College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 2, 2020
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 19, 2020	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** PSME: Working on Title 5 updates; working with Bio Health CC re: draft update to DE addendum—very important to STEM faculty. Fine Arts: Faculty excited about CourseLeaf, rep asked for more info/dates about training— Vanatta responded that training tentatively scheduled for fall quarter. DE addendum discussed at recent division CC meeting, to solicit ideas and feedback. Particular interest in ensuring ADA compliance in all online classes (re: discussion at last CCC meeting)—Kuehnl noted will be included in continued discussions at CCC. BSS: Working on Title 5 updates; LINC dept. creating new courses and program in training K-12 educators on Distance Ed. Update re: discipline for new LINC course presented at previous CCC meeting—should be changing from Education to Instructional Design/Technology. Apprenticeship: No updates to report. Bio Health: Working on finishing up Title 5 updates. Counseling: Discussions regarding Pass/No Pass grade for major courses; working to determine best way to handle drop-in appts during summer. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Language Arts: Working on Title 5 updates; early stages of creating new certificate for NCEL courses. Library: Thanked faculty for completing survey re: new software for course reserves in Canvas. Developing plans to handle reserves in summer and fall, while library still closed. Articulation: No updates to report; UC still has not made a decision regarding if they're going fully online for fall.
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	**Speakers: CCC Team** The following proposals were presented: ENGL 27G; LINC 68G, 78D, 84, 84D, 84E, 84F. Please share with your constituents. Gilstrap noticed LINC 68G lists discipline of Education—BSS rep noted that CORs have started division approval process so more info will be known soon. Bio Health rep commented on title for LINC 78D: thinks title doesn't reflect "fascinating" description, suggested adjusting—BSS rep will bring feedback to faculty.
b. Division Reps for 2020-21	Kuehnl asked reps to email him any changes to reps for 2020-21.
c. Upcoming COR Deadline—June 19	Vanatta reminded the group about the June 19th deadline for CORs to be in Review1 status in C3MS, for 2021-22 catalog. Same deadline for new and updated CORs, including on Title 5 list; also deadline for streamlined certificates to be submitted to Vanatta (post-division CC approval). Reminder that COR editing access in C3MS will be cut-off starting June

	22nd. Plans to check in with reps at least once more before the deadline.
4. Consent Calendar a. GE Applications	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** The following GE applications were presented: Area V & Area VI—Plumbing Technology Apprenticeship Program (for both). Would approve GE Area V & Area VI for students who complete the full program, not one individual course, similar to previous approvals for Foothill GE for this program. PSME rep noted both apps rarely reference language directly from CORs, mostly seemed to be descriptive statements about what's included in the program. Mentioned we usually require info on these apps be copied/pasted directly from CORs. Concerned that these do not follow that process and worried could set a bad precedent. Noted some PSME faculty have concerns re: plan to approve GE for curriculum across the program; would like college to engage in wider conversation to address these concerns, hopefully in the fall. Counseling rep agreed with concerns regarding lack of COR language, and believes there is not clear evidence of requirements being met, particularly with Area VI app. Starer responded to concerns and noted that Ché Meneses and Patricia Gibbs present for discussion—they were involved in process. Noted that first GE app submitted/approved for program merely listed module numbers and division has gotten better with each app; noted prior apps also did not directly copy/paste COR language. Noted work is leading to local degree, and does not involve transfer or articulation, but acknowledged that Articulation Office has concerns. Noted that historically Apprenticeship curriculum has been shuffled around and now has its own division and division CC; worries CCC giving greater scrutiny and establishing stricter standard for these apps vs. what occurs for apps from other divisions, which is unfair to faculty and work they have done on this project. Gibbs agreed with Starer's comments and noted work on this project has spanned almost two years, much of which was shared by Apprenticeship faculty during visit to CCC earlier this year. Assured the group that work has been diligent; fully believes in the integrity of the project. Language Arts rep worked on previous app for Area II, which was approved by CCC—noted current apps look very similar. Apprenticeship rep agreed with Gibbs regarding lengthy process; stated this program's curriculum and CORs among the highest (if not the highest) quality of Apprenticeship programs. Goal is to acknowledge that there are different educational paths for students, and noted that it seems like the closer they get to reaching goal the more hurdles are thrown at them. Gilstrap acknowledged hard work involved in this project and echoed PSME rep's suggestion for college-wide conversation. Noted particular concern re: GE reciprocity—a student who receives an associate degree using these GE approvals (or similar) would not be able to transfer GE to another community college. Also noted need for students to get to 90 units for an associate degree; current program courses total in the 40s. PSME rep responded to Apprenticeship rep, stating that for GE apps from other divisions CCC does require info be pasted directly from CORs. If this is not appropriate for apps from Apprenticeship, that's okay, but does not recall CCC discussing/approving such an exception. Starer stated would need to look back at CCC minutes, but does recall conversation occurred when the first GE app for Apprenticeship presented at CCC; recalls he made the point that the GE criteria was met in a way that was spread throughout the entire program, and not specific to a single course. Agrees that specific conversation re: awarding an associate degree has not yet occurred. Responded to Gilstrap's concerns re: reciprocity, noting this seems to suggest that CCC make a determination about a program based on how we anticipate another college will react. Believes this is a recipe for

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stymieing progress; believes Foothill is ahead of the curve and other colleges may look to us for leadership when they begin to look at GE in this way. Asked the group how to move forward if there is a lack of consensus about this or other votes—is it pure majority; what process do we use? Other PSME rep asked if we need unanimity—Kuehnl doesn't believe so.

PSME rep noted their division has been lone dissenting vote in cases over the years, but stressed that responsibility as rep is to bring concerns from PSME faculty. Noted many cases in which there was not unanimity but motion did pass; doesn't believe it is a requirement. Gilstrap addressed reciprocity, clarifying he is not saying it should prevent the GE apps or program from moving forward; agreed we should not act based on how others might respond. But stressed that we have to protect our students and should ensure it is clear to them that any associate degree using this GE applies to Foothill only and cannot be transferred. Also noted possible situation in which Apprenticeship student returns to Foothill for an additional degree, outside of this program, and asked how GE would be handled.

Teresa Ong, AVP Workforce, suggested iterative process, moving forward, with this program as a starting point, instead of requiring perfection from the start. Goal is to help these students achieve their goals. Gilstrap stressed he wants to make sure it's clear to students that the degree will not be portable. Apprenticeship rep noted intent has always been for this to be a Foothill-only degree; future goal could be for these students to return to Foothill to complete another degree in construction management, using Plumbing Technology degree as a starting point. Meneses noted his work on the Area V app and echoed Gibbs' comments re: rigor of the program; believes the curriculum does map to the GE criteria. Agrees that a college-wide conversation is needed.

Dean Chris Allen thanked the group for their comments. Currently onboarding a new program which decided to leave a different college because Foothill is willing to explore innovation. Wants to ensure he can provide guidance to faculty involved in this program and those who may be working on GE apps for their programs in the future.

Kuehnl asked the group if they would like to bring apps back for further discussion or move for approval now. Starer proposed the group consider these apps, but to suspend moving forward with the program until wider discussion occurs. Will work with Apprenticeship and CCC Team to schedule more substantive discussion about the program/degree as a whole. Asked reps to vote their conscience on apps with the knowledge that wider discussion will be planned. Gilstrap recalled that a larger discussion was promised when Area II app was approved, which never took place; did acknowledge visit by Apprenticeship faculty and students.

Motion to approve **M/S** (Murphy, Meezan). **Approved.**

Vanatta noted these apps will need approval from Kristy Lisle, VP of Instruction, to be included in 2020-21 catalog, and will have to wait to be published in the fall 2020 addendum (too late for initial catalog PDF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New Program Application: Online and Blended Instruction Certificate of Achievement</td>
<td>**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl**
First read of new Online and Blended Instruction Certificate of Achievement. No comments.

Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Deactivation: Field Ironworking Certificate of Achievement</td>
<td>**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl**
First read of deactivation of Field Ironworking Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
7. Stand Alone Approval Request: APSM 123	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for APSM 123. Will be permanently Stand Alone. Vanatta noted that all Stand Alone requests on today's agenda are for existing courses, which were previously listed on curriculum sheets but are being removed for 2020-21. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
8. Stand Alone Approval Request: ART 15D	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ART 15D. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[See item 7 for note.]* PSME rep pointed out that ART 15D and THTR 7 *[item 12]* listed on apps as transfer and noted the responses to Criteria B (Need) are pretty general and could apply to every course that's transferable to CSU—wondered what the point of this app and approvals are in these situations. Fine Arts rep noted that ART 15D was on Art sheet for many years but no longer really fits within Art or GID programs. Noted that faculty believes it could be a workforce course—it is a foundation-level course for many degrees in animation. PSME rep clarified that not objecting to courses being Stand Alone, just mentioned response on app could apply to every transferable course. Fine Arts rep asked if group would like apps returned to faculty for additional info; Kuehnl clarified that PSME rep's comments not necessarily about these courses, more general about the need for this process in this situation. Ong asked if a course may be TOP Coded as workforce but included in a non-workforce program. Kuehnl doesn't believe so; Dean Debbie Lee noted that Computer Science program not TOP Coded as workforce but has both transfer and workforce courses. Ong noted that our CS program is unique in that IT and CS are in the same dept (other colleges use separate subject codes). Lee noted that ART courses frequently cross-listed with GID; Fine Arts rep responded that ART 15D not cross-listed with GID. Kuehnl again clarified that PSME rep and group not requesting these apps be revised. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
9. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 82B	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 82B. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[See item 7 for note.]* No comments. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
10. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 82C	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 82C. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[See item 7 for note.]* No comments. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
11. Stand Alone Approval Request: LINC 87	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for LINC 87. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[See item 7 for note.]* No comments. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
12. Stand Alone Approval Request: THTR 7	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for THTR 7. Will be permanently Stand Alone. *[See item 7 for note; see item 8 for comments.]* Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
13. Honors Institute Course Prerequisite Ad Hoc Committee Presentation	**Speakers: Eric Kuehnl & Scott Lankford** First and foremost, thanks to Susie Huerta, Debbie Lee, and Voltaire Villanueva, for their hard work and dedication to this issue. Scott Lankford

chaired ad hoc committee. Shared committee's report with the group. Committee met throughout May; invited all honors faculty (Lankford listed committee members). Task was to investigate impact of removing the prerequisite and make a recommendation which ensures honors CORs are Title 5 compliant. Researched a number of other community colleges, spoke with honors directors at Skyline and Los Medanos, who are leaders in honors program in our region. Also compared with five colleges, including De Anza. Looked at three options: 1. Change prereq to Advisory; 2. Keep prereq but modify or eliminate entry criteria; 3. Eliminate prereq so there is no entry criteria or barrier at all. Lankford has attended many honors-related meetings around the state and the overall consensus is to break down equity barriers and move forward from the old model of honors programs being for those with privilege. Trend has been to remove entry criteria and place emphasis on exit criteria, as equity move.

Committee made five recommendations (unanimous consensus):
1. **Implement option #3, to eliminate prereq.** Prereq is not Title 5 compliant because not skills-based; removes confusing/off-putting info for 1st-gen and non-traditional students; puts emphasis on exit criteria; aligned with state-wide trends; frees honors co-directors to focus on building learning communities, instead of administrative burden of clearing prereq for students, which is current situation.
2. **Add standard course description "footnote" to all honors courses.** Committee drafted proposed language, which links to honors program website. Believes better than prereq/Advisory, noting students don't always know the difference between the two.
3. **Use UCLA TAP criteria as guideline for standardizing honors CORs**, to tell students and faculty what is meant by an honors course. Allows for flexibility among depts, while creating some standardization. Lankford was present for UCLA TAP site visits; they urgently wanted to increase transfer pipeline for students of color, 1st-gen, etc.
4. **Add additional Methods of Evaluation to all honors CORs**, which might include info re: additional readings, research, written assignments, projects, service learning activities. Would ensure a clear difference between honors and non-honors CORs.
5. **Design student course evaluation similar to Los Medanos' rubric** (shared document with group). Survey is sent to all students in every honors course; helps to include students.

Gilstrap was on committee and agreed with Lankford's presentation. From an articulation perspective, all courses will need to be rearticulated (for UC transfer, CSU GE, IGETC, C-ID, course-to-course in some situations) if prereq removed. For his needs, next step for CCC would be to determine if group will approve blanket removal of prereq for all honors courses vs. require faculty to manually remove it themselves.

PSME rep thanked committee for their work and noted that PSME faculty have been interested in removing honors prereq for some time; noted full support from PSME division. Lankford advocated for blanket removal of prereq, noting that honors is not "owned" by anyone and spans all divisions, which results in question of how decisions about honors program are made. Noted that although Foothill still has a flagship honors program statewide, we are behind many others when it comes to this prereq, in terms of equity. Its removal would help honors co-directors and staff focus on the program.

Vanatta noted precedent for CCC approving blanket COR changes—occurred a few years ago re: AB 705. Noted the bad timing, as prereq removals would not make the 2020-21 catalog PDF; asked Gilstrap to

advise re: articulation timeline. Suggested possibility that group approve blanket removal and delay publication of changes until after Gilstrap hears back re: articulation. Gilstrap noted may need to wait for 2021-22 catalog; could possibly submit for fall 2020 but very close to that deadline for UC transfer. Counseling rep agreed with removal of prereq and supported deferral to Gilstrap re: articulation timeline. Kuehnl noted that today's deadline for ad hoc committee recommendation was so Gilstrap could move forward with "test" of submitting a handful of courses for articulation. Gilstrap said if group does approve blanket removal, he could technically submit for fall 2020, but stressed this is related only to UC transfer. Mentioned that UC reviewers will review the CORs to ensure distinction from non-honors courses. Noted courses submitted in C3MS last year to remove prereq: ANTH 1H, 1HL, 2AH; CHEM 1AH, 1BH; COMM 1BH.

Lankford noted all of these CORs were previously approved for articulation. Other colleges have reported that articulation processes have gone smoothly when they made similar changes to honors courses. Gilstrap acknowledged that it could go smoothly, but will need to see what happens. Lankford advocated for fall 2020 prereq removals. Lee thanked Lankford and noted she was a co-director of honors program last year; removal of prereq has been advocated for by the co-directors for two years. Advocated for not waiting another year, to move forward with equity model. Kuehnl suggested some faculty might not feel comfortable with prereq being removed from their course. Also reminded the group of the previous plan to submit the test courses first, which would provide more information on how to best move forward, campus-wide. Doesn't believe group had ever discussed moving forward with blanket removal for fall 2020. Concedes that perhaps this is cautious, but wants to defer to Gilstrap re: articulation.

Starer thanked Lankford for the committee's work; suggested something this significant not be done outside of a formal resolution. Proposed that depts interested in removing the prereq could make Gilstrap's deadline for fall 2020. Could possibly suspend the first read rules to approve resolution. Depts that wish to move forward now could be for fall 2020, and others could be for summer 2021. Gilstrap noted that his local deadline related to UC transfer changes was yesterday.

Kuehnl pointed out meeting has gone over time, and will continue topic at next meeting. Starer asked if ad hoc committee could draft resolution or work with Starer to do so; Lankford noted their report could easily become a resolution. Addressed group's worry about moving forward, and stressed this would be "dooming" honors co-directors to one more year of paperwork and the students to another year of a barrier to access. Counseling rep again stressed support to move forward ASAP. Starer will head effort to bring resolution to next CCC meeting. PSME rep noted some PSME honors courses not currently in queue to be updated for 2021-22; asked Gilstrap if they should be making quick change to them in C3MS and if he would have the capacity to review them. Gilstrap unsure he could accommodate but acknowledged he will have a large workload if we are removing prereq from all honors courses. Noted his absolute deadline for UC is June 25th but would need COR at least a week beforehand to ensure he can process it. Vanatta mentioned that in previous situations re: blanket updates (e.g., AB 705-related changes) she directly updated CORs in C3MS, as CCC approval takes place of C3MS approval steps; would make sense to do the same, for these. Kuehnl mentioned other changes advocated by ad hoc committee, which could not be made if Vanatta makes direct updates. Lankford suggested a two-step process: blanket removal of prereq with no other COR changes, then advising faculty to use criteria when making next update to CORs. Sees these as separate and believes it would be okay for

	Vanatta to simply remove honors prereq as a first step. Noted that when courses are deactivated they drop off of prereqs without larger campus-wide discussion occurring. Gilstrap reiterated that the courses have already been articulated—hopes the reviewers considered more than simply the honors prereq, but can't say for certain what the outcome of re-review/approval may be. Reminded the group of the stages: June for UC, December for IGETC and CSU GE, and likely December for C-ID. Course-to-course timeline is up to each institution (UC and CSU) to review and determine if they still want to articulate the course with us. Reviewers may be completely different and consider different aspects during their review. Kuehnl asked what happens if articulation denied—for UC transferability, two-year phase-out, so we would still have time to get course back on track. Same with IGETC (two-year phase-out). Unsure about CSU GE. C-ID also has phase-out. Would have opportunity to re-apply for articulation if course denied. Appeals process usually occurs for technical issues, not content issues. Gilstrap noted he likely won't hear back from UC until mid-late September, re: fall 2020. Kuehnl asked Gilstrap, Vanatta, Starer, and Lisle, what the mechanics are if we want to move forward for fall 2020. Gilstrap needs to know ASAP, as he is already in UC submission mode. Vanatta noted recent examples of COR updates being requested/submitted for fall 2020 but delaying publication until winter 2021, until Gilstrap has heard back from UC. Unsure if we can legally publish courses as UC transferable for fall 2020 if we remove prereq, as response from UC will happen after catalog addendum published. Lisle is okay with publishing in an addendum, but also doesn't want to mislead students re: transferability. Asked Gilstrap for examples of what has happened in the past when prereq removed—if prereq is required for C-ID it will likely not be approved, but since these are not skills prereqs it's not the same situation. Lisle noted the difference in these prereqs, which are more tied to our own local expectations for honors program. Gilstrap agreed but noted he is required to resubmit for articulation whenever a prereq is removed, regardless. Agreed that the chance is that they will be approved. Lisle stated that there are a few options for moving forward, re: timing of publication. Starer mentioned the two-year phase-out—Lisle advocated for moving forward ASAP and publishing the prereq removals for fall 2020. Starer will draft resolution shortly. Kuehnl suggested holding an emergency vote. Vanatta strongly suggested not waiting until the next CCC meeting, considering the amount of work this will put on Gilstrap's plate. Kuehnl suggested holding an extra meeting next week to include just this item and the two below. Kuehnl will schedule additional meeting for June 9th.
14. Update Distance Learning Application	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.
15. Revisiting Local Policy Requiring "C" Grade or Better for Major Courses	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.
16. Good of the Order	
17. Adjournment	**4:07 PM**

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Stephanie Chan (LA), Mark Ferrer (SRC), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Patricia Gibbs (BSS), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Katie Ha (LA), Marc Knobel (PSME), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Scott Lankford (LA), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean, FA & KA), Kristy Lisle (VP Instruction), Dokesha Meacham (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Ron Painter (PSME), Lisa Schultheis (BH), Lety Serna (CNSL), Matt Stanley (KA), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Ram Subramaniam (Dean, BH & PSME), Nick Tuttle (BSS), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta