Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 23, 2015
2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

Call to Order	
The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.	
1. Roll Call	
Present: Steve Batham (BSS), Rosann Berg (PT rep '16), Robert Cormia (AS Secretary Treasurer '15), Lisa Drake (BSS); Isaac Escoto (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-chair '15); Meredith Heiser (Faculty Association Liaison), Lauren Hickey (K A), Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16), Kate Jordahl (F A), Andrew LaManque (Administrative Liaison), Scott Lankford (L A); Debbie Lee (PSME), Don MacNeil (K A), David Marasco (PSME), Kimberlee Messina (Cabinet Liaison), Richard Morasci (LA), Tobias Nava (CNSL); Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15), David Sauter (BHS), Mary Thomas (LRC) **Guests**: Lety Serna (Counseling), Stephanie Tran (English). **Absent**: Craig Gawlick (Classified Liaison), Josh Rosales (ASFC President).	
2. Approval of Minutes: March 9, 2015	
Approved by consensus with corrections (Messina was present; last sentence in VP report should read "students also have the misperception that an ADT might guarantee their chance of getting accepted at a preferred campus.")	
3. Consent Calendar	**Action**

The following faculty appointments were approved by consensus:
    Hiring Committee **–** Instructional Services Coordinator: Isaac Escoto
    Hiring Committee – Tech Training Specialist: Simon Pennington (to replace Hilary Gomes)	

4. Unfinished Business	
a. Online Delivery Addendum Process	
• Second read of [resolution] on the "addendum to the Course Outline of Record course approval application for online/distance learning delivery." • Motion (Schaefers/Marasco) to adopt resolution was approved. • **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Kate will talk to Cori Nuñez about working with the webmaster to make the new form available and with Office of Instruction to create a space on the college website where these addenda are visible. Escoto to communicate with College Curriculum Committee.	
5. New Business	
a. Program Review Process (Morasci/Lankford)	

• Lankford reviewed the document he prepared, "[Senate Program Review Presentation]."
    o Highlighted Language Arts Division accomplishments of last ten years
    o Discussed disconnect between the hard work that faculty do and how it is measured by program review
    o Expressed LA faculty frustrations:
        ▪ Requests are refused for reassigned time for department coordinators and a seat count cap of 25 for basic skills (consistent with national standards). They are told, "Don't even ask." Several faculty from other divisions echoed this frustration of working hard on program review, but then having faculty and resource requests denied (also have been told "don't ask.")
        ▪ Since 2005 we've had four VPIs and four new PR processes;
        ▪ LA faculty perceive that the model has gone from collaborative/collegial to top-down.
 • Messina clarified that the current process, including the data-crunching, is required by accreditation and was created over the course of a year by faculty, staff, and administration;
    o The Integrated Planning & Budget task force can discuss at who should analyze data and write program review, but she believes the process has been effective in evaluating programs in a constructive and positive manner.
 • Heiser noted that regarding seat count, the District Load Task Force is addressing this.	

- Regarding reassigned time, OPC eliminated it during the budget crisis in order to save jobs; she recommends asking for reassigned time again now that money is coming back into the budget.
- Marasco conveyed the importance for program review to be written by faculty (rather than dean) in smaller departments like physics.
- LaManque commented he and Elaine Kuo have tried to help with data analysis, but agrees there needs to be more of that.
- Holcroft described a college that hired a researcher who focuses only on SLO's and provides support to the faculty throughout the process, has significantly increased faculty buy-in. Having designated research support for program review data might do the same for our PR process at Foothill.
- LaManque shared that the Program Review Committee is considering recommending having an open meeting where departments that have done a comprehensive program review can present it to the campus community
- Jordahl noted that filling out some of the forms seems like busy work; she wants faculty in her department to review their program, but wants it to be a meaningful process
- Morasci commented that timing is a problem; we're given the data in the middle of fall quarter, and program review is due before winter break.
  - Lee shared rationale for timeline: program reviews due in fall so deans can review during their winter break and submit their priorities to vice presidents early in winter; the VPs then send their ranked requests to OPC, which reviews them during the spring to make a decision by the end of the year.
  - LaManque offered that data could be supplied by the first day of fall quarter.
- The question was raised whether program review needs to be done every year.
  - LaManque explained that a comprehensive is due every three years, but the annual (which is a little shorter) has to be done every year because resource allocation has to be tied into program review.
- Shaeffers asked where the decision to reform the process would go?
  - Holcroft answered that PaRC ultimately makes recommendation to college president, but PaRC recommendation is based on discussions that occur in Academic and Classified Senates, and IP&B.
- Sauter commented that program review doesn't necessarily ask questions that are relevant for his department.
- Holcroft stressed the importance/power of program review in keeping the shared governance processes honest. The faculty senate and the administration have mutually agreed upon the program review process as the mechanism for program planning and resource allocation. These are the rules we've all agreed to play by.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Will agendize follow-up discussion for next senate meeting provided senators think about focus for discussion. What actions/recommendations do we want to make for the program review process? Email suggestions to Carolyn.

b. Enrollment Management and Equity (Holcroft, Marasco, Lee)

- Holcroft presented document prepared for discussion, "Enrollment Management Discussion"
- Concern that new (14-15) district priority registration policy re: prioritizing fulltime vs. part-time status, has adverse impacts on underserved students
- Lee shared concern that fulltime students have the luxury of "shopping" for courses, while part-time students, whose schedule might be tighter, might not find a course that meets their schedule. Marasco agreed, "This is not educational opportunity for all."
- Serna believes that the priorities cause part-time students to take fewer classes than they want because the class or time they needed wasn't available, or they may opt to go to another college or simply stop attending college.
- Acknowledged data that fulltime students more likely to succeed, and we want to incentivize this behavior. However, for many part-time students, it may not be financially possible to

become fulltime – i.e. it is not an attainable behavior just like being affluent is not an attainable behavior.

- o LaManque mentioned that part-time students may not realize that they're eligible for financial aid; Serna countered that financial aid may not enable everyone to become fulltime, and some students should not be fulltime for other reasons. Solution must provide equity and a chance for everyone to be successful.
- Morasci commented that international students are forced to be fulltime to maintain their student visas and thus take priority over resident part-time students. Messina pointed out that international students make up only 10% of the student population, so they're not chasing away resident students; she congratulated Morasci on developing noncredit ESL offered at Middlefield as a way to better serve resident students.
- LaManque clarified that continuing part-time students don't go all they way to the end of the line, they still have priority over new students
- LaManque noted the policy has already been implemented for Spring quarter and suggests that we review District-wide in the Fall, Messina concurred
  - o If problems are identified, could change enrollment priority policy effective Winter 2016.
  - o Holcroft inquired about possibility of collecting data now to use as benchmarks? Are we being as efficient as we could if we wait till Fall?
  - o He will relay concerns to David Ulate in District Institutional Research to investigate.
- Heiser noted that on the Registering for Classes website (http://www.foothill.edu/reg/register.php), the link "see a counselor" goes to an error page, needs to be corrected.
- Holcroft wondered if instead of FT status, there is a way to give priority to students who are following their ed plan
  - o Marasco noted if we give priority to students who are following their ed plan, we need to ensure that all students, e.g. night students, have access to counselors. May not be any more equitable.
  - o The behavior may also be problematic to track. Need to check about DegreeWorks capabilities.
  - o Escoto pointed out that ed plans are constantly being revised.
  - o Messina commented that currently there is no mechanism from DegreeWorks to project what students are planning to take to aid in scheduling classes.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** LaManque to communicate concerns to David Ulate in institutional research. Will request District Enrollment Priority Committee meet in Spring quarter for discussion and possibly begin to review data.

c. **Resolutions for ASCCC Plenary Meeting (Holcroft)**

- 9.0.2, alternative courses for math competency requirements: Lee likes it, but concern re: lack of mention calling for discussion with high schools about Common Core Standards. Will communicate offline with Holcroft about possible amendment
- 12.01, faculty recognition: Marasco suggests that we ignore it if it passes because we can't even fill our existing committees; senate expressed consensus with this suggestion
- 10.01, African American Studies disciplines list: Heiser and Batham support, no objection from Language Arts.
- 2.01, disaggregation of learning outcomes data: Marasco would like a stronger resolution on what seems like an unfunded mandate
- 14.01, "report delayed" grade: Academic Integrity Committee supports.
- 6.03, dual enrollment – No objections except Batham reported that at another college where he worked, high school students would get a bump in their high school grade (i.e. a C in the college class would become a B at the high school), so it was challenging to motivate them
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Holcroft/Escoto to bring to meeting with DA senate officers on April 6th

d. AB 968 (Williams): **Transcript notations (Holcroft)**

- AB 968 is before CA legistlature. Holcroft/Escoto want to hear feedback to inform possible discussion at Spring plenary session.
- The Academic Integrity Committee believes that as written it is too broad and vague to be helpful/effective.
  - Original intent was to prevent sexual predators moving from campus to campus, but this bill would not identify the reason for suspension or expulsion on the transcript. (I.e. would not distinguish violent vs. nonviolent offenses, etc.)
  - PSME supports it.
  - CNSL interested in preventing sexual violence, but this legislation wouldn't do that.
  - Concern about potential liability – what if we "knew" a student had that behavior coming in and we failed to act? What would we do about students who have a suspension/expulsion?
    - Marasco countered that when we deal with a student violation, it would be helpful to know the student's past history and commented that at Foothill the decision to expel a student is never for a minor violation.
    - Lee believes there should be a trail for other schools to follow; the bill should provide more clarity, but this is important for protecting faculty and students.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Holcroft/Escoto to consider this feedback if discussion/action proposed at Spring plenary

e. Faculty/Staff lounge for meditation area (Holcroft, Marasco)	

- BEST having difficulty finding a place for Muslim students to pray (Most colleges label this as a meditation space).
- At this point a leading idea is that we partition the faculty/staff lounge, which has reputation of being underutilized; some space would be kept as a lounge.
- Soundproofing needs to be part of discussion.
- Giving up part of the faculty lounge would show that we are a welcoming campus, especially given the large number of Muslim students on campus.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Senators to gather feedback, concerns and questions from constituents. Will be on next academic senate agenda for action.

f. Proposal for new committee reporting mechanism (Holcroft, Lankford)	

- Proposal to present committee reports in writing ahead of the meeting. Rationale:
  - Important for new business to take priority over committee reports. No need to spend extremely limited face-to-face time reporting information that could be quickly and easily read outside meeting. Also easier to distribute to constituents.
  - Holcroft stressed if a committee needs discussion and/or action for a particular issue a separate agenda item can always be created.
- Holcroft showed sample from VVC as an example
- Motion that committee reports be submitted in writing before each meeting (Sauter/Marasco) was approved.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Holcroft to create template and communicate with senate subcommittees.

6. Reports of Officers	**Information**
a. President's Report (Holcroft)	**Information / Discussion**

- Will be included as report out at next senate meeting.
- **FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED:** Officers to submit report for inclusion

b. Vice President's Report (Escoto)	**Information / Discussion**

- Will be included as report out at next senate meeting.

c. Sec/Treas. Report (Cormia)	**Information / Discussion**

- Will be included as report out at next senate meeting.

7. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take actions)	**Information**

a. Early Alert system demo April 9 before or after lunch (Starfish) – review email announcement

from Holcroft, share with constituents. If you don't provide feedback, you don't get to complain later! This system is dependent on faculty buy-in.

b. DRC new accommodations approval/ booking system: "Clockworks"
- Will launch April 1
- Training for faculty from 12-2PM on: April 9, 10, 16,17 (DRC - 5400)

c. FA: voted on salary on March 17th and 18th.
- 289 votes in favor, 3 opposed.
- 2.5% salary increase, retroactive to July 1, will be for ALL faculty (both full and part-time) and will appear in April or May paycheck.
- Additional step on the part-time faculty pay schedules and the parity increase (from 77.5 % of Appendix A to 83.5% of Appendix A) for true part-time faculty (not overloads) will be effective in Fall 2015. (Full-time overloads get the additional step).

- Next round of negotiations will focus on more parity for part-time faculty, a salary increase for faculty (both full and part time) to compensate for the increase in the STRS contribution, PAA increases (possibly tied to committee work.)

8. **Adjournment**			
The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.			