

**College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 4, 2025
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom**

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 21, 2025	Motion to approve M/S (Taylor, Draper). Approved.
2. Report Out from CCC Members	<p>Speaker: All Apprenticeship: Nate Vennarucci serving as in-person proxy; shared working on Foothill GE apps for an additional program.</p> <p>BSS: Connell mentioned BSS faculty meeting taking place right now; Kaupp will serve as in-person proxy after Connell has to leave.</p> <p>Counseling: Jackson Sandoval shared working on Courses not Taught in Four Years list.</p> <p>SRC: Kaupp serving as in-person proxy. No updates to report.</p> <p>FAC: Fong shared working on new noncredit courses.</p> <p>HSH: Draper noted new course proposal on today’s agenda.</p> <p>LRC: No updates to report.</p> <p>STEM: Taylor shared C S dept. working on new curriculum; working on Courses not Taught in Four Years list.</p> <p>Hueg mentioned recent noncredit summit and noted follow up meeting will be scheduled to continue exploring ideas generated at summit.</p> <p>Gilstrap shared working on creating new Cal-GETC certificate of achievement.</p> <p>Vanatta noted deadline for curriculum sheets for next year’s catalog will be April 18. Expects catalog system to be open for edits no later than March 10, which gives divisions about six weeks, similar to last year’s timeline. Also shared COR form in CourseLeaf will be updated very soon to add new Foothill GE Area names, so they will display in next year’s catalog.</p> <p>Kaupp mentioned some divisions have received emails from him re: De Anza curriculum being developed. Generally, these are just info items. Similarly, when we create curriculum Kaupp shares it w/ De Anza, so faculty might be contacted by De Anza colleagues if they have questions. Kaupp happy to be included in those conversations. Brief discussion occurred re: process of sharing curriculum between the two colleges.</p>
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	No comments.
4. Announcements a. New Course Proposal	<p>Speakers: CCC Team The following proposal was presented: D H 306. Draper noted course will be added to BS degree program; also noted units for course still being discussed within division and might increase when full COR developed. Brief discussion occurred re: lower division vs. upper division coursework.</p>

<p>b. Notification of Proposed Requisites</p>	<p>New prerequisites for MUS 47A, 47B, 47C, 47D; THTR 47A, 47B, 47C, 47D.</p>
<p>5. Consent Calendar a. Division Curriculum Committees</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted no changes since previous meeting (aside from correction made during previous meeting). Motion to approve M/S (Fong, Brannvall). Approved.</p>
<p>6. New Subject Code: EDAC</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp SRC division creating new code of EDAC: Educational Access, which is already being used by De Anza. Will replace current SPED (Special Education) code. SPED 8 is the only active course within the subject code and will change to EDAC 8, effective for the 2025-26 catalog.</p>
<p>7. Certificate Deactivations: Transfer Studies: CSU GE, Transfer Studies: IGETC</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of deactivations of two Certificates of Achievement: Transfer Studies: CSU GE, Transfer Studies: IGETC. These transfer GE patterns will no longer be viable eff. fall 2025, so we will no longer be able to offer these related certs. Gilstrap has begun process of creating a similar cert. for Cal-GETC. Motion to approve M/S (Brannvall, Draper). Approved.</p>
<p>8. New Subject Code: NCAL</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of proposal to create new subject code of NCAL: Non-Credit: Adult Learning. Proposed by the Office of Instruction, rather than a specific division, to be used by all divisions for noncredit courses for older adults. Hueg explained “older adults” is one of the state’s noncredit categories and noted the state doesn’t define any age range for such students. These are primarily enrichment courses. Connell shared feedback from BSS faculty: why is subject code being created?; why can’t depts. use their own subject codes?; how will faculty load and/or stacking be affected?; how will courses appear in the catalog if they’re within this single subject code, rather than dept.-specific subject codes? BSS faculty discussing topic at meeting taking place right now. Brannvall responded to question of why single code might be created, noting it will allow Foothill to better market these courses as a cross-discipline program for older adults. Hopefully courses can be coded so they’ll display under single code as well as under the dept.’s normal code. Latteri asked if “adult learners” just refers to non-traditional adult students. Hueg mentioned some colleges offer large number of these types of courses within a separate noncredit division; Foothill had a noncredit division many years ago, but that is not the current plan. Noted these courses are not workforce/CTE and will not carry same load as credit courses or enhanced noncredit. Clarified that new THTR noncredit courses are workforce/CTE and funded at enhanced noncredit rate. Kaupp sees these courses as “learning for the sake of learning” and without the intent to receive a cert. or degree. Cembellin asked if these courses are open access—Hueg responded, yes, and it’s a local decision if we want to set parameters on what we define as an older adult. Brief discussion occurred re: high school students being allowed to take these courses. Hueg explained the idea is to start with approx. 10 courses in specific topics which have community appeal. Kaupp asked where FTES will go if single subject code used—Hueg responded, details such as this haven’t been figured out yet, and acknowledged this is a valid question. Brief discussion occurred re: funding and pay rate for noncredit. Hueg noted older adult noncredit</p>

	<p>can't really be mirrored w/ credit courses like workforce/CTE noncredit can.</p> <p>Connell shared BSS faculty believe students find it more valuable to take courses within discipline subject code, and faculty are concerned that this is a major decision being made too quickly. Suggested CCC table item until next CCC meeting, so that more discussion can take place at the division level. Kaupp suggested holding listening sessions so Hueg and Kaupp can meet with faculty to address questions and concerns. Brannvall mentioned discussion of projected demographics in Foothill's service area at noncredit summit. Connell clarified BSS faculty in favor of offering these courses, in general, but the concern is around using the single NCAL code. Allen mentioned helpful slides presented during noncredit summit and suggested they be widely shared.</p> <p>Kaupp will schedule listening sessions and announce in the CCC communiqué.</p> <p>Third read and possible action will occur at future meeting.</p>
<p>9. GE Application: Area 2: MATH 47</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for new Area 2, Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area V app being used. Gilstrap noted course approved for UC transferability and we are awaiting Cal-GETC approval.</p> <p><i>See item 12 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>10. GE Application: Area 3: CRWR 9</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE application for new Area 3, Arts & Humanities. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area I app being used. Gilstrap noted course approved for UC transferability and we are awaiting Cal-GETC approval.</p> <p><i>See item 12 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>11. GE Applications: Area 3: HUMN 15, PHIL 15</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE applications for new Area 3, Arts & Humanities. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area I app being used. Gilstrap noted courses approved for UC transferability and we are awaiting Cal-GETC approval.</p> <p><i>See item 12 for motion/approval details.</i></p>
<p>12. GE Applications: Area 7: ATHL 34, 34A, 34C, 34F</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Second read of GE applications for new Area 7, Lifelong Learning. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area VII app being used. Gilstrap noted courses approved for UC transferability; did not submit for Cal-GETC approval, as there is no Cal-GETC area similar to Lifelong Learning. Brief discussion occurred re: using separate course numbers for men's teams and women's teams.</p> <p>Motion to approve items 9-12 M/S (Gilstrap, Brannvall). Approved.</p>
<p>13. New Certificate Proposal: Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Proposal for new Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction Certificate of Achievement. This cert. would be offered by LINC program (BSS division), and differs from artificial intelligence (AI)-related certs./degrees proposed by STEM division at previous meeting.</p> <p>Brannvall noted general AI-related concerns: racial bias in AI, and pressure from administration to have all disciplines engage w/ AI.</p>

	<p>Cembellin mentioned panel held on racial bias in AI, last year. Fong agreed there is a push for faculty to engage w/ AI. Kaupp agreed there is pressure to engage with how AI will interact with the college, and there are valid concerns, but also believes some concerns have sides which have not yet been fully explored. Noted his students who are neurodivergent have found value in using AI in various ways, such as helping them communicate with their instructors. Brannvall advocated for transparency around AI and wonders if there's a funding influence, given our proximity to tech companies. Hueg responded there is not any funding influence. Kaupp believes curriculum being developed by faculty who are genuinely enthusiastic about the topic. Cembellin noted curriculum development has a lot to do with the labor market, and the desire to provide students with opportunities to stay up to speed with their skills, since AI is already widely used. Believes important to teach students how to ethically use AI. Brannvall stressed belief that AI is not appropriate in every discipline; concerned there is a push from college admin. for faculty in all disciplines to adopt it. Kaupp mentioned related discussions at Academic Senate re: concerns about AI. Reed noted his AI-related curriculum is being created for the reasons outlined earlier by Cembellin.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Brannvall, Fong). Approved.</p>
<p>14. Cross-List Application: HUMN 15 & PHIL 15</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp Cross-Listed Course Approval Request for HUMN 15 & PHIL 15—both new courses.</p> <p>Motion to approve M/S (Gilstrap, Draper). Approved.</p>
<p>15. Stand Alone Application: ALTW 218B</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for ALTW 218B. Will be permanently Stand Alone.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>16. Stand Alone Applications: APRT 140A, 140B, 141A, 141B</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for APRT 140A, 140B, 141A & 141B. All four will be temporarily Stand Alone and included in a new certificate. Vennarucci noted the new cert. will be a two-year program, used as a stepping stone to related five-year program. Vanatta noted courses are reactivations and were previously included in a non-transcriptable cert.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>17. GE Application: Area 1B: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician Apprenticeship Program</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of GE application, which would approve Foothill GE Area 1B for students who complete the full major requirements for Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician, not one individual course. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area V app being used. Allen noted that the Apprenticeship programs with previous Foothill GE approval for Area V were granted approval for both new Area 1B and new Area 2 by CCC in December. Division is requesting this app be considered for approval for both Area 1B & Area 2. No members objected to this request; Vanatta will update app for second read.</p> <p>Taylor asked for more info about this apprenticeship program, and Vennarucci provided details, noting a lot of the TAB team's work results in official documentation for buildings; students receive 13 certifications once they've finished the program.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>

<p>18. GE Application: Area 4: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician Apprenticeship Program</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of GE application, which would approve Foothill GE Area 4 for students who complete the full major requirements for Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician, not one individual course. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area IV app being used.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>19. GE Application: Area 5: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician Apprenticeship Program</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of GE application, which would approve Foothill GE Area 5 for students who complete the full major requirements for Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician, not one individual course. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area III app being used.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>20. GE Application: Area 7: Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician Apprenticeship Program</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of GE application, which would approve Foothill GE Area 7 for students who complete the full major requirements for Test, Adjust and Balancing (TAB) Technician, not one individual course. Because new apps have not yet been created, previous Area VII app being used.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.</p>
<p>21. Courses not Taught in Four Years</p>	<p>Speaker: Mary Vanatta Vanatta distributed list to reps and deans with instructions/deadline on Jan. 28; deadline for Course Deactivation Exemption Request forms is March 7. Bissell asked about grey/italicized courses—Vanatta responded, these are Independent Study courses, which CCC decided a few years ago are exempt from process (but still included for visibility). Bissell asked if division needs to take any action if they're okay with course on the list being deactivated—Vanatta responded, no action needed; some divisions like to document in division CC minutes but that's not required. Will make sure to confirm w/ division that they didn't miss any course(s) on the list, if needed. Starer noted deactivation doesn't mean deletion, and a course can always be reactivated. Vanatta agreed but noted that reactivating a course involves a lot more effort and work/time for multiple people than filling out the form. Kaupp asked the group to be thoughtful when reviewing the list; if a course truly isn't being taught, please consider whether it still needs to remain active.</p>
<p>22. Updating Foothill GE—Criteria</p>	<p>Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of application form for each area of new Foothill GE (eight total). Kaupp previously asked for feedback on drafts shared at previous meeting; forms have been updated to include that feedback.</p> <p>Gilstrap commented on Breadth Criteria paragraph four (which mentions proficiency in math and English); noted Title 5 no longer requires such minimum proficiencies and suggested we remove these references. Kaupp noted this paragraph was updated since previous meeting, based on feedback from Starer. Gilstrap provided further explanation of why Foothill previously enforced minimum proficiencies; we no longer need separate minimum proficiencies because new Foothill GE pattern incorporates them, in response to new Title 5 regulations. Gilstrap also commented on Breadth Criteria paragraph five, specifically the use of the word "proficiency" and whether that's related to those minimum proficiencies. If not, what do we mean by "proficiency"?</p> <p>Taylor asked how Course Sequence Addendum page relates to lab requirement of Area 5. Vanatta clarified addendum will be used for full degree programs applying for GE approval (e.g., Apprenticeship) and</p>

	<p>suggested language be updated to reduce confusion. Kaupp noted his original idea was for addendum to also be used for other types of course sequences, which explains that wording.</p> <p>Kaupp mentioned suggestions from participants on Zoom: remove Breadth Criteria paragraph four; change “proficiency” to a different word (e.g., “competence”) since “proficiency” may have specific definition in Title 5; change “Course Sequence Addendum” to “Degree Program Addendum” and update language throughout that page to reflect this.</p> <p>Starer noted these documents are both public facing and internal facing, so even though we no longer require minimum proficiencies we want to ensure students understand they are all equally prepared to succeed in GE courses. Starer also mentioned he’d provided significant suggestions for changes to Course Sequence Addendum, which haven’t been applied—Kaupp apologized, noting he’d overlooked those. Vanatta unsure if these forms should be considered public-facing, as they will be added to the COR form in CourseLeaf and not necessarily anywhere students (or those without CourseLeaf access) can easily access. Before adopting CourseLeaf, GE app forms were available on CCC website, because they were not imbedded within the COR form in our previous system; once we adopted CourseLeaf, they were removed. Kaupp believes that even though these are meant to be internal forms, we should assume students might see them.</p> <p>Agyare mentioned Breadth Mapping question re: Information and Digital Literacy, noting definition is based on sunsetted standards from Association of College and Research Libraries. New framework defines info. literacy as more theoretical and based on “threshold concepts.” Noted we don’t have to change definition but wants to discuss w/ librarians and bring recommendation to discuss at next CCC meeting. Gilstrap thanked Agyare and believes this is important to consider.</p> <p>Taylor mentioned laboratory experience definition on Area 5 form and recommended change; will email language to Kaupp.</p> <p>Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting. Kaupp emphasized that we have an opportunity to re-write these well and do not want to rush the work, so additional reads are likely.</p>
23. Good of the Order	
24. Adjournment	3:33 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Kelly Edwards (KA), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Patricia Gibbs Stayte (BSS), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman (Dean, FAC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee (CNSL), Ethan Liang*, Eric Reed (LRC), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Nate Vennarucci* (APPR)

* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta