

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 17, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Room 4501; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Reaffirmation of Remote Meetings Resolution	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl <i>Item skipped—in-person quorum achieved, so resolution not needed.</i>
2. Minutes: May 3, 2022	Approved by consensus.
3. Report Out from Division Reps	Speaker: All The following divisions/members provided a report: PSME: Rep announced that Anand Venkataraman has stepped down as other division rep. Noted that PSME and Bio Health divisions reorganizing, which will likely affect representation for next year. SRC: Potential new member of division CC (not rep), who would like to also be a CCC rep for a different division—Kuehnl responded yes, as long as they're not trying to represent two different divisions. Fine Arts: Rep mentioned conversation at prior meeting re: report out structure (mandatory vs. optional), suggesting that playing with placement of topic on agenda could result in more dynamic responses/engagement.
4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Bio Health rep gave a shout-out to Allison Herman and Mike McCusker for their hard work putting together upcoming Research & Service Leadership Symposium. Herman encouraged everyone to bring their students and attend.
5. Announcements a. New Certificate Approval by CCCCO: IT Support	Speakers: CCC Team The CCCCO has approved the new IT Support CA!
6. Stand Alone Approval Request: MATH 280	Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for MATH 280. No comments. Motion to approve M/S (Campbell, Svetich). Approved.
7. AB 928 Update	Speaker: Evan Gilstrap Singular GE transfer pathway legislation. Last week, Gilstrap emailed the group about recent memo from ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates) re: recommendations for new pathway (based on current IGETC), which include: UC will include Oral Communication courses in Area 1 (faculty will need to revise their courses and resubmit for transfer GE); Area 3 will decrease from three courses to two (one arts, one humanities); Language Other than English no longer required for GE (will change to graduation requirement for transfer institution); CSU will remove Area E (which will affect athletics, dance, kinesiology, and other courses). ASCCC currently has online survey for folks to provide feedback; Gilstrap will share link. Counseling rep asked if there has been any discussion of local GE patterns changing as a result of legislation—Gilstrap responded that such discussions haven't occurred, noting that if this GE pattern is approved it won't go into effect until 2025. There is legislation for California community colleges to add Ethnic Studies requirement to local GE patterns, so assumption is local GE patterns won't go away; unknown yet how new GE pattern may affect them.

	<p>PSME rep mentioned past CCC discussions re: our local GE pattern being out of sync with IGETC and CSU GE, and wondered if this may be a good opportunity to revisit local requirements and perhaps align with this new pattern. Noted that Foothill serves many students who will be using GE for transfer. Kuehnl responded that the group will discuss priorities for next year, later on today's agenda, and this could be a good topic to include; topic has been discussed some over the past few years but not in depth.</p> <p>Fine Arts rep excited by conversations which will be prompted by new GE pattern, noting that the platform for delivery of communication studies courses is changing, which is influencing the new pattern. Believes we should consider how methods of delivery of courses may impact SLOs. Noted personal experience reviewing transfer applications and considering full breadth of GE; believes important to discuss how changes to local GE pattern may impact the entire learning experience for students.</p> <p>Gilstrap noted memo is simply a recommendation proposed by ICAS, so there will be time to discuss which areas will be impacted and how we'll need to respond and support affected depts. Important to consider what type of feedback we want to provide to ASCCC about the proposed pattern.</p> <p>PSME rep mentioned Guided Pathways Program Maps which direct students to specific GE courses (vs. students selecting GE courses from full area lists), noting concern that many offerings may end up being cancelled as a result. Acknowledged concern is more specific to Guided Pathways but is related to GE. Gilstrap noted recommended pattern has Areas 3 & 4 losing one course each, which could be a big hit on certain depts. Bio Health rep mentioned another potential impact—BIOL 81 currently approved for Area E, and rep unsure how many students taking it specifically for GE (vs. for certificate of achievement). Gilstrap agreed that this is a good example of potential impact of recommended changes.</p> <p>Other Bio Health rep completely alarmed by recommended elimination of Area E, not only re: physical education courses but also those related to mental health, which help students deal with impact of taking very heavy courses. Would like feedback to ASCCC to mention the impact this could have on students' mental health and ability to handle coursework. Gilstrap noted proposal is to change Area E to upper-division requirement, which would put the onus on the student to complete it post-transfer. Kinesiology rep noted there's state-wide pushback re: elimination of Area E, and organized group will certainly be providing feedback to ASCCC about this.</p>
<p>8. Equity in the COR</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl Continuation of discussion from previous meetings. Most of today's meeting allocated, to discuss how we can educate ourselves and colleagues in how to imbue equity into the COR, in general. At prior meeting, breakout groups suggested—today's groups will discuss the Course Description section of the COR, to come up with ideas related to imbuing equity into this specific section.</p> <p>CCC members broke out into small groups of 3-4 (online and in person) for 20 minutes. The full group then reconvened and shared out ideas from their small groups.</p>

	<p>Bio Health rep used R T 200L as example, and noted its description doesn't include any mention of what folks in the field do re: implicit bias. Also used swimming course as example, and liked that its description states that students can have little to no experience, which seems a good way to let potential students feel they are welcome as beginners. Other Bio Health rep first used course with a series of prerequisites as example, but instead chose a more general biology course—felt its description was “dry” and could be edited to be more welcoming to potential students. Believes important to consider where a course falls in sequence of coursework, when considering potential changes to description.</p> <p>PSME rep referenced example from Long Beach college, which provides old and new info from COR (pre- and post-changes related to equity)—could be helpful for faculty to see as examples when they're editing their CORs. Suggested adding info/examples in CourseLeaf and/or Title 5 checklist, to give faculty very specific ideas to put into practice. Also believes important to offer training opportunities (e.g., in-person flex day event) to provide space for engagement and conversations, so that the tool/info we come up with and implement may be successful. SRC rep mentioned removing “for the disabled individual” from their course titles had positive impact on interest/enrollment. Suggested it would be great for someone who is not only an equity expert, but also an expert in the content for a given division's courses, to review CORs with faculty and advise them—most obvious choice would be the division curriculum reps. Kuehnl agreed this could be a case for expanding or changing reps' role/responsibilities, and stressed (personal) neutrality in this consideration. BSS rep responded that reps don't necessarily need to become equity experts but could provide the opportunity for sparking discussion and consideration of equity with colleagues in their division.</p> <p>Language Arts rep mentioned the idea of “questioning” and looking at the description from an action-oriented perspective: Does the description engage students and invite them in as participants/co-participants? Can you remove words/phrases/language as exclusionary (or add as inclusionary)? Can you use verbs which actively engage students? How can you shift/reframe language from being passive to being active (re: engagement with materials)? Suggested posing these questions as a hint/tip within CourseLeaf could be helpful to prompt faculty's thinking. PSME rep responded that they love this idea.</p> <p>Kuehnl noted that breakout sessions will continue at upcoming two meetings, each focused on another section of the COR (likely Course Content and Methods of Evaluation). Hope is to begin developing some consensus, with plan to come up with something in the fall to implement (in CourseLeaf, professional development, etc.). Fine Arts rep commented on need for folks to enter these discussions with an open mind, with the goal of curriculum that is less racist. Also believes there are indeed ways to jazz up “dry” descriptions.</p>
<p>9. CCC Priorities for 2022-23</p>	<p>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</p> <p>The past few years, around this time of the year CCC members suggest topics to discuss the next year, and Kuehnl creates a survey which members vote on to determine priority of each suggestion. Results of survey won't necessarily be set in stone as next year's priorities, but CCC will begin the year with a discussion referencing the rankings. Note that Academic Senate may also dictate priorities, as they've done the past few years. Shared results of last year's survey, noting that some have been accomplished and others still ongoing. Top priority</p>

	<p>was program creation process, which is being worked on but still in process. Load and seat count also ranked highly, but hasn't been discussed as it's a negotiated item.</p> <p>PSME rep suggested revisiting the way we run CCC, not necessarily away from division dependence but perhaps to a hybrid model in which there is more clarity about what's happening re: course approval across campus. Noted that recent discussions of Brown Act (re: meeting remotely) prompted talk of allowing smaller groups to still meet remotely. Kuehnl noted our decentralized model is very unusual, and does relieve some of the burden of review/approval from the central CCC. Mentioned that ASCCC reps met with Foothill last year to discuss our curriculum process re: Brown Act, and concluded that division CCs need to follow Brown Act; this resulted in some divisions considering perhaps curriculum approval should be moved away from the division model. Noted that a few years ago CCC discussed at length the possibility of moving to a centralized model, and clear consensus was that we should not. Suggested perhaps holding a vote of all faculty on the change. PSME rep clarified that there aren't just two models, and perhaps a third model could be devised. Kuehnl responded that re: Brown Act it comes down to where curriculum is approved (division CC vs. CCC).</p> <p>Gilstrap suggested continuing monitoring AB 928; discussing Ethnic Studies graduation requirement (will be required for all California community colleges to include on local GE pattern—waiting for core competencies to come out), which could be included in general conversation about reviewing our GE process; considering moving curriculum start date from summer to fall, and noted that all transfer GE approvals are effective for fall term, which results in a gap, since our year begins in the summer, and can impact students.</p> <p>Subramaniam asked for status update on new program creation process—Kuehnl responded that group is meeting again this Friday and believes work will soon be presented to CCC. Encouraged folks to join Friday's meeting if interested.</p>
10. Good of the Order	
11. Adjournment	3:29 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Kathy Armstrong* (PSME), Jeff Bissell* (KA), Carolyn Brown (FA), Rachelle Campbell* (BH), Roosevelt Charles* (Dean—CNSL), Valerie Fong* (Dean—LA), Evan Gilstrap (Articulation Officer), Allison Herman (LA & LRC), Kurt Hueg* (Interim VP Instruction), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Ché Meneses (FA), Tim Myres (APPR), Lisa Schultheis* (BH), Ram Subramaniam* (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich* (LA), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta