

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 7, 2019
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
President’s Conference Room**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 23, 2019	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Fine Arts: Recently approved new course proposals in MDIA and GID.</p> <p>BSS: Recently approved new courses in BUSI; Business dept. working on Digital Marketing certificate of achievement in partnership with Facebook. Noted that working with outside companies makes it hard to follow local curriculum timelines/ deadlines. PSME rep asked if Facebook proposing a course series—yes, but courses don’t need to be taken in sequence. Hueg mentioned another cert. being created, related to data analytics, in partnership with Silicon Valley Bank.</p> <p>Counseling: Still working to consolidate curriculum, including revising CNSL 1—looking at related course at De Anza; goal to reach a broad range of students (e.g., first year, first generation, returning).</p> <p>Articulation: Day reminded the group that her deadline to submit courses to UC for transferability is June 1st.</p> <p>PSME: VP of Instruction Kristy Lisle recently approved fast-tracking of new courses for Computer Science dept.’s Amazon Cloud certificate of achievement; Chemistry dept. creating 200-level support course.</p> <p>SRC: Working on Title 5 list.</p> <p>Language Arts: Continuing AB 705 discussions; working on Title 5 list; ongoing conversation between English and ESL depts. related to corequisite for ENGL 1A; working on noncredit courses and certificates.</p> <p>Library: Updating LIBR 10 with new language related to framework for information literacy.</p>
3. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding The following proposal was presented: MDIA 8B. Please share with your constituents. Day noted that there exist no lower-division women in film courses offered at any UC, but found four courses at other CA community colleges that obtained UC transfer. Noted that course may be a good fit for some of our existing programs.</p>
4. Program Deactivation: Mathematical Foundations Certificate of Completion	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding First read of deactivation of Mathematical Foundations Certificate of Completion. Memo notes that the courses that make up the certificate are being deactivated related to AB 705. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
5. Stand Alone Approval Request: R T 70A	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for R T 70A. No</p>

	<p>comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Thomas). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Program Deactivations: Traditional Photography & Digital Photography Certificates of Achievement</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Second read of deactivations of Traditional Photography and Digital Photography Certificates of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Serna, Venkataraman). Approved.</p>
<p>7. Honors Course Prerequisite</p>	<p>Speakers: Honors Institute, Equity Present for discussion: Debbie Lee and Voltaire Villanueva from Honors Institute; Melissa Cervantes from Equity. Currently, every honors course at Foothill lists a prerequisite of “Honors Institute participant”—requires student to meet with honors dept. and be coded in Banner as honors student. Earlier this year, Equity & Education group approved this prereq be removed from all honors courses. Lee and Villanueva’s schedules create hardships for students, especially during spring break; new Banner 9 prohibits access when working from home. Have found students become discouraged from taking honors courses, due to difficulty of getting code to enroll.</p> <p>BSS rep asked for details regarding process to clear students for prereq—no longer any entry criteria for honors courses, so it’s just a matter of adding the code; Banner process similar to how Admissions & Records codes students for placement tests. Used to be GPA criteria for honors students, but has been removed; now, any student may enroll in an honors course. Honors designation on transcript does still require certain criteria (24+ units of courses, plus specific GPA).</p> <p>Day provided background re: prereqs—honors dept. met with student for assessment, to ensure student understood rigor of honors course before enrolling. Noted many articulation agreements for honors courses based on knowledge of this assessment/prereq; if prereq removed, many honors CORs will need to be updated to add details regarding how course differs from non-honors. This will trigger re-review (articulation and C-ID), which could result in not being re-approved. Expressed concern that we could lose approval status. Cautioned faculty against simply removing prereq; encouraged thoughtful discussion among faculty when making the decision to remove. Reviewed honors CORs from other colleges which don’t list a prereq—many include lengthy additional information versus non-honors COR.</p> <p>Lee noted update to honors website—adding information for students to use guided self-placement when considering honors course. Provided example of MATH 1AH COR, which is expanded from MATH 1A. Cervantes noted that removing prereq does not change pedagogy of a course; Day explained that because we had an entrance requirement via the prereq, many reviewers allowed for our honors CORs to not differ much from non-honors. Day acknowledged that Math dept. spent a lot of time on MATH 1AH COR but noted that most other Foothill honors CORs not as robust. Hueg noted that by removing the prereq the pedagogy is being changed. PSME rep asked if there is minimum requirement to distinguish honors COR from non-honors—Day stated that there are no guidelines or requirements, just that reviewers compare the honors and non-honors CORs.</p>

	<p>BSS rep noted we should make sure to do what's best for students; does not teach honors but has heard disappointment from some students that honors course just meant additional homework; important to make clear to students, on the COR, what distinguishes the honors course. Hueg expressed concern that removing prereq could result in increase in students enrolling in honors course unprepared, then needing to drop and take non-honors version. Lee noted previous program to allow non-honors students to take honors courses; reviewed data showing that 37 of 40 students passed honors course. Language Arts rep suggested offering professional development for honors faculty, to provide support to ensure we're upholding the excellence in honors course offerings, before prereq is removed. Counseling rep noted equity consideration, to make sure rigor of honors courses does not put them out of reach for many students. Lee offered to speak with any faculty related to honors course offerings. PSME rep agreed with Counseling rep, but noted need for substantial difference between honors and non-honors. Counseling rep echoed need for professional development, especially as no uniform guidelines exist for developing an honors course.</p> <p>Day noted previous professional development opportunities for honors faculty; encouraged collaborative process to review/revise honors CORs. Also suggested college draft memo to send to other colleges/universities re: articulation, outlining plan to remove prereq for equity purposes but express assurance that honors courses will continue to be offered at a higher level of rigor than non-honors.</p>
<p>8. Temporary Program Creation Process— Feedback Form</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Second read of updated Feedback Form for New Programs. Form has been updated since previous meeting, to clarify that simultaneous submission to three groups for feedback is recommended, and to add URL for each group's webpage. PSME rep asked for update on creation of permanent program creation process—Armerding still waiting on other campus groups to move forward.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Cembellin, Venkataraman). Approved.</p> <p>Also shared minor update to Temporary Program Creation Process PDF, adding AVP of Instruction to Step 1. Vanatta noted that AVP is the contact person in Instruction during program creation and serves to advise faculty re: drafting narrative and gathering additional documentation (e.g., LMI, BACCC approval). Reminded the group that Curriculum Coordinator becomes involved only after program approved by division CC. Armerding noted best practice to request Advisory Committee and BACCC approval (for Workforce programs) during Step 1, as it may take many weeks—suggesting adding this to PDF.</p>
<p>9. Auto-informing Students for Degrees and Certificates</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Armerding Fourth read of resolution re: Auto-Informing Students for Degrees and Certificates (topic has been changed from “Auto-awarding Degrees/Certificates”). Document has been updated since third read, to adjust language from “auto-informing/alerting” to “auto-informing”. Resolution aligns with efforts coming out of Vision for Success, specifically related to completion and transfer goals, and CTE student goals. Day asked to whom resolution will be sent—Armerding will work with Isaac Escoto to forward to groups across campus.</p>

	Motion to approve M/S (Day, Thomas). Approved.
10. Improving Cross-Campus Communication Regarding Course Changes	Speaker: Ben Armerding Continuing discussion from previous meeting. Armerding has been adding prompts for reps to share course changes during report out at CCC; asked reps to be prepared to share and discuss. No further discussion.
11. Templates for New Program Narratives	Speaker: Ben Armerding At previous meeting during winter quarter, Vanatta asked the group to send her feedback on template documents for certificates of achievement narratives, to improve them as well as create versions for AA/AS degrees, before uploading to CCC website. No feedback was received. Vanatta made some minor updates to templates: in Item 3, added note to clarify that “Restricted Electives” is term used by CCCCO for support courses; in Item 5, clarified that enrollment data entered in table is historical (not projected). Noted that all information listed is required by CCCCO. Language Arts asked how best to gather historical enrollment data—Vanatta suggested contacting Institutional Research (IR). Suggestion to add information about contacting IR to templates—Vanatta will update. Counseling rep asked about requirement to submit ASSIST documentation—for Local (non-Workforce) certificates, CCCCO requires piece of additional documentation; ASSIST doc. is one option. Fong asked how CCCCO uses information regarding cost of facilities—Vanatta unsure, has never had any pushback from CCCCO regarding that info; Day suggested perhaps it serves to ensure college has considered new costs. Fong asked how document relates to temporary program creation process timeline—faculty should begin drafting during Step 1; narrative is forwarded with feedback form during Step 2. Armerding noted that feedback form is not mentioned on process PDF—Vanatta will add it.
12. Good of the Order	
13. Adjournment	3:11 PM

Attendees: Ben Armerding (Faculty Co-Chair), Zachary Cembellin (PSME), Melissa Cervantes (guest—Equity), Bernie Day (Articulation Officer), Kimberly Escamilla (LA), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Evan Gilstrap (CNSL), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Eric Kuehnl (FA), Debbie Lee (guest—Honors Inst.), Ron Painter (PSME), Paul Starer (Administrator Co-Chair), Ben Schwartzman (SRC), Lety Serna (CNSL), Mary Thomas (LIBR), Mary Vanatta (Curriculum Coordinator), Anand Venkataraman (PSME), Voltaire Villanueva (guest—Honors Inst.), Bill Ziegenhorn (BSS)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta