College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 15, 2025
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: March 18, 2025	Motion to approve **M/S** (Draper, Fong). **Approved.** Gilstrap gave update to his Report Out from March 18: Anthropology ADT update will not be a 2.0 version, just a regular update to the TMC.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	**Speaker: All** Apprenticeship: Nate Vennarucci serving as in-person proxy. Shared finalizing new apps for GE mapping. BSS: Dupree shared working on curriculum sheets. Counseling: Lee mentioned graduation webpage has been updated w/ important dates, deadlines, checklist; please mention it to your students. SRC: No updates to report. Fine Arts & Comm.: Fong shared working on curriculum sheets. Brannvall asked for advice when dealing w/ faculty who cannot attend division CC but aren't interested in sending proxy—Kaupp responded, sometimes it can be hard to identify a proxy; in those cases, faculty could send their comments/talking points directly to reps ahead of meeting. HSH: Draper shared division CC meeting this coming Friday; working on curriculum sheets and Title 5 updates. LRC: Gamez and Ha serving as reps for spring quarter! No updates to report. STEM: Taylor shared working on curriculum sheets. Introduced Bob Sandor, part-time Computer Science faculty. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Gilstrap introduced Melanie Te, who is working with him to find gaps in articulation and on the articulation website. Gilstrap recently attended CIAC conference; no new info re: Common Course Numbering (CCN) templates for course sequences for quarter schools. Will be submitting CCN Phase 1 courses for UC transfer approval this summer, and doesn't expect any issues. Working w/ faculty on Phase 2 & Phase 3 courses. Vanatta reminded reps of upcoming deadline for curriculum sheets (this Friday); emailed reps this morning with up-to-date status of sheets for their division.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Connell mentioned Honors Institute looking for new faculty coordinator, so please encourage folks who might be interested. Role is 0.4 release time and would work w/ a counselor and Christoper Yang. Kaupp mentioned SLO Coordinator role (0.5 release time) is open for next academic year.

	Vanatta mentioned Rainbow Alliance affinity group held its first meeting today and encouraged folks to join! Next meeting is May 6—reach out to Clifton Der Bing if interested. Dupree is working w/ Michelle Wu on this year's Foothill Innovation Challenge; first event is Wednesday of next week, please share with your students! Bissell mentioned pool renovation project on next FHDA Board agenda for approval (May 5 meeting) and encouraged folks to show up in support of project and/or submit public comment. Fong noted President Whalen looking for student artwork to decorate Pride Center. Faculty encouraged to submit, as well!
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	**Speakers: CCC Team** The following proposals were presented: APPT 121A, 127G, 128I; EMS 413, 414. Allen noted APPT courses related to new program being created.
b. Notification of Proposed Requisites	New prerequisites for R T 73. Vanatta shared spoke w/ Rachelle Campbell today, who just got approval from state authorities to allow current Radiologic Technology program students to register for course; prereq language will be updated to reflect this.
c. Foothill GE List for 2025-26	Vanatta shared Foothill General Education requirements for 2025-26. Newly approved GE courses/programs have been added, and deactivated courses have been removed. Noted these changes are on top of transition of current courses/programs to new GE pattern. Related to Foothill GE, in general, Gilstrap mentioned new Title 5 language does not include any minimum grade requirement for GE courses. Currently, students need an overall GPA of 2.0 but must have a grade of C or higher to satisfy English and math proficiency (D grade is okay in other GE areas). With these proficiencies being folded into new local GE and no Title 5 language requiring grade of C or higher, students could complete GE with D grades as long as their overall GPA is 2.0 or higher. Gilstrap suggested CCC discuss this topic, to decide and document whether minimum grade should be established for any or all GE areas. Brannvall agreed that discussion is a good idea and wondered if having a low threshold could affect Foothill's reputation as an institution. Kaupp asked if we know how many students could be affected by setting minimum requirement of C grade—Gilstrap unsure, and noted our current requirements are common at other community colleges. Kaupp agreed that topic should be on next agenda.
d. ADT Updates—New Annual Process	Gilstrap and Vanatta recently met to discuss creating local process and timeline for updating ADTs on an annual basis. State Chancellor's Office is now regularly coming out with updated TMCs, so it will be good to have an established process, as we want to ensure any updates to an ADT are approved in the state's system before they're published in the next catalog. Process will take place during fall quarter and likely begin w/ Gilstrap reaching out to faculty whose ADTs have potential updates. Faculty would also use this opportunity to add new courses to an ADT. Deadline will be set in mid-November for division CCs to approve ADT updates for upcoming catalog. This will provide enough time for FHDA Board approval at December meeting, so Vanatta can submit to the state in January. Over the past year we've been updating all of our ADTs to new TMCs due to Cal-GETC, so now

	that our ADT info is up-to-date in the state's system, we want to maintain this standard. Vanatta and Gilstrap will type up clear info about new process and send it to divisions with ADTs.
e. ASCCC Spring Plenary Resolutions	Resolutions packet was attached as info item. Plenary is April 24-26. Kaupp encouraged reps to read through resolutions and share with constituents. Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva will be attending, so reach out to him with questions or feedback.
f. FW Grade Option	Kaupp shared De Anza has requested the FW grade option be removed, because it is confusing to some faculty and staff there; topic has been discussed at Academic Senate and elsewhere here at Foothill. FW exists for financial aid purposes. Please share with constituents and feel free to provide feedback to Kaupp or Villanueva. Brief discussion occurred re: reasons for using FW grade option. Saroyan noted FW is not an option for students who are Veterans, so its removal would not affect that population. Kaupp noted we are not required by Title 5 to offer this grade option.
5. Consent Calendar a. Division Curriculum Committees	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted changes since previous meeting: updated meeting details for BSS, HSH, STEM; updated LRC reps. Motion to approve **M/S** (Draper, Fong). **Approved.**
6. Stand Alone Application: R T 73	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for R T 73. Motion to approve **M/S** (Brannvall, Taylor). **Approved.**
7. New Certificate Application: Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** First read of new Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction Certificate of Achievement. Dupree explained this cert. will give educators the opportunity to learn how to integrate AI technology into curriculum and explore ethical considerations of AI. Existing certs. at other institutions tend to be more technical. Kaupp recommended faculty reach out to Daniel Kauffman, new Computer Science faculty working in AI. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
8. SLO Framework & Assessment Process	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Foothill is implementing a new SLO assessment framework and process; in doing so, we're making some changes. Academic Senate approved a draft of document, and updated version was included in CCC attachments; additional updates might be made as process evolves. All faculty reflect on their teaching, even if it's not being documented; this is an opportunity to formalize this reflection. Faculty will be tasked with doing quarterly reflections, incorporating data. All SLOs on a course will be reviewed and assessed when the course is due for Title 5 review. Depts. will engage in twice-yearly discussions. Brief discussion occurred re: deans' involvement. Kaupp noted some depts. on campus prohibited from having dept. chairs, which could complicate process for those depts.—Hueg noted this is a negotiated issue. Gamez noted the contract states that for depts. without a chair the dean is responsible—Kaupp responded, discussions have made clear the deans shouldn't be involved in this aspect of the process. Kaupp noted the issue of dept. chairs needs to be brought up at next contract negotiation. Brannvall mentioned Title 5 cycle—Kaupp noted this could be an opportunity for depts. to strategically distribute their courses so not all of their courses are up for Title 5 review at the

same time. Kaupp clarified that faculty will reflect on every course each quarter, but actual assessment and review of SLOs happens only when course is up for Title 5 review.

CCC has been given two tasks: 1. establish standard structure for SLOs; 2. determine minimum expectations for clarity, measurability, and mapping. Brannvall mentioned previous work on SLO process done by certain faculty members as well as accreditation response and asked if new process is related—Kaupp responded, prior work was being done, but this is a brand new effort and is related to accreditation. Connell asked if consultants have been involved—Kaupp responded, accreditation folks are providing guidance but other consultants who've recently been on campus are not involved.

Kaupp presented examples of what could be used for standard SLO structure (e.g., "Students will be able to [verb] + [concept/skill] + [context/condition]"). Use of consistent structure, especially within an individual course, is important. Draper noted we were previously required to have two SLOs per course and asked how new process will impact Course Objectives—Kaupp responded, eventually, COR will include both SLOs and Course Objectives, and faculty are being asked to have 2-4 SLOs per course.

Taylor asked what the timeline is for CCC to complete these two tasks—Kaupp responded, no timeline yet, but he will be reporting on this discussion to SLO Committee this coming Thursday and might find out then. Vennarucci noted that SLOs on Apprenticeship courses usually tied to specific skills students will learn over the full program, and asked that there be some consideration for this unique type of situation—Kaupp agreed with the need for this type of flexibility. Vennarucci mentioned discussion at recent Academic Senate meeting of specific examples of how SLOs on Apprenticeship courses could be written.

Kaupp noted that as part of structure, CCC needs to determine wording to use for the leading part of the sentence (e.g., "By completing this course, the student will…"); Sandor suggested using "successful student". Kaupp asked the group for thoughts on how to start this work, suggesting folks reach out to him to discuss and/or provide feedback, so he can bring a draft of suggestions to next meeting.

Kaupp also drafting a guide to help faculty write quality SLOs, which includes distinction between SLOs and Course Objectives, FAQ, etc. Noted Allison Meezan (Interim SLO Coordinator) and Online Learning Dean Lené Whitley-Putz creating Canvas shell which will also provide guidance. Would like input from reps on guide document, and will distribute draft for feedback after Thursday's SLO Committee meeting. Connell mentioned previous way of thinking about SLOs was to consider what information students would be able to retain 5-10 years after taking a class, and asked if this is still the case—Kaupp responded, current way of thinking is that SLOs are part of the course evaluation and need to be measurable in the moment. Draper noted that while HSH division is reviewing SLOs for Allied Health courses, considering which aspects of the COR could be measurable and thus used as SLOs. Allen noted the similarity with Apprenticeship courses. Discussion occurred re: differences between SLOs and Course Objectives.

Approved, April 29, 2025

	Kaupp will report on CCC's discussion at Thursday's SLO Committee meeting; at next CCC meeting will present draft of suggestions for structuring SLOs. Please reach out to him with any feedback about this topic.
9. Good of the Order	
10. Adjournment	**3:19 PM**

Attendees: Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Kelly Edwards (KA), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Laura Gamez* (LRC), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Katie Ha (LRC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Bob Sandor* (STEM), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Melanie Te* (Articulation), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Nate Vennarucci* (APPR)
* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta