

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 5, 2024
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: October 22, 2024	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p>Speaker: All</p> <p>Apprenticeship: Nate Vennarucci serving as in-person proxy. Allen shared division continuing to work on new apps for GE mapping, with some already completed.</p> <p>BSS: Connell shared Global Studies and Anthropology depts. working on new honors courses.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts & Comm.: Fong shared division working on updating ADTs. Brannvall shared division CC discussed bylaws, and Brannvall participated in Common Course Numbering (CCN) workshops, which she found worthwhile but noted there are still no specific guidelines from the state for quarter schools.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>Kinesiology & Athletics: Bissell shared division CC discussed Brown Act compliance.</p> <p>Language Arts: Rose Huynh serving as in-person proxy. No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: Agyare shared Library drop-in workshop tomorrow on using JSTOR (academic and art database); asked folks to encourage students to stop by!</p> <p>SRC: Kaupp shared division CC approved new cert. proposal for TTW program.</p> <p>STEM: Taylor shared division CC discussed bylaws; mentioned new course proposal on today's agenda.</p> <p>Hueg shared CCN continues to be a "fluid" situation, and Foothill is focusing on Phase 1 while awaiting further guidance re: Phase 2.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared more CCN faculty convenings will be held in December and mentioned certain faculty have shown interest, as well as depts. which still need faculty. Working on updating ADTs; attending state-wide CCN meetings. Mentioned discussions starting re: Military Articulation Platform (MAP), a form of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), and noted creation of district CPL task force, on which he'll participate.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Vanatta mentioned reception for Judy Walgren's photographs of TTW students in 1900 building tomorrow.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	<p>Speakers: CCC Team</p> <p>The following proposal was presented: BIOL 1BH. Connell expressed thanks for creating more STEM honors courses.</p>

<p>b. Notification of Proposed Requisites</p> <p>c. ASCCC Fall Plenary</p>	<p>New prerequisites for ACTG 55, 56; C S 11A, 12A. New corequisites for ACTG 57; MATH 211A, 211B, 247; NCBS 411A, 411B, 447.</p> <p>Kaupp will be attending (virtually) to serve as proxy for Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva. Noted resolutions which pertain to curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 101.01 Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5: Gilstrap noted topic being discussed at state curriculum committee level. Explained that Title 5 currently requires course objectives on CORs, and there’s a desire to use outcomes instead, which are used at four-year institutions in CA and nationally. Brannvall asked if this would mean replacing objectives with outcomes, or requiring both, and asked if outcomes are the same as SLOs—Gilstrap responded, believes there’s currently no discussion of removing objectives, and confirmed that “outcomes” means SLOs. Gilstrap believes this resolution will pass. • 101.02 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Course: Gilstrap noted this does affect Foothill, as we do have a nutrition course without Area 5B approval (BIOL 8). • 101.03 Cal-GETC External Examination Credit for Cambridge International Assessments: Gilstrap explained this is similar to AP & IB Exams. • 101.04 Automatic California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Approval of California Community Colleges (CCC) Ethnic Studies Courses: Gilstrap explained this is in response to some colleges’ Ethnic Studies courses being rejected for Cal-GETC approval, even (in some cases) those which copied COR elements directly from CSU Ethnic Studies courses. • 105.01 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies: Gilstrap explained that Title 5 allows each college to draft its own policy, and this is urging colleges to review their policy, ensure it’s not punitive, and, if needed, make the policy better/clearer for students. <p>Kaupp also mentioned 105.02 & 105.03 re: textbooks/cost of materials, and 105.04 re: guidance for course syllabi. Connell asked if CCC is being asked to guide Kaupp on how to vote—Kaupp responded, voting will be on behalf of Academic Senate, so if anyone has comments or feedback, reach out to Kaupp or Villanueva. Kaupp then mentioned 113.01 re: student choice on English and Math, and Gilstrap explained this is in response to AB 705/1705; ASCCC seeking to allow colleges to offer pre-transfer English and math courses. Gilstrap mentioned 114.01 re: support for faculty for AB 1111 (Common Course Numbering). Gilstrap’s takeaway from resolution packet is that there’s a lot happening at the state level and encouraged CCC members to take time to read through resolutions because it helps us understand what’s happening at the state level.</p>
<p>d. Common Course Numbering Update</p>	<p>Gilstrap mentioned ongoing faculty convenings and noted Foothill has been meeting with other quarter schools. At this point, we’re waiting on guidance from the state re: how to handle course sequences, as currently there’s no way for us to comply. One thought is for the quarter schools to collaborate on developing our own templates, but no decisions have been made.</p>
<p>e. Recent CCCCC Approvals!</p>	<p>Vanatta announced we’ve received state approval for two new certificates of achievement: Retail Operations Specialist, and Visual Storytelling and Comic Arts.</p>

<p>5. New Subject Codes: POLS & STAT</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Foothill is being required to begin using these subject codes for courses in Phase 1 of Common Course Numbering. Lee asked if every community college will need to use these subject codes—Gilstrap responded, yes.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Applications: MATH 211A, 211B, 247</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for MATH 211A, 211B & 247. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve items 6 & 7 M/S (Campbell, Draper). Approved.</p>
<p>7. Stand Alone Applications: NCBS 411A, 411B, 447</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCBS 411A, 411B & 447. No comments.</p> <p><i>See item 6 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>8. Stand Alone Application: SPAN 51C</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for SPAN 51C. Brannvall expressed enthusiastic support for this course!</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Draper, Huynh). Approved.</p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Applications: THTR 421A, 425, 425B, 427, 431, 440A, 440B, 442, 445A, 445E</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for THTR 421A, 425, 425B, 427, 431, 440A, 440B, 442, 445A & 445E. Each will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in one or more new noncredit certs., currently in development. Vanatta noted these are CTE mirrored noncredit versions of existing Technical Theatre credit courses. Discussion occurred regarding subject codes for noncredit courses; some depts. use same code as for credit and others use different codes. Connell asked if students can repeat these courses—yes. Discussion occurred regarding CTE noncredit vs. older adult noncredit.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. Updating Foothill GE</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Continuing our discussion from the previous meeting, re: how to place courses currently approved for Foothill GE within the new Foothill GE pattern. Kaupp created visual to categorize relationships between current Foothill GE areas and new Foothill GE areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current Area I → new Area 3 ○ Current Area III → new Area 5 ○ Current Area IV → new Area 4 ○ Current Area VII → new Area 7 • Simple: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current Area II → new Area 1A ○ Current Area V → split between new Areas 1B & 2 • Involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current Area VI (not required in new pattern) ○ New Area 6 (no equivalent in current pattern) <p>Kaupp agreed with comments made at previous meeting, regarding importance of reviewing criteria and application process as part of this transition, but believes it will be very helpful to simply place courses in the “direct” areas into new areas, which can then be followed by more in-depth discussion of the criteria. There’s a strong argument for placing courses in the “simple” areas into new areas, as well. What will take more time to figure out are current Area VI and new Area 6: we’ll need to figure out where to place courses in current Area VI, and draft criteria</p>

for new Area 6. Gilstrap noted only ETHN courses may be included in new Area 6.

Kaupp strongly encouraged the group to approve blanket placement of courses in “direct” and “simple” areas, and Gilstrap commented in favor. Gilstrap mentioned Program Maps, which will need to be updated and reviewed to incorporate new Foothill GE; noted he’s required to review every single Map and made it clear that he needs to do that work in winter quarter. Hopes placing courses can happen soon and suggested that next year CCC review the criteria. Doesn’t believe it will be difficult to draft criteria for new Area 6, as we can look at criteria for Cal-GETC Ethnic Studies area (and/or previous CSU GE & IGETC info). Drafting criteria for new Area 2 might be tricky, but we can begin with math-related criteria in current Area V. Kaupp mentioned Apprenticeship programs having approval for Foothill GE areas as a full program (not as individual courses), and stressed need to ensure this method of applying for Foothill GE be included in wider discussion of application process.

Starer asked if there are state-prescribed descriptors or do we have to create them—Gilstrap responded, Foothill faculty created the current criteria and we have freedom to either keep it or create new criteria. Starer asked about Intermediate Algebra graduation requirement—Gilstrap responded, once the new GE pattern is adopted, there will no longer be minimum proficiencies or add’l graduation requirements; student just needs to complete GE for graduation. Brannvall asked if CCC will approve these changes or bring them back to constituents—Kaupp responded, CCC members represent their constituents, so a member’s vote is on behalf of their constituency group. Kaupp would like to present at the next meeting a list of every current Foothill GE course and which area(s) of the new pattern it could fall under, and request blanket approval from the group. Also hopes to present draft criteria for new Areas 2 & 6.

Connell asked about De Anza’s new local GE—Kaupp responded, De Anza is still finalizing their new pattern. Connell believes it would be very beneficial to students for both colleges to align new GE patterns—Kaupp noted their new pattern will likely be similar to ours but not exactly. Vanatta asked how we will handle new courses for 2025 which applied for Foothill GE in CourseLeaf using current criteria/questions—Kaupp needs to think more about how to handle those. Discussion occurred regarding how to handle courses in current Area VI—Gilstrap noted hope that some of these courses also meet another GE area, which would be a more straightforward placement. Kaupp asked if the group would be in favor of all ETHN courses being automatically placed in new Area 6. Gilstrap noted that ETHN 1-5 will be approved for Cal-GETC Ethnic Studies area, but ETHN 7 & 8 will not.

Kaupp moved on to discussing our GE application process, noting it’s difficult to get volunteers for GE subcommittees. We’re not required to use subcommittees, and we have the option of reviewing all GE apps here at CCC. We don’t get too many GE apps each year, so workload wouldn’t be too heavy. Kaupp in favor of having all GE apps reviewed/approved at CCC. Noted GE subcommittees also approve students’ course substitution requests, and suggested we use single subcommittee to handle those requests. Campbell expressed concern that a GE app could come to CCC when there is no discipline expert present, and asked if we would delay those discussions—Kaupp

	<p>responded, first/second read process would help handle that type of situation.</p> <p>Herman referred back to placement of current Area VI courses and noted a few aren't approved for a second area, so those would be dropped off the new pattern; asked what the process would be for those courses to retain GE approval—Gilstrap responded, perhaps CCC could review those courses and see if they meet a different area. Kaupp added, when he's creating proposed course placement list he'll reach out to faculty associated w/ those courses to discuss and see if a different area might apply. Campbell asked if we could use a transition process specific to those current Area VI courses so they can be retained—Kaupp will invite affected faculty to next CCC meeting to participate in decision-making process. Gilstrap added, he'll check to see if those courses have Cal-GETC approval, which could help inform which new Foothill GE area might apply. Taylor asked how this transition will apply to current Apprenticeship GE approvals—Kaupp responded, same placement process will be used for Apprenticeship GE, and new Apprenticeship apps for next year should be reviewed in the same way as new apps for courses for next year.</p>
11. Division CC Brown Act Compliance	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</p> <p>Continuing our discussion from the previous meeting, re: ensuring division CC compliance with Brown Act. Kaupp plans to add new agenda item called Consent Calendar, starting with next meeting, which will include the following info for each division CC: when/where the next meeting will be held, where agendas are posted, who is in the membership, and what constitutes a quorum. This will help divisions prove they're in compliance. There have been some challenges to certain division CCs, as well as to Foothill's division structure, and we have to make sure we're following the rules in order to keep our unique structure.</p> <p>Asked the group for their thoughts on bylaws template. Campbell loves it and noted we've needed a framework for a long time. Asked what details will be needed for membership (i.e., specific names of members or just the number of total members and what constitutes quorum). Kaupp reminded the group that any discussion between the division CC's quorum outside of an official meeting is in violation of Brown Act, which makes the case for larger division CC membership. Kaupp asked to be invited to division CC meetings, so he can be more aware of what's going on, and will attend if he's able to. Hueg noted he's attended division CC meetings. Discussion occurred regarding what's allowable for curriculum discussions depending on size of quorum, as well as dept.-level discussions. Sarver asked for specific language related to posting of agendas—Kaupp responded, agendas must be accessible to the public, meaning it must be physically posted in a place that is not (for example) behind locked doors. Draper commented on the importance of transparency within divisions and noted prior experience as a part-time faculty member being excluded from curriculum discussions. Believes transparency will allow for wider participation and higher quality curriculum development.</p> <p>Allen asked Kaupp for more details re: posting of agendas online—Kaupp responded, reps will send Vanatta their agendas for posting on the CCC website, but this offered as a courtesy and doesn't satisfy Brown Act requirements. Herman asked if agendas may be posted on bulletin board—Kaupp responded, yes, as long as it's publicly accessible. Kaupp hoping to eventually have single bulletin board on campus for all division CC agendas to be posted on.</p>

Approved, November 19, 2024

	Kaupp will email the reps asking for specific information to be included on Consent Calendar for the next meeting and noted appreciation of the reps for their robust conversations on this topic and willingness to help ensure we're in compliance.
12. Good of the Order	Fong mentioned Fandomcon at San Jose convention center this weekend. Kaupp mentioned campus Wellness Center open to everyone for election-related needs.
13. Adjournment	3:27 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), 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), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Rose Huynh* (LA), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Amber La Piana (LA), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Eric Reed (LRC), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Nate Vennarucci* (APPR)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta