

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 29, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 15, 2022	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All Apprenticeship: No updates to report. BSS: No updates to report. Note that Ben Stefonik acting as in-person proxy vote for division reps. Counseling: No updates to report. Fine Arts: Gomes reported that Theatre Arts faculty Tom Gough provided response to concerns re: THTR 48A Stand Alone application—no plans to offer course in the next year but would like to keep it active in case new faculty hire wishes to update/offer it. HSH: Eshman reported that Shae St. Onge-Cole will be rep for winter quarter, still need to find a second rep. Holding division CC meeting this month to approve a few curriculum items. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Language Arts: No updates to report. LRC: Agyare reminded group about faculty workshop tomorrow (about streaming video platforms); asked folks to please remind students about extended Library hours next week. Penate reported that drop-in Spanish tutoring being offered. STEM: Painter reported division CC meeting this month to approve a few curriculum items. Schultheis noted she will not be attending CCC meetings in winter quarter but will still be a behind-the-scenes rep. SRC: Kaupp mentioned recent announcement of sunseting of Family Engagement Institute (FEI); division is discussing how to handle the associated courses. Gilstrap reminded the group about upcoming Dec. 1 deadline for course submissions for CSU GE & IGETC.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Kaupp reminded the group that the Tools for Transition and Work (TTW) program provides student volunteers and encouraged folks to reach out if interested.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposal b. Notification of Proposed Requisites c. ASCCC Fall Plenary Update	Speakers: CCC Team The following proposal was presented: ANTH 53. Vanatta noted that the Anthropology dept. might be using a different course number. New prerequisites for SOC 10 & V T 54A (eff. 2023-24). No comments. Packet of adopted resolutions was attached as info item. Vanatta asked if there are any which specifically affect curriculum—Gilstrap pointed out resolutions related to CalGETC and common course numbering

	<p>system. Brief discussion occurred re: failed resolutions. Kuehnl suggested folks contact Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva or Kathryn Maurer with any questions.</p>
<p>5. New Certificate Proposal: Educational Immersive Media</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Proposal for new Educational Immersive Media Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Kaupp, Agyare). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Cross-List Removal Application: PSYC 10 & SOC 10</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Request from Psychology and Sociology depts. to remove cross-listing of PSYC 10 & SOC 10 (eff. 2023-24). No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Eshman, Lee). Approved.</p>
<p>7. Certificate Deactivation: CPA Examination Preparation</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of deactivation of CPA Examination Preparation Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Lee, Schultheis). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Applications: AATA 101A, 101B, 102A, 102B, 103A, 103B, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 105C, 105R</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for AATA 101A, 101B, 102A, 102B, 103A, 103B, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 105C & 105R. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Stefonik, Kaupp). Approved.</p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Applications: LINC 60C, 60E, 77, 97B</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for LINC 60C, 60E, 77 & 97B. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Kaupp, Stefonik). Approved.</p>
<p>10. Stand Alone Applications: NCP 404A, 404B, 404C</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCP 404A, 404B & 404C. Eshman noted dept. listed as FEI, which is being sunsetted— Kaupp responded that AVP of Workforce Teresa Ong is working to find a home for them.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Eshman, Agyare). Approved.</p>
<p>11. Stand Alone Application: THTR 48A</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for THTR 48A. Vanatta shared additional info from Tom Gough, addressing concerns from first read: 48A removed from Theatre Arts AA degree because, for now, it has been replaced in the schedule by 48G. No plans to offer 48A in the immediate future, but course has value and would like to keep it active as Stand Alone in case Gough’s successor wants to offer it (Gough is retiring soon).</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Kaupp, Stefonik). Approved.</p>
<p>12. New Certificate Application: Research, Design and Development for Global Good</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Research, Design and Development for Global Good Certificate of Achievement. Vanatta noted application wasn’t preceded by proposal because it was approved by division CC in May (was waiting on LMI). Mentioned LMI uses different TOP Code than narrative (they must match)—will follow up w/ faculty to clear up before second read.</p> <p>Parikh raised concerns that required courses, when considered as a whole, seem to be offering engineering content; ENGN 10 covers very similar content. Voiced specific concerns re: LINC 77. Also noted that LMI mentions engineering-related careers, but does not believe this</p>

	<p>cert. would necessarily lead to an engineering career. Suggested hypothetical situation of Engineering dept. creating a technical writing course and wondered if English faculty would be concerned.</p> <p>Meezan responded, noting that Anthropology and Global Studies faculty have also brought up concerns. Noted that LINC dept. seems to offer slimmed-down, teacher-focused courses to a very specific audience of K-12 teachers, which may include content related to a variety of disciplines. Suggested scheduling a meeting between concerned faculty and LINC faculty. Fong recalled historical example of Accounting dept. proposing a writing course which overlapped with existing ENGL course, which led to difficult conversations at CCC; at the time, Fong was English faculty and met with Anthropology faculty to discuss their course and brainstorm ideas. Believes that conversations between faculty important when situations such as this come up.</p> <p>Parikh acknowledged that LINC 77 might be a slimmed-down version of ENGN 10, on its own, but believes that when packaged with other core courses (on cert.) there is significant overlap with existing ENGN 10 course content. Kuehnl suggested perhaps the target audience for LINC courses would justify their offerings; agreed with Meezan and Fong re: importance of discussions between faculty when concerns arise. Agyare noted that cert. also open to dual-enrollment students.</p> <p>Kaupp mentioned NCP 404A/B/C courses, which are similar to existing BUSI courses, with the difference that NCP courses focused on a specific population; suggested this might be the case re: LINC courses (targeted to a specific demographic who might not be interested in ENGN 10). Parikh noted ENGN 10 has been offered to dual-enrollment students. Meezan suggested that, since next CCC meeting isn't until January, all interested parties come together for discussion in the meantime. Subramaniam suggested also reviewing the cert.'s Program Learning Outcomes, noting the list is quite lengthy. Eshman pointed out the use of "know" and "use" in PLOs and wondered how such outcomes could be evaluated; suggested perhaps revising these for clarity.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>13. Adding Clarifying Language to COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Mary Vanatta</p> <p>Vanatta was contacted by some division reps and their dean, because while reviewing COR submissions, on some CORs Vanatta removed language from Methods of Evaluation section which stated, "may include but not limited to." Language was removed because, on all CORs, methods listed are not strictly required and serve as examples. The dean said this is not universally known among faculty, especially part-timers, so Vanatta suggested that boilerplate language be added to the COR form, so it is included across all courses. Discussed w/ CCC Team adding language to both Methods of Evaluation and Methods of Instruction. CCC Team is proposing adding the following language: "Methods of Evaluation may include but are not limited to the following:" and "Methods of Instruction may include but are not limited to the following:"</p> <p>Vanatta displayed COR form in CourseLeaf, noting each section contains a table with a standard header (currently mimics the name of the section)—Vanatta suggested headers be changed to the new language. Believes headers can be edited separately from section name, but will need to confirm w/ CourseLeaf support. Additionally, since some faculty (especially part-timers) look at CORs in the online</p>

	<p>catalog, will need to add the new language to the CORs in the catalog (the table headers don't show up on those particular CORs).</p> <p>Parikh mentioned that faculty in Engineering dept. were under the impression that methods listed on COR are required to be used by all faculty teaching course. Vanatta displayed CourseLeaf help bubble, which includes language from ASCCC's "COR: A Curriculum Reference Guide" document. Parikh asked why methods are included on COR if they are merely examples—Vanatta believes the sections are legally required. Subramaniam noted he believes final exam is required for all courses, because finals week is part of the 12-week quarter. Parikh asked if a project or some other non-exam activity is okay; Subramaniam responded, yes. Kuehnl noted that Representative Texts section is another which lists examples, as opposed to a strict list.</p> <p>Fong asked if there could be a way to allow depts. to note requirement of specific items within the two sections (e.g., incl. "required" in parenthesis for certain items). Kuehnl believes this is getting into a conversation about academic freedom; displayed full ASCCC document, which states that "instructors have the freedom to choose" methods. Group agreed that adding new language will help to clarify these two sections; Vanatta will request this change from CourseLeaf support ASAP.</p>
<p>14. Equity in the COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Kuehnl and Vanatta worked on draft of guidelines document for faculty to use when creating/updating CORs from an equity perspective. Kuehnl noted that Glendale CC document was used as a basis, with updates to make it more Foothill-specific. Goal is to have document completed by end of March, to forward to Academic Senate (AS) for review/approval. Today, group will have a first look at draft, but starting in January will need to begin efforts to edit and improve the document.</p> <p>Vanatta pointed out text highlighted in blue, in bulleted lists for COR section—items are based on suggestions shared during breakout groups (documented in CCC minutes); unhighlighted items from Glendale document. Noted before/after COR examples from Glendale removed, so we can include our own. Kuehnl asked the reps to please ask constituents to help come up with examples, as some faculty have already made updates to CORs with an equity lens. Examples do a lot to help faculty understand how to update a COR to be more equitable.</p> <p>Kuehnl mentioned language in introduction comes from both Foothill's Strategic Vision for Equity and AS's Equity Action Plan. Certain items on Plan are explicitly assigned to CCC, and have been included.</p> <p>Eshman suggested adding "epistemology" to the glossary. Schultheis shared initial reaction is that the document sets a bit of a negative tone, by first outlining a lot of issues, whereas our goal is to move forward in a positive way by making meaningful change. Suggested background information be moved to end of document—others agreed. Eshman suggested that perhaps instead of moving info, re-word and/or add explanation of how issues will be addressed; Parikh agreed. Eshman added that for faculty being asked to update their CORs, the point is to inform them on what they need to do, rather than provide background. Suggested perhaps background info doesn't even need to be included. Parikh suggested including info as footnotes to show the impact of making certain COR changes. Kuehnl noted that all are options (e.g., moving info, re-writing it to change tone, etc.).</p>

Approved, January 24, 2023

	<p>Discussion occurred about how faculty members interpret CORs (unrelated to creating/editing a COR), especially part-time faculty; Kuehnl suggested perhaps not enough training is offered to ensure part-time faculty understand all elements of COR. Kuehnl and Subramaniam made clear that this specific document intended to guide faculty who are actually creating/updating CORs.</p> <p>Kuehnl pointed out glossary of terms, which is from Glendale document, and COR section-specific info. Suggested CCC moves forward by either using breakout groups to directly refine COR section-specific info (each group looks at a different section) or reviewing info in a whole group discussion.</p>
15. Good of the Order	
16. Adjournment	3:35 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Lisa Eshman* (HSH), Valerie Fong (Dean, LA), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Ana Maravilla (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Brian Murphy (APPR), Tim Myres (APPR), Ron Painter* (STEM), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Crissy Penate (LRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Lisa Schultheis* (STEM), JP Schumacher* (Dean, SRC), Ben Stefonik* (BSS), Ram Subramaniam* (Administrator Co-Chair), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta