Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Draft Notes

## January 14th 2018, 2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **NOTES** |
| 1. Call to Order
 | Escoto called meeting to order 2:01PM |
| 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)Natasha Mancuso (BSS)Micaela Agyare (Library)Amber La Piana (LA)David McCormick (LA)Hilary Gomes (FA/Comm)Jordan Fong (FA/Comm)Donna Frankel (PT rep 20’)Robert Cormia (PSME)Sara Cooper (BHS/FA Rep)Rita O’Loughlin (KA/Athletics)Don Mac Neil (KA/Athletics)Tracee Cunningham (Cnsl)**Liaisons Present**Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development)Kristy Lisle (Admin rep)**Senators Absent**Mimi Overton (SRC)David Marasco (PSME)**Liaisons Absent**Chelsea Nguyen (ASFC President)**Guests**: Lene Whitley-Putz, Dean of Online Learning |
| 1. Adoption of agenda
 | ***Approved by Consensus*** |
| 1. Public comment on items not on agenda (senate cannot discuss or take action)
 | **None** |
| 1. Approval of Minutes:
 | ASdraftminutes12-3-18Fix adjournment time (2:03PM) to 4:03PM**With correction, *Approved by Consensus*** |
| 1. Consent Calendar
 | **Consent Calendar:**-Honors Advisory Board Search Committee: David Marasco (PSME), Jordan Fong (FA)-Acting Dean of Fine Arts/Communication and Kinesiology Search Committee: Kay Thornton (FA), Dixie Macias (Kinesiology)**Committee Needs:** -Academic Senate: We need another part time rep!-Community and Communication: 1 faculty rep needed Note:Friday, January 18th – Advisory Council is meeting. At this time, President Nguyen is sharing out the entirety of the campus reorganization proposal.***Approved by Consensus*** |
| 1. Unfinished Business (10+1 area(s) indicated):
 |  |
| a. Annual Budget Request Form | AnnualStratBudgetPlanningForm Please request feedback from your constituents regarding this form.The form is an ongoing document and will be open to change in the future.Feedback: Rumor - If this form will replace the Annual Program Review form, we may then be in violation of accreditation requirements?Clarification: This form will *not* replace the overall Program Review process. This form is *not* the complete replacement for the Program Review process. Program Review, with a new and improved template, will take place every 5 years. This form is an Annual Strategic Budget Planning form that will help to inform the Program Review process. Question: What time of year will we be submitting this and who will be submitting this too?Answer: The Revenue and Resources committee to help answer these questions.Question: There will be a portion at the beginning of the form. What will this look like?Answer: The form will have a piece where programs can provide recent relevant updates related to previously submitted program reviews.Answer: This will be developed and brought back to the Senate for feedback.Motion: Approve the form as-is and change the form as needed for following years. We would like to use the form this year, with the goal of creating and putting forth a perfected form next year.**First: Kathryn Maurer****Second: Jordan Fong****Approved by Consensus** |
| b. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Tool | FacultyPrioritizationRubricBackground:**Lisle:**The College will be going out for 6 new full-time faculty positions this upcoming year (2019/2020), with the addition of a position funded by an innovation grant: Counseling Position in the MPS (Math Performance Success) ProgramThe College would like to start prioritizing positions to hire, and would like to have recommendations. Foothill College received State apportionment in July of 2018 to hire Full Time faculty in 2018/2019. The money arrived at a bit late to hire full-time faculty for the 2018/2019 year. This money was re-prioritized to hire part-time faculty and add additional class sections.For the 2019/2020 school year, we are attempting to plan for the State-allocated money for full-time faculty as soon as possible, so that we will be able to hire full-time faculty.Feedback: We need a space on this form for programs to note when there is a faculty hiring need as related to accreditation needs. In particular, CTE programs have staffing requirements specific to their accreditation body.Feedback: We need feedback from counseling and the library that is not represented on the form.Feedback: How is this going to be scored? If my division needs expensive equipment, does that mean we will be prioritized higher or lower? Are we more likely to get a hire if we are doing or not doing certain things?Clarification: The **Education and Equity committee** spent quite a bit of time addressing these concerns. Many specific changes to the template were proposed for this cycle, as well as more long-term changes.Immediate Changes requested:1) Order of the questions asked, and what these communicate about College values. If we are prioritizing money, we should make this clear at the beginning of the form.2) Move Question 9 to the first question (question regarding Equity).-Question 7, there needs to be a headcount instead of a percentage.3) What role will service learning and leadership play in prioritization? Clarification that it won’t be prioritized, but instead it was introduced to raise awareness.4) Question 5, we need to disaggregate between ethnicity and race.5) Honors should be housed under the Equity portion of the form. Honors should be here, but dual enrollment should not be part of the Equity section.6) Replace the word “targeted” with “disproportionately impacted student groups”7) Completion rates – degree? course? What does this mean?8) It appears priority will be given to departments that can shift more courses online. Is this a College value? Need more extensive research into equity gaps online before the Education and Equity Committee can endorse this as a College value.*In summary, words matters, order matters.***Lisle:** If we get almost 3 times more money for a dual enrollment student, if we can get more money for more certificates…my concern is that we want to avoid having a deep dive off a cliff when the funding formula goes into place. Face to face is tanking while online is staying stable. How do we balance these priorities with bringing in money? How can we consider how to balance these money-making strategies with our College values?Comment: The form needs to be more transparent. “A department will have higher priority if it has a higher percentage of dual enrollment” “If the Department does not teach Honors classes, the priority will be lower” “We need to focus on enrollment.” Lead with these statements. We need these explicitly stated to garner trust.Comment: We need to put a year on the form. 2019-2020. Put the year’s priorities on the form. Prioritize differently each year if necessary.Comment: If funding is a priority, perhaps have a section that states the department’s preferences. This section could then be compared to the College’s preferences and see were these two sections might match up.The Senate would like to invite David Ulate to share tools he/the district uses to plan for/manage enrollment goals/priorities. Comment: How is this going to be used and evaluated? Something that involves the faculty, rather the administration unit making priorities and then governance committees having a limited amount of time to offer input.Comment:If we take a month to decide on what to do with this form, it will seem to hurt our hiring for this year. Maybe we would need to entrust a small study group to make these changes.Comment:The Education and Equity committee did make specific recommendations that could provide the template for a study group’s changes.Comment:Create a rubric mock-up of how positions will be weighted. Let’s do this faster, we could do this online. Let’s try and take action on January 28th, at our next Senate meeting.Comment:Carolyn Holcroft will look at colleague feedback, and see what changes could/should be prioritized in order to make changes so as to use the rubric ASAP. Senate officers will also look at feedback given, and work with Carolyn and the Office of Instruction to create an updated rubric for action at the next senate meeting.  |
| 1. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated)
 |  |
| * 1. AP 4222 Remedial Coursework
 | AP4222RemedialCourseworkWe are in agreement that the word “Remedial” is not preferred, but it is language used in Title 5.This Administrative Procedure (AP) was created through the lens of AB705**Please share out with your constituents for feedback** |
| * 1. AP 4230 Grading and Academic Record Symbols
 | AP4230GradingandAcademicRecordSymbolsRegarding different versions of “W” into our grades, which the Senate approved for usage, last year.Explains the Military Withrdraw (MW), the Medical Withdraw (MW), and the Fail Withdraw (FW)**Please share out with your constituents for feedback** |
| * 1. BP 4230 Grading
 | BP4230 GradingRegarding the “Fail Withdraw”The “FW” assigns a grade point value.Note: The Military Withdraw (MW), and the Medical Withdraw (MW) do not have a grade point value.**Please share out with your constituents for feedback** |
| * 1. BP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates
 | BP4100GraduationRequirementsforDegreesandCertificatesBoard policies are broad, unlike administrative procedures, which are more specific. **Please share out with your constituents for feedback** |
| * 1. Textbook Cost Memo
 | TextBookCostMemoThe Advisory Council was tasked with how to help lower costs for students, specifically in regard to learning materials.Keep in mind…-Maintaining high standards for all course materials will remain a priority-Academic Freedom should be respected-The College purchasing large numbers of textbooks is not a viable long-term solution to reducing textbook costs-The Advisory Council will also request feedback from students and the Bookstore regarding how best to address the cost of course textbooks/materialsThe Advisory Council requests (by way of a memo) that the Academic Senate consider the following questions-Would faculty incentives (to develop/adopt lower cost options) be helpful in our endeavor to lower educational costs? If so, which incentives might work best?In order to make progress in these endeavors, would the Academic Senate support a timeline/bench marks for progress in reducing textbook/course materials costs?What concerns does the Academic Senate have about this initiative?Comment: In our online schedule of classes, we already note “no cost” and “low cost” classes (classes whose books are below $50)Comment:If there are more low-cost sections, maybe more students will come and stay? What would be the unintended outcomes of low-cost/no-cost course offerings?Comment:It is time-consuming to create a course that is no-cost and involves faculty curation of the course. Some recognition of that time needs to happen. PGA or funding.Comment:We need to clearly lay-out the options that faculty have in adopting no and low-cost educational resources. Besides the intensive effort of faculty course curation, what other options are there?Comment:If no-cost options are created, those courses also need to be ADA compliant, which is an additional non-readymade workload for faculty.Comment:The Library has an OER (Online Educational Resource) support page for faculty. How often is this used?*Mikaela Agyare (Lib) is the OER liaison to the state-wide Academic Senate (ASCCC)*Comment:These questions appear to be much bigger than the scope of the new Committee on Online Learning (COOL), as in these questions are geared towards face to face classes as well.Comment: If COOL could please take a look at the textbook cost memo, and provide feedback to the Senate regarding where/how they may be able to support these efforts.Comment: The Curriculum Committee is also a body that could discuss/support the Senate’s ask of responding to the textbook cost memo.Comment:We could work with publishers to reduce costs of educational materials, instead of completely doing away with textbooks.Next steps:-COOL discussions-Curriculum Committee discussions-Senate officers will see how best to work this into our upcoming agendas. |
| * 1. COOL Committee Proposal
 | ProposalToReviveCOOLLast meeting, we approved the idea of bringing the Committee On Online Learning (COOL) back.We now have a proposal to share out. COOL would again be a sub-committee of the Academic Senate.Before, COOL worked closely with the Distance Education Advisory governance Committee (DEAC). The DEAC no longer exists as an entity.COOL would ideally be looking for a representative from each Division and a representative from the Faculty Association (FA). ***Approved by Consensus*** |
| 1. Committee reports:
 | BookstoreWe need faculty who are familiar with or work closely with the Bookstore, with the goal of reducing costs. Bret Watson will be chairing this group.Email Bret Watson and CC Isaac Escoto with interested faculty names. |
| 1. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)
	1. Incident Report Form
	2. Senate Meeting Dates (additional date?)
 | <https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?FoothillCollege&layout_id=0>a. Maxient is the platform we use to report classroom incidents. The link above will take you to an “Incident Reporting Form” Training on how to use the report system/form (Maxient): January 23rd, 12pm-1pm in Room 6402. b. Last year, the Part Time Faculty appreciation event was a success. The event was off-campus and relatively inexpensive for the Senate. This year, our PT faculty representative, Donna Frankel, will look to repeat the event.c. Do we need an additional meeting to put forth final recommendations on budget reductions? We will revisit this need during our January 28th meeting.d. Smoking policy. We have made progress on containing smoking to certain areas in the parking lots. Increase in vaping. Perhaps create a risk assessment survey on vaping. Request to make this an Agenda Item.e. If students have questions regarding CSU and UC application updates, please forward student concerns to the transfer center or the counseling office. |
| 1. Adjournment
 | Meeting adjourned 4:02PM |