Foothill Academic Senate Minutes January 24, 2022

<mark>DRAFT Minutes</mark>

#'s represent items numbered on the [Agenda](#)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Roll call

Executive Committee Officers:
Kathryn Maurer (President)
Paul Starer (Exec VP) (absent)
Eric Kuehnl (VP Curriculum)
Robert Cormia (Sec/Treas)
Division Senators:
Alexis Aguilar
Brian Murphy
David Marasco
Donna Frankel
Ellen Judd
Frank Niccoli

Jordan Fong
Katy Ripp
Kelly Edwards
Kerri Ryer
Kimberly Escamilla (absent)
Mary Thomas
Matthew Litrus
Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera
Milissa Carey
Patricia Crespo-Martin
Sara Cooper
Stephanie Chan
Tracee Cunningham
Voltaire Villanueva

Extended Exec Committee
Adrienne Hypolite
Ajani Byrd
Carolyn Holcroft
Fatai Heimuli
John Fox
Kurt Hueg
Guests
Allison Herman
Kate Jordahl
Natalie Latteri
Amy Leonard
Isaac Escoto

3. Agenda was adopted by consensus. With a requested change to the discussion on proposed new committees of the academic senate related to faculty burnout and overwhelm, the minutes from the 1/10 meeting were then adopted by consensus.

4. Public Comment: Allison Herman shared information on the planning for the 2022 Research and Service Leadership Symposium. There are many workshops to help students get going on their projects, and help connect them to mentors. She is seeking faculty's help in recruiting students to get interested in participating in the symposium and signing up for these workshops. You can email rsls@fhda.edu for more information.

5. The appointments on the consent calendar were adopted by consensus. Kathryn thanked all the faculty who are stepping up to serve on the 12 hiring committees for new FT faculty this year, as this is exciting. She acknowledged that this is a lot of work. She also said that the district is still recruiting for EO reps, so please encourage faculty who aren't appointed to these committees to volunteer. Ellen Judd asked if PT faculty could serve as an EO rep, and if there was compensation for them. Multiple people said they think PT faculty can serve but that there is no compensation. Kathryn said she would check with HR to confirm and get back to the group. She also thanked everyone for additional recruitment that has filled all program review reader positions except for one (TTW). Please help fill the last spot!

6. Governance updates:

Kathryn briefed the Academic Senate on the half-day governance retreat hosted by Bernadine last Friday. At Bernadine's request, she wanted to keep this small – presidents of AS, Classified Senate and ASFC + two reps (so 3 total) from each body, plus Bernadine. It is scheduled for two-days (this Friday as well). Kathryn had invited Kerri and Paul (who had served on the Shared Governance Task Force over the summer) for AS, but Paul was unable to attend. The Classified Senate reps also attended, but Fatai and students couldn't attend, and it was mentioned that were missed, but nothing was decided and wouldn't be without the students. The group began conversations about where we are at in the governance process. The general consensus by all was that we do not want to restart the governance structure that was in place up through June 2021 (the five councils: Advisory, R&R, C&C, E&E and Return to Campus). Desire to do something different, but not go backwards, go forwards, and learn from the past. We need to do this quickly, going into accreditation. Discussed what the mission of Foothill College is, and the role of governance. How do we contrast governance from operational, and the role for ten plus one in governance.

Kerri added that it was definitely disappointing that the students weren't there, but she agreed with Kathryn's summary.

Adriene commented that it was a productive conversation. What are our roles on committees that will have an impact on College planning? Representation in these spaces is (should be) meaningful. Getting back to the mission of Foothill.

Milissa asked about the timetable for coming up with a structure. Kathryn commented that we need something that works, right away, but we also don't want to rush into something that isn't going to work. This is tricky.

Patricia asked how and when constituents can provide feedback. Kathryn encouraged any input be sent either her and Kerri and/or directly to Bernadine. And Kathryn will bring any concrete proposals to senate for discussion and approval.

District technology plan: Kathryn invited Kate Jordhal to talk about the draft District plan. Kate said that it only reflects input from De Anza because Foothill hadn't prepared a tech plan in time. That said, she, Mike Murphy and Lydia Daniels have been bringing Foothill input to the ETAC meetings. Anything that impacts Foothill College should be brought forward through the reps. We need to respond to COVID, as well as transitional time as Joe Moreau retires.

Foothill Tech Task Force: A new group being chaired by Teresa Ong. Main task is to draft Foothill's new Tech Plan. Charter is being worked on. For now, 3 AS reps.

7. Draft 41320 Faculty hiring procedures - Kathryn showed a document with a side-by-side of the current procedure related to hiring full-time faculty, and recommendations for hiring from the District diversity committee. Today is the first read of the new language. This will come back to the Senate on the 7th or 14th, then go to APM (District Academic and Professional Matters) then back to District (diversity and equity).

Kathryn mentioned that the yellow highlights in the text came from Cheryl Baum at De Anza, items that we should talk about more. There is language about adding students to hiring committees, how would we do that, and where in the hiring process are students inserted? Senators and faculty can comment on any section, not just the highlighted sections. We're working towards approval of a document.

David commented on language about the makeup of the selection committee. David commented this was not the language that left DDEAC. Mary Thomas commented about students being part of the teaching demonstration, and should, or could, students be compensated for their time? David commented that the language on participation was permissive, we may include students, but we shouldn't hold up a hiring committee if students aren't available. Ellen commented that the student perspective during the teaching demonstration is very important. Patricia commented that students should be part of teaching demonstration, but there are concerns about "privacy" confidentiality during the hiring process, students aren't bound to the same confidentiality requirement (contractually). David commented that having students participating on the ethnic studies hiring committee impressed the faculty candidates interviewing for the position. Ajani commented on the unit enrollment requirement for students on hiring committees, where it came from, the question was asked if an enrollment limit prevented part-time students from participating. Or should a student have enrolled in classes that directly related to the position being interviewed. Fatai commented that she shared the same concern as Ajani, that students with less than 8 units are still engaged, she also commented that being included in the conversation felt included and empowered. Ellen suggested that rather than a unit count per quarter, a cumulative unit count over a previous period of time might be better. Ellen commented that students want to make a good impression, and they should be trusted to do a good job, just as any other member of the committee. Adriene also commented that when including students on hiring committees, what if the student were a College employee?

Kathryn commented that we need to push this through, as it is time sensitive, and we are committed to getting it finalized before the end of this academic year so it doesn't again get held up. She asked Fatai and Adrienne if they would be willing to meet with her to bring forward some more suggested language around student participation.

8. Next up on the agenda is to look at the draft [AP (Administrative Procedure)](#) and [BP (Board Procedure)](#) for COVID requirements. Board policies go to the board for approval, administrative procedures do not. Cormia commented on boosters and what full vaccination is? Donna commented on face coverings (that is not explicitly laid out as part of the vaccination policy). Kathryn commented that we are using the Academic Senate to gather faculty input, but we are working with FA, where FA is taking the lead. Kerri commented that if vaccination is going to be an ongoing requirement, that we need to have resources (or partners) to help provide that vaccine. Kerri also commented about mask wearing especially among the unvaccinated. Sara commented that it would be helpful if the definition of fully vaccinated were not too rigid, as things are changing and we want the policy to not have to be updated again and again, for

instance would the Omicron booster be part of a requirement. Sara also commented about masks, and the health sciences people understand the importance of masks, and have onsite support for vaccination, masks and testing.

Kurt commented we have testing available for faculty at the division offices, and send students to the health center. Kurt shared he wasn't completely clear on the status of thousands of kN95 masks that were ordered. Kurt also commented that tests were available in multiple locations.

Kathryn asked for our faculty to bring forward the most specific language possible when giving feedback.

9. Natalie Latteri, Amy Leonard and Isaac Escoto were introduced as presenters. Natalie gave Academic Senate a recap after the sorting day last Friday (1/21/22). Amy talked about student challenges in navigating classes and pathways, and how the metamajors project helps students stay on a path that matches their interests even if one particular path wasn't the best fit. Students want to pick a major that allows them to build a career with a livable wage and stay in the area. Students look at SLOS and PLOs and how it fits, and how it helps build their personal brand. Pick skills that will last a lifetime. Natalie commented on three different models for sorting. At the end of the second day, the career and academic pathways model sorted to the top. The District unity model (didn't) take into account different approaches between Foothill and De Anza, so a unified District model didn't work out. For many of our programs, curricularly, things don't align between Foothill and De Anza. Between the interdisciplinary and skills model, there already were many places that had interdisciplinary in a career model. Comment that some areas had more differences (arts and liberal studies). Some areas were very narrow, like education or trades. There were comments from some faculty (Foothill versus De Anza) e.g. communications that wanted to stay with Fine Arts, and not be placed in Language Arts at Foothill, but not at De Anza. Career and academic pathways fit job families and the metamajor model. Students want jobs that allow them to stay in the Bay Area. Cost of living and inflation are also concerns to students right now. There was a display of different models.

Amy Leonard asked the senate to share with their constituents a survey to collect further input into the desired meta major model, and the link to the survey was shared in the chat.

Cormia briefly commented on ontologies, topic maps, job families overlap of knowledge and skills, how people with different backgrounds get to a job, and the importance of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary education. Nothing protects or extends our careers more than building specific skills on top of a broad educational foundation.

Kathryn mentioned the importance of getting the word out to faculty that we are at the point of approving a model and we need to make sure everyone is comfortable with the model and sorting.

Alexis asked for his discipline, Geography, if it could belong to more than one meta major as it seems to belong in more than one. Natalie commented they tried not to group meta majors in

more than one model (topic) as it confuses students, which kind of defeats the purpose of the meta majors. She said the best way is to be strategic about the placement, what fits best for the strengths of the program at Foothill.

Isaac talked about counselors and their work in this process.

Amy commented that students are already doing this thinking about their personal branding, and how specific knowledge and skills contribute to that. Where are the jobs now, and where are they going to be in the future? What's the innovation that's possible, and what can we do for future students? There was a comment about bringing in overarching themes, like business ethics (and sustainability) into our curriculum, and how are those topics addressed? There were comments about where to put a topic like Japanese, where is it now, where could it be? Programs shouldn't feel stuck in a particular place, where we are now with meta majors and these models. This is coming back on February 7th, as a draft resolution with the meta majors model(s).

10. The [proposal for new senate subcommittee](link) discussion is now cut to two minutes - there is one change from the last meeting, take off the scholarships (as it's not ongoing work). The election committee is time sensitive, we do need to run an election, assuming we have more than one candidate. Other time sensitive events are the faculty part-time celebration event. Kerri Ryer, Matthew Litrus, and Mary Thomas volunteered to serve on the elections committee (approved by consensus). Kathryn, Donna Frankel and Ellen Judd volunteered to start planning for the part-time faculty celebration event (approved by consensus).

11. For the Good of the order: Cormia spoke about the strong team Foothill built in March 2020 as COVID forced us into virtual instruction, our singular focus on student success (and never quitting on that goal), and recognizing our COVID warriors fighting delta and Omicron, while delivering instruction and student services. We are a strong and winning team, and need to be managed as such.

Other announcements: Jewish heritage week

12. Meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m