Approved, November 5, 2024	
	First read of Stand Alone Approval Requests for NCBS 411A, 411B & 447. Each will be permanently Stand Alone and used as coreq support for MATH 1A, 1B & 47, respectively. Vanatta noted these are noncredit
	versions of the MATH courses in item 6.  Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.
8. Stand Alone Application: SPAN 51C	Speaker: Ben Kaupp First read of Stand Alone Approval Request for SPAN 51C. Will be permanently Stand Alone. No comments.
	Second read and possible action will occur at next meeting.

## 9. Updating Foothill GE

Speaker: Ben Kaupp

We need to begin discussing how to place courses currently approved for Foothill GE within the new Foothill GE pattern. Goal is to hopefully make the process as streamlined as possible. Gilstrap explained the new areas and suggested potential equivalencies:

New Area 1 has two subdivisions: English Composition would likely be equivalent to current Area II; Oral Communication & Critical Thinking would likely consist of COMM courses, essentially current Area V (minus MATH).

New Area 2, Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning: likely consist of MATH courses from current Area V.

New Area 3, Arts & Humanities: likely equivalent to current Area I. New Area 4, Social & Behavioral Sciences: likely equivalent to current Area IV.

New Area 5, Natural Sciences w/ lab: likely equivalent to current Area III

New Area 7, Lifelong Learning: likely equivalent to current Area VII.

This leaves new Area 6, Ethnic Studies, which is brand-new for Foothill GE. Additionally, current Area VI (United States Cultures & Communities) does not have a potential equivalent in new pattern.

Kaupp asked the group if they would like to make a motion to approve placing current Foothill GE courses in new areas in the cases where equivalencies likely exist or bring topic back to their constituents for discussion and feedback—group agreed, bring back for discussion.

Woodbury asked if Foothill has developed criteria for new areas—Kaupp responded, not yet, that's the next step. Parikh asked if there are descriptions of the areas—Kaupp responded, descriptions of current areas are on current GE apps, but CCC has not created criteria for new areas. Parikh asked if CCC will need to create all new GE apps—Gilstrap responded, noting some current apps could potentially be used to create new apps (based on equivalency details, above), but a few likely need to be created (e.g., new Areas 29862 Parikh asked if CCC should know what the criteria for the new areas will be before deciding to place courses—Kaupp responded, noting some areas will likely be the same. Parikh concerned that deciding to place courses before knowing criteria

Approved, November 5, 2024

explained change to new pattern will require manual updating (by Vanatta) of each COR in CourseLeaf; would like course placement to be figured out by March/April, in order to be ready for the catalog. Kaupp noted we have seven areas for which criteria needs reviewed/ created, and asked the group how we want to handle that work (subcommittees, as a whole group, etc.). Gilstrap responded, if done at CCC, recommends including discipline experts to inform conversations. Noted current GE subcommittees frequently have just one or two members, which might not be ideal for this work. Suggested possibility of creating ad hoc group, noting concern that creating seven separate groups would be inefficient. Starer agreed that discipline expertise is needed and believes work is too important to fall on GE subcommittees; asked CCC members to communicate importance of this work to their constituents, because GE approval can drive enrollment in a course. Suggested convening separate committee of discipline experts to discuss and make recommendations to CCC. Sarver supported leveraging subject matter experts.

Brannvall asked for clarity re: what aspects of criteria are statemandated vs. local control—Gilstrap responded, criteria is local faculty purview. Recommended reviewing current criteria to see if it needs updating. Brannvall advocated having discussions at CCC with discipline experts, which will ensure Apprenticeship included. Kaupp suggested creating seven groups of discipline experts to bring proposals to CCC with updates/new criteria, with goal of having those proposals ready by the end of fall quarter. Connell advocated streamlining GE apps, which currently are very lengthy. Vanatta mentioned groups will need to figure out how to handle new courses for 2025-26 catalog, which filled out current GE apps in CourseLeaf, as well as Apprenticeship GE mapping in progress. Parikh asked for specifics about state-mandated changes to local GE—Gilstrap responded, local GE requirements in Title 5, but not very detailed. Parikh asked for Title 5 language—Kaupp will distribute.

Gilstrap mentioned new Area 1 has two subdivisions so may need larger membership in discipline group. Parikh encouraged communication between the seven groups to determine any criteria overlap or distinctions between similar areas.

10. Division CC Brown Act Compliance

Speaker: Ben Kaupp

There are two separate paths we can take to ensure compliance with

Approved, November 5, 2024

11. Good of the Order	
12. Adjournment	3:30 PM

Attendees: Micaela Agyare\* (LRC), Chris Allen (Dean, APPR), Ben Armerding\* (LA), 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), Patricia Gibbs Stayte (BSS), Evan Gilstrap\* (Articulation Officer), Ron Herman\* (Dean, FAC), Rose Huynh\* (LA), Maritza Jackson Sandoval\* (CNSL), Ben Kaupp\* (Faculty Co-Chair), Stephanie King\* (LA), Amber La Piana (LA), Natalie Latteri (BSS), Andy Lee\* (CNSL), Tim Myres\* (APPR), Sarah Parikh\* (STEM), Richard Saroyan (SRC), Amy Sarver (LA), Paul Starer (APPR), Kyle Taylor\* (STEM), Mary Vanatta\* (Curriculum Coordinator), Fiona Wiesner\*, Erik Woodbury\* (De Anza AS President)

\* Indicates in-person attendance

Minutes Recorded by: M. Vanatta