College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 5, 2013
2:03 p.m. – 3:17 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 29, 2013	Minutes approved as written. **M/S** (Baker, Armstrong) **Approved.**
2. Announcements a. Report out from Divisions b. Upcoming events c. GE Application Reminder d. Curriculum Sheet Reminder	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** a. Division Reps had no items to report. b. Reminder about the Global Citizenship Pathway meeting this Friday, 12:00 p.m. in the President's Conference Room. c. Remind faculty: opportunity to add a course to the FH GE list for 2013-14 is fast approaching. GE applications must be through your Division CCs and to the Instruction Office by **Feb 28** to ensure that they can be reviewed and acted upon by CCC. d. Curriculum Sheets must be in **Review** status by **March 1st** for the 2013-14 Catalog. Holcroft reminded that all certificates of achievement must specify presence or absence of minimum competencies in math and English. Elaine Kuo finishing data collection re: certificate completion vs. math/English completion, will have to reps by next meeting so discipline faculty can make informed, data-driven decisions.
3. Consent Calendar: a. GE Applications b. Stand Alone Applications	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** a. ENGL 16 and 46B: Knobel noted that there was no division signature on these two applications. Armstrong: Why would there be "advanced" courses included in GE? Are advanced courses really general ed? A: Sometimes there are students that may enter FH at a higher than the entry course level so this makes a GE course available to them in their area. Motion to approve all GE applications on consent calendar (**M/S**, Armstrong, Pennington). **Approved.** *Humanities:* ART 4A, 5A, ENGL 16, 18A, 46B, HUMN 3, 4, MUS 7E, MUS 2/THTR 2F and *Communication & Analytical Thinking:* C S 1A, 1B, 1C, 2B, 2C. b. Francisco asked for clarification as the need statement on this application doesn't give statistical/workforce information to substantiate the need as is required by Title 5. Holcroft/Messina explained that this course is very different in that it has been created to serve multiple disciplines by providing a work internship experience component to be added to established programs. Will ultimately be part of many programs and therefore not stand-alone. Holcroft reminded the committee that we actually have two types of "stand alone" courses: those that are intended to be permanently Stand Alone (i.e. no plan to include them in state approved degree/certificate) and those that require consideration as stand alone temporarily, to get State approval before they can be included in the programs for which they were created. Committee recommended that the application be modified to explain the broad-based need. **Move** to approve ITRN 50 with changes to the application need statement.

	Criteria A spelling error and date incorrect. (**M/S**, Francisco, Cashmore) **Approved**
4. Program Creation	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** Wrong document was attached to agenda, therefore this item will be moved to the next agenda. CH will forward correct document to everyone ASAP.
5. Prerequisite Content Review	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** Holcroft drafted a document outlining a plan based on our discussion at the last meeting. There is a concern that adding English and math prerequisites might cause a shortage of sections to accommodate the student demand. It was suggested that wording be added to indicate that faculty work in consultation with administrators to coordinate the offering of the appropriate number of sections of the requisite courses. Murray encouraged us to push basic/primary courses and encourage students not to wait until their last quarter. Also, should we discuss cut-scores for the Math courses? Can add cut score wording to plan if needed. Armstrong suggested "booster" courses be created that bolster the skill set for the main course rather than requiring a full prereq course. Example: a low-unit math "booster" or prep for Chemistry. Holcroft asked for opinions re: how CCC training re: prereqs be handled? Committee suggested that CCC reps be trained and then they train their constituency groups on at least a yearly basis. CH will add the items discussed to the document and we will review at the next meeting. Will also discuss monitoring for disproportionate impact at next meeting.
6. Minimum Units for a GE Course	**Speaker: Marnie Francisco** GE subcommittee reviewed a 2.5-unit course application for Communication & Analytical Thinking GE Area. Since the area only requires "one course" from that area, there is a concern that a 2.5 unit course would be unable to cover the breadth and depth to satisfy the intent of the GE area. IGETC and CSU-GE require minimum 4 quarter units. May be doing disservice to students if we let them use a lower unit course that we know will not satisfy GE at transfer school. We would like to consider requiring 4 unit courses for GE areas other than physical activity courses. Please discuss this topic with your constituency groups, will take action later this quarter.
7. New Course Proposal Process Issues	**Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft** Discipline faculty have expressed some concerns about the established process. If there is a conflict between faculty from two disciplines and they are not able to come to consensus, what action occurs? Although our process states that the discussion would then come to this body, it appears courses may still be moving forward in approval process even when there is unresolved conflict. It appears what is missing from the procedures is a timing/mechanism that indicates when conversations move to the next level of moderation. Holcroft suggested the process should be modified to ask the faculty to go to their Division CCC Reps for assistance in mediating conversations, as CCC reps may have more insight about curriculum from a campus-wide perspective. If those conversations do not resolve the issue, the discussion will come to CCC. The CCC's responsibilities are

	to oversee and approve courses and although we have not been in the business of micro-managing individual courses, it is our responsibility per Title 5 especially when content is interdisciplinary or overlapping. One committee member requested that they receive a document listing the courses being changed or added either be posted to the website or distributed to the members.

Atendees: