

**College Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 13, 2025**  
**2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**  
**Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 29, 2025	Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Draper, Taylor). <b>Approved.</b>
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p><b>Speaker: All</b></p> <p>Apprenticeship: Myres shared continuing to work on Foothill GE apps; working on Title 5 updates. Allen acknowledged Vanatta’s work on the course proposals on today’s agenda.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report. Connell shared 860 students taking honors courses this year, an increase from prior years!</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts &amp; Comm.: J. Fong shared working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>HSH: Draper shared working on Title 5 updates. Campbell introduced guest Glenn Kurisu, who might serve as rep next year!</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Taylor shared working on Title 5 updates.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared working on articulation-related updates to catalog pages; reviewing COR submissions. Last week, attended Common Course Numbering (CCN) meeting in Sacramento, and noted there’s an overall feeling of frustration from all sides, including UC &amp; CSU. Although community colleges receiving state funding related to CCN, four-year institutions are not, even though they also have to make changes related to the legislation. Hueg asked if there was any discussion specific to quarter schools—Gilstrap responded, no, and noted the articulation process in general still hasn’t been figured out.</p> <p>Additionally, Gilstrap shared recently received Cal-GETC results, which unfortunately included some denials, partially due to CCN and partially due to some lack of clarity around what would or would not be approved for Cal-GETC (e.g., honors courses). For those courses denied we have a two-year phase-out during which we can update the course and resubmit for approval, so there won’t be any disruption for students. Connell asked if the honors course denials are because the honors version wasn’t “robust” enough when compared to the regular course—Gilstrap responded, there’s no official language regarding what constitutes an honors course, in general, so unfortunately there’s not good communication. CCN honors courses are even more complicated because we must adhere to the CCN template. Connell noted there is interest by the Honors Institute to create more consistency across our honors courses. Lastly, Gilstrap shared we won’t be able to submit certain course sequences included in CCN Phase 2 Part A (American</p>



	<p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Campbell, Draper). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>8. Certificate Deactivation: Landscape Technician</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b>                  Second read of deactivation of Landscape Technician Certificate of Achievement.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Lee, Campbell). <b>Approved.</b></p>
<p>9. Stand Alone Applications: NCBS 404A, 404B</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b>                  First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCBS 404A &amp; 404B. Both will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a certificate. Allen explained we're partnering with area high schools to provide dual enrollment courses to help students prepare for Apprenticeship math entrance exams, which can be challenging for some. Noted the trades already provide a lot of resources, and these courses will help fill gaps.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>10. Allowing "P" Grade for Major Courses for AA/AS Degrees</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b>                  Topic was briefly mentioned at previous meeting, and CCC Team felt it would be useful to agendaize as an official item. Attachment explains language change being made to curriculum sheets for 2025-26 catalog in order to ensure compliance with updated Title 5 language; clarifies that grade option selections on individual CORs not affected. Vanatta will include attachment in CCC Communiqué.</p> <p>Allen asked about process to update grade options on CORs—Vanatta responded, this is done through the normal COR edit/update process. Brannvall asked about situations related to transfer institutions not accepting P grade—Gilstrap responded, this does happen and is why students are encouraged to meet with counselors to discuss potential consequences of taking courses for Pass/No Pass. Discussion occurred re: adding language to curriculum sheets as a warning to students about taking courses for Pass/No Pass. Vanatta noted additional language being added to curriculum sheets which links to another catalog page explaining catalog rights and graduation requirements, in general, which is maintained by folks in Admissions &amp; Records dept.; perhaps language about selecting Pass/No Pass option can be added on that page if it isn't already included.</p>
<p>11. Minimum Grade Requirement for Foothill GE Courses</p>	<p><b>Speaker: Evan Gilstrap</b>                  Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding need to decide if we want to establish a minimum grade requirement for Foothill GE and, if so, what this requirement would be. Attachment presents four options discussed at previous meeting, and info about what other community colleges in our area are doing. Kaupp shared feedback from Language Arts faculty: mostly want to push for grade of C or better for all Foothill GE areas. Taylor shared feedback from STEM faculty, who also recommend grade of C or better. Dupree noted the same from BSS faculty. Campbell mentioned question brought up by HSH faculty: why do we have both D and F grades, if neither is passing—Kaupp explained, D grade can be used in some circumstances for passing. Brief discussion occurred re: D+ and D- grades and their usefulness. Brannvall noted Fine Arts &amp; Comm. division CC had to delay this discussion to their next meeting.</p> <p>Kaupp noted history of equity-related issues re: D grade, which has historically been used to push people through education who had not actually earned it; mentioned the impact on disabled population. Kaupp not in favor of allowing D grades for entire Foothill GE pattern. Lee shared consensus from Counseling to require grade of C or better for Area 1A, Area 1B, and Area 2, and allow D grade for other areas.</p>

	<p>Gilstrap doesn't think there will be circumstances in which a student comes in with all D grades and tries to get a degree, but there will be students who have one or a few of them. Gilstrap in agreement w/ Counseling consensus opinion and noted CSU allows for D grades for some of their GE areas (similar to option 2 on attachment). Brannvall asked how D grades affect transfer students—Gilstrap responded, a student could be accepted at a CSU campus with a D grade in certain GE areas, but not necessarily any CSU campus.</p> <p>Connell expressed discomfort with requiring C or better for certain GE areas but not others, as this suggests that some disciplines are more important than others. Campbell shared HSH faculty split between options 2 &amp; 3 on attachment, and noted a question came up of how to make the transition of putting "harder" requirements on Foothill GE (if we require C or better for entire pattern). Campbell would like to see data on how many students have satisfied GE courses with D grades before making this decision. Kaupp asked Hueg if this data is available—Hueg responded, yes, we could request it but might not receive it before the end of the year. Gilstrap noted that if no decision is made before catalog is published, then by default students will be able to satisfy all Foothill GE areas with D grades.</p> <p>Jackson Sandoval shared personal experience and expressed doesn't want to make it harder for students who might be in a similar situation. Gilstrap mentioned he struggled similarly to what Connell expressed, regarding "ranking" some areas above others by requiring C or better. Kaupp added clarification to his previous comment (about not allowing D grades for entire pattern), which is more about the historical use of D grades vs. the grade itself. Kaupp noted some community colleges are allowing D grades across the board for their local GE patterns.</p> <p>Kaupp summarized today's discussion, noting there doesn't currently seem to be consensus on the decision. Dupree suggested reps return to their constituents and solicit additional feedback. Campbell asked if an additional option can be considered: grade of C or better for entire GE pattern, with allowance for one D grade to be used in any GE area; this would avoid the concept of "ranking" areas. Kaupp wonders if, in practice, this would be similar to option 4 on attachment, since requirement to have GPA of 2.0 or higher wouldn't allow for students to have many D grades. Campbell still believes this specific option would allow Foothill to have high standards while at the same time acknowledging that students are dealing with tough situations.</p> <p>Additional discussion occurred re: adding another option to attachment, with final decision to copy option 2 and edit second sentence to state that students can satisfy just one of the other GE areas with a D grade. Vanatta will add additional option to attachment and include it in CCC Communiqué.</p>
12. Good of the Order	
13. Adjournment	<b>3:21 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Chris Allen\* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall\* (FAC), Rachele Campbell\* (HSH), Zach Cembellin\* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell\* (BSS), Cathy Draper\* (HSH), Angie Dupree\* (BSS), Kelly Edwards (KA), Jordan Fong\* (FAC), Valerie Fong (Dean, LA), Laura Gamez\* (LRC), Evan Gilstrap\* (Articulation Officer), Katie Ha (LRC), Ron Herman\* (Dean, FAC), Kurt Hueg\* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval\* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp\* (Faculty Co-Chair), Glenn Kurisu\* (HSH), Andy Lee\* (CNSL), Tim Myres (APPR), Bob Sandor\* (STEM), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Kyle Taylor\* (STEM), Mary Vanatta\* (Curriculum Coordinator)

\* Indicates in-person attendance

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta