

College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 17, 2012  
2:07 p.m. - 3:28 p.m.  
Toyon Room

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: March 6, 2012	Minutes approved with grammatical corrections in section #4. M/S/C (Starer, Cammin)
2. Announcements: a. CCC goals Spring Quarter  b. Plenary Reminder & Feedback  c. GE Convocation 5/18  d. Final GE Draft  e. SLOs Progress Update   f. Transfer Degrees Reminder   g. SSTF Brown Bag	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> a. Review of the status of the Working Topics list for the 2011-12 year. As always, if there's something that you would like to see be moved up/down in priority, or added to the list, please let us know. b. Reminder: coming this week, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. Comment regarding the Santa Monica College resolution (tiered fees 6.4): there are faculty concerns about the lack of checks and balances regarding what determines how many "regular" sections of a particular course must be offered before colleges are allowed to offer sections at a higher cost to the students. Concern that the resolution singles out a particular CC. Resolutions re: rules regarding non-credit courses (13.1): seems contradictory to require "proof of progress" in non-credit courses. c. Reminder: the Convocation will be approx. 3-3.5 hours. Ken O'Donnell will speak. Topics of discussion to include how CSU evaluates out applications for CSU-Breadth, and GE trends/reform. Professional growth credit available. d. Please review and let Nuñez know if there are any corrections. She'll send another copy for distribution. e. Program Level SLOs are written and entered in TracDat with only 4 exceptions and those faculty have been contacted. PL-SLO assessment plans have also been entered for all but a couple programs and notifications have been sent to all those still needing info. About 100 courses missing CL-SLOs and Deans have been notified. Please remind faculty teaching GE courses that they also need to comment on student achievement of the relevant GELO (ILO) when they enter reflections. f. English AA-T and Math AS-T applications are with the Instruction Office. History should be to Instruction by Friday and Business Management projected to be finished next week. Please contact Bernie Day when drafting AA-T as she has found that some courses that are options on the TMCs don't always serve our students best. There is also a statewide group working on a pathway for Engineering (requires a higher number of units and has been problematic fitting into 60 unit max for AS-T). Day announced that UC has stated that they will guarantee a "read" of the student's application (as long as they meet the minimum qualifications) if the student has received an AA-T or AS-T degree. This is a huge shift for the UC system. Up until now, if the student's GPA was below a particular cutoff, the application was automatically denied without even being read. g. This event is sponsored by the Transfer Work group to discuss the Student Success Task Force recommendations and how they might be implemented at Foothill College.

<p>h. Division Reports</p>   <p>i. Other</p>	<p>Weds. April 18<sup>th</sup>, 12:00 in Appreciation Hall.</p> <p>h. A few faculty are working to build a sustainability certificate of achievement. English has developed a Vampire Literature course. Multidisciplinary course is being discussed in biophysics. An American Cultures program is being developed by Ziegenhorn. He plans to bring it to CCC for discussion.</p> <p>i. Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions regarding the process for a new course that's been presented at CCC: since new course proposals are being presented in CCC, what is the procedure from there? There seems to be some confusion about the next step(s). The example used was the recent Humanities courses discussed on 3/20/12. After Cammin shared proposals, BSS rep noted there might be some overlap with some BSS courses. Cammin contacted BSS faculty to discuss the outlines and in one case did not have any response. What is the appropriate length of time that she should wait before moving forward? It was suggested that when you contact a faculty member from another division, you might want to also notify the CCC Rep for that area so that they might express the importance of responding to the request. The committee felt that a week was an appropriate opportunity for response from others. After that, the faculty should move forward with development of the course. Clarified that once proposal presented in CCC, faculty would be given C3MS shell.</li> <li>• Lankford announced that there will be a tour available to see the Stanford Design School by the founder of the school. Contact Scott Lankford or Mia Casey if you're interested.</li> <li>• Stanford Human Rights in CC Education: is going to have an all-day conference to assist in building human rights issues into curriculum.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Consent Calendar: Stand Alone Applications</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> Approve Stand Alone status for ENGL 242A, 242B and VART 9 (Franciso, Starer) Approved.</p>
<p>4. CLEP Feedback</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> Concern was voiced that although we are required to carefully review every course we put in our GE pattern and assess using SLOAC these CLEP tests are not held to same standards. PSME faculty want to have an opportunity to see the rigor of the tests before they have further discussions. One faculty member that has had experience with CLEP and AP tests said that there was a huge gap between the two, and most of the CLEP tests are exclusively multiple choice, only 5 require any writing. We support the idea of giving credit for life experience but this test set is not appropriate/authentic. BH believes Credit-by-Exam process more appropriate to accomplish this outcome. Comment: Francisco asked if the mandate requiring CSUs to accept CLEP credit came from the State Chancellor's Office or the CSU State-wide Academic Senate? Holcroft confirmed that it came from the Chancellor's Office. Escoto presented some possible CLEP catalog wording. It will be forwarded to all asap for feedback at the next</p>

	meeting.
5. Area V “Across Disciplines”	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> During previous conversations regarding the Communication & Analytical Thinking GE pattern, there was a question regarding the words “other disciplines” in C1 of the guidelines. What is the intent of this wording? The sub-committee thought on first read, that the intent of the GE pattern authors was different than the discipline faculty course author interpretation expressed in a recent GE application. As they could see the faculty applicant’s position with regard to the course and the guidelines, they approved the course but would like clarification going forward. Perhaps a resolution to modify the wording of this sentence would clarify the intent of this directive for future application evaluation. Ziegenhorn will have conversation with the editors of the particular course that brought forward this question. His understanding of the creation of the course was for a very narrow focus, and not for GE.
6. GELO feedback	<b>Differed to the 5/1/12 meeting.</b>

**Attendees:** K. Armstrong, J. Baker, F. Cammin, R. Campbell, B. Cashmore, B. Day, I. Escoto, M. Francisco, P. Gibbs, B. Hanning, R. Hartwell, C. Holcroft, K. Jones, K. Jordahl, M. Knobel, D. MacNeil, P. Murray, P. Starer, K. Svetich, V. Villanueva, B. Ziegenhorn

**Minutes Recorded by:** C. Nuñez