

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 21, 2023
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 7, 2023	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All STEM: Working on curriculum sheets.</p> <p>LRC: Agyare shared Library has extended hours this week and next.</p> <p>Language Arts: Armerding mentioned recent division retreat to discuss SLO process; faculty created process for meaningful creation and assessment of SLOs. Working on curriculum sheets.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Gough shared recent division CC meeting discussed process to review/update curriculum sheets, which are being worked on. Gomes noted received some feedback re: equity guidelines document.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: Meezan shared a few depts. creating new honors courses.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p> <p>Vanatta shared hoping to have Title 5 list ready by end of week; will email to reps and deans.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Armerding shared English faculty Hilda Fernandez used equity guidelines draft for reading assignment for students; shared students' responses with Kuehnl.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals b. Spring Plenary Resolutions c. New Certificate Approvals by CCCCCO: Accounting Ethics CA, Community Health Worker CA, CPA Exam Preparation - Financial Accounting Reporting CA, Tax Specialist CA	<p>Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: ANTH 5H, BUSI 11H, GLST 1H, HUMN 12H, MDIA 12H. No comments.</p> <p>Resolutions packet was attached as info item. Reach out to Kuehnl or Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva with any questions or feedback, or if interested in attending plenary meeting in April.</p> <p>Vanatta shared that the state recently approved these new certificates of achievement! They have all been added to the catalog.</p>
5. Equity in the COR	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document, which has been updated based on discussion during first read. Kuehnl commented on new bullet in Types/Examples of ... Assignments section, and asked for clarification. Parikh responded, idea is that</p>

	<p>instead of assuming all students come into class with the exact same experiences/background, faculty builds up from where various students are coming from. Kuehnl also asked about placement of bullet in document—Parikh responded, placement related to where ideas are coming from; students are “co-constructing.” Meezan asked if bullet is about students incorporating their lived experiences into assignments—Parikh responded, no, it’s related to introducing a course/lesson/topic. Gough agreed perhaps bullet should be moved to different section. Gomes suggested: “assignments are based on prior knowledge.” Kuehnl asked if Course Content section more appropriate, or if bullet should be revised to mention assignments—Parikh believes moving to Course Content more applicable. Vanatta noted existing bullet in Course Content section, re: students’ lived experiences—Parikh believes new bullet different enough to be separate.</p> <p>Meezan commented on “asked to begin” and Kaupp suggested: “asked to approach the course.” Parikh clarified bullet can apply to individual topics, as well as the course in general. Jenkins asked for clarification, is the bullet asking students to approach the content or asking faculty to give space to students to approach the content—Kuehnl noted guidelines are for faculty. Jenkins suggested: “are instructors asking students to begin.” Rideaux asked how Course Content could actually be written to incorporate bullet, and wondered if bullet more applicable to pedagogy; Meezan believes could be more appropriate for syllabus construction. Holcroft commented on pedagogy, noting it’s already good practice to ask students to surface prior knowledge which applies to course topic/content as opposed to making assumptions; could relate to a reading assignment or act as another type of prompt. This practice helps students realize they’re not coming from a blank slate. Discussion about whether Methods of Instruction section more appropriate.</p> <p>Rideaux suggested keeping bullet in Types/Examples of ... Assignments section and modifying language: “do assignments elicit students’ prior knowledge of the content?” Parikh agreed and suggested also adding bullet to Methods of Instruction section; someone pointed out similar bullet already there re: students’ lived experiences. Group agreed to update new bullet to Rideaux’s suggestion and keep in Types/Examples of ... Assignments section only.</p> <p>Morriss shared feedback from STEM division faculty re: Representative Texts/Materials section, to move bullet re: free texts to top of list—group agreed. Holcroft mentioned Academic Senate OER liaison in addition to library liaison—group agreed to add (same bullet re: free texts). Morriss commented on possible typo in definition of equity—Vanatta noted Office of Equity team likely updating definitions but will correct typo.</p> <p>Motion to approve document with modifications M/S (Morriss, Kaupp/Jenkins/Parikh). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Course Deactivation Exemption Requests</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl List of courses not taught in four years was distributed via email on Feb. 8; divisions submitted requests to exempt courses, per Policy on Course Currency. Requests for the following courses were reviewed and voted on as a group, with the option to pull any course for individual discussion/vote: ALLD 402; ALTW 431; ANTH 2B, 67B; APPT 126, 128; APSM 123, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 155B; BUSI 19, 90A; CHLD 54A, 54C, 54D, 73; C S 20A, 50C, 52A, 52B, 56B, 80A, 81A, 84B; EMS 200; ENGL 49; ESLL 248; GEOG 11; GID 46, 47; HIST 3B, 18; HORT 60G, 90E, 90L, 90M; JRNL 53A, 53B, 60, 61, 62, 64; KINS 54; LIBR</p>

	<p>10H; MATH 1BH, 1BHP; MDIA 4, 7, 31, 52; MTEC 66A, 70G, 80B, 80C, 84A; MUS 3D, 38A, 38B, 38C; NCEL 403A, 403B; PHDA 24; PHED 15C, 20B, 21D, 24C, 24D, 25B, 43A; PHIL 11; PHOT 22, 57B, 68E, 78B, 78C, 78D; PSE 20; PSYC 54H; R T 71; SOC 54H; THTR 7, 26.</p> <p>No discussion occurred regarding any specific requests.</p> <p>Meezan believes this process is a really good exercise for faculty to engage with, as it forces them to look at their catalog listings and really consider whether a course should continue to be active if it's not been taught in recent years.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (St. Onge-Cole, Kaupp). Approved.</p>
<p>7. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding need to discuss how Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document will be used across campus; for example, who will be reviewing equity updates to CORs, will CORs be rejected for not having been updated for equity, etc. Academic Senate (AS) has made clear that determining these things included in mandate to CCC to create guidelines. One suggestion at previous meeting was to add checkbox on COR form; Parikh hopeful that this seemingly simple option will prompt faculty to eventually read guidelines, even if they don't the first few times they check the box. Recalled discussions earlier this year, during which group assumed initial faculty compliance wouldn't be 100%. Kuehnl clarified checkbox would be for faculty to sign off that they've done the work, but someone else would then need to review and ascertain whether or not the work was actually done.</p> <p>St. Onge-Cole suggested when faculty presents course update to division CC, they must explain equity-related updates they've made; can be opportunity for discussion if faculty unsure how to incorporate equity. Kaupp suggested adding text field alongside checkbox, for faculty to summarize their equity-related updates. Gomes asked who will be in charge of reading faculty's explanation, if such a text box is added; worried about reality of Title 5 updates submitted late in the process, very close to deadline, which doesn't leave a lot of time for division reps/CCs to review. Gough mentioned suggestion at previous meeting for this document/topic to be campus-wide Opening Day activity; does not believe division CC should be put in position of having to police equity-related updates. Kuehnl believes responsibility of review will likely fall to division reps, as currently no plan for release time for separate group to review. Jenkins recalled the reason we created guidelines was to not add specific equity-related field to COR; Kuehnl noted CCC was mandated by AS to create document. Jenkins mentioned faculty concerned that editing COR content will trigger need for rearticulation; Morriss agreed.</p> <p>Parikh believes you can force someone to reflect and check a box, but you can't change their mindset; hope is that by repeatedly checking the box faculty who are resistant will eventually apply the guidelines. Kuehnl agrees but believes reasonable to ask faculty to make a statement re: how they have used the guidelines. Acknowledged division reps already have a lot on their plate when reviewing CORs. Holcroft commented some items (on guidelines) can be implemented very quickly, while others may take years; hope is to set colleagues up for success by making sure they understand that they have time and support. Does not believe policing should be used. Noted many items</p>

	<p>are very subjective and even the most dedicated faculty member (re: equity) won't be able to nail 100% of them. Believes ongoing conversations with peers within discipline will be critical and will help address individual blind spots.</p> <p>Morriss noted guidelines discussed at math dept. retreat, prompting question of "who's the audience for the COR?" as well as concern re: retriggering articulation. Math dept. faculty believe discussions within dept., such as Holcroft suggested, will be important in ensuring faculty teaching in an equitable way. Morriss believes checkbox could serve as way for faculty to confirm teaching in an equitable way. Noted some colleagues concerned they don't have background/expertise re: DEIA. Gomes expressed hope that there will be professional development for faculty to implement guidelines. Armerding believes our de-centralized model will help, as equity guidelines will become part of each division's individual process, rather than coming down from central CCC; will be different for each division/dept., just as other processes already are. Agreed with idea of checkbox to prompt confirmation of reflection, and asked about visibility on COR (internal vs. external). Agreed that although checkbox wouldn't force faculty to actually do the work, could lead to folks feeling they're being held accountable.</p> <p>Vanatta explained checkbox and related text field would be visible within CourseLeaf to anyone who has an account, but won't display on public-facing COR (in catalog) unless we want it to. Jenkins wondered where spaces can be created for conversations and what barriers may exist for faculty to not engage (e.g., workload, resistance, etc.). Believes Opening Day is appropriate; Parikh agreed and noted has discussed equity-related questions re: Program Review with dept. colleagues, some of whom believe all equity-related content can simply be included in intro course and doesn't need to be in all dept. courses. Believes, for some faculty, thinking about applying equity to every course will be a big step; believes checkbox can prompt reflections and conversations about equity in all courses, not just intro.</p> <p>Kuehnl believes process will be different for courses in different types of disciplines (e.g., will be easier for some than others); noted some faculty responsible for updating CORs for courses they never teach, which may be difficult. Believes adding text field for faculty to explain their equity-related approach could be worthwhile; no decision needs to be made today, and discussion will continue at future meetings. Pointed out that faculty decided application of guidelines across all courses will be completed within five years, tied to Title 5 process. Jenkins asked if Kuehnl can send reps actual language of mandate—Kuehnl responded, mandate is to review every COR for equity within five years; can ask Villanueva to attend future CCC meeting to discuss further.</p> <p>Holcroft mentioned robust Peer Online Course Review (POCR) program, which is not forced and has incentive attached to it; faculty going through POCR program has led to very different results (in a positive way) vs. simply asking faculty if they are doing the work.</p>
<p>8. Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Grant Phase I</p>	<p>Speaker: Carolyn Holcroft Instructional materials a huge part of the cost of students' education and, ultimately, a huge factor in students' financial stability. For clarification, instructional materials include textbooks, digital course materials (e.g., open educational resources [OER], licensed materials, homework systems); doesn't include equipment such as calculators, yoga mats, paintbrushes, etc. Looking to eliminate cost of instructional materials for students. ZTC course = students can take course without</p>

	<p>having to pay for any instructional materials. ZTC program = students can complete entire degree/cert. without paying for any instructional materials throughout. State has been working to establish ZTC grant program, to develop ZTC courses/programs, to reduce cost for students and also decrease the time for students to complete their degree/cert. ZTC initially tied to CTE, but has expanded to include transfer.</p> <p>Grant program has three phases: planning, expedited implementation, and expanded implementation; we're currently in Phase I. We have \$20,000 to plan development of implementing at least one ZTC degree/cert. Most colleges begin by mapping which faculty are teaching ZTC courses, to determine which degrees/certs. ZTC courses are included in (incl. GE); if one is close, incentivize faculty to get entire degree/cert. ZTC. Phase 3 grants additional \$180,000 which could be used for incentivizing faculty, professional development, OER creation and/or remediation to bring materials up to accessibility standards.</p> <p>By June 30, we must report to the state a framework of our strategy. Currently, mapping almost complete; survey sent to faculty asking what they teach and if they're interested in ZTC. Holcroft shared example of a program, with courses indicated as "ready" (at least one faculty already teaching course as ZTC) or "interest" (at least one faculty interested in moving course to ZTC). Noted other colleges have seen a shift in enrollment in favor of ZTC courses/programs. Also pointed out ZTC fits nicely with equity in COR initiative.</p> <p>Kuehnl asked what if program has, for example, 10 courses, nine of which are ZTC, but one uses a textbook which cannot be replaced (e.g., outside body requires it); is it possible for college to pay for books so students don't have to pay for them and would that count as ZTC? Holcroft responded, yes, and some colleges have bought an entire course set of textbooks; noted must have enough available for every student in order to qualify as ZTC. St. Onge-Cole noted their degree has been ZTC for a year, and Library has full set of textbooks which students check out. Holcroft noted this situation likely a temporary stop-gap, as state moving toward not just shifting textbook costs to taxpayers but instead eliminating textbook costs.</p> <p>Parikh noted tried same approach as St. Onge-Cole but was told by Library staff not an option, as would result in too many different textbooks having to be offered. Also noted each topic in discipline (engineering) has different textbook; Holcroft suggested meeting to discuss situation. Agyare commented re: Engineering textbooks, noting all of the books they're getting are either from dept. lottery funds or ASFC funds; believes if STEM division would like to use lottery funds, circulation staff can put books on reserve. Kaupp noted both OER and ZTC equity-minded by nature.</p>
9. Good of the Order	
10. Adjournment	3:40 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Jeff Bissell (KA), Valerie Fong* (Dean, LA), Hilary Gomes (FA), Tom Gough* (FA), Carolyn Holcroft* (Equity and Professional Development), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan* (BSS), Patrick Morriss* (STEM), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Chrissy Penate* (LRC), Tiffany Rideaux* (BSS), Amy Sarver (LA), JP Schumacher* (Dean, SRC), Shaelyn St. Onge-Cole* (HSH), Maia ten Brink (guest), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta