

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 14, 2016
2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 31, 2016	Motion to approve M/S (Starer, Jones). Approved.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Isaac Escoto The following proposals were presented: MDIA 13; MTEC 51C, 64A, 85A [<i>note: late request to use a different number for MTEC 85A—will be offered as MTEC 54A</i>]. Please share with your constituents. Comment that MTEC course titles are familiar, and question regarding possibility of duplicate courses—Escoto noted at least one is part of a series; will follow up with division [<i>note: course author stated that these courses all "feature new, advanced content that has (thus far) never been taught at Foothill"</i>].
a. New Course Proposals	
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	Prerequisites for new PHT courses for 2017-18. Please share with your constituents.
c. CCC Meeting Dates for 2016-17	Meeting dates for the 2016-17 year have been scheduled. CCC will continue to meet every other Tuesday, from 2:00-3:30 p.m., in the President's Conference Room. Note that dates are scheduled for weeks that alternate with Academic Senate (with a few exceptions), to aid in communication between the two bodies, as well as assist those who attend both meetings. Note that CCC will meet during Thanksgiving break week. Vanatta will send calendar invitations once attendee list has been finalized.
d. CCC Reps for 2016-17	At previous meeting, CCC reps were asked to report back with names of division attendees for 2016-17 (CCC reps and administrators) [<i>note: the following list of potential reps may differ, for some divisions, from the reps attending for 2016-17; please refer to agendas/minutes from 2016-17 for the correct information</i>]: CNSL: Lety Serna will continue; hoping to identify someone to replace LeeAnn Emanuel. BSS: Bill Ziegenhorn will replace Allison Lenkeit Meezan; Brian Evans will continue for fall and winter only. Dean is currently unknown. PSME: Kathy Armstrong, Marnie Francisco, and Marc Knobel will continue. Dean is currently unknown. LIBR: Kay Jones will continue. LA: Valerie Fong and Ben Armerding will continue; Paul Starer believes he will continue. BHS: Sara Cooper and Dave Sauter will replace Rachelle Campbell and Brenda Hanning. ASFC: Student rep is currently unknown. FA: Mark Anderson will replace Suzanne Weller; Kristin Tripp-Caldwell will continue for winter and spring only, if possible.
3. New Program Application: Public Health ADT	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Second read of new Public Health ADT; no changes to documents since last meeting. No comments or additional changes. Motion to approve M/S (Francisco, Hanning). Approved.
4. Cross-listing Policy	Speaker: Isaac Escoto Second read of document. Note that draft has been updated since previous meeting, to strike-through text related to

	<p>discussion of policy creation, which is not appropriate to include in final policy document. No comments or additional changes.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Tam, Evans). Approved.</p>
5. Apprenticeship Curriculum Review	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Second read of document; no changes to draft since first read at previous meeting. Escoto noted that each of the four options presented in document has its own pros and cons. The goal is to move forward with a plan, but without forcing or rushing the issue. Acknowledged that group consensus is unlikely; hope is that a majority decision can be reached. Noted that a Technical Review Team (TRT) can be implemented for any of the four options. Suggestion shared to prioritize options, to help aid in conversation if majority cannot be reached.</p> <p>Escoto asked each division for selection: FA: Interested in TRT. Selected option #1. CNSL: Selected option #1. Noted discussion among counselors resulted in agreement for option #2 in similar situations, but believe that option #1 best for Apprenticeship. BSS: Can no longer house Apprenticeship; volume is overwhelming. Noted need to return half of the 50+ CORs submitted for Title 5 updates, for revisions. Noted recent submission of 70+ new course proposal forms for one BSS CC meeting. Noted that BSS invites Apprenticeship to attend BSS CC, but Apprenticeship faculty rarely attend. Expressed belief that Apprenticeship needs to be more involved and should not be siloed by having their own CC—needs more support, not less. Concerned that separate Apprenticeship CC will result in problematic curriculum decisions. Selected option #4, with addition of TRT, as well as requiring Apprenticeship to attend CCC regularly. PSME: Selected option #2. Expressed belief that, most importantly, Apprenticeship needs to be more involved with CCC, regardless of which option is selected. LIBR: Selected option #4, with addition of TRT. Noted interest in combination of technical review and curriculum review by those outside of Apprenticeship. LA: Selected option #2. Noted concern that option #4 might not address problem of Apprenticeship needing to be more involved—would need to require attendance at CCC. BH: Selected option #2. Stressed importance of Apprenticeship attending CCC.</p> <p>Tam supported idea of Apprenticeship becoming more involved (option #2), as well as belief that they need support of TRT and/or another division (option #1).</p> <p>Messina noted need for on-campus person to serve as liaison with off-site faculty, as well as instructor of record for CORs. Reported on faculty member reassign time to coordinate Apprenticeship curriculum. This person would work with off-site faculty and attend all relevant Division CC and/or CCC meetings. This person would report to VP of Instruction. Noted that this arrangement can work with any agreed-upon process, going forward. Echoed concern of Apprenticeship having their own CC, especially considering course approval happens at the division level.</p> <p>Question for more information from BSS regarding current technical review process and associated issues. BSS noted that</p>

	<p>two adjuncts have recently worked with Apprenticeship. First person seemed to have little knowledge of the trades but was able to work with them; second person is off-campus and has not attended any BSS CC meetings. Noted additional issue of current on-campus Apprenticeship liaison appearing to be unengaged with BSS CC and not participating in process to BSS's expectations. Stressed need for on-campus presence to be engaged and understand implications of curriculum changes.</p> <p>Escoto noted that option #2 and TRT selected most often. Will share selection with Academic Senate at retreat on Friday, and will note that decision was not by consensus but was option selected the most often. Additionally, will share concerns regarding this and other options. Messina suggested identifying additional option, in case initial plan does not work as expected. Escoto stated that CCC can revisit, if plan does not work out.</p>
<p>6. CCC Topics for 2016-17</p>	<p>Speaker: Isaac Escoto Escoto created document listing pending topics for future discussion; topics to discuss on an ongoing basis; and topics discussed at CCC this year, noting action taken. Noted variety of topics discussed and approved, and thanked group for hard work. Noted that discussions at CCC result in wider action being taken across campus, e.g., honors discussion resulted in new honors courses being developed.</p> <p>Ongoing topics list includes creation of new ADTs, C-ID standards, content review, and course equivalency with De Anza. Noted interest in discussing course equivalency more closely with district senate next year, in order to possibly help this item move forward.</p> <p>Pending topics are those that CCC had hoped to discuss this year but was unable to address. Hope to do so in 2016-17. List includes department review of CORs; student preparedness (including requisite recency); review of Foothill GE requirements (noted that preliminary discussion did occur this year); curriculum sheet approval process in divisions; high school articulation.</p> <p>Escoto asked group to share topics of interest to add to document, noting that CCC mainly discusses issues of policy. The following topics were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of substantial and non-substantial changes, regarding CORs, and discussion of possibility of allowing fast-tracking of non-substantial changes. • Equity across our curriculum. • Academic dishonesty; need for better effort to deter. Escoto noted Academic Integrity Committee. Noted that COOL frequently discusses academic integrity. Mention of COOL-DEAC/Academic Integrity meeting to address topic, tomorrow. • Need for faculty training, to understand curriculum processes. • Discussion of ways for department/division CCs to be better supported. Comment that local committees rely on CCC reps to do a lot of curriculum-related work. • Reverse articulation and intricacies of being a quarter-system school in a semester-system world—becoming a more frequent issue with ADTs. • Need for administrative perspective at division CCs, especially regarding creation of new programs. Comment that curriculum is faculty purview and to be careful regarding level of

	<p>administrative input and influence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support expressed regarding topic of prerequisite recency. • Comment regarding discussion of Foothill GE on list of pending topics—group should not necessarily focus on making it less “rigid” (in response to language on document). Escoto noted that document can be changed to reflect purpose of discussion. Comment regarding including discussion of separate issue of link between local GE and CSU GE/IGETC. • Relationship of curriculum and accreditation process. Escoto noted that there are four main standards that will be addressed for accreditation, and curriculum is mentioned throughout. Foothill’s self-study will be submitted in spring 2017, and different groups have been formed to help write self-study—have begun to meet. • Comment regarding how articulation is related to writing and approving CORs. Concern expressed that, at department-level, faculty aren’t necessarily aware of Title 5 requirements. Does incorrect information on CORs (e.g., inactive courses listed as requisites) mean that current level of COR review insufficient, for some? Suggestion of group brainstorm of ways to ensure better COR review. Comment that CCC reps only see CORs for their own division and not the larger scope of frequent issues. • Division-level discussion of requisites and advisories—how does it occur? Suggestion to bring ENGL/ESLL faculty to CCC for discussion regarding what students are learning, to aid divisions in determining requisites. <p>Escoto asked group to pick three topics to focus on for 2016-17: equity, academic dishonesty, requisite recency. Will prioritize these and hope to discuss as many as possible, from the others listed.</p>
7. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All FA: Division CC approved Bruce McLeod's proposal to create Theatre Tech department, for those courses.</p> <p>Question regarding what happens if no one in a division steps up to be a CCC rep. Escoto noted that curriculum is faculty purview and that, from a senate perspective, this situation would be concerning. If this situation arose, senate President and/or VP might offer to attend a division CC meeting to discuss importance of curriculum representation and encourage faculty to represent their division.</p>
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	3:28 PM

Attendees: Benjamin Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), LeeAnn Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (Faculty Co-Chair), Brian Evans (BSS), Basil Farooq (ASFC), Valerie Fong (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kurt Hueg (Acting VP, Instruction—guest), Kay Jones (LIBR), Marc Knobel (PSME), K. Allison Lenkeit Meezan (BSS), Kimberlee Messina (Interim President—guest), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Victor Tam (Dean, PSME), Kristin Tripp-Caldwell (FA), Bill Ziegenhorn (History faculty—guest)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta