

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 28, 2023
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 14, 2023	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out and Check-in	<p>Speaker: All Fine Arts & Comm: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: No updates to report.</p> <p>BSS: Connell asked the other reps how they communicate general curriculum info to their constituents. Kaupp forwarded the communiqué when he was a rep. Connell noted communiqué is after the fact for voting items, and asked for suggestions on how to notify faculty of those—Parikh responded, STEM reps send communiqué to all faculty, and if upcoming agenda item important for faculty to know, reps contact specific faculty to bring to their attention. Concern is that forwarding everything to all faculty could be overwhelming, so targeted approach used. Dupree noted reps’ concern is they might not be voting the way the full constituency might; Kaupp noted CCC a representative group, so reps trusted to vote on behalf of their constituents. Parikh described process used by STEM reps to hold division CC meetings. Brannvall shared she and J. Fong both take notes at CCC meetings and include those notes with agenda for upcoming division CC meetings, also share communiqué. J. Fong added, they call out important CCC items (e.g., Stand Alone courses). Kaupp noted that each division has the freedom to use process which works best; helpful to get ideas from other reps and tailor process to own division.</p> <p>Counseling: Lee reminded the group that the UC/CSU transfer application window closing in just a few days. Refer students to the Transfer Center—in-person, Zoom, and phone drop-in available.</p> <p>HSH: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap reminded the group about the upcoming Dec. 1st deadline for IGETC & CSU GE submissions. Mentioned upcoming meeting of AB 1111 committee Dec. 7th, discussing final draft of recommendations.</p> <p>Language Arts: No updates to report.</p> <p>Apprenticeship: No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Kinesiology & Athletics: No updates to report.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Kaupp shared that the Owls Nest has events all next week. Encourage your students to attend!
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals	Speakers: CCC Team The following proposals were presented: NCEL 460; PHOT 5H, 22H. Kaupp reminded the group that new course proposals are approved by the division CCs but are info items at CCC (CCC does not take action).
5. New Certificate Application: Semiconductor Processing	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of new Semiconductor Processing Certificate of

	<p>Achievement. Narrative has been updated since first read, to add note re: MATH 40A coreq in Item 3. Vanatta asked for clarification on whether this is an official Apprenticeship cert. (vs. regular workforce); discussion occurred re: email thread following first read. Allen mentioned note re: MATH 40A coreq and asked whether total units for cert. need to be updated—Vanatta responded, no, can't include MATH 240A as major course, and units listed on narrative must match what's entered in state's inventory system. Parikh mentioned noncredit coreq option being created.</p> <p>Hueg confirmed need to create two certs., noting different approval processes for Apprenticeship and non-Apprenticeship certs. Parikh noted that minor edits will be needed to language in narrative, to create different versions (required courses are the same). Parikh asked about process for students, to select correct cert. and courses, noting different sections set up for Apprenticeship students vs. non-Apprenticeship. Allen clarified special sections needed for Apprenticeship because tuition is waived. Vanatta asked if CCC approval today could stand for both versions—Hueg responded, can be used for just one version; today's is Apprenticeship. Hueg will schedule meeting to discuss creation of non-Apprenticeship cert. Parikh reminded the group that edits needed to remove mentions of non-Apprenticeship students from narrative.</p> <p>Motion to approve with minor editorial changes to narrative M/S (Draper, Parikh). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Application: MUS 70R series</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for MUS 70R series. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Lee, J. Fong). Approved.</p>
<p>7. New Certificate Application: Spanish</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of new Spanish Certificate of Achievement. Hueg clarified cert. is non-workforce.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Degree Deactivation: Communication Studies ADT</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of deactivation of Communication Studies ADT, which is being replaced by new 2.0 version. No comments.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Updating Foothill GE</p>	<p>Speaker: Evan Gilstrap Gilstrap reminded the group of recent changes to Title 5 language outlining local GE pattern; new pattern is based on upcoming CalGETC. Two new areas: 2 (Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning) and 6 (Ethnic Studies); new pattern has no comparable areas to our current US Cultures & Communities and Lifelong Learning areas.</p> <p>What needs to be discussed by CCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifelong Learning—do we include it (we have that freedom)? • Area 2—currently, MATH courses in Communication & Analytical Thinking; do we automatically move them all over to new Area 2, or require faculty to fill out application? • Area 5 (Natural Sciences)—Title 5 language doesn't specify lab requirement; do we want to require a lab or not? • Area 6—do we allow only courses approved for CSU GE/IGETC to be included (could minimize impact for students who change their

- mind and decide to use transfer GE pattern)? Or do we allow for additional ETHN courses to be included?
- What process will we use to move courses currently approved for Foothill GE to new pattern?
 - What changes need to be made to GE application forms? Brand-new forms needed for new Area 2 & Area 6, and forms for other areas may need updates.

Connell asked if Area 6 will include just ETHN courses, or if other subject codes allowed—Gilstrap responded, only ETHN courses allowed, but still need to create application form listing core competencies for GE area. Noted transfer GE patterns already have core competencies for Ethnic Studies, so could use those as basis for ours, if we want. Connell mentioned onerous process of applying for Foothill GE and recommended streamlining form. Gilstrap noted CCC can consider grandfathering in courses on current Foothill GE to new pattern. Brannvall asked for clarification re: lab requirement for Area 5—Gilstrap responded, no specific language stating that lab is or is not required, but units required for Area 5 suggest that lab is not required. Noted current Foothill GE does require lab for Natural Sciences. Brannvall asked about labs in Art History courses, noting it's unusual and ends up making it more expensive for students taking Foothill Art History courses vs. other colleges (e.g., De Anza); asked about process to remove the lab—Gilstrap responded, would be major course revision. Discussion occurred about some Natural Sciences courses having imbedded lab, with others offering lab as separate coreq course.

Parikh asked for clarification that these changes are for local associate degrees only, and do not affect transfer degrees—Gilstrap responded, local GE cannot be used for transfer degrees, but noted that students are known to change their minds and might not think they want to transfer but later on decide they do want to.

Gilstrap mentioned previous impression that these changes aren't needed until fall 2025; however, recent email from ASCCC suggests colleges must implement changes sooner. No guidance or concrete deadline from state Chancellor's Office yet, but colleagues at some colleges trying to implement for next academic year. Best to get the ball rolling on this conversation as soon as possible, just in case. Lee asked if CSU GE will still exist after move to CalGETC—Gilstrap responded, not yet known yet what the plan will be for CSU GE. Lee mentioned many depts. with courses in Lifelong Learning, and the difficult discussion that needs to take place. Gilstrap interested in getting data to see how many units students are actually having to complete to fulfill Foothill GE; minimum is 30, but many students may be taking more, depending on which courses they select. Also hoping data can inform whether removal of Lifelong Learning will impact enrollment in those courses. Wonders if we could include Lifelong Learning without increasing units needed to for students to complete new Foothill GE.

Parikh noted potential concern for faculty teaching Lifelong Learning courses, if its removal results in lower enrollment. Also mentioned general concern that if we keep Lifelong Learning students might choose a different college because they won't need as many units. Gilstrap noted every college having this conversation about removing or keeping Lifelong Learning. Hueg noted specific data on Lifelong Learning courses not simple to gather, but we're trying. Noted moral dilemma of asking students to do something not required by Title 5. Bissell pointed out that Lifelong Learning mentioned in Foothill College

	<p>Mission Statement; believes college should stand behind the concept, we talk about wellness and mindfulness all the time. Concerned the conversation is a matter of sheer numbers. Kaupp believes the conversation leaning toward figuring out a way to keep Lifelong Learning, as we still see value in it. Bissell hears from past students who value their experiences in Lifelong Learning courses. Noted faculty in Kinesiology & Athletics feel helpless in this situation.</p> <p>Brannvall wonders if we remove Lifelong Learning, could the courses exist elsewhere, perhaps in a new cert.—Hueg clarified, no plan to eliminate specific courses. Hueg noted many courses already included on degrees/certs., and students take courses for reasons aside from GE, which is why we don't know exactly what the impact might be if they're removed from Foothill GE. The state wants to make it faster and cheaper for students to earn degrees; these Title 5 changes are related to this. Parikh suggested we look at data to see how many students have taken more than just the 4 units currently required for Lifelong Learning. Gilstrap noted if we do continue to include Lifelong Learning, we have option to rethink the unit requirement. Connell mentioned possible changes to repeatability restrictions—CCC Team noted, unfortunately, governor vetoed that legislation.</p> <p>Discussion on this topic will continue next quarter.</p>
<p>10. Best Practices for Equitable COR Updates</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Kaupp mentioned some faculty have come to him with the opinion that the Guiding Principles document created last year is sufficient and faculty don't need additional direction to make equitable COR updates. Also mentioned concerns discussed at Academic Senate that adding 30 minutes/month of RSI-related training will be overwhelming for faculty; with this in mind, some are concerned that adding training re: equity in the COR will result in resistance from faculty. Training overload! Asked the group for their thoughts.</p> <p>Dupree recalls CCC's previous discussions have been about providing accessible resources for faculty engaged in this process, which would be user friendly and bite-sized, and not meant to be "required reading." More like gentle nudges, to help them work through necessary revisions. A helpful tool, as opposed to required training. Kaupp agreed, noting some of the resistance he's encountered seems to be more about the initiative as a whole. Asked the group for ideas re: specific topics to make "tidbits" out of—Parikh and Brannvall planning to work on that; Kaupp asked if they could perhaps come to second CCC meeting of winter quarter w/ list a dozen topics to suggest for tidbits.</p> <p>V. Fong wonders if there's any reason reps couldn't solicit list of topics from their constituents, so the list is more collaborative in nature. Parikh's understanding is the tidbits are a way to parse the Guiding Principles document, to help make it more digestible; not creating a new list of best practices. Kaupp agreed, this discussion is how to parse the existing document for faculty. Asked the group if a survey could be helpful, acknowledging that lots of surveys go out. Dupree asked what survey would ask—Kaupp responded, would ask faculty what they would like to see covered. Dupree noted BSS has surveyed faculty on this topic and got few responses; seems faculty don't yet know what they need or what is expected of them. V. Fong noted unclear on what is meant by nudges and tidbits, and unsure if selling the Guiding Principles document is the right vantage point for this task. Asked if Parikh and Brannvall are working to clarify the outcomes of the document—Brannvall responded, not necessarily, more like trying to</p>

Approved, January 16, 2024

	<p>help faculty more easily use document to update their CORs. V. Fong suggested we think through how faculty are going to actually use the document, noting that most faculty think about their CORs only when they're updating them. Kaupp noted faculty also interact with CORs when they're interpreting them, which includes reading CORs created by other faculty.</p> <p>Discussion on this topic will continue next quarter. Kaupp noted V. Fong has brought up valid questions that need answered before we can move forward with creating resources.</p>
11. Credit for Prior Learning Summit	Speaker: Ben Kaupp Topic delayed to future meeting, due to time constraint.
12. Good of the Order	
13. Adjournment	3:34 PM

Attendees: Ulysses Acevedo (LA), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Valerie Fong* (Dean, LA), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Eric Reed (LRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)
* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta