College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 23, 2023
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: May 9, 2023	**Approved by consensus.**
2. Report Out from Division Reps	**Speaker: All** Apprenticeship: No updates to report. BSS: Working on Title 5 updates. Counseling: Working on Title 5 updates. SRC: Working on Title 5 updates. Fine Arts: No updates to report. HSH: Working on Title 5 updates. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Language Arts: Working on Title 5 updates and Program Maps. Svetich shared English dept. creating new honors versions of some courses. LRC: No updates to report. STEM: Morriss noted new course proposals on today's agenda. Working on Title 5 updates. Parikh shared Engineering dept. creating new courses for an Apprenticeship program. Gilstrap shared recent update re: Cal-GETC—standards have been released, which are similar to IGETC standards. Of note is that our Communication Studies courses will need to be resubmitted. Will have more detailed update on topic at next meeting.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals b. AB 1705 Update	**Speakers: CCC Team** The following proposals were presented: C S 8; MATH 233; NCBS 433, 440A; PHOT 422. No comments. Subramaniam shared AB 1705 is a follow-up to AB 705 (from a few years back) and will affect different depts./programs across campus—especially (but not just) Math. One impact is that a student who has completed a math course in high school (e.g., precalculus) cannot be required by us to retake the course. Another is that a student who selects a major which requires a "gateway" math course must be allowed to enroll directly into that course, without being required to complete any prerequisite. Subramaniam and others working to ensure we correctly interpret the law and will be in compliance by the deadline of July 1—very soon!
5. New Certificate Application: Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) Technician	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of new Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) Technician Certificate of Achievement. No comments. Motion to approve **M/S** (Kaupp, Morriss). **Approved.**

6. New Degree Application: Industrial Technology and Building Construction Management BS	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** First read of new Industrial Technology and Building Construction Management BS Degree. Gilstrap thanked the Apprenticeship folks and believes the degree will be beneficial to our students; asked if the proposal has been submitted to the state—Allen responded, not yet, deadline in August. Gilstrap noted six CSUs offer Construction Management degrees, although he believes ours would be a different program—Hueg shared we're in contact w/ CSU East Bay to discuss, and we recognize our degree will be a tough sell if CSU objects. Allen added we've reached out to the other CSUs, as well. Agyare asked about recent news that BDP applications are on pause—Hueg responded, noting that while a few legislators asked for the process to be put on pause, it hasn't been, and August deadline still in place. Gilstrap commented on GE requirements info in Program Requirements section, and mentioned proposed GE pattern for BDP programs. If implemented, will be the standard GE pattern for our bachelor degree programs; noted it's proposed to be lower in units than CalGETC. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
7. Program Discontinuance Process	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Second read of Degree or Certificate (Program) Discontinuance Process, which has been updated based on discussion during first read. No discussion occurred. Motion to approve **M/S** (Kaupp, Parikh). **Approved.**
8. Process for Implementing Equity Updates to CORs	**Speaker: Eric Kuehnl** Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding need to determine how Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document will be used across campus. As requested at previous meeting, Vanatta created mock-up of text field on the COR form in CourseLeaf; noted discussions mentioned both a checkbox and a text field, but included just a text field on mock-up, to reduce redundancy. Field question/text wording on mock-up simply a suggestion and should be workshopped. Parikh commented on wording, which suggests Guiding Principles have been incorporated on COR, even though this won't always be the case. Kuehnl and Parikh both suggested more direct wording be used. Sarver suggested wording include example of how field should be filled out. Also noted wording/mock-up doesn't provide details to faculty re: who will be reviewing their response/work. Vanatta mentioned help pop-ups on COR form—one can be added to the field to provide examples, further instructions, etc. Morriss asked if the primary audience for faculty's response to the field would be division reps—Kuehnl responded, yes. Morriss believes wording on mock-up sets a positive tone (instead of enforcement) and compared it to similar types of questions posed in a classroom setting. Murphy asked for clarification, if this process will be a requirement vs. suggestion—Kuehnl responded, will be required for all courses. Murphy concerned that incorporating equity into certain Apprenticeship CORs will be difficult, citing a welding course as an example. Kuehnl responded, faculty could explain why Guiding Principles haven't been incorporated, in situations like this. Kuehnl noted there will likely be situations in which faculty don't want to engage in this process, for various reasons. Bissell suggested adding the "considered" to wording ("Please describe how you have considered/incorporated…") to allow for situations in which Guiding Principles don't apply to a course. Kuehnl expressed concern with

watering down the process. Jenkins finds "considered" more inviting and friendly than "incorporated." Kuehnl asked the group if anyone is opposed to changing "incorporated" to "considered"—no consensus. Parikh suggested adding additional wording to summarize the reason for creation of Guiding Principles and/or provide insight into who is asking faculty to go through this process. Kuehnl responded, faculty as a whole are asking our colleagues to do this work. Parikh noted certain faculty may disagree that all faculty have committed to this process; Hueg noted that since CCC and Academic Senate (AS) are representative groups, reps are representing the faculty within their divisions. Kuehnl agreed that while each individual faculty has not agreed to this, the representative bodies have. Gough suggested that wording mention AS, in this case.

The group drafted new wording: "Foothill faculty, through our Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee, ask you to consider the Guiding Principles for Equitable CORs document while creating or revising this COR. Please describe how you have incorporated principles of equity." Kuehnl wonders if this addresses situations such as Murphy's example, as well as faculty who may not want to engage in the process. Kaupp believes new wording provides space for faculty to explain that they believe no changes are necessary; Kuehnl concerned some might interpret new wording as requirement to incorporate equity no matter what. Svetich noted some may argue that principles of equity can be incorporated into every COR, regardless of discipline; Kuehnl believes such conversations should occur on a course-by-course basis, and the college relying on each division to handle the process in the way which is best for their courses. Svetich mentioned certain examples from Guiding Principles could apply to all courses (e.g., adjusting language to be more welcoming to students).

Kuehnl noted this process will evolve and currently we're figuring out the first iteration. Gough wants to make sure we don't overlook the importance of including process in a campus-wide presentation at Opening Day; Hueg mentioned training. Kuehnl is working on this for Opening Day. Svetich asked if process will be ready for current Title 5 updates—Kuehnl responded, not until next year's cycle. If division wants to incorporate equity into CORs during this cycle, they are welcome to, but text field will not yet be on COR (previous equity-related updates can be mentioned the next time COR updated).

Vanatta noted the group needs to decide if field response will be cleared out each time faculty initiates edit (to require faculty to add a new response). Kaupp made a case for previous response remaining. Parikh agreed, noting previous response could exist as record of ongoing progress (e.g., one COR section updated the first time, another the second time, etc.). Bissell noted the onus is on reps to review these responses and expressed concern about situations in which reps don't think enough consideration was put in by the faculty. Wondered if course would not get approved, in these situations—Kuehnl responded, course wouldn't get approved and wouldn't be able to be taught. Kuehnl wonders if a process for dispute resolution needs to be created. Hueg noted although we cannot foresee every potential situation, need to do our best to move forward with this process and hold each other accountable. Kuehnl believes text field will allow for faculty to state that they don't believe equity can be incorporated.

Kuehnl mentioned process allows for individual division to assign peer review or create group of faculty to review CORs for equity, instead of

	reps holding the responsibility; divisions welcome to come up with their own process. Hueg noted technically division CC approves Title 5 updates, not individual reps—Kuehnl agreed, but noted reps usually the ones doing the bulk of the review. Vanatta asked the group for their thoughts on where text field should be located on COR form. Gough suggested that because field will exist on every course, it should be positioned within the bulk of the COR, meaning alongside fields included on every course (so, above the cross-listing and GE fields). Kaupp agreed and noted since it will be required, faculty will get a warning message if they inadvertently skip over it. Gilstrap suggested offering training after field added to COR form, to help reps find it. Kuehnl asked if faculty's first response to field will display in green (re: CourseLeaf mark-up)—Vanatta unsure, and noted has found inconsistencies in that functionality. Kuehnl stressed need to ensure reps' review of this field is made clear as part of Title 5 process. Vanatta suggested field might be better positioned above Distance Learning section—group seemed to agree with this. Vanatta will create new mock-up for next meeting, to update wording and change field's location. Kuehnl mentioned AS has not specifically asked CCC to write a resolution related to this process, so CCC needs to decide if we want to do so and/or create another type of process-related documentation (e.g., for dispute resolution). If we feel that adding text field to COR form is sufficient, this would be fine, as AS has simply asked CCC to come up with the mechanism for incorporating Guiding Principles. Group consensus seemed to be that a resolution is not needed. Kuehnl would like next week's mock-up to be considered a first read—group agreed.
9. Good of the Order	Subramaniam mentioned upcoming Part 2 of Cooking with Ram, on June 11. Will be on Zoom, and will raise money for London Study Abroad program.
10. Adjournment	**3:24 PM**

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Kelly Edwards (KA), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Tom Gough* (FA), Kurt Hueg* (Interim VP Instruction), Julie Jenkins* (BSS), Ben Kaupp* (SRC), Eric Kuehnl* (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), Ram Subramaniam (Administrator Co-Chair), Kella Svetich* (LA), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)
* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta