

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 15, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehni CCC approved Resolution Authorizing Remote Teleconference Meetings Pursuant to Brown Act Provisions Included in AB 361 at Oct. 5th meeting and reaffirmed at Nov. 16th, Jan. 18th & Feb. 15th meetings. If we wish to continue to meet virtually, we are required to reaffirm it every 30 days. We'll most likely be holding hybrid meetings, when we start back up in April.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Armerding, Venkataraman). Approved.</p>
2. Minutes: March 1, 2022	Approved by consensus.
3. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Recently hired new coordinators at Pipe Trades facility; no other updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report; working on curriculum sheets.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Working on curriculum sheets. Art dept. working on edits to Program Map, with help from Guided Pathways Team. Going to start having 15-minute conversations at each division CC meeting re: equity, as a regular part of meetings.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Upcoming LACC/LRCCC dual retreat—focus on equity in the COR, especially Methods of Evaluation & Methods of Instruction; will discuss AB 705 incl. revising/reconfiguring of courses. Working on curriculum sheets. Armerding will be on PDL for spring quarter; Herman & Svetich will be reps.</p> <p>LRC: Library open extended hours this week (9-7). Recently brainstormed hybrid workshops between library and tutoring, for spring quarter.</p> <p>PSME: Trying to figure out how to handle MATH 105 on curriculum sheets, in Associate Degree Requirements section—Vanatta responded that faculty/reps should not be editing this section, as it is the same across all and CCC must first approve any changes (e.g., adding ESLL 26, which CCC approved recently). If changes end up needing to be made, Vanatta will apply them to all sheets. Rep also anticipating issues re: MATH 105 being listed as a prereq, and will await further info. from Gilstrap and others.</p> <p>Vanatta shared she expects to have the Title 5 list ready this week; will email to reps and deans.</p> <p>Subramaniam mentioned Kurt Hueg can't attend today's meeting, so he is filling in as admin co-chair.</p> <p>Gilstrap responded to PSME rep's comment re: language for MATH 105</p>

	<p>prereqs—attended regional meeting for Articulation Officers last week and learned that Cabrillo College using “Intermediate Algebra” language and has received approval for transfer GE and C-ID for courses using this language. Seems promising, and Gilstrap can work w/ faculty to make similar adjustments.</p>
<p>4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>No comments.</p>
<p>5. Announcements a. New Course Proposals b. Spring Plenary Resolutions</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: AATA 101A, 101B, 102A, 102B, 103A, 103B, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 105C, 105R; ETHN 7, 8; MATH 80, 280; NCP 404A, 404B, 404C; RSPT 300, 304, 305, 306. Please share with your constituents. No comments.</p> <p>Resolutions packet was attached as info item. Please reach out to Kuehnl or Academic Senate President Kathryn Maurer with any questions or feedback for them to take to area meeting.</p>
<p>6. Course Deactivation Exemption Requests</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl List of courses not taught in four years was distributed via email on Feb. 2nd; divisions submitted requests to exempt courses, per Policy on Course Currency. Requests for the following courses were reviewed and voted on as a group, with the option to pull any course for individual discussion/vote: ACTG 68C; ANTH 67B; APPT 125, 126, 128; APSM 130, 131, 132, 133, 134; BUSI 19, 53, 90A; CHLD 54C; CNSL 89; C S 52B, 80A, 82A, 84B; EMS 200; GEOG 11; HIST 19, 20; HORT 54D, 60G, 90A, 90E, 90F, 90K, 90L; LINC 81A; MDIA 31, 52; MTEC 66A, 70G, 80B, 80C; MUS 3D, 47A, 47B, 47C, 47D; NCEL 403B; PHDA 24; PHED 15C, 21D, 21E, 40, 40A, 40C, 42; PHOT 68E, 78A, 78B, 78C, 78D; PSYC 54H; R T 71; THTR 7, 26.</p> <p>PSME rep reminded the group that this policy didn’t always exist and was created to minimize courses being listed in the catalog which are never offered—can be an issue for students trying to plan. Suggested perhaps since the dean is approving the form, there’s hope the course may actually be offered, but cautioned against simply continuing to approve these. Wondered if COVID caused so many courses to be on this year’s list.</p> <p>Other PSME rep noted that in some cases there aren’t enough instructors to offer full suite of courses in the catalog, and lack of student interest can also have an impact. Suggested we list in the catalog only courses which dean is planning to actually schedule. Kuehnl acknowledged the suggestion but noted catalog meant to serve as a record of all courses college offers, and added that publishing simply a selection of courses would be tricky.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep mentioned their recent work w/ Guided Pathways Team has brought to light need to ensure offering courses listed on Program Map. Agrees that many courses couldn’t be scheduled during the past few years, due to COVID restrictions not allowing for face-to-face offerings.</p> <p>Vanatta responded to PSME rep’s suggestion about the catalog, agreeing with Kuehnl and adding would be very difficult to have catalog reflect upcoming schedule, due to schedule changes being made up to the last possible minute; college is not legally allowed to offer a course which is not listed in the catalog. Also noted that any course listed on a curriculum sheet must be included in the catalog, and that some programs have a large number of support courses (e.g., Horticulture).</p> <p>No discussion occurred regarding any specific requests.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Murphy, Armerding). Approved.</p>

<p>7. New Program Application: Air Conditioning Mechanic AS Degree</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Air Conditioning Mechanic AS degree. Apprenticeship rep noted program will be an opportunity for students to take additional coursework above the existing certificate of achievement, to earn degree.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. New Program Application: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician AS Degree</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of new Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician AS degree. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Adding Equity Section to COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Vanatta reached out to colleagues at other colleges to find out what they do to include equity on the COR; Kuehnl shared example of Mendocino College’s “Cultural Audit Review Process”—has seven questions to guide faculty in evaluating COR from equity perspective (e.g., does course description include diverse representation and have meaningful/accessible language for students?). Another college shared that their faculty are re-writing course descriptions to “directly address” students. Kuehnl noted many items in Mendocino’s process similar to what Foothill has addressed through Professional Development sessions. Mendocino’s process includes SLOs—do they incorporate clear/precise language for diverse students?; do students understand what the outcome is? Kuehnl noted sometimes faculty tend to write SLOs for faculty audience.</p> <p>PSME rep asked if any of these items going to be mandatory, meaning that if item is required to include on COR will faculty be required by law to teach the item? Expressed concern about overcompensation when it comes to courses for which these items are “irrelevant.” Kuehnl responded it is completely up to us, locally, to determine how to incorporate equity into the COR—maybe a specific field, maybe a yes/no question about equity consideration, but it’s our decision. PSME rep clarified they’re in favor of considering equity but concerned about overcompensation. Kuehnl believes important to encourage consideration of equity issues, even in areas where in the past folks didn’t think that equity was relevant, and agreed we don’t want to overcompensate or have a “heavy hand.”</p> <p>BSS rep asked Gilstrap whether certain changes to language (re: student-centered) could result in articulation-related issues. Noted previous push-back from UC, in particular, re: needing to include specific terminology and ensuring use of technical language. Gilstrap responded that articulation is layered (transferability approval, transfer GE, C-ID, course-to-course), so response depends on a few factors. For transfer GE, we can look at the reviewers’ guiding notes to see what reviewer for a specific area will be looking for. Noted ASCCC trying to work more collaboratively w/ UCs & CSUs on equity language, but nothing concrete yet. Biggest factor may be course-to-course, as we cannot put ourselves in the mind of an individual faculty member at a UC/CSU. Believes since there is an initiative to move to more equity-driven CORs, could be good idea to balance equity considerations w/ technical language which certain reviewers want to see.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep mentioned they’re on Committee on Online Learning (COOL) subcommittee re: online equity; group drafted Online Equity Affirmation, which acknowledges need for CORs to be updated before online equity changes can be made. Suggested CCC reach out to COOL to discuss. Apprenticeship rep asked if the plan is to require every COR to have equity component; unsure how their division’s CORs could comply and wonders if they could be excluded—Kuehnl responded this decision/process is up to us to determine, and right now we’re discussing possibilities. At one</p>

	<p>extreme, could be recognition/acknowledgement that equity has been considered during COR creation/review; at another, could be new section added to the COR. Noted faculty do have some flexibility in their specific teaching of a course.</p> <p>PSME rep noted they reached out to Dean of Online Learning Lené Whitley-Putz re: affirmation, who responded it isn't a requirement for faculty to make specific updates to CORs. Kuehnl noted equity is also related to how faculty teach classes. PSME rep suggested perhaps equity not be specified on COR but captured by support services, to ensure those students who need it have access. Fong suggested the group unpack the various ways equity appears on CORs, as well as what is meant by equity vs. culturally-responsive teaching, etc. Noted Mendocino's process has equity manifesting in different ways—content-related (SLOs), as well as in things such as assignments which are more like universal design. Cautioned against lumping all possibilities together as “equity in the COR,” as there are many aspects to COR. Believes support for faculty (through Professional Development, etc.) will be necessary to incorporate any planned changes.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep agreed faculty training/PD is helpful, and added that training for curriculum reps will be needed so they may properly guide and advise faculty. Other PSME rep mentioned Distance Learning Addendum; believes an Equity Addendum could be useful but needs to be well thought-out to be effective. Main concern is academic freedom. Believes having addendum with carefully-worded ideas on how to bring equity into COR would be helpful and there is a way to create one that's not too prescriptive. Kuehnl clarified that the rep is suggesting we use a separate addendum—rep responded not necessarily, but could be hard to integrate into COR, so perhaps a separate section of the COR.</p> <p>Other Fine Arts rep mentioned equity informs every facet of faculty's work, from assessment to relationships w/ students. Believes this work must come from faculty, but the starting point is curriculum and the standards we set, and then how we enforce/apply those standards. Need to be mindful of inclusivity. Noted that, with finals week coming up, ensuring faculty available to their students when they're needed is an equity-related issue.</p> <p>Kuehnl stated that although CCC cannot make equity “happen” around campus, group does have the ability to decide how we want to incorporate it into curriculum. Conversation will continue and will take time; important not to rush it, but at some point we'll need to make a decision on how to move forward.</p>
<p>10. Guided Pathways Mapping Approval Process</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl First read of Guided Pathways Program Mapping Process. Guests from the Guided Pathways (GP) Team: Amy Leonard, Isaac Escoto, Natalie Latteri. Escoto began conversation with related topic—Foothill moving forward with Program Pathways Mapper software; as we prepare for all of the work to upload info. into software for the fall, need to determine how best to move forward. Plan is to consider all Program Maps created last year as “ready,” with the caveat that if a dept. doesn't feel comfortable with a specific Map, we delay it and make some tweaks (e.g., recent work on Art dept. Map). Kuehnl asked if this would be a consent calendar type of approach—Escoto responded perhaps action not needed and GP Team may move forward unless a dept. wishes to make changes first. Latteri added that if folks want to modify a Map, please reach out to GP Team ASAP. Leonard shared link to Canvas page with all Maps.</p> <p>Draft process was discussed at previous meeting; Leonard incorporated</p>

	<p>feedback for first read. Main change to move step involving collaboration w/ other depts. earlier in process. Reminded the group that process will be used for both creation of new Map and update of existing Map; updating process could potentially go quicker, depending on nature of changes. Escoto noted discussion w/ dean occurs early in process, in response to feedback from deans. Leonard noted there will still be a GP Lead for next year, but if that position is removed in the future process can be updated. PSME rep concerned that not everyone has reviewed Maps and asked if everyone has had access—Leonard responded Maps have been shared many times and dept. chairs were closely involved in Map creation, but suggested perhaps certain dept. chairs didn't share out with wider faculty. Also mentioned additional work during fall quarter to update some Maps. PSME rep doesn't believe Maps have been discussed at the division-level, in their division. Escoto asked rep to please reach out w/ list of Maps which need attention/revision before being incorporated into Mapper software.</p> <p>Leonard noted CCC requested online form, and noted information/fields which will be included on form. Escoto acknowledged that signatures can sometimes be uncomfortable but believes need to ensure that everyone involved in process is included in form workflow. Leonard shared planned workflow for form, noting that during workflow folks will have option to reject and add comments, which will move form back to previous step. Escoto noted that within Mapper software, language will be used to explain that at times a course listed on a Map might not be able to be offered—has heard some concerns from faculty, which prompted this idea. Kuehnl asked the group to please share with their constituents and noted that changes are still possible before the group votes to approve.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
11. Good of the Order	
12. Adjournment	3:22 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean—APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Kathy Armstrong (PSME), Jeff Bissell (KA), Rachelle Campbell (BH), Roosevelt Charles (Dean—CNSL), Isaac Escoto (CNSL), Valerie Fong (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Julie Jenkins (BSS), Ben Kaupp (SRC), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Amy Leonard (De Anza), Don Mac Neil (KA), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Brian Murphy (APPR), Tim Myres (APPR), Ram Subramaniam (Interim AVP Instruction), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta