College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 29, 2025
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: April 15, 2025	Motion to approve **M/S** (Draper, Fong). **Approved.** (1 abstention)
2. Report Out from CCC Members	**Speaker: All** Apprenticeship: Myres shared continuing to work on Foothill GE apps. BSS: No updates to report. Counseling: No updates to report. SRC: Kaupp shared TTW program might be expanding! Fine Arts & Comm.: No updates to report. Reps asked for feedback from other divisions on how to handle situation in which a faculty adds an item to the division CC agenda but can't attend meeting and doesn't send a proxy. They've had difficulty handling this type of situation, including follow-up/communication. Kaupp believes that if an item is on an agenda, anyone who wants to be involved in discussion should attend or send comments to reps ahead of meeting if they cannot. Kaupp noted faculty can also request special meeting be held during a time they can attend. Draper shared HSH division CC requests program director/faculty be present when curriculum from their dept. being discussed; if they cannot, they're asked to send written comments ahead of meeting and be available via phone if possible. Dupree shared BSS division CC uses Canvas site dedicated to curriculum; anyone submitting agenda item must post it on Canvas, which is used for discussion and advisory voting (two BSS reps are actual voting members). Kaupp noted this is allowable under Brown Act. FAC reps asked if it's reps' responsibility to meet with faculty and act as their proxy if they cannot attend—Kaupp responded, this is up to the division, but is one way to handle the situation. Noted the reps do have responsibility to represent their constituents, so there is some need to ensure reps are up-to-date on curriculum developments in their division. HSH: Draper shared working on Title 5 updates. LRC: No updates to report. STEM: Taylor shared working on Title 5 updates. Kinesiology: No updates to report. Gilstrap shared working w/ faculty on Common Course Numbering Phase 2 Part A templates; reviewing catalog pages for 2025-26 edition; reviewing CORs being submitted for 2026-27 catalog.
3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda	Brannvall shared Honors Symposium at UC Berkeley was a success!
4. Announcements a. Curriculum Institute Conference (July 10-12 in Ontario—[more info here](#))	**Speakers: CCC Team** Kaupp, Hueg, and Gilstrap are attending and encouraged reps to attend if interested! All highly recommend the conference. Vanatta noted online option is available.

b. SLO Coordinator Role	Kaupp shared this is a two year role with 50% release time. Applications close May 5. This is an important position within Academic Senate, and an opportunity to help shape how our processes.
5. Consent Calendar a. Division Curriculum Committees	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Document includes details about each division CC. Kaupp noted changes since previous meeting: updated STEM reps. Motion to approve **M/S** (Lee, Taylor). **Approved.**
6. New Certificate Application: Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Second read of new Artificial Intelligence Empowered Instruction Certificate of Achievement. Motion to approve **M/S** (Dupree, Jackson Sandoval). **Approved.**
7. New Certificate Application: Transfer Studies: Cal-GETC	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** First read of new Transfer Studies: Cal-GETC Certificate of Achievement. Gilstrap explained this cert. will replace our current Transfer Studies certs. for CSU GE & IGETC, when the changeover to Cal-GETC takes place for fall 2025. On a related note, Gilstrap mentioned recent legislation to create Cal-GETC for STEM majors, which will be available for certain ADTs. Connell asked if this cert. is a way for the college to get funding for students completing Cal-GETC—Gilstrap responded, it's primarily a way for students to receive certification that they've completed Cal-GETC pattern. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
8. Certificate Deactivation: Geriatric Home Aide (noncredit)	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** First read of deactivation of Geriatric Home Aide noncredit certificate. Ha asked if any curriculum being developed to replace this cert., noting ESL courses which support these students. Draper noted that the two courses included on the cert. haven't been taught in many years and are being deactivated, which is why the cert. is being deactivated. Some reps expressed disappointment in the courses not being taught. Brief discussion occurred re: living wage evidence for these jobs. Campbell noted that people are able to work in this industry without needing a cert., and can even take just one course to be eligible for employment (vs. two required for cert.). Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
9. Certificate Deactivation: Landscape Technician	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** First read of deactivation of Landscape Technician Certificate of Achievement. Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
10. SLO Framework & Assessment Process	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** Continuing discussion from previous meeting, re: CCC's tasks of establishing standard structure for Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and determining minimum expectations for clarity, measurability, and mapping. Kaupp asked for feedback on draft Writing Quality SLOs doc. Sandor suggested adding "successful" wherever student is mentioned ("successful student"). Brannvall likes that doc is presented as questions, and believes it's well written and clear. Kaupp wants to ensure doc is accessible and clear to faculty who aren't as well-versed in pedagogy and/or SLOs. Campbell believes doc is straightforward and simple, which is needed in this situation. Connell agrees that doc is pragmatic and straightforward, which is good. Kaupp also asked for feedback on SMART Rubric doc, which was created by Online Learning dept., based on Writing Quality SLOs doc;

	he'll share the group's feedback at next SLO Committee meeting. Noted rubric appears to be unfinished. Brannvall likes the rubric and noted that when it comes to SLOs they serve as an anchor; she teaches so much content it's helpful to review SLOs to help focus on what needs to be taught. Draper asked for clarification that rubric is meant to be used to evaluate actual written SLOs—Kaupp responded, yes. Kaupp noted rubric goes (left to right) from Emerging, Developing, Strong, which seems backwards.
	Dupree commented on Writing Quality SLOs doc and wondered if it could be helpful to indicate in the SLO examples which language is measurable, specific, equity-minded, etc. (from the rubric); suggested including one example for each item on rubric, with explanation as to how example satisfies that item. Taylor asked if there's any update on codifying the wording for the leading part of the sentence to use on SLOs campus-wide, which was mentioned at previous meeting—Kaupp responded, the suggestion being put forward is "A successful student will be able to…"; asked for the group's thoughts. Consensus was positive. Kaupp noted decision to not include "upon completing this course" (or similar), in order to allow for flexibility for unique situations (e.g., Apprenticeship). Kaupp asked the reps for their help in ensuring faculty use this standard wording to begin each SLO. He and Interim SLO Coordinator Allison Meezan are available to help faculty write their SLOs through the end of this year, noting this responsibility doesn't need to be taken on by the reps. Campbell shared HSH division is currently reviewing all of their SLOs, and rewriting if needed. Fong noted GID dept. currently reviewing SLOs.
	Brannvall asked if SLO work should be initiated by dept. chairs—Kaupp responded, each division can decide. Kaupp believes SLO Framework doc mentions dept. chairs will have primary role, but encouraged folks to provide input on this if they have concerns. Framework is a living document and feedback is welcome.
	Kaupp summarized the items included in today's discussion: a broad level overview for faculty members (Writing Quality SLOs doc), a rubric which is a work in progress, and a recommendation from CCC that the leading part of the sentence for SLOs be "A successful student will be able to…".
	Motion to approve **M/S** (Campbell, Brannvall). **Approved.**
	Kaupp noted CCC, as a body, will likely be called on throughout this process to assist; he'll do everything within his power to ensure this occurs during CCC meetings and not as extra time commitments.
11. Minimum Grade Requirement for Foothill GE Courses	**Speaker: Evan Gilstrap** Topic was briefly mentioned at previous meeting and decision made to agendize for further discussion. Gilstrap explained new Title 5 language doesn't establish any minimum grade requirement (e.g., C or better) for local GE pattern, so technically we could allow students to pass GE courses w/ D grades, as long as their overall GPA is 2.0 or higher. Previous Title 5 language required grade of C or better for minimum proficiency in English and math, and the rest of local GE allowed for D grade (as long as overall GPA is 2.0 or higher). Gilstrap explained our options: 1) require grade of C or better for Area 1A (English Composition) & Area 2 (Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning), and allow D grade for other GE areas; 2) require grade of C or better for all Foothill GE areas; 3) set no minimum

grade requirement for any Foothill GE areas. GPA of 2.0 or higher will still be required, regardless. Shared grade requirements for local GE at other community colleges in our area: Cañada, Gavilan, and Ohlone require a C or better for Area 1A, Area 1B (Oral Communication and Critical Thinking) & Area 2; College of Marin requires a C or better for Area 2 and just ENGL 1A course; Hartnell requires a C or better for full local GE pattern. Ha asked about ESLL 26—Gilstrap responded, this course is in Area 1A, so if we require a C or better for Area 1A this will include ESLL 26. Brannvall asked Gilstrap to share with the reps his info on the three options and what other colleges are doing, so reps can easily share with their constituents—Gilstrap happy to do so.

Kaupp asked about situations in which a course meets two different GE areas, but the two GE areas have different minimum grade requirements, could a student who gets a D grade use the course for the area in which a grade of D is allowed—Gilstrap responded, yes. Cembellin commented he doesn't like the idea of allowing D grades across the board for Foothill GE, noting that Foothill has a reputation for academic excellence.

Jackson Sandoval noted current requirements and asked for the reason behind this change—Gilstrap responded, new Title 5 language does not require any minimum grade for individual GE areas (or for GE as a whole) so we need to decide how we want to move forward. Brief discussion occurred re: minimum grades required for major courses. Connell asked if students can retake a class if they get a D grade—yes. Jackson Sandoval noted it would be easier for counselors if we align Foothill GE grade requirements with those for Cal-GETC, which requires a C or better; also believes requiring a C or better will help protect students who may want to get a graduate degree in the future. Campbell asked about C- grades—Gilstrap responded, Title 5 does not allow a C- so we cannot award that grade. Brannvall asked what the advantage would be to having lower minimum grade threshold for Foothill GE and wonders if it could be misleading to students who might not yet realize they want to transfer—Gilstrap responded, he believes the state is making a big push for degree attainment, and allowing lower grades for local GE could help more students earn a degree. Brief discussion occurred re: various goals students might have (e.g., workforce vs. transfer).

Campbell suggested allowing D grades but only for a certain number of GE courses, and Kaupp noted this is basically enforced by the GPA requirement of 2.0 or higher. Campbell believes being student-centric allows students to get D grades, but on the other hand having D grades on their transcript could have consequences in the future. Lee thanked Gilstrap for the valuable info about other colleges, and noted this decision isn't clear-cut, since other colleges aren't in alignment. Agreed that it's nice for students to be able to earn a degree with a D grade, but noted many students are interested in transferring. Rarely sees students with D grades for GE courses, and students usually retake those courses if they get a D grade. Believes it's important to know what UC and CSU will accept—Gilstrap responded, UC will not accept a D grade. Gilstrap suggested we require a grade of C or better for Area 1A, Area 1B & Area 2.

Cembellin pointed out language on curriculum sheets stating letter grades required for major courses—Vanatta responded, this language is being changed for upcoming catalog, also related to new Title 5 language which states P grades be allowed for major courses when

	course is taken for Pass/No Pass. This is a very fresh topic of discussion, and care is being taken to ensure language is correct for any programs which may be subject to additional requirements (e.g., Allied Health, Child Development, Apprenticeship programs). Campbell clarified that updating language on curriculum sheets to allow P grades for major courses will not impact grade options specified on individual CORs—Vanatta responded, correct, if a COR specifies the course is Letter Grade Only, this restriction will still be in effect. No changes being done to grade options on CORs, only to boilerplate language on curriculum sheets. Kaupp asked how many students are taking classes at Foothill and another community college at the same time, towards a degree—Hueg unsure if we have those numbers but believes it's gotten much more prevalent in recent years. Kaupp believes the group should take this into consideration, as students might be piecing together courses from multiple colleges to earn a degree. Taylor asked if we know how De Anza is leaning—Kaupp unsure if they have discussed this topic. Taylor suggested we try to align with De Anza, and Gilstrap agreed. Hueg noted the importance of identifying all downstream effects of this decision. Brannvall asked if GPA has effects for financial aid—Kaupp responded, yes, students can lose financial aid if they fall under a certain threshold. Cembellin asked if Foothill GE courses can be taken for Pass/No Pass—Gilstrap responded, if COR allows that option, yes. Brief discussion occurred re: D grade related to No Pass grade, and Gilstrap noted grade info in catalog for purposes of calculating GPA. Grade of No Pass would not count for Foothill GE, but D grade would. Kaupp asked the reps to bring topic to their constituents for feedback to bring to next CCC meeting for further discussion, as this decision needs to be made in time for the upcoming catalog to be published.
12. Foothill GE & Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)	**Speaker: Ben Kaupp** SLO Committee has asked CCC to discuss draft ILOs, and Kaupp will share any feedback from the group. Draft has also been presented to other groups on campus. Noted CCC decided earlier this year that new ILOs will inform our future discussions about Foothill GE. Hueg asked what the approval process will be for new ILOs—Kaupp responded, Academic Senate, MIPC, likely FHDA Board and other groups. CCC is not an approving body, we are an advising body, but the final ILOs may influence future revisions we make to Foothill GE. Connell believes the draft is very simple and straightforward and is in favor of it; Brannvall agrees. Fong mentioned VPI Stacy Gleixner sent out a survey for feedback, open until May 18.
13. Good of the Order	
14. Adjournment	**3:20 PM**

Attendees: Ulysses Acevedo (LA), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Cynthia Brannvall* (FAC), Rachelle Campbell* (HSH), Zach Cembellin (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Laura Gamez* (LRC), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Katie Ha* (LRC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), 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