

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 19, 2020
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via ConferZoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 30, 2020	Approved by consensus.
2. Minutes: May 5, 2020	Approved by consensus.
3. Report Out from Division Reps	<p>Speaker: All Articulation: CSU announced virtual instruction for fall 2020, with the exception of a few in-person classes. No update from UC re: their plans.</p> <p>BSS: Child Development dept. working on converting non-transcriptable certificates; LINC dept. creating new courses around teaching/learning strategies for online environments/technologies.</p> <p>PSME: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>SRC: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Language Arts: Working on Title 5 updates, Distance Ed for noncredit ESL.</p> <p>Fine Arts: Working on Title 5 updates, Stand Alone forms; ensuring full-time faculty own CORs in C3MS.</p> <p>Library: Mentioned email sent by Kristy Lisle, VP of Instruction, re: new software to integrate all library holdings, online resources, and educational resources, into Canvas. Seeking faculty feedback—encourage your constituents to take a look and provide feedback. Reach out to Library rep with any questions.</p> <p>Kinesiology: Working on Distance Ed for activity courses.</p> <p>Counseling: Working on drop-in counseling process to make it as simple as possible for students. In summer, majority of counseling services are drop-in to try to help as many students as possible during transition to fall.</p> <p>Bio Health: Working on Title 5 updates. Received response from faculty regarding fall quarter DE planning discussions—will send to Kuehnl.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: Dean Chris Allen provided update. Working on Title 5 updates. Planning to deactivate Ironworkers program, as that site is no longer with Foothill.</p> <p>Instruction: Starer mentioned email sent today announcing he is returning to Language Arts as dean. No plans yet re: AVP of Instruction position.</p>
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	<p>Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: LINC 57A, 57B, 84C. Please share with your constituents. Gilstrap noted proposed discipline for 84C is Education and asked if this is an issue—Vanatta noted that both departments/disciplines are within BSS, so no additional sign-off required on proposal form. BSS rep responded that LINC faculty regarded as content experts, so division CC deferred to them. Hueg stated the discipline should not be listed as Education; Starer mentioned conversation with LINC faculty, believes Education is the intended discipline. Hueg noted that LINC faculty will need to confer with Education faculty; BSS rep will reach out to</p>

<p>b. New Program Approvals: GID Certificates, Bridge to College Level English Noncredit Certificate, Environmental Science ADT</p> <p>c. CCC Priorities for 2019-20— Survey Results</p>	<p>LINC faculty for follow-up, and division CC will determine if proposal needs re-approval. Discussion occurred regarding the difference between discipline and subject/department code; Vanatta noted that we don't have any local rule stating that they must match.</p> <p>Starer made general observation re: creation of new courses—concerned that given our current budget crisis we are approving new courses which may require new resources, without knowing if they will be available. Suggested new courses be approved with caveat that resources will be dependent on the outcome of the budget situation. Noted this also includes new programs which contain new courses. Kuehnl agreed this is an important consideration. BSS rep asked how this would work in practice, re: new courses such as these LINC courses that have “no track record” to help gauge level of student interest. Hueg noted that many such discussions will occur in the next few years; believes these particular LINC courses will be okay. Fine Arts rep suggested working with Institutional Research and getting feedback from students re: the courses they would like to take.</p> <p>The CCCCO has approved the four GID Certificates of Achievement (Game Design, Graphic Design, Illustration, Web Design), the Bridge to College Level English Noncredit Certificate, and the Environmental Science ADT!</p> <p>Kuehnl shared the results of the survey he conducted. Noted the topics are all clustered closely together, in terms of voting outcome. At the top is updating the Distance Ed form, which is on today's agenda. Noted that most topics will be addressed next year.</p>
<p>5. Update Distance Learning Application</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Lené Whitley-Putz, Dean of Instructional Technology, present for discussion. Whitley-Putz advised that recent Title 5 changes affect the DE addendum, including honing definitions of “online” and “hybrid” courses, and addition of two features. First, regular and effective contact defined as not only instructor-to-student but also now student-to-student—subtle change that can have big impact. Addendum will need to address how instructor enables student-to-student interaction. Second, process must be in place to ensure ADA compliance. Language clarifies that even a single document used in a course which is not accessible means the course is not ADA compliant. Need to ensure that the class itself is accessible—difference between the course/curriculum and the actual class being taught. Lastly, slight changes in language: “in-person” instead of “face-to-face” or “traditional;” and “online” used for all other.</p> <p>Starer asked if Title 5 language states which entity should be responsible—the CCCCO has listed many different roles across campus that are involved, but have stated that the faculty member teaching the class is the final person responsible for ensuring their class is accessible. This means the campus needs to have infrastructure in place to support faculty; otherwise, both will be out of compliance. Starer asked about DE approval process, in general, not just regarding ADA compliance, and if there are any deadlines being enforced—every campus will look different, and the CCC's level of involvement is a local decision. Whitley-Putz mentioned one example of a college incorporating accessibility into their curriculum process, but also mentioned the need for academic freedom and the ability for faculty to fine-tune their offerings.</p> <p>Starer clarified that he is asking more about how these Title 5 changes affect the CCC's responsibility; asked if new regulations now require CCC</p>

to follow up to ensure that “regular and effective contact” is taking place as noted on the DE addendum or if CCC may defer to the faculty member to ensure standards are being met. Whitley-Putz noted that Anthony Cervantes, Dean of Enrollment Services, responds to quarterly audit requests re: regular and effective contact—having such information on the DE addendum would be helpful for his process. Would also help ensure compliance and transform addendum from list of checkboxes into more of a campus mission. Starer noted that our current decentralized curriculum process puts trust into the division/department and faculty to do what is required of them; noted that changing our DE approval process could significantly slow it down—similar to our process for GE course approval.

PSME rep agreed with Starer, noting that Foothill regarded as putting a lot of trust in its faculty. Also expressed support for Whitley-Putz. Fine Arts rep involved in the creation of our current DE addendum, and noted that faculty asked to include DE information in syllabi. Asked if changes to addendum would require re-review/approval of all courses already approved for DE; asked if information re: ADA compliance could be included on COR (e.g., Special Facilities section) instead of on DE addendum. Believes faculty more likely to refer to COR rather than DE addendum for this sort of information. Whitley-Putz noted her presence is to provide insight and share Title 5 changes; CCC free to make their own decisions re: level of changes that need to be made. She is not recommending any specific changes.

Other PSME rep believes the CCCC is going to require all courses go through normal DE approval process, starting in January, to be offered online—no more blanket DE approval. Starer also believes this will be the case. Rep noted that PSME has many courses not approved for DE but are currently being taught as such, under emergency circumstances. Suggested amending our current DE addendum to allow for approving a course for DE in case of emergency only; noted that other colleges have already moved forward with this. Would ensure that a course may be taught online/hybrid in an emergency situation, and also make clear that the course not “officially” approved to be taught online/hybrid. Proposed that Foothill consider doing this at the same time as updating DE addendum to incorporate Title 5 changes.

Other PSME rep suggested accessibility be a separate consideration, and not necessarily incorporated into syllabi or courses—Starer unsure if this would be allowed, legally. Starer addressed suggestion to add emergency DE approval checkbox to DE addendum, noting concern about how “emergency” could be defined, as some could misinterpret it and offer a course online/hybrid in non-emergency situations. PSME rep agreed that “emergency” would need to be defined; for example, if the FHDA Board closes campus in the case of a fire or earthquake. Kuehnl noted additional consideration that, when campus initially re-opens, certain faculty may not feel safe returning right away if they are in a high-risk group—may need to address such nuances. Whitley-Putz noted fast-moving field of DE—curriculum process is not quite as fast. Can anticipate situation in which a new DE addendum created, but then technology changes occur. Noted that just because a course is DE approved doesn’t mean it must be taught online; suggested that, similarly, approving emergency DE for a course would not necessarily mean that a faculty member forced to teach online.

Bio Health rep asked for clarification; believes that if a course approved for DE, faculty could be asked/compelled to teach online/hybrid—Starer noted this is not his understanding, but there could be a situation in which the only available offerings left for a faculty member are online/hybrid. Does not

	<p>recall any situation in Language Arts in which a full-time faculty member was compelled to teach DE who didn't want to. Kuehnl and Starer noted the same may not be true for part-time faculty, who may end up having only DE classes available for them to teach. Lee agreed, noting there could be a lack of student interest in a certain course being offered in-person, so only DE scheduled.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep noted new scheduling codes being created for online/hybrid offerings, re: synchronous and asynchronous—suggested new DE addendum mention these codes. Noted that certain faculty in Fine Arts uncomfortable teaching certain types (a/synchronous).</p> <p>Starer has heard a lot of concern re: how rapidly the emergency DE approvals came forward, and suggested the group think ahead to fall quarter to be prepared in the case of something similar occurring. Kuehnl noted the CCCCO does want local approval to occur in the fall quarter (of courses which fell under blanket approvals); planning to update our DE addendum in fall quarter to coincide with local approval. Whitley-Putz shared link to Title 5 language; offered to continue to be involved in discussions and/or revision of DE addendum.</p>
<p>6. Revisiting Local Policy Requiring “C” Grade or Better for Major Courses</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Continuing discussion from previous meeting. Kuehnl noted that Isaac Escoto, AS President, requested CCC discuss issue, which is that Pass/No Pass grades currently being accepted for major courses (due to COVID-19), but this is counter to our local policy. Noted that De Anza already does allow for P/NP for certain programs. Starer noted that ASFC leadership has heard concern from students that selecting P/NP would impact their transfer ability. Issue was discussed at President’s Cabinet. Starer suggested that if CCC doesn’t feel compelled to continue discussion, we can move on. Gilstrap noted that certain transfer institutions allowing P/NP grades, temporarily, due to COVID-19, but most normally do not. Mentioned information in our course catalog re: maximum P/NP units allowed for transfer—this would need to be taken into consideration, if college decides to adjust our local policy.</p> <p>Bio Health rep noted general feedback from division faculty was to not do anything which could negatively impact students, in terms of transfer ability. Gilstrap noted situation is very individualized, based on which school they intend to transfer. Counseling rep would like to have larger discussion within division before CCC settles discussion (have not had time to do so, yet)—Kuehnl agreed with this. PSME rep noted concern that many students will be taking gap years, since many universities plan to be virtual in the fall—this could create a throughput issue for Foothill students. Concerned that our students will be less competitive, and wondered if having a lot of P/NP grades on transcript could create additional risk. Counseling rep agreed that issue is very complicated; has talked to students who have been accepted to universities but are unsure what to do (e.g., defer, etc.). Noted there are also risks associated with a student deferring, and we don’t yet know what university environments will look like post-COVID-19. Kuehnl would like Counseling reps to bring discussion back to their division, and will continue discussion at CCC following that. Gilstrap noted not every Foothill course has the option to take P/NP; also noted our course catalog does not state that a Pass grade is equal to a C or higher grade—suggested this language may need to be updated if local policy is changed to allow Pass grades for major courses.</p>
<p>7. Requisite Recency</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>Reviving discussion that occurred earlier this year. Kuehnl noted research has revealed we are locally allowed to make decision about whether to enforce recency requirement for requisites; Title 5 does mandate a 36-</p>

	<p>month minimum. PSME rep noted concern originally came from Physics dept., but Chemistry dept. faculty currently more concerned, especially re: safety concerns in lab classes. Recalled suggestion that faculty confer with counterparts at De Anza, and noted was hoping Starer could help facilitate such discussions—Starer happy to do so. Fine Arts rep noted that ceramics faculty interested in setting recency requirement; also interest in setting requirement for higher-level painting courses (when offered in-person). Noted that current virtual instruction situation creating extra level of concern, in terms of students being ready to take advanced courses when lower-level taken virtually. Recalled ceramics faculty suggested seven years for recency. Kuehnl offered to speak with AS reps at De Anza to gauge interest in discussing. Starer and Kuehnl will move forward with initiating discussions with De Anza.</p>
8. Good of the Order	
9. Adjournment	3:27 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LIBR), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Stephanie Chan (LA), Mark Ferrer (SRC), Valerie Fong (Acting Dean, LA), Marnie Francisco (PSME), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Hilary Gomes (FA), Allison Herman (LA), Kurt Hueg (Dean, BSS), Marc Knobel (PSME), Eric Kuehnl (Faculty Co-Chair), Debbie Lee (Acting Dean, FA & KA), Dokesha Meacham (CNSL), Allison Meezan (BSS), Ché Meneses (FA), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Ron Painter (PSME), Katy Ripp (KA), 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), Lené Whitley-Putz (Dean, Instructional Technology)

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta