# Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
## Monday, October 26, 2015
## 2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

| ITEM | SPEAKER |
|---|---|
| **1. Call to Order** | Quorum present, Holcroft called meeting to order at 2:06PM |
| <u>Senators Present</u> – <br>Steve Batham (BSS) <br>Roseann Berg (PT rep '16) <br>Sara Cooper (BHS) <br>Cathy Denver (CNSL) <br>Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15) <br>Jordan Fong (F A) <br>Lauren Hickey (K A) <br>Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16) <br>Debbie Lee (PSME) <br>Kathryn Maurer (BSS) <br>David Marasco (PSME) <br>Richard Morasci (LA) <br>Patrick Morriss (AS Sec'y Treas '15) <br>Tobias Nava (CNSL) <br>Simon Pennington (F A) <br>Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15) <br>Gillian Schultz (BHS) <br>Mary Thomas (LRC) <br>Stephanie Tran (L A) <br><br><u>Liaisons Present</u> – <br>Meredith Heiser (Faculty Assoc) <br>Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet) <br>Breeze Liu (ASFC President) <br><br><u>Guests</u>: <br>David Ulate <br>Elaine Kuo <br>DeAnza Academic Senate Officers and Representatives <br><br><u>Senators Absent</u> <br>Rita O'Loughin (KA) <br><br><u>Liaisons Absent</u> <br>Kurt Hueg (Cabinet) <br>Allison Largent (Classified Senate) | |
| **2. Approval of Minutes** | Minutes of the October 12, 2015 meeting were approved by consent. |
| **3. Consent Calendar** | <u>Human Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC):</u> Nick Tuttle (Psyc) <br><u>Due Process Pool</u>: Fatima Jinnah <br><u>Program Review Committee</u>: Michelle Palma (Geog) <br><u>Hiring Committee</u> – "<u>Instructional Services Coordinator – Equity</u>": <br>    Carolyn Holcroft (Bio) <br><u>Basic Skills Workgroup</u>: Valerie Fong, Katie Ha, Voltaire Villanueva, <br>    Eric Reed, Sam White, Tilly Wu, Sara Munoz, Susie Huerta; <br>    (Teresa Zwack tri-chair) <br><u>Tenure Review Committee Service</u>: for Steve Batham (Hist) – <br>    Dolores Davison (Hist) replacing Konnilyn Feig (Hist) |

| | Approved by consent. |
|---|---|
| **4. Unfinished Business** | |
| a. SLO Committee Resolution | Senators commented that faculty resistance to another committee appeared to mute when it was understood that the SLO coordinators support this and want the committee.<br><br>One senator asked why this was just being brought forward now?  Why has nothing happened in the three years we've had divisional SLO coordinators, why have the coordinators not been fulfilling their duties?  Representatives of two other divisions indicated that their SLO coordinators have been assisting their divisions with the basics of SLOs.  Until now, the coordinators have been isolated; this resolution will provide them with some support. Has been difficult to organize professional development. Also noted that policies and procedures have to be established, and this resolution delegates the policy-recommendation authority to the SLO committee.<br><br>Motion to adopt the resolution (M Batham S Marasco). Approved by consent. |
| b. Canvas Implementation Timetable | Maurer corrected a characterization of the decision to make Spring 2016 the deadline for restricting LMS usage to Etudes and Canvas: that decision was made by administration, not COOL and not academic senate.<br><br>There are still at least two faculty members who see certain instructional functionalities of Moodle to be superior to either Etudes or Canvas.  They are in a conversation about migration, but neither Etudes nor Canvas currently allow the functionality they desire.<br><br>On the related topic of the divisional instructional standards for online and hybrid courses that are under development, Heiser asked that the documents be labeled "best practices" as opposed to "standards of practice" which could be construed as evaluative standards; she reminded that all evaluation criteria are subject to collective bargaining. (reference: http://www.foothill.edu/senate/resolutions/2014-15/SPRING_15/OnlineCourseStandardsADOPTED.pdf)<br><br>Clarification that the College Curriculum Committee recently discussed this very issue and explicitly chose to call them "standards of practice."  Heiser then expressed FA's desire for a footnote that these are not evaluative tools, perhaps with language like, "Our divisional colleagues have developed these expected standards of practice."<br><br>It was remarked that on Tenure Review Committees, the divisional standards will come up.  The difficulty of negotiating separate standards for each academic division was noted. |

| | | Returning to the topic of Canvas migration, question about what support faculty will have.  Is there a point of contact? Maurer responded for COOL: a migration tool is being developed, and there is also a Canvas users group, though it's not as robust as the Etudes users group.  There is also a Helpdesk, and our new instructional designer is available. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| | | One senator felt strongly supported locally by Judy Baker, but perceived transparency issues regarding the availability of Canvas support beyond our college. |
| | | Question asked about the term of our contract with Canvas and whether there is danger that we will change CMS again. Holcroft responded that per past discussions with Judy Baker, organizations typically review their CMS periodically on an approximately 3 to 5-year cycle. We should have a campus-wide discussion of our LMS regularly and if the LMS is not meeting our needs, we can and should change. |
| | | Motion to adopt the timetable (M Marasco, S Thomas). Approved by consent. |
| | c. District Academic Senate Description | Not addressed due to time constraints. Holcroft to re-agendize. |
| **5. New Business** | | |
| | a. Enrollment management data | David Ulate presented the enrollment management data that academic senate had requested last winter/spring re: the impact of implementing the new enrollment priorities in Fall 2014. |
| | | Two takeaways are 1) many students fail to take advantage of their enrollment priority by registering as soon as they're eligible, and 2) on average, students tended to "engage" the registration system earlier in the registration period after implementation. As a result, many students compete for classes with other students who had lower registration priority (although this may not be related to the changes in registration priority). |
| | | Senators raised many questions about the data presented.  It was not clear what it meant for a student to "engage" the registration system, nor was it clear why a fair number of students engaged the system at times when they were not yet eligible to register.  There were questions about the possible effect of payment timing: students who register early must pay early, too, and that may put some off. |
| | | Ulate presented data for two courses in particular, English 1A and Math 105.  One senator noted that looking at those classes is inappropriate to answer the academic senate's concerns, as there is little competition for seats in them.  The language arts division has promised to accommodate all students in need of English 1A, and the pre-collegiate Math |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 105 often has sections that do not completely fill until late in the registration process. The academic senate's concern is that by assigning part-time students lower registration priority, we make it more likely they'll be shut out of limited-offering classes, setting back their educational plans. It was also noted that our most underserved student populations are over-represented among our part-time students.<br><br>Ulate noted that DeAnza students tend to take more advantage of registration priority than Foothill students, suggesting a communication solution.<br><br>There is a move on the enrollment management committee to revisit enrollment priority in the coming year, possible to combine full- and part-time students at the same priority. Lety Serna represents the academic senate on that committee.<br><br>Senators asked to continue registration priorities discussion at our next meeting. |
| b. ASCCC Resolutions for Discussion at plenary session – joint meeting with De Anza | DeAnza academic senate joined the meeting. Mayra Cruz, (De Anza College Academic Senate President and FHDA District Academic Senate President,) led the discussion.<br><br>After introductions, Cruz asked the body to provide direction for the officers as they prepare to debate and vote on the resolutions for the Fall Plenary meeting of the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges. Cruz called for items of interest from the group. Four resolutions were identified for beginning the discussion:<br><br>13.03 Opposition to Compensation for Adoption of Open Educational Resources<br><br>From last week's Area B meeting came the news that the law itself seems to prohibit direct compenstion, so the resolution may be moot, though ASCCC President David Morse was not certain on this point. The resolution language is really about "adoption," not "development." Intent is to prohibit paying for adoption of previously curated resources, which requires much less effort than reviewing/curating/developing resources from scratch. The Textbook Affordability Act specifically prohibits directly paying faculty for adopting open ed resources, beyond providing professional development, but later authorizes reassigned time for adopting materials. The OEI Resources Council has already curated many materials, and is continuing to review and add more. The general consensus of the room was support for resolution 13.03.<br><br>9.10 Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher-Generated Course Materials |

| | |
|---|---|
| | There was really no opposition to the resolution (which asked for ASCCC to produce a paper about professional guidelines), but much interest in offering input for the paper. Noted that the ASCCC always solicits volunteers for service from the field via senate officers. If/when resolution is adopted and ASCCC calls for volunteers, Holcroft/Escoto will make sure to let faculty know.<br><br>10.01 Minimum Qualifications for Instruction of Upper Division Courses at the California Community Colleges<br><br>The crux of this resolution is the second resolved proposing to eliminate the option of equivalency for teaching upper division courses, so that the minimum qualifications must be strictly adhered to.  Current equivalency procedures at both colleges call for collaboration between discipline faculty, academic senate officers, and administration.  The procedures work best when all parties understand the question in front of them.  One senator commented that if we have faith in our current equivalency procedures perhaps it is appropriate to allow equivalency for upper division.<br><br>It was noted that equivalency rules are inconsistently applied, and that there is much ambiguity in the term "professional experience," so that definitions are up to discipline faculty. Also pressure on discipline faculty to approve requests. DeAnza Automotive Program Director Randy Bryant (who proposed to pilot a baccalaureate degree for De Anza) offered his opinion as a CTE program director that he does not think equivalency is appropriate, faculty must meet minimum qualifications.<br><br>The sense of the room was that we needed to hear from our CTE faculty, and senators were asked to solicit their feedback on this resolution by Friday, October 30.<br><br>9.09 Revisit the Title 5 Definition of the Credit Hour<br><br>The group asked for clarification about the intent of the resolution:  this resolution calls for ASCCC to work with the chancellor's office to determine whether title 5 changes are necessary to realign California's definition and/or applications of the credit hour with that of the U.S. Department of Education. There was no opposition to the resolution. |
| c.   De Anza resolution re: Modes of Instruction | Setziol/Cruz withdrew the resolution from consideration. (Moot) |
| 6.   Committee reports | The reports were distributed with the agenda. |
| 7.   Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take actions) | General/ Public<br>None |
| 8.   Adjournment | Meeting concluded at 4:03pm without formal adjournment. |