

**College Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, November 15, 2011**  
**2:02 p.m. - 3:33 p.m.**  
**Toyon Room**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1. Minutes: November 1, 2011	Minutes approved as written <b>M/S/C</b> (Schultz, Lankford).
2. Announcements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Need/Justification Statements due Nov 15<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>b. Other</li> </ul>	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> New path of CORs is causing delay. Concern about meeting the December deadline b/c CORs not reaching Curriculum rep status in a timely manner. C3MS glitch has caused trouble with moving CORs out of Articulation status correctly, but Lee working to fix ASAP.
3. Report out from Fine Arts Division	<b>Speaker: Robert Hartwell</b> Presentation from Hartwell. Expressed kudos to Dean Anderson for assisting the faculty in moving curriculum ahead. In an effort to re-invigorate their division curriculum committee, FA is using Etudes to facilitate their curriculum discussion and decision-making. Faculty developing Media Studies program, and Bruce Tambling is updating the Music Technology program. BHS will present at the next meeting.
4. Consent Calendar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Ed Applications (26)</li> <li>b. Stand Alone Applications (6)</li> </ul>	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General comment that the dates on the applications seem old. Holcroft &amp; Cammin clarified that although original date of app might seem old the CORs have not changed and they only recently underwent review for GE inclusion.</li> <li>• Two reps commented that on some applications the author didn't reference the actual item number from the COR so it's more difficult for the subcommittee to review those applications. Curriculum team will add explicit examples to the applications to make it clear that the COR item numbers need to be on GE application. <b>M/S/C</b> (Hartwell, Cashmore)</li> </ul>
5. New Course Process	<b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horowitz suggests that CCC take back the responsibility of reviewing ALL NEW courses here. Starer suggests that that topic is a larger issue that needs to be agendized for a larger discussion and Holcroft confirmed this.</li> <li>• PSME proposed a resolution suggesting creation of an Interdisciplinary subcommittee which would review each new course proposal, identify which courses are interdisciplinary, and then direct the faculty author to be responsible to talk with faculty in other identified disciplines. CCC would be notified of those courses.</li> <li>• Lankford proposed resolution that process could be less formal. CCC would have a standing item on the agenda where each Curr Rep announced by the reps at the beginning of the CCC meetings and from there the Curr Reps could filter the info (with a form in hand that the faculty author has completed).</li> <li>• PSME is only interested in entertaining this process if it stays with a discussion about interdisciplinary status and doesn't morph into interdisciplinary faculty trying to control each other's curriculum and pedagogy.</li> <li>• Several reps proposed slight modification to</li> </ul>

	<p>Lankford's resolution. The group is in favor of keeping the process simple. The CCC team will make suggested adjustments and return on the next agenda.</p>
6. Division CC & Non-Credit Processes	<p><b>Speaker: Kimberlee Messina</b></p> <p>What and how does the curriculum process happen in each division? Cammin reminded that our curriculum organization is very different than other colleges, and our process can only be successful if we are vigilant with our duties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BHS curriculum committee is the entire division. All curriculum is reviewed by all the faculty. They are expected to review all the CORs, make comments and suggestions and initial the CORs. Horowitz commented that he doesn't think all faculty participate and that the reviews are not as rigorous as needed. Schultz countered that those faculty who do review, do an extremely thorough job.</li> <li>• LA division process has recently been reinvigorated to be more thoughtful of the curriculum as described in detail at last CCC meeting. LA has had very vigorous discussions regarding distance and stand alone courses.</li> <li>• BSS has 12 different departments, many with only 1 or two faculty. Their Division curriculum committee meets once a month and they also use Etudes for communication and decision-making in between the Division mtgs.</li> <li>• FA has a 7-person committee that has been reinstated to have more clearly defined processes.</li> <li>• CNSL curriculum committee now meets once a month. They start every meeting with "what's happening". They want "lean &amp; mean" curriculum discussions. They have also decided that there will be more continuity with CCC as they are going to off-set their tenure on the committee so the there's a consistent voice.</li> <li>• PSME has departmental curriculum meetings and one Division curriculum meeting once a quarter, at which each department gets a single vote. Much communication via email in between meetings.</li> <li>• AL has had a difficult time because faculty are very scattered physically, and the limited number of full-time faculty in each area has been problematic. Primary reliance has made a large shift in curriculum away from dean and onto faculty. The current Division Curriculum committee is three and they try to meet after each Division meeting. Not all the faculty in the division are from academia and that posses some unique issues.</li> <li>• PE is in transition. Up until now, all new curricular updates were circulated thru the division in paper form and they all voted. They are currently establishing a specific division curriculum committee that is more focused, more green and more inclusive.</li> <li>• We'd like to keep having these conversations to develop best-practice resources and help divisions be as effective as possible.</li> </ul>
7. Report Out from Plenary	<p><b>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft</b></p> <p>Distribution of three documents for discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document: Resolutions concerning repeatability that</li> </ul>

	<p>passed at ASCCC Fall plenary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Repeatability being eliminated for almost all disciplines. Repeatability corrections in CORs should be done ASAP b/c the change likely to take effect Spring 2012. Since COR updates are being done now, this will prevent us scrambling come Spring quarter. Instead of allowing repeats, one option is to make up to four levels of a subject.</li><li>○ Repetition is an immediate issue. This is retaking a course to alleviate a substandard grade and applies within the entire District, not just FH. Reps need to make sure their faculty are aware of this and can advise students appropriately. Equivalent courses within the District are the next project for Kimberlee, to determine which courses map to the other campus. Drops/W's will directly effect apportionment. Implementation will be Summer 2012.</li><li>• Documents regarding Student Success Task Force Recommendations: memo from Michelle Pilati and ASCCC adopted resolutions re: SSTF recs. Please read and share with constituents.</li></ul>
--	--

**Attendees:** K. Armstrong, J. Baker, F. Cammin, 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, J. Nguyen, G. Schultz, B. Shewfelt, P. Starer, B. Ziegenhorn