

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: February 5, 2019	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Counseling: Continuing work on condensing curriculum; looking to change CNSL 52 to UC transferable.</p> <p>SRC: Finishing up course title updates.</p> <p>PSME: Finalizing curriculum sheet updates; Computer Science dept. creating new certificate in Cloud Services.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Working on Courses not Taught in Four Years, re: implications concerning outside athletic organizations.</p> <p>Library: No updates to report.</p> <p>Bio Health: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Related to AB 705, trying to create noncredit coreqs (for ENGL 1A, 1S/1T) that may qualify for enhanced funding. Discussing offering concurrent face-to-face and online sections of Literature courses.</p> <p>Fine Arts: No updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: Working on curriculum sheets.</p>
3. Announcements a. CourseLeaf Update	<p>Speaker: Paul Starer We now have a signed contract with Leepfrog! Pre-orientation meeting tomorrow, with formal orientation meeting on Thursday. Our needs and nature of homegrown C3MS system will require a somewhat unorthodox implementation of CourseLeaf.</p>
4. Consent Calendar a. GE Applications	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding The following GE applications were presented: Area VII—PHDA 15A, 15B, 15C. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Thomas, Kuehnl). Approved.</p>
5. Stand Alone Approval Request: PHDA 401	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for PHDA 401. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Gilstrap, Cembellin). Approved.</p>
6. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 467	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 467. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
7. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALCB 468	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALCB 468. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>

<p>8. Stand Alone Approval Request: ALTW 233</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 233. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Language Arts rep shared positive reaction to creation of course.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Courses not Taught in Four Years (70R series courses)</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Follow-up to discussion at previous meeting, regarding how to handle Independent Study series courses (i.e., 70R series) when they appear on the list. Previous discussion included possibility to exempt such courses from process, since they are not offered in the same way as a “normal” course. Could still include them on the list, with notation that they are exempted, and add notation on the Course Deactivation Exemption Request form. Group agreed. Armerding asked if group would like to formally vote—yes.</p> <p>Motion to approve exempting Independent Study series courses from the Courses not Taught in Four Years process M/S (Kuehnl, Herman). Approved.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep asked if this decision is immediate to affect the current list—yes. Vanatta noted that she has already been contacted by some divisions about their IS courses; will follow-up to ensure faculty are aware of this change.</p>
<p>10. Program Creation Process Revision</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding CCC drafted New Program Proposal form at previous meetings; Advisory Council has now seen it and responded positively. Study group has been considering which groups should receive form for informational purposes and to provide feedback (e.g., deans, various governance committees, Academic and Professional Matters for share-out with De Anza). Still discussing how process would work, as some groups meet only once a month, which could slow feedback process. After form has gone through all groups, faculty/division would receive it back with all feedback, to then move forward in developing program. CCC would vote to approve all new programs, but role of division CC still under discussion (e.g., approval role or just part of the info/feedback form process). One argument against division CC approval is that programs are more of a central, college-wide thing, but an argument for it is that programs must be housed within a division.</p> <p>Language Arts rep noted it seems logical for division to be supportive of a program, asked for a scenario in which one is not. Armerding cannot recall, but noted Social Justice Studies ADT which is interdisciplinary and involved faculty in multiple divisions—it worked out fine, but a similar situation could occur in which campus community supports, but no single division wants to take ownership. Starer noted propensity to involve many people/groups in discussion/creation of new programs; central issue is does the buck stop at CCC, or elsewhere? Argued it should be at CCC, as programs are central to the college, and to not bring many other groups, if any, into a formal approval process—this is how info/feedback process came to be. Noted that division CC approval of actual courses would not change. Armerding noted that all feedback submitted during process would be visible to CCC during CCC review/approval step, so in a case in which division doesn’t necessarily support, CCC would see such feedback.</p>

Vanatta asked if info/feedback step would occur concurrently across all involved groups, or in a certain order—being discussed. New technology in CourseLeaf could end up influencing this, once implemented. Armerding advocated for concurrent review. Vanatta asked if, in a case in which faculty from multiple divisions involved in creation of program, those divisions would all provide feedback (or approve)—has yet to be determined, but Armerding supports. In response to both questions, Starer expressed opinion that no review group should be able to stop the process, as they are not approving the program.

Armerding stressed that foundation of the process is based on CCC's previous discussion and brainstorming, details are now being fine-tuned. Language Arts rep noted differences between creation of interdisciplinary program vs. more traditional program within one department; suggested process could differ depending on nature of the program and courses included. Other Language Arts rep agreed that division feedback is critical; expressed opinion to not add steps/groups just for the sake of doing so. PSME rep asked for clarification regarding current proposed process having just one point of veto, at CCC—yes. Armerding noted that Advisory Council asked for feedback from CCC, especially regarding role of division CC in process. Counseling rep expressed opinion of the need for division CC to be fully in support (whether via formal approval or otherwise). Language Arts rep noted possibility of seeking out a “home” for program in different division, if faculty's home division does not support. Starer asked group to consider example of multiple divisions wanting to house a program; example of Global Studies ADT. Language Arts rep suggested division assignment be part of CCC approval step.

Armerding noted possible scenario of faculty enthusiastic about a program but division is not; could become complicated if CCC approves. This could be seen as an argument for division CC approval, not just feedback. Language Arts rep asked what it means for a division to “own” program—Starer noted responsibility to maintain program (e.g., courses being offered, kept up-to-date for Title 5). Argument could be made that dept. approval more important than division CC approval. Stressed that programs are collaborative effort; can become problematic if a single faculty claims “ownership” of a program. Bio Health rep expressed hesitation to speak for others in division, especially as many of their programs are heavily influenced by outside accreditation/approval groups; division CC approval might be appropriate for such programs.

Armerding suggested continuing discussion at next meeting, to come to consensus regarding feedback to present to Council study group. Language Arts rep asked what faculty who are currently working to create a new program should do, as there is no current process; English dept. has urgent need to create a new noncredit certificate for coreq courses in response to AB 705. Armerding noted that in rare cases we have exempted programs from the full creation process. CCC would need to approve a temporary process for the specific program and determine steps within that process. Spoke with Isaac Escoto, who agreed that it is necessary for unique circumstances, such as related to AB 705. Armerding if group would like to vote on exception—yes.

	<p>Motion to approve allowing English dept. to use a temporary program creation process to create new noncredit certificate M/S (Schultheis, Escamilla). Approved. CCC will discuss at next meeting specific process for English dept. to use.</p> <p>Armerding mentioned issue of deadlines for new programs and frequency of FHDA board meetings. Study group requested feedback from CCC regarding setting annual deadline for all new programs, or continuing rolling submission process—group unanimously would like to keep rolling submissions.</p>
<p>11. Credit by Exam Policy</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding CCC Team drafted proposed process for faculty to use when making a course available for Credit by Exam. CBE policy already exists, but we don't currently have associated process. Armerding noted that list of courses available for CBE must be published in college catalog. Current FHDA Administrative Procedure (AP 4235) states Office of Instruction maintains the list of CBE courses; Vanatta noted that currently Admissions & Records is responsible for CBE section of the catalog. Counseling rep noted language on draft that faculty "should discuss" with dean and articulation officer; suggested change to "must discuss"—will update on next draft. Armerding noted dean's involvement is local decision, not Title 5 or AP, so can be changed. PSME rep asked what would happen if faculty teaching a course on the list does not want to offer CBE—instructor must approve a student to take their course CBE. Starer noted that if no faculty in the dept. is willing to offer the course for CBE, should not be included on the list. Bio Health rep asked if courses on the list would need to be re-submitted each year for continued inclusion—no, but need to include language in process for removing a course from CBE list.</p> <p>Armerding noted that CBE not offered during summer quarter. Bio Health rep noted discussion at previous meeting regarding possible change in Title 5 language regarding mirrored credit and noncredit courses, that a student who passes noncredit version would then be allowed to challenge credit version using CBE. Problematic for EMS dept., as outside accrediting body does not allow all students to use CBE (only those in certain groups). Armerding noted language states students may "seek" CBE, so perhaps in those cases instructor would not allow. Starer noted it could be problematic to allow only certain groups of students to use CBE. Language Arts rep believes Title 5 language applicable only to situations in which credit version of course is on the CBE list. Counseling rep asked which faculty interested in offering CBE—Spanish dept. very interested. Armerding noted possibility of situation in which course on CBE list has been revised; asked group if process should include language to address needing to update exam—yes. Armerding suggested updating draft to state that instructor is responsible for creating exam.</p> <p>Please share with your constituents. Possible first read of updated draft will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>12. Auto-awarding Degrees/Certificates</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of CCC resolution re: Auto-Awarding Degrees and Certificates, drafted by CCC Team. Armerding spoke with Escoto regarding creation of a policy; was told CCC does not have authority to draft such a policy but may pass resolution or motion. Armerding prefers more formal resolution. Counseling rep noted feedback from international counselors, that auto-awarding could</p>

	<p>affect international students, who might be required to reapply under a different major if they're awarded a degree. Also affects EOPS students, who can no longer be EOPS students once awarded a degree. Armerding suggested those student groups be addressed in updated draft; if policy/process does result will need to take those groups into consideration. Noted suggestion from Escoto that resolution be updated to mention current process students use to apply for completion, and add second resolution stating CCC supports institutional resources to support/fund process of auto-awarding.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>13. FHDA Administrative Procedures 4100, 4222, 4230</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Legal service that district subscribes to (CCLC) has advised district to update language on three APs that involve curriculum. Academic Senate asked Armerding to bring to CCC for feedback; noted possibility that legal team will not allow suggested changes. Noted that AP 4100 states "Ethnic studies must be offered," but we currently do not offer any courses assigned the Ethnic Studies TOP Code—Armerding has followed-up to see if this refers to only courses using that TOP Code or if encompasses all courses related to Ethnic Studies. Such language is mandated by Title 5. Counseling rep asked if language requires us to offer a specific program, or simply courses—Armerding will follow up. Language Arts rep asked if Social Sciences dept. aware of language—Armerding unsure but asked reps to share this item with their constituents. Counseling rep noted we offer Social Justice Studies ADT but without any specific Ethnic Studies courses.</p> <p>Armerding noted, re: AP 4222, need to determine who on campus "determines [AB 705] support will increase [students'] likelihood of passing." Asked group for suggestions—Counseling rep suggested Assessment dept.; other Counseling rep agreed but suggested Assessment could act as first step, with faculty as additional step. PSME rep asked about criteria for the person making determination—data would be involved, but no clear answer; perhaps Institutional Research should be included. Noted new FW (Unofficial Withdrawal) grading symbol on AP 4230; could affect students using Financial Aid, as well as international students. PSME rep expressed support for FW grade, to address behavior of students who simply stop attending class. Starer asked if FW will still count as an attempt—yes. Fine Arts rep asked if FW would be at the discretion of the instructor—yes. Language Arts rep noted similar grading option at different college, tied to student's hours of attendance (would not allow for FW if attended over a certain number of hours). Starer noted need for further discussion, especially considering adding grading options opens the door for increase in grading disputes.</p> <p>Please email any additional feedback to Armerding.</p>
<p>14. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>15. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:31 PM</p>

Attendees: Ben Armerding (Faculty Co-Chair), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Stephanie Chan (LA), Kimberly Escamilla (LA), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Allison Herman (LA), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Rosa Nguyen (PSME), Ron Painter (guest—PSME), Katy Ripp (KA), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ben Schwartzman (SRC), Lety Serna (CNSL), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Mary Thomas (LIBR), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta