

College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 4, 2025
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: February 18, 2025	Motion to approve M/S (Gilstrap, Brannvall). Approved.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Myres shared continuing to work on Foothill GE apps.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts & Comm.: No updates to report.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: No updates to report.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap mentioned he's emailed reps the C-ID newsletter mentioned at previous meeting. Working on Cal-GETC cert.; reviewing Program Maps; working w/ Communication Studies dept. faculty on courses for Cal-GETC Area 1C. Mentioned upcoming change to Cal-GETC Area 5: currently, students required to take one biological science course and one physical science course (incl. one w/ lab), but change will allow students to also satisfy requirement by taking two biological science or two physical science courses (lab still required). The reason for the change is that certain science ADTs require a high number of units and those students are already taking multiple biological science or physical science courses; this will allow students to not have to take extra courses. Mentioned TMCs for Elementary Teacher Education ADT and Environmental Science ADT have been updated; will reach out to faculty. Math and Physics ADT TMCs have been updated, related to UC transfer pathway, which gives us more time to respond. Noted Common Course Numbering (CCN) development workgroup might be ending soon, which he's been sitting on; CCN Council currently discussing how the work on that project will continue.</p> <p>Hueg mentioned recent meeting w/ De Anza colleagues re: communication about new curriculum and believes it was productive. Kaupp added, the process will continue the way it's been working, in that we will encourage sharing notice of curriculum development w/ De Anza, and vice versa, which seems to have been going well. Kaupp shared examples of positive and productive meetings between Foothill & De Anza faculty and administrators about new curriculum. Hueg mentioned the topic of duplication of curriculum frequently brought up as a concern; in many cases it's fine for both colleges to offer similar curriculum, but in some workforce/CTE situations it can be an issue.</p>

	<p>Vanatta mentioned things are on schedule for curriculum sheets to be available for editing next week. Also noted Title 5 list should be ready next week.</p>
<p>3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>Kaupp made comment outside of his role as Faculty Co-Chair, related to terrifying developments in the news. Reminded the group that our colleagues and students are humans, and many are going through possibly the most traumatic experience of their lives. Urged everyone to have grace and remember that we're all going through this together.</p>
<p>4. Announcements a. ASCCC Spring Plenary b. Courses not Taught in Four Years Deadline Reminder: This Friday 3/7! c. Division Rep Changes for Spring?</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team April 24-26 in Irvine. Area meetings March 21. Reach out to Kaupp if you're interested in attending.</p> <p>Vanatta reminded the reps of the upcoming deadline to submit Course Deactivation Exemption Request forms.</p> <p>Kaupp asked the group if there will be any changes for spring, and mentioned faculty going through tenure process might be looking for opportunities to serve. Brannvall asked if there is a maximum number of reps a division can have—Vanatta responded, no, and noted that each division gets one vote regardless of number of reps. Schultheis will be on sabbatical, but hasn't yet found someone to step up. Reed will be in Japan, but unsure if someone will fill in.</p>
<p>5. Consent Calendar a. Division Curriculum Committees</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted changes since previous meeting: LRC details updated.</p> <p>Kaupp mentioned he's received a request from De Anza's Academic Senate President, Erik Woodbury, to include Woodbury on every division CC meeting invite; reps might receive an email from Woodbury about this. Hueg asked if there is any one place where all the division CC meeting info is published (dates, times, locations)—Kaupp responded, this document contains all that info.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Draper, Reed). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Degree Deactivation: Public Health Science ADT</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of deactivation of Public Health Science ADT, which is being replaced with new Public Health ADT in summer 2025.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>7. Updated Resolution: General Education Options for a Foothill College Associate's Degree</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of updated resolution, originally approved in May, 2011, to allow students the option of using CSU GE & IGETC patterns for local AA/AS degrees (rather than allowing only use of Foothill GE pattern). Proposed updates allow students the option of using new Cal-GETC pattern, and notes that students with catalog rights for prior catalog years will continue to be able to use CSU GE & IGETC.</p> <p>Gilstrap explained that updating this resolution is helpful for evaluators and counselors to have confirmation in writing that students are allowed to use transfer GE to complete a local degree.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Foothill GE Area Groups</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp At the previous meeting, CCC approved new Foothill GE application forms to be used temporarily, so broader conversations can occur about the Foothill GE pattern. The group also mentioned upcoming changes to Foothill's Institutional Learning Outcomes, which are</p>

reflected in Breadth Criteria, and Kaupp noted we still don't know when those changes will be complete. Today's conversation is to determine what we want the conversations/work to look like (e.g., at CCC, subcommittees, etc.).

Brannvall interested in cross-discipline conversations; Kaupp agreed. Kaupp asked if we want to include students, administrators, etc.; who are the stakeholders? Noted many of our students also go to De Anza, and the two college's local GE patterns do not align. Brannvall believes including students could be valuable, as well as De Anza colleagues. Myres asked for clarification re: Kaupp's suggestion of subcommittees and how this will affect GE application submissions—Kaupp clarified, CCC approved disbanding the use of GE subcommittees for reviewing apps; what we're discussing now is whether subcommittees should be used to discuss rethinking the Foothill GE pattern, in general.

Gilstrap thinks it's a good idea to have one group for each GE area, and within each group any faculty whose discipline area is relevant should be invited; students and faculty from other disciplines should also be welcome. Brannvall clarified this is what she meant by cross-disciplinary, the disciplines which fall within each area. Gilstrap believes including faculty from outside the expected disciplines can help people better understand the GE pattern, in general. Kaupp asked the group to consider how much of this process should take place at our public CCC meetings, or public in another way; we're not required to have all these discussions fall under Brown Act.

Starer thanked the group for allowing him to be so involved in this topic and noted that, when he drafted the document shared at the previous meeting, his motivation was to consider why we have GE in the first place; suggested the group consider this question as a foundation for the conversations to come. Additionally, Starer believes there are two audiences to consider: internal, creating GE apps for faculty to fill out; and external, where we make the case to students, the public, and the community we serve, that GE is a valuable part of education. GE pattern is fully under faculty purview and Starer believes there's value in having area-specific discussions among faculty whose courses fit within each area. Believes starting discussions with "what is the value of GE" will help motivate and inform further discussions.

Taylor expressed concern with the time commitment needed to have these discussions, especially with all of the work coming up (e.g., curriculum sheets, Title 5 updates, spring quarter classes). Believes it could be worthwhile to incentivize discussions, to help motivate more than the usual group of faculty to participate. Kaupp agreed that usually the same faculty participate in these sorts of projects, and wonders how asynchronous the process can be; could Canvas be used to facilitate discussions? Brannvall suggested we hold an on-campus GE summit with food! Kaupp mentioned recent Marketing dept. event to solicit input on signage, which was very successful. Believes we should provide as many opportunities as possible for people to participate.

Campbell believes there are many faculty on campus who don't feel that they can fully participate in this discussion, because they believe all they can provide is critique of what others have written. HSH division has very few GE courses. However, GE aligns all faculty, since students in all degree programs must complete it. If it's the foundation of the degree, it's the foundation of Foothill. Kaupp responded that "just critique" is valuable and should not be minimized. Wonders if this is a

	<p>marketing problem, and we need to make people better aware that GE isn't just a form, it's not just a class that students take to tick a box. It's the foundation we provide to students before they go out into the world.</p> <p>Kaupp asked the reps to please push this opportunity to their constituents. We bought ourselves a year, so let's do this with intention!</p>
<p>9. Catalog Start Term</p>	<p>Speaker: Kurt Hueg We don't have the same start term as De Anza, and the CCC Team is interested in changing our start term from summer to fall. Common Course Numbering (CCN) is going to cause a lot of disruption for the upcoming catalog, because those changes go into effect in fall. Hueg strongly recommends we change from summer to fall effective 2026.</p> <p>Kaupp asked what this change would impact—Hueg responded, start date of our catalog, but not our academic calendar or fiscal year, which will continue to begin in summer. New courses would begin in the fall. Campbell asked if this will help Vanatta—Vanatta responded, it will be a big help when it comes to CCN Phase 2 and beyond. Too late to change for CCN Phase 1, so Vanatta will need to publish massive catalog addendum for fall 2025. Gilstrap noted it will have a much bigger effect on his work re: articulation, because so many aspects of articulation are effective for fall. Latteri noted it might move her due dates. Cembellin asked if this would apply only to credit courses—Hueg responded, no, would affect all courses.</p> <p>Vanatta wants to make it clear that this change would mean that all COR submissions would change from an Effective Term of summer to fall (e.g., currently Summer 2026 is the default term, but if we agree to this change it will be Fall 2026). This could impact programs with a summer start (e.g., Allied Health programs), so we may need to figure out a process to allow for summer catalog addenda to accommodate such situations.</p> <p>Gilstrap suggested we check with Financial Aid dept. to see if this change would have an effect, and Kaupp suggested checking with VRC. Hueg doesn't believe this would have any effect on those depts./processes. Jackson Sandoval asked why we begin in summer—unknown. Campbell asked if this change would affect summer-to-fall term-spanning courses—Hueg responded, no; the only term spanning not allowable is spring-to-summer, due to financial aid (which won't be affected). Taylor asked if there are any consequences if we don't align catalog start term with the fiscal and/or academic year start—Hueg responded, no, and noted De Anza doesn't align.</p> <p>Kaupp asked the group to bring topic to their constituents and solicit any questions or concerns we might not be considering.</p>
<p>10. Good of the Order</p>	<p>Kaupp mentioned a robust discussion took place at recent Academic Senate (AS) meeting re: allowing students to register for overlapping classes (should we, and if so what's the process). Encouraged the reps to really think about this topic and share their thoughts with AS reps.</p>
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:00 PM</p>

Attendees: Ulysses Acevedo (LA), Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Rachelle Campbell* (HSH), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Kelly Edwards (KA), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman* (Dean, FAC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Tim Myres* (APPR), Eric Reed* (LRC), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Lisa Schultheis* (STEM), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta