

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 30, 2021
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 16, 2021 2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Approved by consensus.</p> <p>Speaker: All</p> <p>Apprenticeship: Allen provided update. Going to be onboarding new Apprenticeship partner in winter—unique program working primarily with veterans and underserved communities in the aerospace field.</p> <p>Bio Health: Tying up a few loose ends; Horticulture dept. working on new certs.</p> <p>BSS: Child Development and Business depts. working on new certs.</p> <p>SRC: Finished up Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Guided Pathways folks attended recent division CC meeting to discuss process. Brainstorming curriculum-based newsletter, and asked other reps to let them know if their division has done anything similar or if they can recommend best practices.</p> <p>Language Arts: Finishing up updates to noncredit courses.</p> <p>LRC: Tying up loose ends re: Distance Learning. Developing new courses for a new cert. involving Research & Service Leadership Symposium and other independent learning opportunities for students within the LRC.</p> <p>PSME: Working on updating Distance Learning addenda for courses previously approved for state of emergency-only (but need full approval).</p> <p>Gilstrap reminded the group about the upcoming deadline for new CSU GE and IGETC submissions—end of day tomorrow.</p> <p>Hueg mentioned recent discussions re: software for SLOs and curriculum; working w/ Paul Starer to form a group to review our SLO process/system. Noted still have another CourseLeaf module to implement, for programs; may also look into implementing their scheduling module. If anyone interested in being involved in any of these discussions, reach out to him.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	<p>Language Arts rep reminded the group that Research & Service Leadership Symposium application period is now open; encouraged folks to share out to students. Have until end of winter to apply.</p> <p>Lee requested future CCC discussion of Program Maps, specifically process for bringing Maps to CCC for approval and process for updating Maps. Noted no Maps have come to CCC for approval. Stressed importance of discussing process for courses on Maps that fall outside of division, especially re: scheduling. Kuehnl mentioned that the process approved by CCC states that Maps approved at the division CC level, not at CCC; currently talking with Isaac Escoto to determine specifics of process. Lee mentioned Maps which include courses outside the division and asked if those go to CCC for approval. Hueg mentioned recent conversation at deans meeting about extenuating circumstances re: short staffing, and need for deans to review Maps to identify potential issues re: scheduling.</p>

	<p>Fine Arts rep mentioned recent situation in which dept. was ready for division CC to review their Map, but rep felt unprepared to consult w/ other divisions re: their courses. Believes administrators should be involved and it should not necessarily be the responsibility of the reps. Suggested that this aspect of the process approved last year be revisited. Kuehnl clarified that outside consultation is required only when the core courses for the program fall within another division/dept., and that reps shouldn't feel obligated to become involved if only support/GE courses fall within another division. Kuehnl assured group that topic will be brought back to CCC for further discussion; is currently in discussions to determine mechanism for approval of Maps, and hopes to have something to bring to CCC in January.</p>
<p>4. Consent Calendar a. New Program Application: Business Administration 2.0 ADT</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Venkataraman, Armstrong). Approved.</p>
<p>5. New Program Application: Introduction to Sports Medicine CA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Introduction to Sports Medicine Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Murphy, Schultheis). Approved.</p>
<p>6. New Program Application: Advanced Sports Medicine CA</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Advanced Sports Medicine Certificate of Achievement. Ong took comments from first read back to Warren Voyce, and KINS 62C/D/E being removed from program, as they don't need to be included. (Changes aren't reflected on today's attachments.) PSME rep would like to view edited documents before voting; Ong shared updated narrative with the group. PSME rep recalled discussion at first read about LMI (re: master's degree); Ong responded that while a person does need a master degree to become a certified athletic trainer, these certs. would allow them to work at a gym or in other businesses as an assistant to an athletic trainer. PSME noted confusion re: the statement about the master's degree requirement, because comes off as being connected to justification for creating these certs. Ong added that the students currently taking these courses tend to be dual-enrollment students; these shorter pathways are targeted toward entry-level work and not intended to train students into a master's level.</p> <p>BSS rep asked about the ITRN courses, noting that their dept. has used them in the past and ran into a lot of trouble with them; asked for details. Ong responded that the hands-on experience portion of the cert. allows for students to gain experience at Foothill's Athletic Treatment Center via KINS 62A/B, but to allow students to gain experience elsewhere (e.g., gym, chiropractor's office), ITRN courses would be used (would be overseen by Voyce). Hueg asked about evaluation of LMI data; Ong noted that, while there aren't a lot of jobs available in the lower-mid salary ranges, the dept. still believes worthwhile to provide the cert. Lee mentioned new program creation process being developed, and asked what happens if CCC doesn't believe a program should be created based on LMI. Ong noted we don't have any such standards, for the purposes of discussion/decision making at CCC; believes these standards are important to determine. Noted that BACCC does have these standards, and program will be submitted to that group. Kuehnl asked if BACCC would reject a program that showed growth but didn't achieve livable wage; Ong noted that what does get attention is when a college proposes a program very similar to one offered by a nearby college—then job availability is scrutinized. PSME asked when LMI required for a cert.—Ong responded, only CTE programs.</p> <p>PSME rep believes Foothill wouldn't want to market a program to students if</p>

	<p>there aren't available job prospects or if wage growth is sluggish. Kuehnl agreed that this is an important discussion, re: do we want to approve a cert. if wage growth does not match a living wage in the region; but doesn't recall ever discussing this about any other new program and cautioned against scrutinizing this cert. in a way that others have not been. Vanatta noted that once cert. is approved by CCC it will go to BACCC for approval—new CTE programs do not get sent to FHDA board for approval until after approved by BACCC. Ong suggested bringing cert. back for additional read, to allow dept. faculty to attend meeting and discuss and advocate for program. The group agreed.</p> <p>Third read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. New Program Application: Plumbing & Pipefitting Apprenticeship AS</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of new Plumbing & Pipefitting Apprenticeship AS degree. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Murphy, Venkataraman). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Planning for Winter CCC Meetings & Division CC Meetings</p>	<p>Speakers: Kurt Hueg & Eric Kuehnl Continuing discussion from previous meeting, re: need to return to partially in-person meetings starting in winter quarter, as CCC will need to have a quorum meeting in person. Additional, related discussion of process/guidance for division CCs, to ensure following Brown Act. Kuehnl has been discussing topics with Academic Senate (AS) leadership—noted that recently AS added student rep and classified rep as voting members. AS leadership's guidance is to not allocate a vote to student rep, at either CCC or division CCs; would be members in advisory capacity. CCC not required to follow this advice if we don't want to. PSME rep asked for clarification—Kuehnl responded that student reps may still vote, but in an advisory capacity, so would not affect voting outcome. Fine Arts rep asked if students may participate in subcommittees (e.g., GE), as their input could be helpful—Kuehnl agreed with and encouraged this idea. BSS rep asked what progress being made to guide/mentor students through curriculum process, noting there's already a learning curve for reps, even those who have been involved in curriculum for some time. Kuehnl has been talking with ASFC leadership and Daphne Small about appointments of student reps by ASFC; taking longer than he'd hoped so unsure if student reps will be on board by first meetings in January. Hoping to create onboarding/training materials, but in the meantime can use the same materials we use to train CCC reps. PSME rep suggested taking advisory votes separately during meetings, to reduce confusion; Kuehnl noted that normally votes aren't taken separately unless it's a roll call situation, which isn't common at CCC but does sometimes happen at AS. Recommends using roll call process for momentous voting situations. Plans to draft resolution related to student representation; will eventually be included in CCC bylaws.</p> <p>Kuehnl will come up with system for CCC reps to use, on per-meeting basis, to confirm in-person attendance, in order to achieve quorum. Plans to have this in place within next few weeks, to be ready for our first meeting in January. Noted that if there is a meeting during which we cannot achieve quorum, meeting will be cancelled. PSME rep suggested some folks may be willing to attend in person if meeting in danger of not reaching quorum—Kuehnl will definitely put out an announcement, in that type of situation. AS leadership has advised CCC not to meet if we can't achieve quorum, due to Brown Act provisions, even if no voting items on the agenda. BSS rep asked if any clarification given re: division CCs following Brown Act, including quorum—Kuehnl has discussed w/ AS leadership, and noted that each entity may determine their own quorum. CCC uses 50% + 1. Noted that some large bodies with historically low attendance have quorum lower than 50%, so it's not unprecedented, but it's good practice to at least use</p>

50% + 1. Each division CC will need to determine what its membership is, for purposes of achieving quorum; cautioned against including all division faculty as members of division CC.

BSS rep noted goal of maximizing faculty participation in curriculum—their virtual division CC meetings have had much higher participation than previous in-person meetings; pushed back a little on the need to return to in-person meetings. Hueg clarified that Brown Act was created to allow for public access to meetings; while virtual meetings have allowed for greater participation among folks at Foothill, Brown Act is related to public participation. Believes we need to solve the question of whether division CC meetings are, indeed, subject to Brown Act. Kuehnl mentioned meeting with ASCCC reps in the spring, who advised that if we want to continue with our unique decentralized division CC structure, division CCs should follow Brown Act, as they are approving curriculum (e.g., new courses). Otherwise, our structure/process does not meet legal requirements. Hueg agreed this does mean that division CCs will need to meet in person.

PSME rep asked about "grey areas" re: Brown Act, especially re: 72-hour rule for agendas. Kuehnl responded that this rule will apply to division CCs, as well as rule for two reads before approval. Bio Health rep provided info on how their division has been operating: they don't have meetings, and conduct everything over email; due to their schedules they can't find a time when they can all meet. Rep sends email to curriculum group, with deadline for voting (usually a week or two); keeps tally of votes on a spreadsheet. Certain things handled by this small group, with larger items sent to full division (also via email). Have discussed setting quorum for their division to be one rep—that person will have a designated meeting spot, on campus, open to public attendance, but will continue to conduct meetings via email as they have been. Rep asked the group if this sounds reasonable—Kuehnl responded that this idea "doesn't feel right" but that it might be okay; ideally, the student rep would attend. Hueg doesn't think this meets the spirit of the Brown Act, in that the actual work not being done in public—it's being done in a closed group, over email. Kuehnl noted that the way CCC is conducted is that reps discuss topics with their constituents and get feedback outside of CCC (so, not a public forum), and suggested this idea is similar. Kuehnl cautioned against having a quorum of just one person.

Fine Arts rep shared their division's tentative plan, noting they have been meeting on Zoom since before shelter-in-place, which has garnered higher attendance. Plan is for the two reps to be on campus every two weeks, in a public room; will have Zoom running, as well. Will post agenda and minutes on campus, and possibly also on their division's website (cannot use Canvas as it's not open to the public). Will take into consideration Kuehnl's suggestion for student rep to attend in person. Asked if quorum can still be achieved if another faculty subs for one of the reps (if they're sick, etc.)—Kuehnl noted use of proxy rep, who does not need to be a confirmed rep; that person may vote and help meet quorum. Noted that proxy must be given in writing, and that AS uses proxy reps when needed. Believes that Fine Arts' plan seems reasonable and should work.

BSS rep hopes CCC will revisit this topic once division CCs have started to meet in winter quarter, to discuss how things are working. Wants to ensure spirit of Brown Act being met while still getting high faculty participation. Language Arts rep asked if state has made any updates to Brown Act—Kuehnl noted that ASCCC lobbying for virtual meeting allowance to be permanently added to law, but this hasn't gone anywhere. Language Arts rep asked about potential repercussions if we aren't in full compliance with Brown Act, especially considering campus is still in flux re: reopening.

	<p>Noted it will be much easier to fully comply once everyone is back on campus. Kuehnl responded that there's not much chance of our getting in trouble, but the spirit of Brown Act is for openness and transparency. Believes it is disingenuous for us to continue to say it's unsafe to meet in person, especially considering kids are back in school.</p> <p>Subramaniam suggested keeping decentralized structure, with division CCs functioning as they currently do, but that they don't take a formal vote and instead send their recommendations to CCC for voting. Kuehnl noted this would effectively re-centralize our curriculum process. Currently, divisions have autonomy to create new courses, and CCC has no authority to block creation of a new course. Kuehnl suggested that to make this change simply because of Brown Act would be a mistake; mentioned many prior discussions at CCC re: centralizing our structure, none of which ended in favor of the idea. PSME rep suggested at each CCC meeting, each division present their voting agenda for that day, with only the reps for that division voting on the items for their division. Kuehnl noted that making such a change to our process would require a resolution, and worried that general faculty might take issue with this type of change. Does not believe it's a realistic plan for January. Hueg suggested that division CC meeting process is a larger conversation, noting that pre-COVID some divisions had very little participation in their division CC meetings. Kuehnl believes that this is a separate issue, and doesn't think that the lack of participation in certain divisions should subvert the process for those divisions that have more robust participation.</p> <p>BSS rep believes it might be time to again float the idea suggested by PSME rep; again mentioned how encouraged they were by the increase in participation on their division CC. Worried that having to ensure full Brown Act compliance may be beyond the scope of reps' responsibilities, in what is a volunteer position.</p> <p>Kuehnl encouraged the reps to reach out to him to let him know how they plan to hold their division CC meetings, noting that student reps for division CCs likely won't be in place right away. Encouraged the reps to do the best they can to make this work, for winter quarter.</p>
<p>9. Program Pathways Mapper Proposal</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of GP Proposal to CCC to Recommend Foothill College's Purchase, Implementation, and Maintenance of Program Pathways Mapper. Hueg noted that adoption of software pending resource/budget review; Kuehnl acknowledged that this aspect is beyond the scope of CCC.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armstrong, Meezan). Approved.</p>
<p>10. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:37 PM</p>

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean—APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Isaac Escoto (CNSL), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Kurt Hueg (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Amy Leonard (De Anza), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean—FA & KA), Dixie Macias (KA), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Ram Subramaniam (Dean—BH & PSME), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta