

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

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: November 18, 2025	Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Dupree, Taylor). <b>Approved.</b>
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p><b>Speaker: All</b></p> <p>Apprenticeship: Myres mentioned approval items on today's agenda.</p> <p>BSS: No updates to report.</p> <p>Counseling: No updates to report.</p> <p>Fine Arts &amp; Comm.: Walgren shared news of upcoming cert. proposals.</p> <p>HSH: St. Onge-Cole mentioned new course proposals on today's agenda.</p> <p>Kinesiology: No updates to report.</p> <p>Language Arts: No updates to report.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>SRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Sinclair shared Math dept. discussing developing honors version and support courses for Statistics.</p> <p>Cembellin announced the state recently approved new Principles of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence cert.!</p> <p>Herman shared Art &amp; Graphics and Interactive Design depts. will be exploring Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) opportunities; Kaupp noted CPL will be on the agenda for the next CCC meeting. Cembellin shared Computer Science dept. also exploring CPL.</p> <p>Gilstrap has no updates to report!</p> <p>Kaupp confirmed he's now sending FYI emails to relevant divisions re: new mirrored noncredit courses being developed by De Anza (related to his report out from previous meeting).</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Dupree expressed gratitude for the great group we've currently got at CCC; others agreed!
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposals  b. ASCCC Fall Plenary Update	<p><b>Speakers: CCC Team</b></p> <p>The following proposals were presented: V T 83A &amp; 83B. St. Onge-Cole noted current V T 83 course being split into two, to provide more comprehensive instruction and reduce workload for students. Noted students have been requesting more time to learn content for years.</p> <p>Kaupp attended virtually. At time of agenda distribution, packet of approved resolutions was not yet available, but our votes on resolutions aligned with the general outcome. Encouraged folks to get involved in state-wide governance!</p>

c. New Fields on CourseLeaf COR Form	Vanatta announced two new fields have been added to COR form in CourseLeaf, Lecture Units & Lab Units. New Title 5 regulations state this info must be included on CORs for credit courses with both lecture and lab hours. New fields visible to all users but only admin users have edit access; info will be entered/maintained by Vanatta, who will be slowly updating CORs to add the info (approx. 600 CORs). Will include info in CCC Communiqué, but if any faculty have questions or concerns, don't hesitate to forward them to Vanatta.
5. Division Curriculum Committees	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted no updates since previous version and asked folks to send updates for winter quarter (e.g., meeting dates).</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Sinclair, St. Onge-Cole). <b>Approved.</b></p>
6. New Degree Application: Elementary Teacher Education: Integrated Programs ADT	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Second read of new Elementary Teacher Education: Integrated Programs ADT.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Brannvall, Sinclair). <b>Approved.</b></p>
7. Stand Alone Application: GID 70R series	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Request for GID independent study series (GID 70R, 71R, 72R &amp; 73R). Sinclair asked for more details about four course series—Vanatta responded, students can select from 1, 2, 3, or 4 units, each unit value is a separate course. To reduce workload on faculty, they create 70R course which Vanatta copies into the three other CORs in the series; 70R course is stand-in for full series, in terms of local approval process. Brief discussion occurred re: logistics of scheduling independent study courses.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Brannvall, St. Onge-Cole). <b>Approved.</b></p>
8. Stand Alone Applications: JRYM 403, 420, 422, 422A, 422B, 422C, 422D, 422E, 423B, 423C, 423D, 423E, 423G, 423J, 423K, 423L, 426A, 426B, 427A, 427C, 427E, 427F, 427J, 427K, 427L, 428, 432A, 434E, 434F, 434L	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Second read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for JRYM 403, 420, 422, 422A, 422B, 422C, 422D, 422E, 423B, 423C, 423D, 423E, 423G, 423J, 423K, 423L, 426A, 426B, 427A, 427C, 427E, 427F, 427J, 427K, 427L, 428, 432A, 434E, 434F &amp; 434L. Allen noted hoping to eventually include these courses in certs.</p> <p>Motion to approve <b>M/S</b> (Brannvall, Kurisu). <b>Approved.</b></p>
9. New Certificate Proposal: Fundamental Foreman (noncredit)	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Proposal for new Fundamental Foreman noncredit certificate.</p> <p><i>See item 11 for comments and motion/approval details.</i></p>
10. New Certificate Proposal: Intermediate Foreman Development (noncredit)	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Proposal for new Intermediate Foreman Development noncredit certificate.</p> <p><i>See item 11 for comments and motion/approval details.</i></p>
11. New Certificate Proposal: Advance Foreman Development (noncredit)	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Proposal for new Advance Foreman Development noncredit certificate.</p> <p>The group agreed to discuss and vote on items 9-11 together, as the certs. are related. Allen explained these certs. will include JRYM courses for Cupertino Electric, similar to those in item 8. Allen noted minor title changes might be made for items 9 &amp; 11.</p> <p>Motion to approve items 9-11 <b>M/S</b> (Dupree, Jackson Sandoval). <b>Approved.</b></p>

12. Foothill GE Application Criteria:  
Area 3

**Speaker: Ben Kaupp**

Kaupp began by thanking the group for the robust discussions thus far. Today's discussion is about Depth Criteria/Mapping for Area 3: Arts and Humanities. Gilstrap noted Area 3 currently includes 16 subject codes.

Discussion occurred re: the intent behind "respond ... affectively" language used in Mandatory Outcome 5 Analytical and Affective Responses. Dworsky suggested perhaps refers to students' emotional connection to a text. Kaupp noted that if this (or any) language is confusing or unclear the group should feel free to update or remove it. A few folks read from definitions found online. Brannvall commented on importance of skills students gain from studying the humanities and encouraged updating this language to be clearer as opposed to removing the outcome. Allen mentioned the approach used by the building trades when completing this form for GE mapping. Brannvall believes this outcome promotes the importance of thinking with empathy and development of critical thinking skills around analytics.

Kaupp mentioned "Significant Works and Contexts" name of Mandatory Outcome 1, and asked who is deciding what is significant. Noted GE forms should stand on their own without the need for someone to explain what's being asked, so in this context not only is clarity necessary, but we want to ensure we don't end up getting stuck in a particular point in history. Brannvall appreciates the question and noted that while there are canons (established scholarship) which are important, this is an opportunity to include equity. Dworsky agreed that "significant" terminology can result in putting certain works on a pedestal and marginalizing other works. Gilstrap noted the relevance of these discussions because there is a state-wide push to incorporate more equity into CORs. Believes it could be good to at least discuss how we can make the mandatory outcomes more equity based.

White mentioned Mandatory Outcome 2 Knowledge of the Human Condition, and asked how "human condition" can be defined; Dworsky agreed and added "human life" to that question (in Mandatory Outcome 3 Appreciation for Human Life and Creations). Kaupp again noted the group has complete control over these forms and can choose to update and/or delete any language. Dworsky believes Mandatory Outcomes 2 & 3 can be combined and noted the current wording of 3 could be read as problematic. Brannvall suggested adding "expressions" if 2 & 3 are combined into one outcome, as well as "intersectional" to invite race, class, gender, etc.

Kaupp noted concern that Mandatory Outcome 4 Ethical and Aesthetic Judgments could result in policing good taste. Walgren believes "aesthetic" and "values" (in 4) somewhat contradictory; Brannvall believes this could be related to aspects of an item beyond its primary function and provided some examples (e.g., decorations on ancient pottery).

Kaupp asked if the group wants to revisit the requirement of 5 Mandatory Outcomes + 2 Optional Outcomes (5+2) currently used on all GE application forms. Agyare asked if doing so would affect current GE courses—Kaupp noted, likely not, as in the past courses have been grandfathered in when forms change. Allen would like to revisit 5+2. Dworsky asked if there is a particular concern behind 5+2—Kaupp responded, wants to ensure we're not just continuing with that requirement because it's the way we've always done it. Allen noted Apprenticeship division will discuss and provide feedback at future

	<p>meeting. Brannvall advocated for continuing to have optional outcomes, nothing their inclusion allows for a variety of disciplines to be approved. Sinclair believes 5+2 gives faculty a fair amount of leeway in terms of academic freedom and worries if we decide to narrow this down it could introduce bias towards specific disciplines. Also noted it might be restrictive to force the same number of questions across all application forms, but at the same time appreciates the pattern.</p> <p>Allen asked if this could be an opportunity to add an open-ended question to allow faculty to provide details that don't necessarily fit within any of the outcomes listed on the form. Kaupp asked if this would replace an existing outcome or add to the form—Allen responded, open to either. Kaupp asked the group to consider this suggestion, which would allow faculty to provide information they believe is relevant and important but which doesn't necessarily conform to the specific outcomes on the form.</p> <p>No specific edits were agreed on, and Kaupp reiterated his plan to incorporate all feedback he receives to update all application forms for final discussion after all individual forms have been discussed.</p>
13. Foothill GE Application Breadth Criteria and Breadth Mapping	<p><b>Speaker: Ben Kaupp</b> Continuing discussion from previous meeting, regarding possible need to update Breadth Criteria/Mapping to reflect Foothill's new Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Kaupp noted that current forms' instructions written in such a way to allow faculty to not have to respond to any Breadth Mapping competencies ("indicate if and how"); would like the group to consider if there is a minimum number of competencies a course should meet. Discussion occurred re: retaining competency 5 Information and Digital Literacy, which is not linked to a current ILO; Agyare noted related concepts are included in some of the new ILOs.</p> <p>Dworsky commented that ILOs aren't specific to GE courses and suggested there could be a clear argument to removing Breadth Mapping completely. Kaupp believes the original intent was to help ensure students who complete full GE pattern will satisfy ILOs. Sinclair believes this is related to Student Learning Outcome (SLO) mapping, so by establishing Breadth Criteria we're asking faculty to map their courses to the relevant ILOs. Kaupp believes removing Breadth Criteria likely won't affect student learning/outcomes, but on the other hand keeping them likely won't affect any course's eligibility for GE. Taylor believes this is related to general discussion re: what purpose we want GE to serve. Kaupp suggested the possibility of changing Breadth Mapping from specific competencies (with answers copied from CORs) to one essay-style question which asks faculty how their course contributes to students fulfilling ILOs. Dworsky suggesting enforcing a word count maximum if we make this change.</p> <p>Topic will return for continued discussion at next meeting; Kaupp plans to bring forward an updated draft.</p>
14. Good of the Order	
15. Adjournment	<b>3:29 PM</b>

**Attendees:** Micaela Agyare\* (LRC), Chris Allen\* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall\* (FAC), Zach Cembellin (Dean, STEM), Angie Dupree\* (BSS), Rachael Dworsky\* (LA), John Fox (BSS), Evan Gilstrap\* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman\* (Dean, FAC), Maritza Jackson Sandoval\* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp\* (Faculty Co-Chair), Glenn Kurisu\* (HSH), Andy Lee\* (CNSL), Tim Myres\* (APPR), Teresa Ong (AVP Workforce), Bob Sandor\* (STEM), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Jennifer Sinclair\* (STEM), Shae St. Onge-Cole\* (HSH), Kyle Taylor\* (STEM), Mary Vanatta\* (Curriculum Coordinator), Judy Walgren\* (FAC), Sam White\* (LA)

\* Indicates in-person attendance

**Minutes Recorded by:** M. Vanatta