

Foothill/De Anza Academic Senate Meeting Draft Notes
October 29th 2018, 2:00 P.M., Foothill Campus, Toyon Room 2020

ITEM	Attachments
1. Call to Order	Escoto called meeting to order 2:13PM
2. Roll Call	<p><u>Senators Present</u> Isaac Escoto (AS President) Katherine Schaefer (AS Secretary/Treasurer) Tracee Cunningham (CNSL) Voltaire Villanueva (CNSL) Kathryn Maurer (BSS) Micaela Agyare (Library) Amber La Piana (LA) Hilary Gomes (FA/Comm) Jordon Fong (FA/Comm) Donna Frankel (PT rep) Robert Cormia (PSME) David Marasco (PSME_ Sara Cooper (BHS/FA rep) Mimi Overton (SRC)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Present</u> Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development)</p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u> Natasha Mancuso (BSS) Rita O'Loughlin (KA/Athletics) Dixie Macias (KA/Athletics) David McCormic (LA) Ben Armerding (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-Chair)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u> Kristy Lisle (VP Instruction/Institutional Research)</p> <p><u>Guests</u> Ron Painter</p>
3. Adoption of agenda	Adopted by consensus
4. Public comment on items not on agenda (senate cannot discuss or take action)	None
5. Approval of Minutes:	<i>DeAnza Senate not at quorum, their minutes will be approved during their next senate meeting.</i>
6. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated)	

a. Fall 2018
Plenary
Resolutions

ResolutionsPacket-F18-Thursday-final

Both Senates discussed various resolutions in the Fall 2018 resolutions packet, in order to inform officers of the Foothill and DeAnza Senates on how to vote during the state-wide Plenary session held this upcoming weekend (Nov 1-3 2018)

***17.01**

***1.01**

***7.01**

***9.01**

***9.03**

***8.01**

***9.04**

***1.01**

1.01 F18 Academic Senate for the California Online Community College

“Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert to the California Community Colleges Board of Governors and the California Online Community College District Board of Trustees that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the academic senate of the California Online Community College until such a time that faculty of the California Online Community College establishes an academic senate. “

This resolution clarifies the stance that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will still undertake the responsibility for being the representative body for the new fully online California Community College.

Last year, ASCCC formally opposed the creation of a new fully online community college, proposed by the Governor and supported by our Chancellor.

Comment: We should add info to the resolution that states, even though we opposed its creation, we still hold a responsibility to support the faculty of this new online College. Maybe add it to the first Whereas?

Voting in support of this amendment, ideally with an amendment, but still voting in support if the amendment does not go through.

***7.01**

7.01 F18 Redefine the Faculty Obligation Number to Include Noncredit Faculty

“Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, the Community College League of California, faculty union leadership, and other interested parties to redefine the Faculty Obligation Number in a way that includes noncredit faculty and that more effectively encourages and promotes the hiring of full-time faculty in order to make progress toward the legislative goal of 75% full-time faculty instruction.”

The BOG (California Community College Board of Governors) and the Chancellor’s Office establishes a minimum number of full time faculty (as

opposed to part time faculty) that are employed at the College, there is also an ideal number. That 75% of the faculty are full time is the ideal number.

This percentage of the faculty numbers that are full time is called the “FON” (Full Time Faculty Obligation number)

Comment: Non-credit faculty are not typically counted toward the FON. If non-credit faculty *are* counted in to the FON, then there may also be more incentive to hire more full time faculty in non credit programs.

Comment: Do we support non-credit faculty included in the FON? What would be the consequences of this?

Comment: There are issues regarding pay parity in teaching credit vs non-credit courses for a full time faculty member that would like to teach non credit courses as an overload.

Comment: This may not directly lead to hiring or not hiring, but it is opening a door to our body that we would support full time faculty teaching non-credit courses to be counted towards the FON.

Comment: If faculty teaching non-credit courses are counted, many of our (at Foothill/DeAnza) faculty teaching the non-credit courses are part time. If we support this resolution, we may get financially dinged, as the part time faculty would count against the FON.

Comment: We want to support student need by having more full time faculty, but what would this do to our district financially?

We need more information from our District finance office, before we can make a fully informed decision on how to vote. If this resolution would significantly negatively impact us, we would probably vote this down. Regardless, both Senate executive committees will be kept in the loop.

***8.01**

8.01 F18 Using Multiple Measures in addition to High School Grade Point Average for Student Assessment and Placement Practices

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that local academic senates work with their discipline and counseling faculty when determining multiple measures and consider that those multiple measures consist of more than high school grade point average for student assessment and placement.

8.01.01 F18 Amend Resolution 8.01 Amend the Resolved: Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that local academic senates work with their discipline faculty, and counseling faculty, and other appropriate faculty when determining multiple measures and consider that those multiple measures consist of more than high school grade point average for student assessment and placement.

Comment: There has been critique that the “multiple measures” of assessing student placement still relies primarily on high school GPA.

Comment: With AB705, assessment tests that Colleges have been using in the past are not being supported by the Chancellor's office as legitimate. Due to this situation, "multiple measures" for assessing students now falls primarily to looking at high school GPA.

Comment: The inclusion of counseling faculty is important to make these decisions. Encourage trusting counseling faculty in helping to guide these decisions.

Agreement to approve with an amendment to include institutional research. Also approve this resolution if amendment fails.

***9.01**

9.01 F18 Degree and Certificate Awards in Response to the New Funding Formula

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to support the efforts of colleges to best meet the educational goals of students in both awarding associate degrees and, when appropriate, guiding students through transfer preparation when the University of California or California State University does not require an associate degree;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to provide guidance to colleges for awarding multiple degrees or certificates to a single student; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to advise local academic senates and curriculum committees about the effects on financial aid when auto-awarding degrees and certificates.

Comment: Much discussion at our Area B meeting. Do we automatically award a degree to a student if they meet qualifications? Would there be negative affects to students if we do this? We should pull back and discuss this before do an automatic award.

Comment: If a student garners many automatic degrees, this situation may cheapen the degrees we give.

Comment: This resolution is in response to the new funding formula from the Governor's office.

Comment: Auto-awarding a degree might jeopardize a student's financial aid.

Agreement to support the resolution.

***9.03**

9.03 F18 Local Adoption of the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative Course Design Rubric

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates, through their curriculum committees and online education committees, to adopt the CVC – OEI Course Design Rubric for local use and explore the development of local peer online course review.

9.03.01 F18 Amend Resolution 9.03

Amend the Resolved: Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates, through their curriculum committees and online education committees, to adopt the CVC – OEI Course Design Rubric for local use ~~and explore the development of local peer online course review.~~; and

Add a second Resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to explore the development of local peer online course review.

Comment: The former Foothill COOL committee (Committee on Online Learning) had discussed that the rubric from the OEI (Online Education Initiative) is a pretty high standard. At Foothill, we developed divisional recommendation standards that were not as rigorous as the OEI rubric, but were set up as a frame/stepping stone, to eventually get to the quality of the OEI rubric. There would need to be additional support structures for our classes to attain the level that the OEI is laying out.

Comment: If this passes, we could have our local Senates discuss how our respective faculty feel. Eventually, this would need to go to the Union if faculty are to be evaluated based on the OEI rubric. The Union may need to be involved sooner rather than later.

Comment: Whatever we decide for online faculty, we should also encourage the same measures be followed for face to face classes.

***Move to vote the amendment through as-is, without splitting out the amendment, Maurer
Seconded by Marasco
Approved by consensus
If the amendment does succeed, we would still vote the resolution through***

***9.04**

9.04 F18 Flexibility in Local Curriculum Submission Deadlines as Related to the Implementation of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017)

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local curriculum committees to be flexible with curriculum submission deadlines; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to work with their administrations and governing boards to be flexible with catalog and scheduling deadlines.

9.04.01 F18 Amend Resolution 9.04 Amend the Resolveds:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local curriculum committees to be flexible with curriculum submission deadlines within the constraints dictated by regulations and accreditation standards in order to comply with AB 705 (Irwin, 2017); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to work with their administrations and governing boards to provide adequate resources to support to be flexible with catalog and scheduling deadlines.

Comment: Asking for flexibility on timeline in rolling out changes requested by AB 705.

Comment: The amendment adds to make sure we are applying for accreditation. The second resolved in the amendment asks for resources.

Comment: We need to look at process and look to speed it up and look for resources.

***Motion to vote through this Resolution and both amendments by Marasco
Seconded by Cooper
Approved by consensus***

***17.01**

17.01 F18 Guided Pathways, Strategic Enrollment Management, and Program Planning

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to review the faculty representation on enrollment management committees to ensure broad representation, program expertise, and general education expertise; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper Enrollment Management Revisited (2009) in light of the new Student Centered Funding Formula, guided pathways, and the implementation of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) and bring the updated paper to the Spring 2020 Plenary Session for adoption.

Comment: Where is the controversy? This seems to support the notion of agency for faculty.

Comment: Wording in the first resolved – Is enrollment management under the purview of Academic Senates?

Comment: Yes, appointing faculty to enrollment management committees falls under faculty purview. At Foothill College, we'll look into how best to help faculty feel more included in enrollment management/class scheduling efforts.

Comment: We should also look into having a district wide enrollment management committee.

General sense of approval for this resolution.

Other resolutions

Comment: Strongly support **15.01**

15.01 F18 Support for University of California Associate Degrees for Transfer in Physics and Chemistry

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the University of California Academic Senate (UCAS) to offer by fall 2019 UC Associate Degrees for Transfer in Physics and Chemistry.

Comment: Any strong opinions on **18.01**?

18.01 F18 Guided Self-Placement

	<p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges make available to colleges guided self-placement strategies, including a variety of options that support the success of California community college students; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to implement policies that give all students access to the local guided self placement process.</p> <p>Comment: General sense of counseling faculty in support of this resolution. Offers support for discussion.</p>
7. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)	
8. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned 3:58PM