

**College Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 25, 2023  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 21, 2023	<b>Approved by consensus.</b>
2. Report Out from Division Reps	<p><b>Speaker: All</b> Apprenticeship: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>BSS: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts: No updates to report. Gough noted new certs. on today's agenda.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Finalizing curriculum sheets.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Fong shared a new issue of The Script came out today!</p> <p>Gilstrap shared CalGETC (single transfer GE pattern) was approved by the faculty segments (community college, UC &amp; CSU); next step is to determine core competencies for each GE area, likely to be similar to IGETC. Noted upcoming public meeting re: AB 1111.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals  b. CORs for Update 2024-25 (Title 5 list)  c. Foothill GE List for 2023-24  d. COR Language Adjustments in CourseLeaf	<p><b>Speakers: CCC Team</b> The following proposals were presented: APPT 134C; ENGR 41A, 61A, 101A; SPAN 51B. No comments.</p> <p>Vanatta compiled list of courses that need to be reviewed/updated for the 2024-25 catalog; list was emailed to reps and deans on March 23rd. COR deadline for the 2024-25 catalog, incl. Title 5 courses, is June 23rd. Painter asked if updating a course not on the list changes its timeline for Title 5 updates—Vanatta responded, yes, any time a course goes through full update process its Title 5 “clock” restarts.</p> <p>Vanatta shared Foothill General Education requirements for 2023-24. Newly approved GE courses have been added, and deactivated courses have been removed. Kuehnl mentioned GE subcommittees and encouraged folks to volunteer next year.</p> <p>Vanatta shared that CourseLeaf recently updated to implement language adjustments discussed at Nov. 29th CCC meeting, as well as minor change to another field—details on agenda attachment.</p>

<p>5. New Certificate Application: Commercial Photography</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Commercial Photography Certificate of Achievement. Jordahl explained these new certs. will allow students to quickly gain skills in the field aligned to workforce needs. Additionally, noncredit courses/certs. will allow students who don't necessarily need to earn units to refresh their skills.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>6. New Certificate Application: Digital Photography Techniques</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Digital Photography Techniques Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 5 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. New Certificate Application: Photography Criticism</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Photography Criticism Certificate of Achievement. <i>[See item 5 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. New Certificate Application: Commercial Photography (noncredit)</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Commercial Photography Certificate of Completion (noncredit). <i>[See item 5 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. New Certificate Application: Photography (noncredit)</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Photography Certificate of Completion (noncredit). <i>[See item 5 for related comments.]</i></p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. New Certificate Application: Educational Immersive Media</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> First read of new Educational Immersive Media Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>11. Program Discontinuance Process</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b> Academic Senate (AS) delegating CCC to create a formal discontinuance process for degrees/certificates; this does not include the "political" aspect of deciding if a degree/cert. will be discontinued, only the actual steps/process to follow once that decision has been made. Until now, an informal process has been used. Hope is for CCC to draft and approve a process by the end of this academic year.</p> <p>Vanatta explained current informal process, which mirrors degree/cert. creation process—division CC approval, CCC approval (division drafts short memo explaining reason for discontinuance), FHDA Board approval. Following Board approval, degree/cert. removed from next catalog edition, to prevent add'l students from claiming catalog rights, but its official status in state's inventory system "in limbo" until Vanatta has confirmed that all students have completed.</p> <p>Kuehnl plans to draft a process to discuss/edit at next CCC meeting. Kaupp asked what catalog rights are—Lee responded, refers to when a student starts a program and maintains continuous enrollment (specific policy depends on the college/district; Lee explained specifics for FHDA). If a student begins after a discontinued program has been removed from the catalog, they cannot claim catalog rights for the program. Gilstrap mentioned example of CSU GE adding Area F—students who started before that effective term don't need Area F, but those who started after do. Kaupp asked how catalog rights affect</p>

	<p>courses listed on a program being discontinued—Gilstrap and Lee responded, ideally the college would offer the course(s) long enough for students to have opportunity to take them, but not necessarily always the case. Gilstrap noted catalog rights also refers to which version of a program students can claim (when changes are made to program’s requirements). Further discussion occurred regarding how depts. might handle teach-out of courses listed on a discontinued program.</p> <p>Painter asked if courses listed on discontinued program become Stand Alone—Vanatta responded, if course remaining active and isn’t listed on another degree/cert. or Foothill GE, will need Stand Alone approval. Noted this is also the case re: courses removed from a curriculum sheet. Parikh mentioned low enrollment of courses sometimes drives program discontinuance—Kuehnl noted this falls on “political” side of things, which CCC won’t be involved with (more likely AS will be involved). Mitchener asked if process would be different if the program requires teach-out vs. not—Kuehnl suggested perhaps; Vanatta noted the goal in either case should be to approve the discontinuance so the degree/cert. can be removed from the catalog, so no add’l students can claim catalog rights. Discussion occurred re: how to best teach-out a program being discontinued; Subramaniam recommended details re: teach-out be included in process created by CCC.</p>
<p>12. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Eric Kuehnl</b>          Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding need to determine how Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document will be used across campus; for example, who will be reviewing equity updates to CORs (division reps, subcommittee, etc.). Kuehnl noted likelihood of disagreements between faculty and reviewers re: whether or not equity principles sufficiently incorporated. Mentioned “neutral” perspective of GE subcommittees as example, but believes realistically the division reps will be involved; a subcommittee would need to review every Title 5 update submitted across campus, which is a large volume of work. Vanatta clarified that equity review would be done to every updated and new COR submitted, not just those on Title 5 list—Kuehnl agreed.</p> <p>Jenkins stressed importance of ensuring maximum buy-in and concerned about division reps being the reviewers, due to political aspect. Believes reps could be put into vulnerable positions when disagreements arise. Asked if AS has approved document yet and wondered how/if it will be implemented for this year’s COR deadline/ Title 5 list—Kuehnl responded, this was meant to be the first year to implement guidelines and update CORs with an equity lens, but AS has not yet approved document, so unlikely to be implemented for this COR cycle. Also noted CCC unlikely to finalize process until end of this academic year.</p> <p>Bissell agreed with Jenkins’ concerns and added that there needs to be a strong campaign throughout the college, to make very clear what’s being asked of all faculty, so that if division reps are the reviewers they will be in a better position to follow-up with faculty if disagreements arise. Believes all faculty should go through same workshop/seminar; mentioned recommendation at previous meeting re: Opening Day topic, but hopes it doesn’t end there. Agyare noted suggestion at previous meeting to add checkbox on COR with text field for faculty to explain how/where they implemented equity—Kuehnl noted this seemed to be the more popular option discussed at previous meeting. Recalled discussion that having just a checkbox would not be sufficient.</p>

	<p>Subramaniam asked the group to step back and recall why guidelines were developed in the first place. If they're going to have any sort of meaningful effect, cannot be implemented quickly; will need long-term discussion within depts./divisions to evaluate each course and determine how to best make changes. Does not believe process should be rushed through, just for the sake of saying we've implemented the guidelines. Jordahl asked at which point equity-related changes might trigger articulation-related review—Gilstrap responded, whenever there are changes to certain sections (e.g., description, content, objectives), course is subject to re-review (incl. transfer GE if applicable). Noted that typical Title 5 updates (e.g., textbooks) do not require re-review.</p> <p>Parikh echoed Subramaniam's comments and believes tying process to Title 5 cycle means it will continue past initial five-year cycle (of all CORs across campus being evaluated), which is good. Continuing to ask the right questions, even if it's just a checkbox, should eventually result in seeing the change we want to see and effecting positive changes in faculty's thinking. Kuehnl noted AS has mandated that CORs be reviewed with an equity lens and believes simply a checkbox will not be sufficient. Gough believes that two subjective points of view (faculty and reviewers) will result in clashes; also wonders if some sort of re-articulation trigger could be built-in to alert faculty that they're making too many extensive changes—Gilstrap noted that, just like his current process, he'd determine this when he reviews COR.</p> <p>Morriss believes process will demand faculty ask themselves difficult questions; believes not possible to hold someone accountable if they're unwilling to hold themselves accountable. Concerned process could result in tricky situation re: part-time faculty, and suggested this responsibility fall on tenured faculty only. Jenkins unsure if needs to be restricted to tenured, but agrees that tenured should lead it; believes college as a whole should put topic at the forefront, perhaps for the entire upcoming academic year, incl. Gilstrap providing articulation-related expertise. Kuehnl wondered if process for dispute resolution needed; suggested such situations could come to CCC for discussion/resolution. Gilstrap mentioned Bissell's comments re: difficult conversations w/ colleagues, and asked if there will be some sort of rubric for reviewers; rubric helps to set expectations for faculty and lets reviewers know what they're looking for. Could help remove some of the subjectivity. Kuehnl mentioned Office of Equity, but also believes we need to push for specific/targeted professional development. Unsure that general professional development re: equity will be the most effective, in this situation. Reiterated that dispute resolution should be incl. in process created by CCC.</p> <p>Subramaniam noted this isn't just about updating CORs, but also more important aspect of how changes will manifest in the classroom. Jenkins believes many faculty will ask why it's necessary to put so much effort into CORs when what matters is what's done in the classroom, and stressed importance of making clear how COR affects the classroom. Parikh anticipates a lot of pushback from dept. colleagues, even if simply a checkbox is added to COR, based on years of attempts to discuss equity with colleagues. Gough asked about next steps—Kuehnl would like to have one more discussion at CCC before drafting document/process. Mitchener asked where document can be found—will be posted online after approved by AS.</p>
<p>13. Good of the Order</p>	<p>Subramaniam noted happy to see so many participants in person!</p>
<p>14. Adjournment</p>	<p><b>3:27 PM</b></p>

*Approved, May 9, 2023*

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare\* (LRC), Jeff Bissell\* (KA), Kelly Edwards (KA), Valerie Fong\* (Dean, LA), Evan Gilstrap\* (Articulation Officer), Tom Gough\* (FA), Julie Jenkins\* (BSS), Kate Jordahl (FA), Ben Kaupp\* (SRC), Eric Kuehl\* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee\* (CNSL), Ana Maravilla\* (CNSL), Tiffany Mitchener\* (HSH), Patrick Morriss\* (STEM), Brian Murphy (APPR), Ron Painter\* (STEM), Sarah Parikh\* (STEM), Chrissy Penate (LRC), Amy Sarver (LA), JP Schumacher\* (Dean, SRC), Ram Subramaniam\* (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich\* (LA), Mary Vanatta\* (Curriculum Coordinator)

*\* Indicates in-person attendance*

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta