

Academic Senate Approved Minutes February 13, 2023

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

Roll call (Cormia)

Voltaire Villanueva (President)	x
Jordan Fong (Executive Vice President)	x
Eric Kuehnl (Vice President of Curriculum)	online
Robert Cormia (Secretary/Treasurer)	x

APPR

Brian Murphy	absent
--------------	--------

BSS:

Mona Rawal	x
Sam Connell	x

CNSL:

Luis Carrillo	x
Tracee Cunningham	x

DRC/VRC:

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera	online
-------------------------	--------

FA/Comm

Ché Meneses	x
Kate Jordahl	online

HSH:

Rachelle Campbell	x
vacant	

KA:

Katy Ripp	online
Kelly Edwards	online

LA:

Stephanie Chan	x
Rocio Giraldez Betron	online

LRC:

Kimberly Escamilla	online
Mary Thomas	x

STEM:

Sara Cooper	x
Matthew Litrus	x

PT Reps:

Ellen Judd	x
Roxanne Cnudde	online

Other Members:

ASFC:

Skye Bridges	x
--------------	---

Classified:

Janie Garcia	online
--------------	--------

FacAssoc:

John Fox	x
----------	---

Prof. Dev.:

Carolyn Holcroft	online
------------------	--------

Chair of COOL:

Kerri Ryer	online
------------	--------

Dean of Equity:

Ajani Byrd	x
------------	---

President's Cabinet:

Kurt Hweg	x
-----------	---

Guests: David Marasco

Adoption of the agenda - motion to approve by Tracee Cunningham first, Stephanie Chan second, the agenda was adopted.

Public comment - Sam Connell asked that enrollment data be more up-to-date on the Foothill College website.

Approval of the minutes from February 6th with extensive edits by Carolyn Holcroft, motion to approve, Jordan Fong first, Tracee Cunningham second, the minutes approved.

Consent calendar - Roxanne Cnudde was added as the P/T representative replacing Donna Frankel, Kathy Armstrong replacing Rosa Nguyen on Kyle Taylor's tenure committee, a search hiring committee counseling (psych service), was added to renew the failed search from last year, and Robert Cormia and Sarah Williams were added as program review readers. A motion from Mary Thomas first, Rachelle Campbell second, the consent calendar was approved.

Regular business

Item #7 Academic integrity committee

Mary Thomas commented that a decade ago the honor code was rewritten, it became less punitive, and more “responsible” oriented. John Fox also commented on an Academic Integrity conference (meeting), and the College forums that were held then. Sam Connell commented on a brochure that was developed. The brochure is still there, but it is “ripe for editing”. David Marasco commented that the new policy doesn’t integrate the dean of students into the process until the “second strike”. There was a comment about the “first strike” being automatic. New reporting goes into Maxient. Kurt asserted that it’s the responsibility of the dean to follow through on reports of academic integrity. Sara commented that she’d love to hear from Catalina (acting dean) on policies and what happens if an academic integrity issue is reported. Some faculty may be concerned about reporting an issue, if nothing is done, or if it is too harsh. John Fox suggested Cormia should check in on the academic integrity statistics. Cormia quoted Bernadine Fong on Stanford Chat GPT statistics from fall quarter 2022. Skye commented that students in their majors might use a bot. For academic integrity, students would want to be involved. Voltaire commented on a goal of getting the Academic Integrity committee together by March 13th. Ellen shared that the structure of her classes might be vulnerable to cheating, how could she rework her assignments to be more “interesting, clever, etc.) John commented that when he teaches online, many more academic integrity violations. Rachelle commented that many Foothill students are ill prepared, and the need to really understand fundamentals. Ajani commented on the need to “know the why” of doing an assignment, and that leveraging tools like ChatGPT doesn’t enhance learning, how do we engage with an AI tool, or not, in an academic setting? What are the impacts of using this new technology?

Stephanie commented on the need to know how to respond to new (technological) challenges to integrity. Stephanie asked, what would be the scope and timeline of the committee? Voltaire included a link to the academic integrity committee’s charge from 10 years ago. Che suggested this is a great opportunity to lean into culturally responsive pedagogy and authentic assessment. He discussed questions he asks students, analysis, synthesis, forecasting, and reflection. What type of people are we wanting students to become? Che further commented that his grading time has been cut in half since going to an authentic assessment as he knows exactly what he wants the assessment to do. He also commented about repurposing classroom work. Sara commented on the dilemma that students face, not having the time to do the classroom work that they know they need to do to succeed in class.

Mary Thomas shared that the library is working on a new guide to ChatGPT. Kate Jordahl shared that we (faculty) may have a difficult time knowing what an appropriate and inappropriate use is of (AI and other technology). Che suggested that breaking down silos in our thinking might help students identify the interdisciplinary connections between and among their courses. Skye shared the importance of using education as part of a lifelong value investment, and Ajani about the problematic use of grades as a single measure of student learning outcomes.

Item #8 election committee update

Mary Thomas shared there are three positions open, executive VP, VP of curriculum committee, and one of the part-time positions. VP positions come with release time, PT position comes with a stipend. Nominations due by March 10th, at the next meeting an outside observer. There was a comment about the need for headshots, in addition to campaign statements. There were comments about bias and headshots, and that campaign statements are much more important. John shared that we should have open forums for candidates and positions. Mary shared that if there are contested elections, there will be candidate forums the week of May 8th.

Item 9 - guidelines for acknowledgment (messaging) of off campus events

John Fox asked for education (guidance) on this issue. Collegewide messaging - when or not do we share (or not) our feelings and emotions, guidance, reactions. A question was asked, when do we share, i.e. what type of event and impact? College presidents and spokespeople generally speak out to their campus communities. Ajani commented on when and what College presidents speak out on an issue. Messages to console, versus messages for awareness. Ajani shared that this discussion was about “frames” of the discussion. Is it a compassion notice? Che commented on the news industry struggling on the issue of “agenda setting”, the importance of reflecting on the values and purpose of an organization and aligning them with the cultures and values of an institution. Ellen commented that it’s part of a College president’s job.

Item 10 - course stacking

Ellen brought up the topic of course stacking, teaching students at three different levels in a common subject as the enrollment is poor. For 10+1 falls under curriculum, as far as MOU, it falls under FA. There were comments on numbers (3,4,5, and 6) and there needs to be mutual agreement with the instructor. Spanish 4,5 and 6 can be stacked. There were questions about the curriculum and pedagogy of a stacked course. There were comments about workload issues and pedagogical issues. John Fox said that he will share the MOU with Cormia, link into the minutes. There was a comment involving stacking and the MOU that courses need to be approved and indicated in the MOU. Rachelle commented about “stacking” in K12 (elementary school) but had co-teachers. Focus on learning, is it harming the student? Kathryn Mauer talked about the importance of stacked courses being pedagogically appropriate, and separately, that in field schools, classes are often stacked, and to try to avoid rigid rules. Sam commented that honors classes are often stacked. Eric commented that some music courses are stacked, but these only include asynchronous online. There was a comment about De Anza stacking a language course, but it was discovered by a private university, and it caused some problems. There are curriculum issues and transferability, but these are tied to enrollment. Ellen commented that there are also some compensation issues involved in stacking classes, including workload, and the student experience. David asked if we could get all of these MOUs, which are not formally part of the FA contract, on a website so it’s transparent and available? We will bring this issue back to our constituents.

Item #11 Equity in the course outline of record

Eric spoke about issues that have come up with Equity and title V updates. Is this guide going to be used to update a Course Outline of Record (COR). Will this be required or endorsed, based on “equitableness”, and do faculty have the freedom to update the COR, through multiple perspectives, including an equity lens? Voltaire commented that in 1355, the Academic Senate did have responsibilities (authority) in this area, and is this something that we want to enforce? Voltaire commented on the importance of Title V. Jordan shared that over the summer a campus meeting discussed that we would update all our CORs, over a period of 5 years, through an equity lens. Jordan quoted from the minutes of that meeting. Eric asked, who reviews, and potentially rejects COR title V updates, based on an equity lens. The question: are we asking division curriculum reps to reject title V updates, if they sufficiently address equity. Kurt commented on the division system for curriculum to provide a higher degree of expertise. Now we’re asking these reps to address equity issues within a discipline for very specific classes. Eric asked people to consider the complexity of what we’re asking division curriculum reps to do, who reviews, and potentially rejects them, because they didn’t sufficiently address. Voltaire commented that this is very transformational work, these conversations aren’t happening everywhere. Rachell commented that curriculum reps don’t approve anything, divisions do. Rachelle suggested that divisions have a process for equity interpretation. David commented on the needs to support curriculum reps with “training” and other resources as needed. Carolyn shared this was an important topic to bring to the Academic Senate, and that it’s a lot of work. Right now, evaluating curriculum through an equity lens might not be well understood (by all faculty) but that training can be provided. Voltaire agreed, and Eric commented that what we’re sharing, in this discussion, is common sense, but at some point it gets down to the mechanical process, and that’s where issues might arise. Twenty percent of the catalog is updated every year, and that’s a huge job, often using a checklist, e.g., currency of the textbook, and moving to an equity conscious (effective) curriculum will be even harder. Ellen commented that this sounds like something we’re going to pay people to do. Eric (subtly) hinted this might require having a subcommittee of curriculum to get this (equity) work done. And there’s nothing in place to really do this work now. This is a transformative shift, and shouldn’t fall on a small number of faculty, we all own this curriculum, are we committed to equity? Carolyn commented on having something like PGA to help out.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m. Next meeting is in two weeks.