

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

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 16, 2024	Approved by consensus.
2. Report Out and Check-in	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Myres shared continuing work on Foothill GE apps.</p> <p>Hueg shared working to get first Credit for Prior Learning workgroup meeting scheduled w/ De Anza, starting with a small group. Hoping folks from CCCCCO will attend the next district enrollment management committee meeting to discuss noncredit.</p> <p>Fine Arts & Comm: Brannvall shared title of Animation certificate of achievement being changed to Visual Storytelling and Comic Arts. Asked if faculty may move forward with creating mirrored noncredit courses—Hueg responded, yes, and noted that even though these are mirrored courses they need to go through regular course creation process. Brannvall mentioned topic of local GE and asked if college should wait to make a decision re: Lifelong Learning until we know how other schools are leaning, and asked how the decision could affect funding—Kaupp noted local GE will be discussed later this meeting. Brannvall shared received positive feedback re: equity “tidbits,” division faculty believe will be more helpful than full Guiding Principles document.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Taylor noted new course proposals on today’s agenda.</p> <p>BSS: Dupree mentioned also received feedback re: local GE changes.</p> <p>HSH: Campbell noted division discussing possibility of allowing courses to be used as prereqs for other programs.</p> <p>Counseling: Lee mentioned Career Hacks workshop series, for any students interested in getting a head start on job searching. Jackson Sandoval asked faculty to remind students that scholarship deadline is this Friday; mentioned workshop tomorrow.</p> <p>Gilstrap reminded the group we need to update all of our ADTs to be in compliance w/ CalGETC; will start to email faculty this week. Noted recent update to CalGETC standards, and there will be one more revision, sometime in May. Received notice that implementation of new local associate degree requirements (e.g., local GE changes) will be required by fall 2025; we should receive guidance very soon.</p> <p>Vanatta mentioned this year’s Courses Not Taught in Four Years list is almost ready to distribute to reps and deans. List and process will be on next CCC agenda so folks can ask questions, but will distribute via email as soon as it’s ready, so divisions may begin the process right away. Quickly shared details about process. Connell asked what drives this process—Vanatta responded, CCC created process because there were courses in the catalog which hadn’t been offered in many years,</p>

	<p>sometimes decades. Connell asked if CCC could decide to revoke the process—Kaupp responded, believes there is value in the process, to ensure our catalog is up-to-date.</p> <p>SRC: Saroyan also mentioned scholarship deadline, noting specific scholarships for veterans.</p> <p>Language Arts: Armerding noted ESL dept. changing some prereqs to Advisory for lower level courses (ESLL 236 & 237).</p> <p>Kinesiology & Athletics: Edwards shared division faculty asking why PHED courses can't be offered as noncredit mirrored courses—Hueg responded, state policy specifies PE is excluded, due to repeatability restrictions. Edwards asked if PHED is the only excluded subject—Hueg unsure, but believes so.</p>
<p>3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda</p>	<p>Naranjo (student visitor) made public comment about synchronization of due dates for Distance Education courses. Also commented that students are requesting more availability of STEM honors courses. Also commented on confusion among students re: science courses w/ embedded lab vs. those w/ separate lab, noting it's more convenient for students to fulfill their transfer GE requirements when lab is embedded.</p>
<p>4. Announcements</p> <p>a. New Course Proposals</p> <p>b. New Subject Code (De Anza): ATMG (Automotive Technology Management)</p> <p>c. New Infographics on CCC Website</p> <p>d. New Joint Foothill-De Anza Workgroups: Credit for Prior Learning & Noncredit</p>	<p>Speakers: CCC Team</p> <p>The following proposals were presented: ALTW 234; HIST 70R series; HUMN 15; MATH 211A, 211B; NCBS 411A, 411B; PHIL 15. Kaupp noted ALTW course might change to different subject code.</p> <p>Subject codes are shared across the district, so each college is expected to notify the other when they wish to create a new one, in case of any concerns. Parikh asked which division this new code falls under—Vanatta responded, didn't receive this info. Kaupp clarified that this simply means Foothill cannot create an ATMG code on our end that's different than this one.</p> <p>Kaupp showed folks where to find new infographics on CCC website, one for new course creation and one for new degree/cert creation.</p> <p>Hueg shared info during report out about meetings. Noted new AVP Instruction at De Anza, Sam Bliss, will be joining. If you're interested in participating, reach out to Hueg.</p>
<p>5. Consent Calendar</p> <p>a. GE Applications</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</p> <p>The following GE applications were presented: Area V—MATH 33; Area VII—PHED 19B, 19C, 19D. Parikh commented very positively on creation of MATH 33, noting it's math people actually use in everyday life. Intended to fulfill math requirement for students who don't need to complete calculus. Vanatta noted PHED courses are reactivations.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Fong, Parikh). Approved.</p>
<p>6. Stand Alone Application: NCBS 440A</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</p> <p>Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for NCBS 440A. Fong mentioned asked division faculty for feedback, and some questioned why they were reviewing a course outside their division. Asked if this was the right thing for reps to do—Kaupp responded, highly encouraged, noting worthwhile for course to be reviewed by faculty outside the discipline. Parikh added can be helpful for faculty to see what other divisions are doing, especially in a situation like this where division is responding to AB 1705 regulations.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Reed, Draper). Approved.</p>

<p>7. Stand Alone Application: THTR 49E</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for THTR 49E. No comments.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Fong, Reed). Approved.</p>
<p>8. Updating Foothill GE</p>	<p>Speakers: Evan Gilstrap, Ben Kaupp Kaupp shared concerns from De Anza CCC Faculty Co-Chair: concerned about PE and personal development courses (re: Lifelong Learning), wants to see enrollment data, and concerned about impact to AA and AS degrees. Gilstrap believes would be interesting to see De Anza’s AA/AS completion numbers, since Foothill’s are apparently low enough to not be statistically relevant. Kaupp noted De Anza interested in collaborating with Foothill on these decisions; we’re not required to align, but the district is interested in seeing more collaboration.</p> <p>Kaupp hopes today’s discussion will result in a decision about whether to keep Lifelong Learning (or at least some solid thoughts), as well as a decision on whether or not to require a lab for Natural Sciences. Recalled comments from STEM reps at previous meeting, related to Natural Sciences labs.</p> <p>Dupree shared question from division faculty: does CalGETC require a lab for Natural Sciences? Noted faculty okay with not requiring lab if it’s not required for CalGETC. Connell believes most students taking ANTH labs do so because of transfer GE requirements, not Foothill GE. Gilstrap responded, lab is required for CalGETC (Physical and Biological Sciences area). Connell believes students are primarily concerned with transfer GE requirements, not local GE. Parikh asked for clarification that our decision will not change which courses/labs we’re offering, in general—correct. Parikh believes we shouldn’t require lab, to help encourage students to complete a local degree. Kaupp noted that by not requiring lab we could save students time and money.</p> <p>Brannvall asked if it’s possible that a student would complete an AA/AS and still intend to transfer, and wonders if students communicate this plan in some way—Gilstrap responded, almost impossible to know, noting students’ plans and intentions can easily change. Connell asked Apprenticeship folks for their feedback—Allen responded, division offers eight AS degrees which are not transferable, and would like their students to be able to complete degree without added requirements. Dupree asked about transfer requirements for other (non-UC/CSU) institutions—Gilstrap responded, students will need to use CalGETC, wherever they want to go. Lee added many non-UC/CSU institutions know about CalGETC but have their own requirements and will likely continue to require a lab. Parikh mentioned plans to create AS degree for semiconductor Apprenticeship program; these students would use local GE. Concerned it could be difficult for these students to fulfill Lifelong Learning area within timeframe employers are asking for.</p> <p>Campbell noted Radiologic Technology is a terminal degree, but majority of students go on to complete bachelor degree. Encourages students to use transfer GE pattern, as a safeguard. Expressed general concerns that we’re encouraging students to get a degree which doesn’t benefit them. Brannvall asked what would happen if we don’t require a lab, a student completes an AA/AS degree w/o lab, and then decides they want to transfer—they simply need to complete lab units.</p> <p>Agyare shared division CC discussed Lifelong Learning, in particular the potential impact on LIBR 10, noting faculty conflicted because they</p>

	<p>don't want to require additional units for students but are concerned about what will happen to depts. with Lifelong Learning courses. Would like to explore moving LIBR 10 to a different GE area and/or adding it as a requirement to a certificate. Gilstrap mentioned attachment comparing current Foothill GE to new requirements, and pointed out units listed at bottom of each. Mentioned attachment doesn't note that currently 1) if a student takes a non-MATH course for Communication & Analytical Thinking, they additionally need a MATH course to fulfill graduation requirement; and 2) Lifelong Learning lists minimum of 4 units but requires two courses, which is tough to complete at just 4 units and can end up being as much as 8 units. Important to note new Title 5 language doesn't include additional graduation requirements beyond the GE pattern, so 30-35 units total is pretty set in stone; even if we decide to include Lifelong Learning, total units could still end up being fewer than what students currently need to complete. Vanatta asked for clarification that new language don't include minimum proficiency— Gilstrap responded, no, everything is now included in GE pattern.</p> <p>Connell mentioned scenario of Apprenticeship students completing AS degree and wondered what reason would they need to take a Lifelong Learning course. Parikh agreed and wonders if the majority of students taking Lifelong Learning courses do so because they want to, not because of local GE requirement; believes students will still take those courses because they're interested in the subject matter. Armerding mentioned efforts to map Apprenticeship programs to Foothill GE requirements, and asked if we decide to keep Lifelong Learning because we see value in it for students, is there a way to argue that Apprenticeship students are meeting such requirements within their major courses. Encouraged the group to keep in mind the benefits of including Lifelong Learning in GE, and the value those courses have to the student in general. Draper teaches Lifelong Learning course (HLTH dept.) and noted many students take it because it's required to get into a program, not because of GE requirements. Brannvall shared personal experience of taking many Lifelong Learning-type courses but doesn't believe they need to be required. Myres noted Lifelong Learning is built-in to education provided by training centers for Apprenticeship students.</p>
<p>9. Best Practices for Equitable COR Updates</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Kaupp reminded the group that most recent CCC discussion of topic resulted in interest in "chunking out" content of full Guiding Principles document into more easily digestible pieces. Shared example of how this could be done; created PDF w/ help from Parikh, which provides short blurb about why equity should be included in six COR sections, followed by short list of suggestions on how to include equity in each section. Kaupp noted this is very rough draft and represents a framework of what could be created. Parikh concerned draft language for Course Content section phrased in a negative way and asked for it to be changed if we move forward with this draft. Kaupp noted that conversations about making equitable updates to CORs might need to include difficult considerations, but agrees language could be modified. Kaupp asked the group for feedback.</p> <p>Draper likes the way the information is presented and believes faculty will be able to demonstrate equity in these COR sections. Parikh mentioned tried to use positive tone in drafting concise language, while refraining from making it sound instructive (e.g., avoiding "you must"). Connell asked about process, moving forward, noting equity section already added to COR in CourseLeaf—Kaupp responded, as faculty update their CORs, these suggestions would help them figure out edits to make the COR more equitable. Kaupp noted there are situations in</p>

	<p>which a change isn't possible or appropriate, and that's fine, as long as the review is done.</p> <p>Campbell shared recently sat down with faculty to edit CORs and they wondered how to document equity in Course Content section for very technical courses. Kaupp suggested equity could be imbedded into other sections of the COR, in these cases. Campbell clarified, such courses are being taught in equity-minded ways, but it can be tough to figure out how to document this. Wants to make sure it's clear how reps can use this as a training tool to guide faculty in documenting equity on their CORs.</p>
<p>10. Ethnic Studies Graduation Requirement</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of memo requesting update to graduation requirements for local associate degree, to add completion of Ethnic Studies course. This is required by new Title 5 language starting fall 2024; memo specifies our requirement will begin summer 2024 (due to our catalog year starting with summer session). Brannvall asked for clarification re: the type of feedback reps should ask from constituents—Kaupp responded, reps should share suggested language to ask if there are any questions or concerns.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>11. Good of the Order</p>	
<p>12. Adjournment</p>	<p>3:28 PM</p>

Attendees: Micaela Agyare (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Ben Armerding (LA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Rachelle Campbell* (HSH), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Kelly Edwards (KA), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Don Mac Neil (KA), Tim Myres* (APPR), Jonatan Naranjo* (student), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Eric Reed* (LRC), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator)
 * Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta