Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Draft Notes

## January 28th 2018, 2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **Notes** |
| 1. Call to Order | Escoto called meeting to order 2:02PM |
| 1. Roll Call | **Senators Present**  Isaac Escoto (AS President 20’)  Ben Armerding (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-Chair 19’)  Katherine Schaefers (AS Secretary 19’)  Voltaire Villanueva (Cnsl)  Kathryn Maurer (BSS)  Micaela Agyare (Library)  David McCormick (LA)  Hilary Gomes (FA/Comm)  Jordan Fong (FA/Comm)  Donna Frankel (PT rep 20’)  Robert Cormia (PSME)  Sara Cooper (BHS/FA Rep)  Tracee Cunningham (Cnsl)  Mimi Overton (SRC)  David Marasco (PSME)  Mary Anne Sunseri (PT rep for Winter/Spring 19’)  Amber La Piana (LA)  **Liaisons Present**  Kristy Lisle (Admin rep)  **Senators Absent**  Rita O’Loughlin (KA/Athletics)  Don Mac Neil (KA/Athletics)  Natasha Mancuso (BSS)  **Liaisons Absent**  Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development)  Chelsea Nguyen (ASFC President)  **Guests**:  Foothill College President Thuy Nguyen |
| 1. Adoption of agenda | **Adopted by consensus** |
| 1. Public comment on items not on agenda (senate cannot discuss or take action) | **Approved by consensus** |
| 1. Approval of Minutes: | ASdraftminutes1-14-18 |
| 1. Consent Calendar | Associate Vice President of Instruction Search Committee:  Ben Armerding (LA), Kathryn Maurer (BSS), Isaac Escoto (CNSL).  **Approved by consensus** |
| 1. Unfinished Business (10+1 area(s) indicated): |  |
| a. Faculty Hiring Prioritization | FacultyPrioritizationRubric1.28.19  Escoto: This form is something we can use for now, and then adapt as we feel necessary for the coming years. We will not be tied to the tool as is right now.  Comment: At the end of the last meeting, we agreed to consolidate feedback from our faculty, along with our Equity and Education feedback, and then have Carolyn Holcroft/senate officers make changes to the tool and share with Kristy Lisle and our Deans. The tool would then come back to the senate. Was this process followed? Concern that not all feedback is reflected on the form.  Escoto**:** This version of the tool reflects consolidated feedback we were able to reflect on the form within the last week.  Lisle: We would like to move forward with the data we have, while incorporating data from the Equity and Education committee to prioritize three faculty positions. We need faculty prioritization from an equity lens, but also mesh this with best practices around hiring. We need folks to work on best practices as well. It would be good to get ahead of the hiring cycle instead of chasing it, as we are currently.  Comment: We are behind, late in the cycle for next year’s hiring. This late, the pool will be more and more sparse. Speed is of the essence.  Comment: Where are we on the revised hiring policies that we have been working on for the past two years?  Escoto: Both De Anza and Foothill Senates took a look at the hiring practices and made proposed changes over the last couple years. We need to follow up with the district and see where we are as HRAC/DEAC already approved the update hiring practices. Will report back.  Feedback: Good to see that enrollment is way up, accreditation has been added back in. However, this is still not a rubric.  Feedback: Why is only “online” specified and not online *and* hybrid?  Feedback (Counseling): Better understanding needed around dual enrollment/funding formula.  Feedback (Honors): Honors is under the equity section and not enrollment because it is not tied to any funding. However, if it is under equity, is it appropriate to ask for disaggregated data on ethnicity and FTES?  Feedback: Want to see disaggregated data in Honors. What is the track record of Honors sections in departments? Also, how does it work if high school teachers are teaching in dual enrollment? What does that look like for faculty preference? For example, if faculty in one department are being asked to teach most of the dual enrollment classes, vs. another department that is mainly using high school teachers to teach those classes.  Lisle: Dual enrollment will increase our FTES, but is this the direction we want it to go? Need feedback on whether or not this is a good idea.  Feedback: Concern that asking for faculty racial demographic information could open us up for a law suit.  Lisle: These are valid points, how do we incorporate this in time for hiring? Should we backfill with PT faculty for now? Once we post the positions, we still need to wait those 30 days for the application period.  Feedback: Deans are already asking for which positions departments think they may need.  Comment: What we are hearing is that we need to do this now. So what is the plan?  Lisle: Traditionally, in order to prioritize faculty positions, Deans would hold a meeting. Here, a facilitator would write out on a board on all the possibilities based on the form. Going forward, this meeting would be holistic, taking into account college-wide thinking. Most likely, some of the programs considered for new hires would be programs that have a higher likelihood of gaining additional FTES for the College.  Lisle: Ideally, have leadership from the Education and Equity committee, Academic Senate, and Administration sit down to work on faculty prioritization.  Comment: PSME division would be in support of more faculty voices to the table besides the Deans on faculty prioritization.  Comment: Let’s create an Action item/statement  Comment: Could we also include disaggregating data on the Honors Program?  Comment: Since we are under a time pressure, let’s make a faculty prioritization list that goes straight to the Advisory Council for this year.  General agreement on this statement.  Comment: This Spring, let’s return to perfecting the faculty prioritization tool, so we will not have a last-minute scramble. Also, general agreement.  Comment: At this point, it is encouraging that we are establishing a faculty presence in faculty prioritization decisions. We’re moving in the right direction.  Comment: Once we have established the faculty prioritization meeting where Deans and faculty leadership will get together, could we have an announcement regarding when this will occur?  Comment: Let’s keep in mind the difference between taking something that has traditionally been a Dean’s meeting and opening it to faculty, and taking a meeting that has traditionally been closed and making it open. Let’s make it open to faculty leadership, but not publicly open.  *Motion: Have leadership of the Academic Senate, and the Education and Equity committee join the Dean’s meeting on faculty prioritization for this year, with the understanding that we will continue to work on process for future years*  **Approved by consensus**  *Motion: Move to approve the form as-is and commit to revising it in the Spring*  *Move: Marasco*  *Second: Villanueva*  **Approved by consensus**  *Motion: Move that after faculty prioritization has been discussed at the collaborative Dean/faculty meeting, it goes right to the Advisory Council*  *Move: Marasco*  *Cooper: Second*  **Approved by consensus** |
| b. AP 4222 Remedial Coursework | No changes  **Approved by consensus** |
| c. AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols | No changes  **Approved by consensus** |
| d. BP 4230 Grading | Took out the reference of a 14th week. We are a quarter system, we do not have a 14th week. We instead inserted “75%” to match with our schedule.  **Approved by consensus** |
| e. BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates | Added wording regarding our baccalaureate degree.  Should we specifically mention the Associate Degree for Transfer? Title V does not make a distinction between an “AA” or an “AS” and an “AA-T” or an “AS-T”  **Approved by consensus** |
| 1. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated) |  |
| * 1. Part Time Faculty Appointment | Mary Anne Sunseri  From Fine Arts/Communication, also chair of the newly formed Committee on Online Learning (COOL).  *Motion: Appoint Sunceri for Winter/Spring 2019 as our second PT faculty representative.*  *Move: Frankel*  *Second: Maurer*  **Approved by Consensus**  Formal elections for this PT faculty seat will be held in Spring for the next two years. |
| * 1. Enrollment Management | AP4230GradingandAcademicRecordSymbols  David Ulate  State funding formula **In the** **Past**  For the past several decades, State apportionment for California Community Colleges (CCC’s) was just based on enrollment (number of full time equivalent students or “FTES”).  State funding formula **Now**  Starting this year (2019), the funding formula for CCC’s is broken up into three criterion:  1) Base Allocation  Base FTES  Special Admit FTES  Inmates FTES  2) Supplemental Allocation  Pell Grant  AB 540  Promise Grant  3) Student Success Allocation  Associate Degrees  Associate Degrees for Transfer  Baccalaureate Degrees  Credit Certificates  13.5 or more CTE Quarter Units  Transfer  Transfer Level English or Math  Regional Living Wage  How this new funding formula affects Foothill  Based on this new funding formula, Foothill College would get approximately 5.2 million less in funding. This year though, Foothill College is in a “hold harmless” stage, in which we are going to be funded based on last year’s budget, and won’t be dinged 5.2 million, as we adjust our College finances to meet the budget we will be forced to operate under for next year.  Concern: Pedagogy would be downplayed in favor of obtaining more FTES and giving more degrees so that we can meet the new funding formula guidelines.  Lisle: Working with curriculum committee to ensure Apprenticeship students would qualify for degrees.  Comment: What about students that leave and come back?  Ulate: Currently, we do not receive transfer funding if a student transfers but is still taking courses at Foothill.  Lisle: We are only giving 18% of our students financial aid. We need to bump up the financial aid awareness to students. Not only will it help our students, it will also help us with apportionment.  Comment: This new funding formula is all about completion. This seems like a system that is designed to be “gamed”. |
| * 1. Budget Reduction/Reorg | Budget\_Reorg\_Presentation\_Council - 1-18(1)  **BSS**:  Let’s try and separate types of feedback instead of lumping it all together:  a. Questions for Clarification  b. Concerns  c. Process on how the plan was created  Today is the first time we are all getting together to talk about it. We had an email announcement, and then we had a Town Hall. However, this is the first time we (the Academic Senate) have been together to talk about this Budget Reduction. If we on the Senate as faculty leaders are meant to guide our faculty, what is our purpose during this meeting today in regards to the budget reduction?  Escoto: We are here to help inform decisions and make a recommendation to our President.  **PSME**:  a. Process issues, when were certain voices heard and not heard?  b. The decision itself regarding the administration hub. If we don’t make this decision, what are we going to do? There really is not a good alternative. If not this, then what?  c. If this is the best of bad decisions, it will affect students and faculty, how can we best mitigate the impact?  Escoto: We can also discuss with our administrative colleagues how we can mitigate these concerns, if a Hub were to be created.  Comment: We need to make good choices out of bad options, and manage those options well.  Comment: There are different responses to the solution of the “administrative hub.” It is challenging to remove process from plan.  Comment: Can we try this for a year and then change it if the administrative hub doesn’t work?  Comment: Have these decisions already been made? Is there any wiggle room for negotiations on positions?  President Nguyen: Administration is sincere in our efforts to gather feedback and make adaptations based on that feedback.  As far as the library, we have attempted to move positions in accordance with the skillsets of the divisional administration assistants. We are attempting to minimize layoffs.  Comment: To clarify, these decisions are not set in stone, but the alternative would be layoffs?  President Nguyen: If there is another alternative, or another thought process on where an employee could go that we have not explored, please let us know.  The administration followed seven guiding principles for this reorganization:  1) Preserve Quality Education  2) Follow College’s Core Values  3) Strategic Enrollment Growth  4) Cabinet Review/Approval  5) Minimize the number of lay-offs and (when possible) the effects on employees, including racial/ethnic impact, and in accordance with collective bargaining agreements, while improving efficiency and being strategic in reorganization  6) Spending relates to strategic objectives  7) Shared Impact  People do not know who is about to retire, or what alternative skillset an employee may have. Hopefully, we can understand the nuance that went into these decisions.  Hopefully, breaking down of silos is noticed in this reorganization. Student services and different divisions coming together.  Administration is affected by the budget. Three full-time, permanent administrative positions have been cut off the books.  At the Advisory Council meeting on Friday, February 1st, we will be proposing a design team around the hub idea. |
| 1. Committee reports: |  |
| 1. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)   a. Elections Committee | a. Elections  VP - Ben Armerding is finishing the two-year term formerly served by Rachelle Campbell.  Secretary/Treasurer – Katherine Schaefers is finishing her two-year term.  PT faculty seat – Mary Anne Sunseri is finishing the two-year term formerly served by Brendan Mar.  **Frankel willing to serve.**  **Cormia willing to serve and possibly lead.**  Agenda item in next meeting needed for Elections |
| 1. Adjournment | 4:08PM |