

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 1, 2011
2:15 p.m. - 3:47 p.m.
Toyon Room**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: October 18, 2011	Minutes approved as written. <i>M/S/C</i> (Ziegenhorn, Schultz)
2. Announcements a. CCC Charges b. Task Force Recs/Resolutions Fdbk due 11/4, 9p.m. c. Reminder for Degree & Certificate changes for 2012-13 d. TBA Hours	Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft a. Messina reminded the committee of the duties that are our responsibility. She also commented on the audit findings and that we must be more diligent in our duties. b. Rich Hansen spoke yesterday at Academic Senate and shared his insight as one of the members of the Task Force. Please get all comments re: the recommendations and/or ASCCC resolutions to Carolyn and/or Dolores by this Friday so they may vote accordingly on Saturday, November 4th. c. Degree and certificate corrections/additions are due March 1 st . d. Messina explained that TBA hours are a scheduling item and do not appear in the CORs. TBAs are being evaluated and corrected for the Winter 2012.
3. Report out from Divisions (LA)	Speaker: Scott Lankford <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Division Curriculum Process: LA working to tighten process and help faculty be more familiar with curriculum flow. Lankford introduced a sign-off sheet that R. Arca created that they are using in their division. New curriculum: Recently wrote a series of courses that will teach reading and writing simultaneously, "Integrated Reading and Writing," to bring students up to college level in 2 courses rather than 3. It has a portfolio course associated with it. In the old series, of the students that were successful in the first course, 40% did not go on to the 2nd course. This series has the potential to get more students thru the entire series with more success. FA will speak next meeting.
4. Consent Calendar: a. General Ed Applications b. Non-Credit Course	Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to approve consent calendar (<i>Area I, Humanities</i>: ART 2A, 2AH, 2B, 2BH, 2C, 2CH; ENGL 12, 17, 22, 31; PHOT 10H; THTR 2A, 2B; VART 2C; <i>Area IV, Social & Behavioral Sciences</i>: BUSI 22, 53; HIST 20; PHED 2; POLI 1, 3, 3H, 15, 15H; PSYC 30; <i>Stand Alone</i>: NCBS 405) minus the courses pulled for individual discussion noted below <i>M/S/C</i> (Lankford, Murray) <u>Pulled for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASTR 10BH w/10L: Discussion re: laboratory composition. <i>M/S</i> (Francisco, Murray) approved. CHLD 1 & 2: Ziegenhorn explained that these 2 courses were the old CHLD 55 divided into two courses and since 55 had been approved prior, the subcommittee had recommended approval by CCC. Nuñez pointed out that 1 & 2 are very different from the original 55 and should be reviewed in their own right. Schultz pointed out that since the changes constituted a major revision, it seems appropriate that the applications & CORs should be fully reviewed.

	<p>Ziegenhorn agreed and will take the applications back to the subcommittee for full review.</p> <p>Other discussion: The committee agreed that if a course is cross-listed, both courses should be included in the approval (ie. PSYC 30 and SOC 30).</p>
5. GE Review -BUSI 18 for FH Area IV (Social & Behavioral Sciences)	<p>Speaker: Glenn Violett Holcroft reminded that at last CCC meeting the committee requested the author come to CCC to provide more information regarding the GE application. Violett explained that BUSI 18 has depth due the contract portion of the course. This discussion is very familiar in that we have had multiple conversations about our philosophy of general ed at Foothill. One rep opined that it seems our view has changed in the last year since we agreed to accept IGETC pattern to satisfy the GE requirements for an AA or AT degree. Move to approve (Lankford, Ragey) 6 against, 4 in favor, 1 abstain. Motion failed, BUS 18 not approved for GE.</p>
6. Interdisciplinary Prerequisite Implementation Options	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft Options are on the table: 1) implementation via rigorous content review alone, 2) implementation via statistical validation and content review, or 3) faculty option to chose between options 1 and 2. Feedback: FA wanted #3. Motion to adopt option #3 M/S/C (Lankford, Knobel). Holcroft to bring to academic senate.</p>
7. New Course Process Resolution	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft Holcroft explained that CCC is responsible for all curriculum regardless of how our approval system functions. We are charged with preventing overlapping curriculum and with ensuring appropriateness of curriculum within the context of the overall college offerings. Current process makes this impossible as courses may be developed without any faculty outside division seeing them. Creating courses in a divisional silo may also have additional consequences for other divisions. To that end, Holcroft drafted this resolution as a starting point for discussion. Lankford expressed concern that although he agrees that current process doesn't work, does not want to create additional hurdles to an already complicated process. Several other members expressed agreement with this opinion. MacNeil suggested a checklist/sign-off sheet that faculty authors would need to file verifying they had consulted with appropriate faculty in other divisions. CCC invited to suggest changes, have discussions, or even draft an entirely different proposal. Further discussion at next meeting.</p>

Attendees: K. Armstrong, J. Baker, B. Cashmore, B. Day, I. Escoto, M. Francisco, R. Hartwell, C. Holcroft, K. Horowitz, K. Jones, M. Knobel, S. Lankford, A. Lee, D. MacNeil, K. Messina, P. Murray, M. Pierce, J. Ragey, G. Schultz, P. Starer, B. Ziegenhorn.

Minutes recorded by: C. Nuñez