

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 22, 2024
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: October 8, 2024	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Myres shared division working w/ Starer on new apps for GE mapping.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts & Comm.: Fong shared new cert. approved by the state; working on noncredit offerings for older adults. Herman shared working on Common Course Numbering (CCN); Brannvall volunteered for CCN faculty convening.</p> <p>HSH: Campbell shared division exploring noncredit options; Draper shared EMS dept. working on new course proposal.</p> <p>Kinesiology & Athletics: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: Rose Huynh serving as in-person proxy. No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Taylor shared Biology dept. submitted new course proposal; working on CCN.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared recently distributed UC transfer approval results; all courses were approved! Thanked some of the reps for their help in quickly resubmitting courses not initially approved. CCN Phase 2 has begun: Economics, History, Art History, English in block one; Biology, Chemistry, Math, Astronomy in block two. Working w/ faculty to update CORs for CCN Phase 1, and noted all Phase 1 courses now required to be submitted for Cal-GETC approval (initial guidance was only Communication Studies needed submission). Will be presenting at the state-wide CCN Council this Thursday, on the challenges of course sequences for quarter system schools, as well as the issues we're experiencing related to the course numbering taxonomy. Hope is for the Council to understand the challenges being faced by quarter schools re: course sequences, because currently we cannot comply. Brannvall asked if Cal-GETC submission requirement is for quarter schools only—Gilstrap responded, no, all schools required to submit. Brannvall asked if this will also be the case for Phase 2 courses—Gilstrap responded, likely, but those should be more on track with regular articulation cycle. Taylor asked if CCN changes considered updates to existing courses or new courses—updates.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. Notification of Proposed Requisites	<p>Speakers: CCC Team New prerequisites for BIOL 36AH, 36BH, 36CH; ENGL 16H; MATH 47; R T 55A, 200L. Updated prerequisites for C S 18; MATH 1A, 1AH, 22;</p>

<p>b. Technical Review Committee</p>	<p>PHYS 4C. Vanatta explained that share-out of new requisites at CCC part of our normal process; Content Review forms are approved by division CC but do not come to CCC.</p> <p>Kaupp announced plan to convene Technical Review Committee to add to our COR process. Its purpose will be to review COR submissions for technical compliance related to Title 5, formatting, grammar, etc. Draper commented on name of committee and suggested “Compliance Review”—Kaupp agreed w/ Draper’s comment, but noted compliance is only one aspect of it. “Technical Review” name is common at other colleges, most of which have this type of committee. Parikh asked how this review will differ from what division CCs currently do—Kaupp responded, part of this plan is to help us get better, as a whole. Vanatta noted extensive amount of clean-up required by her on many CORs, which this review should help mitigate.</p> <p>Brannvall asked for more details about what committee will do—Kaupp responded, will ensure formatting is correct and all fields completed. Vanatta added that this year (as well as previous), many Content Review forms were not completed within CourseLeaf, and faculty/ divisions had to complete them after COR was fully submitted, using old Word doc form; new committee would help identify this sort of issue early in the process. Campbell asked for examples of Title 5 compliance issues—Kaupp responded with an example of a prereq listed on one of his own courses, which turned out was not compliant w/ Title 5. Discussion occurred about how this particular example would be identified by new committee. Concerns expressed about the nature of the committee and what the group would be checking for. Vanatta shared some more general examples of Title 5 compliance issues (e.g., required COR elements missing). Concerns expressed that division CCs aren’t being informed of COR issues which need to be addressed. Rep asked if they can share this news with constituents yet—yes. Rep commented that having this type of committee review early on will help resolve the question of who should be responsible for making formatting adjustments on CORs (faculty vs. reps), which has been a topic of discussion in some divisions.</p> <p>Kaupp made unagendized announcement to mentioned brand-new email rcvd today from CCCCCO re: AI course assistance pilot program being expanded to 100 add’l faculty participants. Happy to forward email to anyone interested, noting info session is this Thursday. Cembellin mentioned Foothill faculty offering a workshop Nov. 4 re: virtual assistant.</p>
<p>5. New Certificate Application: Business and Marketing</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of new Business and Marketing Certificate of Achievement. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Draper, Brannvall). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Applications: MATH 211A, 211B, 247</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for MATH 211A, 211B & 247. Each will be permanently Stand Alone and used as coreq support for MATH 1A, 1B & 47, respectively. Taylor explained courses related to AB 1705, to support students going straight into calculus. Question about why MATH 247 isn’t called “JUST-IN-TIME”—Cembellin responded, this particular course is additional content, which is different than the other support courses. Brief discussion occurred about what we are/not allowed to enforce, re: placement of students.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Applications: NCBS 411A, 411B, 447</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</p>

	<p>First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCBS 411A, 411B & 447. Each will be permanently Stand Alone and used as coreq support for MATH 1A, 1B & 47, respectively. Vanatta noted these are noncredit versions of the MATH courses in item 6.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Application: SPAN 51C</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for SPAN 51C. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Updating Foothill GE</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp We need to begin discussing how to place courses currently approved for Foothill GE within the new Foothill GE pattern. Goal is to hopefully make the process as streamlined as possible. Gilstrap explained the new areas and suggested potential equivalencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Area 1 has two subdivisions: English Composition would likely be equivalent to current Area II; Oral Communication & Critical Thinking would likely consist of COMM courses, essentially current Area V (minus MATH). • New Area 2, Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning: likely consist of MATH courses from current Area V. • New Area 3, Arts & Humanities: likely equivalent to current Area I. • New Area 4, Social & Behavioral Sciences: likely equivalent to current Area IV. • New Area 5, Natural Sciences w/ lab: likely equivalent to current Area III • New Area 7, Lifelong Learning: likely equivalent to current Area VII. <p>This leaves new Area 6, Ethnic Studies, which is brand-new for Foothill GE. Additionally, current Area VI (United States Cultures & Communities) does not have a potential equivalent in new pattern.</p> <p>Kaupp asked the group if they would like to make a motion to approve placing current Foothill GE courses in new areas in the cases where equivalencies likely exist or bring topic back to their constituents for discussion and feedback—group agreed, bring back for discussion.</p> <p>Woodbury asked if Foothill has developed criteria for new areas—Kaupp responded, not yet, that’s the next step. Parikh asked if there are descriptions of the areas—Kaupp responded, descriptions of current areas are on current GE apps, but CCC has not created criteria for new areas. Parikh asked if CCC will need to create all new GE apps—Gilstrap responded, noting some current apps could potentially be used to create new apps (based on equivalency details, above), but a few likely need to be created (e.g., new Areas 2 & 6). Parikh asked if CCC should know what the criteria for the new areas will be before deciding to place courses—Kaupp responded, noting some areas will likely be the same. Parikh concerned that deciding to place courses before knowing criteria is getting ahead of ourselves. Latteri noted Program Maps will need to be updated to reflect new GE pattern. Starer mentioned Apprenticeship GE mapping, noting that while we’re currently discussing course-by-course placement, which is efficient, Apprenticeship programs aren’t approved for GE at the individual course level. Concerned the Apprenticeship division could be burdened with additional work to figure out how to transition current approvals.</p> <p>Kaupp asked Gilstrap and Vanatta when course placement needs to be figured out—Gilstrap responded, state requires it be implemented by fall 2025, but our catalog will begin with summer 2025. Vanatta</p>

	<p>explained change to new pattern will require manual updating (by Vanatta) of each COR in CourseLeaf; would like course placement to be figured out by March/April, in order to be ready for the catalog. Kaupp noted we have seven areas for which criteria needs reviewed/ created, and asked the group how we want to handle that work (subcommittees, as a whole group, etc.). Gilstrap responded, if done at CCC, recommends including discipline experts to inform conversations. Noted current GE subcommittees frequently have just one or two members, which might not be ideal for this work. Suggested possibility of creating ad hoc group, noting concern that creating seven separate groups would be inefficient. Starer agreed that discipline expertise is needed and believes work is too important to fall on GE subcommittees; asked CCC members to communicate importance of this work to their constituents, because GE approval can drive enrollment in a course. Suggested convening separate committee of discipline experts to discuss and make recommendations to CCC. Sarver supported leveraging subject matter experts.</p> <p>Brannvall asked for clarity re: what aspects of criteria are state-mandated vs. local control—Gilstrap responded, criteria is local faculty purview. Recommended reviewing current criteria to see if it needs updating. Brannvall advocated having discussions at CCC with discipline experts, which will ensure Apprenticeship included. Kaupp suggested creating seven groups of discipline experts to bring proposals to CCC with updates/new criteria, with goal of having those proposals ready by the end of fall quarter. Connell advocated streamlining GE apps, which currently are very lengthy. Vanatta mentioned groups will need to figure out how to handle new courses for 2025-26 catalog, which filled out current GE apps in CourseLeaf, as well as Apprenticeship GE mapping in progress. Parikh asked for specifics about state-mandated changes to local GE—Gilstrap responded, local GE requirements in Title 5, but not very detailed. Parikh asked for Title 5 language—Kaupp will distribute.</p> <p>Gilstrap mentioned new Area 1 has two subdivisions so may need larger membership in discipline group. Parikh encouraged communication between the seven groups to determine any criteria overlap or distinctions between similar areas.</p>
<p>10. Division CC Brown Act Compliance</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</p> <p>There are two separate paths we can take to ensure compliance with Brown Act. Since 1992, Foothill has been the only community college with division approval structure, which gives us the benefit of flexibility and strength but adds great complexity. Believes there is potential to get rid of division approval while making minimal changes to our process. If CCC wishes to keep division approval, we need to ensure quality control and that division CCs are in compliance and more uniform than they have been in certain aspects: publication of details about each committee’s membership, quorum, contact persons for questions; predictability of when/where each committee will be meeting; agendas posted 72 hours in advance; ability for public to attend any discussion at committee which results in a vote.</p> <p>Kaupp drafted bylaws template for use by division CCs, which clarifies what division CC does and how they do it. Includes details about membership, publishing of agendas, recording minutes, etc. Division CC agendas and minutes will be posted on CCC website by Vanatta, but agendas still need to be physically posted (not by Vanatta). Template also includes details about division curriculum process. Each division CC having bylaws will ensure the strength of our structure and ensure Brown Act compliance, allowing for transparency in curriculum discussions and approvals. There have been some complaints made</p>

regarding division CCs. Kaupp acknowledged Woodbury's attendance and mentioned importance of communicating curriculum development w/ De Anza.

Parikh asked if there are any parts of the bylaws template that division CCs should not remove—Kaupp responded, he can review any modifications made by division to ensure still Brown Act compliant. Parikh asked if one faculty from each dept. within division must participate—Kaupp responded, no, that language on template was boilerplate. Parikh asked if division CC required to have specific chairs—Kaupp unsure and will check. Woodbury asked for an estimation of the range of current division CC membership—usually under 10 members; Kaupp noted one division CC has just one member. Woodbury wonders how a one-person Brown Act committee could work and mentioned need to ensure curriculum isn't being discussed within divisions outside of committee meetings. Agyare noted reps distribute CCC communicate to constituents and ask for feedback, and asked if feedback being received needs to happen at actual division CC meetings. Noted LRC doesn't have a lot of curriculum to discuss, so meetings aren't as frequent as other divisions. Kaupp noted anything requiring a vote must be discussed at division CC, but reporting out what took place at CCC re: other divisions is okay to distribute and discuss outside of division CC meeting. Specifically voting on own division's curriculum is what must be done within division CC meetings.

Dupree noted she and Connell are currently sole members and co-chairs of their division CC. They share collegially any proposed changes or new courses with division faculty for feedback, but don't consider those faculty voting members. Kaupp said this is okay as long as actual voting happens at publicly accessible meeting. Dupree asked if she and Connell can participate in discussions on share-out forum (outside of division CC meetings)—Kaupp unsure, will look into this. Starer asked if this drills down to dept. level—Kaupp responded, if it's being voted on by a committee, it falls under Brown Act, but general discussions are okay. Can consider dept. votes as advisory so as to not fall under Brown Act. Armerding asked Kaupp to clarify guidance re: discussing curriculum—Kaupp responded, members of division CC cannot discuss an item on the division CC agenda outside of an official meeting if there is a quorum of membership present. Armerding asked if division CC members can advise faculty on writing new curriculum, for example, meeting with faculty to draft COR—Kaupp responded, as long as it is not a quorum of division CC members, it's okay. Kaupp again noted the option to do away with division approvals, which will allow division CCs to not have to follow Brown Act.

Campbell noted that conversations about curriculum are separate from official meetings and official division CC business. Woodbury believes any conversations about curriculum do fall under Brown Act when division CC members are involved. Campbell asked for clarification about division CC members meeting with constituents to discuss writing curriculum—Kaupp responded, discussions are allowed as long as quorum of division CC is not present. If fewer members than are included in quorum for that division are in discussion, it's okay! This does make it tricky for divisions with small division CC membership. Kaupp noted it's his responsibility to ensure division CCs compliant with Brown Act, if CCC wants to continue to use division approval structure.

Kaupp asked the reps to share bylaws template with their constituents and please reach out to him with any questions. Goal is for each division CC to have bylaws so that any questions about the makeup and processes for their division CC are easily answered.

Approved, November 5, 2024

11. Good of the Order	
12. Adjournment	3:30 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Ben Armerding* (LA), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Rachelle Campbell* (HSH), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Patricia Gibbs Stayte (BSS), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman* (Dean, FAC), Rose Huynh* (LA), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Stephanie King* (LA), Amber La Piana (LA), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Tim Myres* (APPR), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Fiona Wiesner*, Erik Woodbury* (De Anza AS President)

** Indicates in-person attendance*

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta