College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 24, 2017
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: October 3, 2017	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** Language Arts: Developing new course, Literature of Protest. Some Literature courses don't completely match C-ID (different requisites). Rep asked if other depts. have done close review of C-ID—PSME rep noted MATH dept. has spent extensive time due to very strict C-ID reviewers. Lisle asked if C-ID committees have community college representation—yes. Day noted issue of varying level of training for reviewers. Day offered to work with Literature faculty to review courses.

3. Announcements
 	
  a. ESL-Beginning and ESL-Intermediate Noncredit Certificate Approvals
 	
  b. ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions
	Speaker: Rachelle Campbell
	New ASFC Rep, Ronnie Miller—VP of Finance.
	
	The CCCCO has approved two new noncredit certificates in Language Arts: ESL-Beginning and ESL-Intermediate.
	
	Campbell noted resolutions that may be of interest to group:
	• Request Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to Readdress Bachelor Degree Program Requirements (2.01). Foothill proposing resolution; global request, not specific to Dental Hygiene degree.
	• College Autonomy and Faculty Purview for Determining Meta Majors or Areas of Focus (9.01) & Local Academic Senate Role in Developing and Implementing Guided Pathways Frameworks (17.02). Both related to Guided Pathways. Campbell and LaManque attending IEPI conference and will bring back info to share with campus.
	• Dialog and Collaboration on Apprenticeship Faculty Minimum Qualifications (10.02), Application of Faculty Policies to Apprenticeship Instructors (17.03) & Local Senate Purview Over Placement of Apprenticeship Courses Within Disciplines (17.04). Senate officers will be going on Apprenticeship site visit to bring feedback to Plenary.
	
	If you have any comments or would like more information, feel free to email Rachelle and Isaac Escoto.
	
	Question regarding resolution, Allow Students to Repeat Substandard Grades at Other Regionally Accredited Institutions (14.01): Foothill policy already allows students to repeat for this purpose, how could this affect us—Campbell believes resolution is trying to develop processes to ensure no students are impacted. Day noted that, when we set our policy, CSU system allowed it and have since changed their policy. Question regarding whether we annotate transcripts when a course is repeated—unsure. Campbell will bring group's concerns to Plenary.

4. DRC Curriculum Committee Proposal	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of document. Present for discussion are LeeAnn Emanuel and Ben Schwartzman, from Student Resource Center (SRC). Motion to approve **M/S** (Cooper, Anderson). **Approved.**
5—31. Stand Alone Approval Requests:	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell**

APSM 151A, 151B, 151C, 152A, 152B, 152C, 153A, 153B, 153C, 154A, 154B, 154C, 155A, 155B, 155C, 156A, 156B, 156C, 157A, 157B, 157C, 158A, 158B, 158C, 159A, 159B, 159C	Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APSM courses (discussion pertains to group of courses, as they all make up one program). Campbell asked if group would like to consider for approval as a packet—yes. No additional comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Anderson, Starer). **Approved.**
32—58. Stand Alone Approval Requests: APSM 171A, 171B, 171C, 172A, 172B, 172C, 173A, 173B, 173C, 174A, 174B, 174C, 175A, 175B, 175C, 176A, 176B, 176C, 177A, 177B, 177C, 178A, 178B, 178C, 179A, 179B, 179C	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APSM courses (discussion pertains to group of courses, as they all make up one program). Campbell asked if group would like to consider for approval as a packet—yes. No additional comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Starer, Francisco). **Approved.**
59. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCEL 447	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCEL 447. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Starer, Thomas). **Approved.**
60. Stand Alone Approval Request: THTR 46C	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for THTR 46C. The application has been updated for clarity, based on feedback at previous meeting. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Anderson, Francisco). **Approved.**
61. Stand Alone Approval Request: THTR 46D	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for THTR 46D. The application has been updated for clarity, based on feedback at previous meeting. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Starer, Anderson). **Approved.**
62. New Program Application: Landscape Technician Certificate of Achievement	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** Second read of new Landscape Technician Certificate of Achievement. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Francisco, Day). **Approved.**
63. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALLD 402	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALLD 402. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Comment that Criteria A language mentions lower division level instruction, but course is not college level. Campbell asked group for thoughts regarding whether a noncredit course could apply to the first primary mission noted on form. LaManque noted noncredit can be vocational (does not apply to this course). Campbell noted argument could be made regarding this course applying to the second primary mission and the secondary mission. Will follow up with faculty to correct form and resubmit. Comment regarding need for separate Stand Alone form for noncredit. CCC Team will review current form for potential alteration and to see if separate form is necessary. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
64. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALTW 230	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 230. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Campbell noted that, regarding all four ALTW Stand Alone requests, the Needs/Justification statement on the COR is well-worded and could have been helpful info/language to include on this form. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
65. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALTW 231	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 231. Will be

	permanently Stand Alone. *[Note: see item 64 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
66. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALTW 232	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 232. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[Note: see item 64 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
67. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALTW 431	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 431. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[Note: see item 64 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
68. Stand Alone Approval Request: DMS 200	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for DMS 200. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Campbell noted that other Allied Health programs at Foothill have a similar 200-level course. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
69. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCBS 403A	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCBS 403A. Will be permanently Stand Alone. PSME rep noted that Math department has offered Summer Bridge program for some time; offers an intensive course to assist students who test lower than they potentially can, with the goal that they will test higher when they re-take the placement test. NCBS 403A & 403B series represents that program; considering offering during the regular year, as well. Working on developing a noncredit certificate. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
70. Stand Alone Approval Request: NCBS 403B	**Speaker: Rachelle Campbell** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCBS 403B. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[Note: see item 69 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
71. Deep Dive of Curriculum Process	**Speaker: Kristy Lisle** Noted recent announcement around budget cutting. Administration and deans focus on FTES; this quarter, Foothill is up but De Anza is down, which does affect us. Being agile and quick will help us gain FTES. At the same time, we must respect shared governance, academic quality, state guidelines. First step is to map out the current process; today's discussion will focus on the creation of a new course. Group first discussed steps of process in pairs, then as a whole group: First step: Starer mentioned hunt for buy-in, necessary because depts. and divisions must approve. Disagreement among group regarding whether or not buy-in need occur before new course proposal form submitted. Second step: New course proposal form goes to division CC for approval. Lisle asked what might hold up form at division CC—if it overlaps with another course, may be rejected. Lisle asked if Program Review considered during discussion at division CC—more likely at dept. level. Lisle noted institutional effectiveness a priority due to accreditation visit; thinking more strategically, including bringing Program Review into process, could help make smart decisions. Third step: New course proposal form goes to CCC. Starer suggested faculty speak with dean early in process. Example of Literature courses with low enrollment—adding a new one may require

removing an existing one from sequence. Lisle noted talking with dean a strategic move early on, during buy-in phase. Starer noted that new course proposal form is an information item to CCC so that campus-wide discussion around overlap and other issues may be addressed.

Lisle asked if any of these steps could be skipped (e.g., division CC), to streamline. BSS rep that division also checks form for content, so forms could be in bad shape if sent directly to Vanatta. Lisle expressed concern that our complex and lengthy process is stifling innovation. Asked group how often division CCs meet—some meet twice a week, some biweekly, some monthly. Campbell noted that because CCC does not approve forms, Vanatta immediately gives faculty access in C3MS to begin working on COR. Lisle asked if CCC discussion ever results in faculty not moving forward with proposed course—examples of concern at CCC necessitating further discussion outside of CCC (deans involved, etc.) to resolve issues, but unusual. Most courses presented without issue. Campbell reminded group that curriculum is 10+1; has recently heard from faculty concerned that deans might be too involved in curriculum (e.g., signing forms). Starer noted that if faculty is driven to create a course, there really is nothing that can/will stop them. Lisle mentioned decline in face-to-face offerings vs. online. Question regarding why total enrollment not considered as a whole—Lisle noted that modality must be taken into consideration when course being developed, to ensure we're best targeting student populations. Apprenticeship rep noted that student populations usually taken into consideration when course developed (e.g., "who are we targeting with this course?").

Fourth step: C3MS process; Edit—faculty member enters info, Articulation, Dean Review, Proof (back to faculty), Curriculum Rep, Instruction. Proof status identified as big hang-up, because faculty don't realize it requires their review. Lisle asked how long Proof can take—depends on what editing might be necessary (e.g., formatting, etc.). Starer noted simultaneous steps of Content Review, etc. Lisle asked how we determine if a prerequisite is needed—examples given of faculty purview, C-ID, transfer institutions. Day mentioned guidelines for each discipline for prerequisites, in terms of articulation. Lisle asked if De Anza can prevent creation of a Foothill course or program—no. Discussion may happen, but they cannot prevent (and we cannot prevent theirs). Campbell noted issue of supplemental forms not being within C3MS. Lisle asked how group would feel about changing software/system—positive reaction. Starer noted expense of changing system and commented that all systems have their own issues. Hueg noted that a few years back outside systems were reviewed and decision made to not change. Rep recalled that the expectation was that C3MS would be updated, based on suggestions. Lisle asked how long C3MS process takes and pain points—Starer mentioned seat counts, Bio Health rep mentioned forms. Campbell mentioned example of prerequisite within different discipline requiring conversation with outside department, perhaps even in a different division. Content Review form goes through division CC, dean, articulation; also requires requisite discipline faculty signature. Campbell noted faculty have varying degrees of familiarity with curriculum process—low familiarity leads to slow-down. SLOs (entered in TracDat) also interrupt process, because new courses not automatically listed in TracDat—nowhere for faculty to list SLOs within C3MS.

Next, all courses must go to FHDA board for approval (meets once per month). From there, entered in the state's system—auto-approval

	of credit curriculum (we submit an annual certification form), but not of noncredit. Once course is approved in state's system, waits for next catalog year. Catalog published once per year; Lisle mentioned she asked deans if we can publish twice per year. Question regarding why we cannot publish live, frequent updates to catalog—could create problems for students' catalog rights, degree auditing, etc. Day noted that the majority of our courses are transferable and we must follow external deadlines which can drag the process out for a year or longer. After state approval of course, submitted for one or more of: UC and/or CSU transferability, C-ID approval, IGETC and/or CSU GE approval, course-to-course major articulation. Apprenticeship rep noted that none of the articulation considerations prevent us from offering a course; Day agreed but cautioned that many students take courses with intention to transfer. Lisle noted that Apprenticeship does not go through articulation but is being held up due to catalog. LaManque noted June curriculum deadline, for the next available catalog. Vanatta outlined her process: reviews all submissions (almost 700 for the most recent deadline) during the summer, follows up with faculty and reps during fall and into winter; must have everything cleaned up and approved in state's system at end of February to being working on catalog. Extensive follow-up required with faculty due to questions regarding COR info, forms needed, etc. Comment regarding reviewing the benefits of centralized CCC vs. division CC set-up. Campbell noted need to ensure that each division, allowing its own process, be transparent about process. Noted that the decentralized curriculum at Foothill is unique among community colleges. Lisle noted concern with lengthy timeline from COR submission in June to ability to offer following summer, as well as constraints of C3MS system. Phuong Tran suggested elimination of new course proposal form. Hueg suggested taking a new look at third party systems. Campbell suggested technical review body to review new courses before submission to Vanatta. Starer commented on tension between expediency and people's feelings—Foothill errs on the side of people feeling good about the outcome of the process, including consensus, which takes time. Lisle noted agreement on positive aspect but concerned that, currently, we don't necessarily have the luxury of sacrificing expediency. Campbell thanked Lisle for facilitating the discussion. Next, Lisle would like further exercise/discussion about strengths and weaknesses, if group agrees. Campbell noted conversation will likely resume at Nov. 21st meeting.
72. Good of the Order	
73. Adjournment	**3:33 PM**

Attendees: Mark Anderson (FA), Ben Armerding (LA), Rachelle Campbell (Faculty Co-Chair), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Sara Cooper (BH), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), LeeAnn Emanuel (guest—DRC), Hilda Fernandez (LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Brenda Hanning (BH), Kelaiah Harris (guest—Instruction), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Ray Kapp (guest—AVP Workforce), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Andrew LaManque (AVP Instruction, Administrator Co-Chair), Kristy Lisle (guest—VP Instruction), Bruce McLeod (Apprenticeship), Ronnie Miller (ASFC), Tiffany Rideaux (BSS), Ben Schwartzman (guest—DRC), Barbara Shewfelt (KA), Nanette Solvason (Dean, BH), Paul Starer (Dean, LA), Mary Thomas (LIBR), Phuong Tran (guest—Apprenticeship), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta