked at Foothill (counselors, evaluations office, faculty, departments) had different messages. The campus is looking to the CCC to clarify/set policy. The decisions need to be made if we are going to accept the CLEP blanket pattern for GE credit as recommended by the ASCCC, and if NOT, whether we will grant ANY credit towards any of the individual GE areas. We also need discipline faculty to determine whether they will grant CLEP credit towards a major(s) requirement(s).• Jordahl suggests that a subcommittee would be appropriate to have further discussions and for a recommendation to be brought back to this body.• Armstrong cautions that whatever guidelines we create, we should be mindful of how many tests a student could use toward their FHGE.• Ziegenhorn asked how these tests are providing outcome information. It's very interesting that we are being asked to provide the “deeper learning” experience validation using SLOs and yet these tests do not. Concern that a single test cannot take the place of an entire course. Holcroft clarified that test is attempting to assess LIFE knowledge rather than knowledge obtained in a classroom.• Concern that anyone can take any CLEP test for a fee, no requirement that they show preparation, etc. Day reminded that we already grant credit for many AP exams, and that there is no prerequisite for those exams either (i.e. student does NOT have to complete an AP class in high school in order to take the AP test). Granting credit in an area for AP but not CLEP might seem inconsistent or unfair.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day, Escoto and Armstrong have volunteered to discuss and return to CCC would some possible catalog wording to clarify to students that our CLEP policy is currently being revised. • Please take this info to your faculty. Introduce them to CLEP, suggest they review the tests and provide feedback. Also look at the ASCCC CCC-GE CLEP Exam score equivalency list (see attachment 17) and consider credit for individual majors. Concern that this is being forced upon us by CSU faculty - Holcroft reminded the committee that CSUs have been required to accept these tests by the CSU Chancellor's Office and were not given a choice. This topic will be agendized for the 2nd CCC mtg in Spring.
<p>5. Transfer Degrees</p>	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft, Bernie Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminded committee about available TMCs and reviewed info (from two CCC meetings ago) regarding status of preparing AA-T/AS-T degrees by Foothill faculty as reported by CCC reps. • Distributed list from CSU Chancellor's Office showing the top majors that Foothill transfer students choose upon entering CSU • Day is hearing that the State Chancellor may soon require us to have more transfer degrees and Holcroft has heard that the State is OK with what we've produced so far as long as we continue to make quick progress. If we stop creating transfer degrees on our own the state is likely to mandate that we create a minimum number of them. • There have been questions regarding how to configure transfer degrees to include all the possibilities of an area or create multiple transfer degrees. An example is English and Creative Writing as the later is a "sub-topic" of the English TMC. The recommendation has been to create single transfer degrees with all the appropriate course options and rely on counselors to advise students appropriately. • Physics is currently preparing a transfer degree application. • This legislation was written for the CSU/Community college connection but what is UC doing with or to the transfer degrees? Day informed us that there have been UC representation on the committees that are approving the TMCs. They are watching carefully as they haven't bought into this process. Messina's understanding is that they wanted to be aware of what was being agreed upon to be assured of the content although they didn't want to agree to the 60 unit guarantee. • Day encouraged everyone to invite faculty from the local CSUs to participate in the creation of a degree to get the best degree possible. • Curriculum team strongly encourages reps to work with discipline faculty to continue transfer degree development with all reasonable haste.
<p>6. GE SLOs</p>	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcement: May 18th, "General Education Convocation" with Ken O'Donnell! PWe are oping to plan three hours broken into 3 different segments -

	<p>how CSUs evaluate our courses for inclusion in CSU-Breadth pattern, the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, and time for faculty to work on own GELOs. Please come and share ideas about SLOs and GE. AAC & U will have an open webinar next week. Bernie has info.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continuing discussion of FH GELOs. As follow up to suggestion to pull GELOs directly from the area descriptors the Foothill faculty have written, Holcroft presented first stab at creating such GELOs (see attachment 21). Reps agreed that at first glance these seem to match better than ILOs. Ziegenhorn volunteered to make changes to the Social & Behavioral section. There were some Humanities area suggestions. Armstrong volunteered to tweak the Natural Sciences area. Holcroft will collect and incorporate the suggested modifications and distribute to reps. We will attach it to the Communique to provide a discussion item amongst the faculty. Please foster discussions about how the current GELOs are working, and what faculty think about these new suggestions.
--	--

Attendees: