Academic Senate Approved Minutes October 24, 2022

Meeting called to order at: 2:05 p.m.

Roll call Cormia

**2022-23 Executive Committee Members**

| | |
|---|---|
| Voltaire Villanueva | x |
| Jordan Fong | x |
| Robert Cormia | x |
| Eric Kuehnl | absent |
| | |
| Brian Murphy | absent |
| Brian Evans | x |
| Mona Rawal | x |
| Luis Carrillo | (online) |
| Tracee Cunningham | x |
| Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera | absent |
| Ché Meneses | online |
| Rachelle Campbell | x |
| Francis Niccoli | online |
| Katy Ripp | x |
| Jeff Bissell | absent |
| Stephanie Chan | x |
| Patricia Crespo-Martin | x |
| Kimberly Escamilla | online |
| Mary Thomas | x |
| Matthew Litrus | x |
| Donna Frankel | online |
| Ellen Judd | x |
| | |
| Skye Bridges | later |
| Janie Garcia | later |
| John Fox | x |
| Carolyn Holcroft | online |
| Kerri Ryer | x |
| Ajani Byrd | x |
| Kurt Hueg | x |

Agenda was adopted by consensus

- Public comment (announcements) Rachell Campbell reminded the Senate about the flu shot event tomorrow from 10 a.m. - 2 p.m., held at the Environmental and Allied Health Services division office.

- It was decided to wait to the next meeting to approve the minutes from October 17, 2022

- Voltaire commented on both the additions and the vacancies in the consent calendar. The consent calendar was adopted by consensus.

Regular business

California Equity 2.0 document. Donna asked if the document has changed much since summer. Voltaire commented there are faculty teams across the campus working on this and 13-55. Voltaire further commented there are a number of documents where faculty have input.

Ajani clarified that the Equity 2.0 document requires seven signatures, including the Academic Senate president. Cormia moved to approve the document, second by Ellen Judd. Stephanie commented that the spelling of Amber's name needed to be corrected. The motion was approved unanimously.

Simple Syllabus was discussed, two senators commented on all the useful features. Brian moved that the Academic Senate approve (but not require) Simple syllabus in Canvas. Tracee seconded. Cormia commented on excellent technical support from Foothill Online Learning. The motion was passed unanimously, with no abstentions.

Definition of item #9 on regular and substantive contact with students. A faculty member questioned what individual contact was. Kerri commented that announcements need to be about the course. Do you need individual communication with every student every week?

The word "individualized" should be defined. There was a question about the word "present" as well. Presence distinguishes the course from "correspondence". If presence is required. Within Canvas communication is built in. This document discusses what constitutes RSI (Regular and Substantive Interaction). Feedback to each student every week (or some other time frame) is a requirement. Senators commented that they look at student input (voicethread) every week.

There was further comment about how students interact with each other every week. Further comment that students appreciate feedback. It was observed that online faculty put a lot of effort into student contact. This topic is important so that we can move ahead on the question of how we evaluate student contact.

A question was asked if rubrics count as feedback? Voltaire commented that he is compelled to hold off on item #5. Kurt commented that times are changing and the federal government is

looking at contact as a means to evaluate if online courses have been effective in student contact. Ellen commented that if we're requiring more work from online instructors, should we discuss how much extra work that is. John Fox commented that if weekly contact is required, then we need to have something structured in our course once a week, which is an academic freedom issue. Kerri commented further that without an agreement to have weekly contact, an instructor might not be as engaged. Carolyn commented that workload is an issue, but faculty should be encouraged to have frequent contact for pedagogical reasons. John shared that academic freedom is an Academic Senate issue, rather than an FA issue. Che shared that many students enjoy the contact with a faculty member through Canvas. Stephanie questioned if our discussion was really about definition (language). Kimberly described announcements as being individualized if it spoke to each (and all) of them. Weekly updates and email is very important. John suggested we strike the word "individualized", but Kurt argued that we might be opening the door to generalization.

Interaction doesn't need to be graded, it could just be a discussion. Kurt reminded the group that this issue is being driven by the federal government. Kerri commented that the document has been circulated across the campus. Brian asserted that if the online instructor must contact each person every week, this could be a lot of work, and some (or many) instructors might not be doing that right now.

Kerri further underscored that in the online educational world, individual contact distinguishes us from correspondence courses. "Presence" by the instructor, is what distinguishes online courses from correspondences. Jordan, first, and Rachelle, second, moved to adopt the document as written. The motion carried. John, Brian, and Matthew abstained. There was agreement that this topic brought up a lot of conversation.

Item #10 - evaluation of regular and substantive contact. Lene is at Educause this week. Kurt shared the reason this is on the agenda, is that the accreditor requires us to do this, and we will need to go into online courses to make sure that this happens. If accreditors do not see regular and effective contact, remediation would be required, which could include losing financial support (federal funding).

The task today is to identify what kind of structure we want to create. It will be reviewed in a year and a half, so we need to get going on this. We won't be meeting on October 31st, we will be meeting on November 7th. Other colleges have been audited on this. Kurt shared that we currently are being audited for accessibility by the federal government.

Kurt asked that if people do have ideas about the proposed structure, that they contact Kurt.

Plenary resolutions. Voltaire commented that on November 3rd- 5th, ASCCC will be meeting to discuss various resolutions. There are three resolutions on general education that impact our students. Foothill and De Anza usually get together to discuss these issues before plenary. Voltaire asked that senators share the resolutions packet. Voltaire also asked Senators to look through the packet carefully, and he (Voltaire) will vote based on the faculty recommendations.

Item #12 - **Closing the loop through integrated planning**. Jordan discussed a town hall meeting (on campus and through Zoom) Voltaiire shared the background to this issue, that in the past, program review required a significant amount of effort. In November, we'll be discussing this (proposed) process to see if this is the direction we want to go for Program Review.

Janie asked where she could find the information, and how many years back we should go in discussing things we have tried. She shared that after the program review meetings there were significant discussions that followed. Rachelle commented that our current program review process is either duplicative, or not much better than a checkbox process, and her department (Allied Health) already does significant reviews of their program, student success, etc.

Item #13 **Leadership team reports**

Leadership team reports - Jordan commented about MIP-C reports on enrollment, and that De Anza and Foothill would likely stay a 60/40 split, even though Foothill is smaller, that De Anza is also becoming a medium sized College. There was an update about gender neutral bathrooms.

Mission statement - how do we as Academic Senate approach the crafting of the mission statement. Kurt commented that he and Elaine participated in the MIP-C statement. There was a subgroup of the main governance groups in drafting something, then getting review and approval. And clarifying what we mean by mission statement. Mission value and statements, and values.

MIP-C Report

- Volunteers are needed for
    - A group to discuss how we deal with resource allocation
    - A building and grounds study group (not clear if this is just for the Foothill campus or Sunnyvale as well but Voltaire will find out).
- Tim Shively, David Marasco, and Kay Thornton will serve on the Chancellor Search Committee; DA has yet to appoint a faculty representative.
- If you have input on changing any of the fiscal processes on campus (e.g. how many people have to be involved to get a bill paid), let Voltaire know.

COOL will discuss Canvas certification and updating the distance education plan. Rachelle asked whether there could be different levels of Canvas certification (e.g. a lower level for faculty who teach F2F and only use Canvas in a limited way).

Announcements:

- John Fox: a new edition of the FACCC journal arrived in your email box, including an article by John and an excellent article about AB1705.

- Voltaire Villanueva: Elaine Kuo is leading the second Quality Focus Essay Town Hall on November 2, 12-1 pm, in the Administrative Conference Room and on Zoom; lunch will be provided for people attending in person.
- Jordan Fong: the Surf Club has been reactivated, and he is faculty adviser.

Art show, local artists about social inequity, thru mid-November

- Kerri Ryer: Global Experiential Learning just published new programs in London and Florence in 2023; let your students know.
- Donna Frankel: FACCC and the other unions will participate in a joint PT faculty conference tackling the “big things” on December 9th, 1-4 pm, on Zoom; Donna will provide a Zoom link.

We’ll talk about program review and evaluation of distance education at our next meeting on November 7th.

The meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m