College Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 8, 2024 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Administrative Conference Room 1901; virtual option via Zoom

Item	Discussion
1. CCC Orientation	Speakers: Evan Gilstrap & Ben Kaupp Kaupp shared presentation, overview of process and responsibilities pertaining to CCC rep role. Highlighted that CCC is a mix of folks with a variety of levels of knowledge and from diverse disciplines, which leads to robust discussion. Brief explanation of Brown Act and what it means for CCC. Noted we're the only college with a division curriculum committee structure. This structure can put a lot of pressure and responsibility on the reps, and Kaupp strongly encouraged reps to reach out whenever they need assistance. Agyare asked what the dean's role is in division CCs—Kaupp responded, they don't have any official voting role in creation of curriculum but are in charge of scheduling so could prevent a course from being scheduled. Collaboration with deans is a good thing!
	Gilstrap shared presentation, overview of articulation. Walgren asked if there's a way to efficiently search for courses re: articulation without having to search multiple individual websites—Gilstrap responded, yes, and can provide that info at next CCC meeting.
2. Minutes: June 11, 2024	Approved by consensus.
3. Introductions & Report Out from CCC Members	Speaker: All All attendees introduced themselves!
	Apprenticeship: Nate Vennarucci serving as in-person proxy. Shared Livermore training facility just began offering ENGL 1A. Mentioned add'I programs will be submitting apps for Foothill GE mapping.
	BSS: Dupree mentioned new cert. on today's agenda.
	Counseling: Jackson Sandoval mentioned upcoming Transfer Fair. Lee encouraged CCC members to reach out with any counseling related questions.
	Fine Arts & Comm.: No updates to report.
	HSH: Campbell shared division developing five year plan for COR updates, to avoid programs having to update all of their courses during the same year.
	Kinesiology & Athletics: No updates to report.
	Language Arts: Rose Huynh serving as in-person proxy. Sarver mentioned division looking for second rep.
	LRC: Agyare shared Library offering series of drop-in workshops for students, and noted various ways Library can support faculty in the classroom, beyond just offering textbooks. Reed shared WLC & STEM Center are both open!
	STEM: Taylor shared working on Common Course Numbering.

SRC: No updates to report. Saroyan encouraged CCC members to reach out with any questions related to the division's services. Kaupp shared TTW planning to create certificate.

Hueg shared there's a variety of curriculum-related initiatives happening college-wide, including workforce/CTE noncredit, noncredit for older adults.

Vanatta shared currently following up w/ faculty re: COR submissions from June; reps are CC'd on emails but don't necessarily need to take action (will make clear when reps' attention needed).

Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda

Parikh mentioned she's going on PDL after fall quarter; found someone interested in taking her place as rep but was told they cannot—they are classified staff with a teaching assignment. Parikh would like this person to be able to serve as a rep. Kaupp will reach out to Parikh to discuss situation.

5. Announcements

a. New Course Proposal

Speakers: CCC Team

The following proposal was presented: AATA 106A. No comments.

b. Common Course Numbering

Gilstrap provided update on Common Course Numbering (CCN). Currently working with faculty on Phase 1: Six courses, which must be submitted in CCCCO's inventory system by Dec. 2 and published by fall 2025. Phase 2 courses have been announced: approx. 20 courses, including some sequences. All three quarter system schools have been meeting, incl. w/ CCCCO folks, to discuss CCN and potential solutions for quarter schools. If we do stay on the quarter system, students may be impacted when it comes to course sequences, in the same way they currently are.

Faculty convenings for Phase 2 being held October through December. Faculty must apply, and only 12 faculty will be selected for each convening. Taylor asked if there is a timeline for the quarter system discussions—Gilstrap responded, not yet; currently, the colleges made recommendations to CCCCO, and CCCCO is discussing on their end. There will likely be a lot of back-and-forth before a resolution is figured out. Gilstrap also noted the various technology systems (e.g., Banner) haven't yet figured out how they will accommodate CCN. Connell asked for more details about course sequences—Gilstrap explained, and provided example of students at quarter schools needing to take three courses to equal two courses at a semester school.

Campbell mentioned C-ID and asked how it relates to CCN—Gilstrap responded, for CCN courses with a C-ID descriptor, that descriptor being used as starting point for creating CCN template. Gilstrap mentioned Phase 3 planned to be about 50 courses, and unknown what will happen beyond that. Parikh noted Engineering dept. offers some courses which no other colleges offer, and asked how those will be handled—Gilstrap responded, local courses like these will likely not become CCN. Cembellin asked if calculus sequence includes MATH 1D—Gilstrap responded, no. Cembellin asked how statistics course will look (e.g., in the schedule), given that the subject code must be STAT (instead of MATH)—Gilstrap responded, it will be up to the college to figure that out. Taylor asked if there are any best practices/advice for reps to tell their constituents involved in this process (e.g., creating new courses, updating SLOs)—Gilstrap responded, faculty should continue forward with whatever they have planned, since a lot is still unknown.

c. New Minimum Qualifications Handbook (AKA Disciplines List) Vanatta announced there's a new edition of the MQ handbook, which has been uploaded to the CCC website. No new disciplines have been

pproved, October 22, 2024	
	added; just one change, to the Ethnic Studies discipline. Kaupp explained that the discipline listed on a course drives the minimum qualifications any faculty teaching the course needs to meet. Noted that if MQs are updated in the handbook, faculty who have been teaching the course get grandfathered in.
d. Recent CCCCO Approvals!	Vanatta announced that, back in June, we received state approval for two new certificates of achievement: Archaeological Field Work and Spanish-Advanced.
6. New Certificate Application:	Speaker: Ben Kaupp
Business and Marketing	First read of new Business and Marketing Certificate of Achievement. Dupree noted Business dept. already has two CAs on the books, and this new one combines courses in traditional marketing into a lower unit CA. Noted there's an industry need for this combination of skills.
	Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
7. CCC Priorities for 2024-25	Speaker: Ben Kaupp One main priority for this year will be ensuring compliance with Brown Act. Some division curriculum committees might not be in compliance, which would be a big problem. For example, Canvas sites, which many divisions use to review and vote on curriculum, are not in compliance. Even though Brown Act does not work well in the modern world, we are still bound by it. If a decision is made in a meeting which ends up being found to violate Brown Act, that decision can be nullified.
	Kaupp believes we have two options: 1) division CCs all come into compliance with Brown Act; or 2) all curriculum decisions/approvals take place at CCC. Kaupp noted that division CCs could continue to operate the same way under option 2, but they would not officially be approving anything. Dupree believes BSS is somewhat in compliance, as the agenda is posted and meetings are in person, although not many folks show up. BSS uses Canvas to share curriculum items for faculty to review. Kaupp mentioned the importance of determining who are the official members of the division CC, noting that (re: BSS) if it's just the two reps then their in-person meetings are okay. Kaupp cautioned all reps against discussing curriculum outside of their meetings. Parikh believes STEM might be following Brown Act. Kaupp noted a big concern is that division CCs are using Canvas to hold votes. Parikh mentioned that, in the past, reps have distributed information to faculty via email to ask for feedback to inform division CC members how to vote, and asked if this is okay—Kaupp responded, as long as actual decisions/voting taking place at division CC meetings, should be okay.
	Campbell noted HSH division CC posts agendas and holds in-person meetings, and believes there needs to be clear, written guidance from CCC to ensure division CCs in compliance, including what constitutes a quorum. Pointed out the high volume of work being done by division CCs, which would be a lot for CCC to take on. Fong asked for clarification re: curriculum discussions between reps—Kaupp responded, curriculum should not be discussed outside of meetings. Starer asked if dept. meetings fall under Brown Act—Kaupp responded, no, dept. meetings exempt because they're more like a report out among constituents. Agyare asked if both reps must be meeting in person for division CC meetings—Kaupp responded, in order to be Brown Act compliant, any person joining online must have their address posted on the agenda in order to vote. Kaupp reminded the reps that division CCs allowed to determine their own quorum. Vanatta mentioned a big part of finalizing COR submissions is emailing faculty with follow-up questions, and asked if these emails are in violation of

Approved, October 22, 2024	
	Brown Act; noted that if any significant edits needed to a COR as a result of emails, division CC must approve—Kaupp responded, discussing minor technical edits via email is okay.
	Topic will continue to be discussed this year, and Kaupp encouraged reps to reach out with questions or concerns from them or their faculty.
	Related to the above, another priority will be discussing possibility of creating a Technical Review Committee. We are one of the only colleges without such a group, which reviews CORs to check for compliance. We need to discuss if we want to create one, and (if so) what its role will be and who will serve.
	Another main priority for this year will be SLOs, which is a college-wide priority. CCC has not been asked to take on any specific role related to SLOs, but we should be ready in case we are eventually asked. Campbell believes that until the college makes a decision regarding a technology solution for SLOs, there's nothing faculty and divisions can really do. Kaupp noted discussion re: tech is currently taking place, and the wider priority is discussing who should be in charge of SLOs (e.g., SLO Committee) and ensuring quality of SLOs. Noted SLO Coordinator role being created.
8. Updating Foothill GE	Speaker: Ben Kaupp The new Foothill GE pattern created by CCC last year was approved by Academic Senate and we can now move forward! Our new pattern isn't quite in synch with De Anza's but is pretty closely aligned. Gilstrap mentioned that a lot of work needs to be done to create our new pattern, including establishing the criteria for each GE area. Believes some can carry over from our current pattern, but there are two brandnew areas, Area 2 and Area 6. Kaupp mentioned the need to discuss if

Attendees: Micaela Agyare* (LRC), Chris Allen* (Dean, APPR), Jeff Bissell (KA), Rachelle Campbell* (HSH), Zach Cembellin* (Dean, STEM), Sam Connell* (BSS), Cathy Draper* (HSH), Angie Dupree* (BSS), Jordan Fong* (FAC), Evan Gilstrap* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman* (Dean, FAC), Kurt Hueg* (Administrator Co-Chair), Rose Huynh* (LA), Maritza Jackson Sandoval* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp* (Faculty Co-Chair), Amber La Piana (LA), Andy Lee* (CNSL), Sarah Parikh* (STEM), Eric Reed (LRC), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor* (STEM), Mary Vanatta* (Curriculum Coordinator), Nate Vennarucci* (APPR), Judy Walgren (FAC)

3:27 PM

we want to continue to have GE subcommittees.

9. Good of the Order

10. Adjournment

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta

^{*} Indicates in-person attendance