

Academic Senate Approved Minutes May 5th 2025

Krause Center for Innovation (KCI) room 4006

1. Call to Order and

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. by Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva.

2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken by Robert Cormia, and quorum was established. See below for attendance.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

A motion to adopt the agenda was made by Lynette Vega and seconded by Jennifer Sinclair.

- Outcome: The agenda was approved by consensus.

There were no changes to the agenda at the time of adoption.

4. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5. Approval of April 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes

The minutes were not approved. Several clarifications and corrections were requested:

- Item #12 (SLO discussion): A comment was attributed to Patrick Morriss that he did not make.
- Item #14 (Spring Plenary review): Patrick clarified that Voltaire had led that discussion, not him.
- Other corrections involved attribution of statements related to dual enrollment, catalog rights, compensation, and the numbering of resolutions.

Additional concerns were raised about the level of detail in the minutes. Some faculty felt the minutes were reading more like a verbatim transcript than a summary.

Voltaire Villanueva exercised his prerogative to table the minutes, with plans to bring a revised version back for Senate approval at the next meeting.

Item 6: ASFC President Updates to the Academic Senate

Paulo Verzosa, ASFC President, shared that 808 students participated in the faculty speaker nomination process for commencement. He thanked faculty who made time at the start of their classes for students to present the nomination opportunity, noting that this access helped increase participation.

Paulo explained that ASFC took a more intentional and equity-minded approach to the selection process this year. Students submitted dozens of nominations, with thoughtful reflections on faculty who had made a lasting impact on their academic and personal journeys.

7. Affirmation of 2025 Faculty Commencement Speaker

The Academic Senate reviewed the ASFC's top three student-selected nominations for the 2025 Faculty Commencement Speaker:

1. Suzy Quezada – English, Language Arts Division
2. Brian Evans – Economics, Business and Social Science Division (noted as a prior commencement speaker)
3. Samuel Connell – Anthropology, Business and Social Science Division

It was noted that this year's nominations reflected a broad cross-section of faculty, including representation from both part-time and full-time instructors. Senators commented on the diversity of the nominee pool, highlighting that a first-year faculty member appeared on the full nomination list, and that only one part-time faculty member was represented among the top three.

The Senate voted to affirm the ASFC's top three nominees, with a motion by Ben Kaupp and seconded by Patrick Morriss.

- Outcome: The nominee list was approved by consensus.
- Next step: ASFC will reach out to the top three candidates and coordinate with the selected faculty speaker for commencement.

8. Learning Outcomes Update – Course-Level SLOs and Draft Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

Allison Meezan, SLO Coordinator, provided a two-part update: first on the current process for updating Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course level, and then on the proposed Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) draft.

A. Course-Level SLO Revisions

Allison noted that Foothill College has a unique one-time opportunity to revise course-level SLOs without triggering a full-scale curriculum review through ACCJC. She emphasized that this process is being approached collaboratively and pragmatically, with department chairs reaching out to faculty to initiate local review of course SLOs.

There are currently an estimated 5,500 SLOs across the catalog. The recommendation is to aim for 2–4 SLOs per course, acknowledging that some courses will naturally have more or fewer. All active courses must have learning outcomes.

Meezan presented a four-step method to guide this update process:

1. Identify which courses need review.
2. Evaluate current SLOs for clarity and alignment.
3. Propose updates collaboratively within departments.
4. Submit revisions by June 30, 2025 for incorporation into the Canvas-based SLO workspace.

She noted that faculty should “do what works best for their department” when structuring these conversations. The initiative also includes a Canvas shell where faculty can review guidance and submit changes.

A question was raised about access to older SLO data. Meezan explained that while there was a TracDat archive “data dump”, it includes some deactivated courses, so additional review through CourseLeaf will be necessary to distinguish active versus inactive course records.

B. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) Draft

Meezan then presented the draft Institutional Learning Outcomes, developed over two years of campus-wide conversations (2022–2024). The draft currently includes the following:

1. Critical Thinking – Ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information in a variety of contexts.
2. Prepared to Thrive in the Global Workforce – Skills in collaboration, leadership, digital fluency, and communication.
3. Engage in a Life of Inquiry – Civic engagement, reflection, and lifelong learning.
4. Personal Responsibility (*proposed addition*) – Self-awareness, ethical behavior, and contribution to team success.

Faculty feedback highlighted both enthusiasm and concern about the proposed fourth outcome:

- Several comments noted that the first three ILOs emphasize outward-facing, socially embedded learning, while “personal responsibility” introduces a more individualized or moral framing.
- There was concern that “regulate emotions” (a phrase in the draft) could pathologize or misrepresent neurodivergent students. Faculty suggested replacing it with language around emotional intelligence or awareness.
- Others emphasized the value of collaborative responsibility—learning to contribute to group efforts and being accountable to others—as a more inclusive framing.
- Additional feedback included:
 - A request to include quantitative reasoning or computation within the ILOs.
 - Suggestions to clarify or remove phrases that imply privileged agency, especially where “personal responsibility” might not account for systemic barriers or limited choices.

Metaphors and imagery emerged in the discussion, with one comment likening students to plants needing the right soil, suggesting that responsibility should be understood in context, not in isolation.

Meezan welcomed the feedback and affirmed that the ILOs are still in draft form. They will return to the Senate for further discussion, refinement, and potential approval.

Voltaire Villanueva closed the item by asking about the timeline. Meezan confirmed that the goal is to incorporate feedback over the coming weeks and revisit the draft before the end of the quarter.

9. Bookstore Operations and Service Model Discussion – Presentation by Bret Watson

Bret Watson, Vice President of Business Services, joined the Academic Senate to provide an overview of ongoing efforts to evaluate and potentially revise the operational model of the Foothill College bookstore.

The current bookstore is operated through a contract with Follett, which is in place until 2026. Watson explained that the existing in-person model, while familiar, has raised concerns about efficiency, accessibility, and responsiveness—particularly in meeting student needs at the start of the quarter.

Key Discussion Points

- Watson presented three potential models for the bookstore's future:
 1. Continuing the traditional in-person model.
 2. Shifting to a hybrid model, where students order materials online and pick them up on campus.
 3. Exploring alternative uses for the physical bookstore space, potentially repurposing part of the footprint for student services or other campus needs.
- One of the proposed ideas involved a minimally staffed physical site to accommodate order pickups and occasional walk-in questions, while streamlining most operations online.
- Faculty expressed concern over ongoing logistical issues under the Follett system, including:
 - Books not being available in time for the start of the quarter.
 - Inadequate staffing to process and stock required materials.
 - Unclear or inconsistent ordering processes, resulting in student delays and faculty frustration.

- A specific example was shared via email and read aloud during the meeting, illustrating how students in one course were unable to access required materials, causing significant academic disruption.
 - Faculty emphasized the value of face-to-face service in the bookstore, particularly for first-time college students, students with financial aid complexities, or those with limited access to online tools.
 - It was also acknowledged that the current challenges were exacerbated by the pandemic, but that deeper issues around vendor accountability and operational responsiveness remain.
-

Questions and Next Steps

- Faculty asked whether any of the proposed models would improve the timeliness and accuracy of book availability.
- Questions were raised about Follett’s contractual obligations, the cost implications of exiting the agreement, and whether any alternate model would truly offer better service.

Watson acknowledged that while exiting the Follett contract might be possible, doing so could lead to unanticipated risks or limited alternatives. He emphasized the importance of collecting input from all campus constituencies and confirmed that he would also be presenting this information to the Classified Senate and other stakeholder groups.

The discussion concluded with an open invitation for faculty to share additional feedback or suggestions, especially regarding how the bookstore can better align with instructional needs and equitable student access.

10. General Education Course Approval Process – Presentation by Ben Kaupp

Ben Kaupp, Curriculum Chair, presented an overview of the updated General Education (GE) course approval process, focusing on revisions to the GE application forms and the related criteria mapping tools.

The updates are part of an effort to make the Course Outline of Record (COR) alignment with GE standards more transparent and functional. Kaupp emphasized that while the GE area designations themselves cannot be changed, departments are responsible for demonstrating how their courses meet the criteria for those designated areas.

Key Elements of the Presentation

- Kaupp displayed the revised GE application forms, which now include:
 - Depth criteria – designed to help departments articulate how a course goes beyond surface-level exposure to the subject matter.
 - Breadth mapping – a section requiring courses to show how they engage with interdisciplinary thinking or connect to broader contexts.
 - Instructions for mapping content – to guide departments in aligning course content with GE expectations clearly and effectively.
- He noted that the new forms are now live, and faculty input is essential to ensure the system works well across disciplines.

Timeline and Faculty Involvement

- Kaupp stated that the deadline for departments to submit revised GE materials is the end of Fall 2025, allowing time for thoughtful departmental conversations and review.
- A key point raised during discussion was the need for subject-matter experts—discipline faculty—to take the lead in evaluating how courses meet GE standards.
- It was also emphasized that cross-disciplinary collaboration will be required to review applications, with both content-area faculty and broader curriculum representatives participating in the process.
- During discussion, concern was expressed that some GE responsibilities are currently being managed by adjunct faculty, which ideally should fall under the purview of full-time faculty due to the institutional importance of GE approvals and contractual workload equity.

Kaupp invited faculty to review the forms, provide feedback, and help pilot the new process, reinforcing that the Curriculum Committee is eager to make this a collaborative effort.

11. Program Viability and Sustainability Review – First Read and Discussion

The Academic Senate conducted a first read and open discussion of the Program Sustainability Review (PSR) draft framework, which outlines a formal process for assessing and responding to academic program viability, revitalization, or discontinuance.

Background and Purpose

Senate President Voltaire Villanueva introduced the item, emphasizing that program viability is squarely within the Senate's 10+1 purview and must remain faculty-driven. There was shared recognition that in recent years, aspects of this work had drifted outside of formal shared governance channels. The development of a structured PSR process is intended to reassert faculty leadership and transparency in these decisions.

Overview of the Draft PSR Framework

The draft document outlines a multi-phase process, including:

- Initial indicators that may trigger a PSR, such as prolonged enrollment declines, reduced completion rates, or loss of regional demand.
- Formation of a PSR team, which would include:
 - Two faculty members (one from the affected division)
 - Classified staff
 - The division dean
 - Program faculty and staff
 - A representative from the Planning and Resource Team (PRT)

The role of the PSR team is to:

- Conduct a comprehensive review using both quantitative and qualitative data
- Make recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding the program's future
- Support the development of a revitalization plan if applicable

Revitalization Process and Timelines

The proposed timeline includes:

- 90 days for initial assessment and team findings

- An 18-month revitalization window, if recommended, during which the program would implement changes aimed at restoring sustainability
- If revitalization fails, a teach-out plan would be developed in collaboration with stakeholders, ensuring that current students are supported through program completion

Senate Discussion

Faculty expressed support for the creation of a transparent and structured framework, noting that program viability discussions have long lacked consistency and clarity. Many agreed this framework addresses a longstanding need and provides appropriate safeguards for faculty, students, and programs.

Discussion also included:

- Suggestions to refine language and expectations in the draft document
- Questions about how interdisciplinary programs would be evaluated under the framework
- Emphasis on the need to center equity in all stages of the review, especially when assessing program relevance to underserved student populations

Senators were encouraged to review the draft document and share it with colleagues for broader feedback. The goal is to revise the framework with input from across campus and bring it back to the Senate for second read and approval in a future meeting.

Item #12 Faculty Association Update – Professional Achievement Awards (PAA) and Administrative Reclassification Discussion

Kathy Perino from the Faculty Association provided an update on ongoing negotiations between FA and the District, with a particular focus on Professional Achievement Awards (PAA) and efforts to restructure how these awards impact salary placement and retirement benefits.

Revisiting the PAA Structure for STRS Compliance

Perino explained that one of the key negotiation goals is to integrate PAA into the full-time faculty salary schedule, ensuring that it contributes to STRS retirement calculations. Under the current system, faculty earn 9 units of professional growth (PGA) every four years to move across salary columns, but PAA units are tracked and compensated separately.

The revised approach aims to:

1. Prevent any faculty from earning less under the new structure
2. Ensure professional contributions are more evenly distributed
3. Simplify the process for tracking and reporting
4. Create a more transparent and equitable system for faculty advancement

Faculty expressed interest in how the transition would affect those currently in the middle of a salary column, and whether their prior work would be counted retroactively. Perino acknowledged that the goal is to honor existing contributions while transitioning into a more sustainable model.

Professional Responsibilities and Evaluations

Perino also described a proposed framework that categorizes professional responsibilities into four broad activity types, reflecting a shift toward 21st-century faculty work. This includes both traditional PGA activities and newer forms of professional development and service that better reflect today's teaching and institutional needs.

She clarified that this work aligns with California Education Code, which outlines expectations for peer, administrative, and student evaluation in determining professional engagement. Compensation and potential release time for certain types of responsibilities were raised during the discussion.

Faculty posed questions about:

- Backtracking previous work to align with new requirements
- The applicability of the new system to adjunct faculty (Perino clarified this current effort is for full-time faculty only)
- How the documentation process would be managed moving forward

There is hope that the revised framework will be finalized and prepared for faculty ratification by the end of spring quarter.

Reclassification of Administrative Position

During the latter part of the discussion, faculty raised questions regarding the reclassification of an Associate Vice President of Workforce position to a full Vice President-level position.

Questions centered on:

- The process and rationale for the promotion
- The source of funding for the expanded role
- Whether the decision had implications for shared governance or budget transparency

It was noted that this change was listed in the Board of Trustees agenda, confirming that the information was publicly available. However, faculty emphasized the importance of understanding such changes in the context of broader institutional planning and budget priorities.

13. Committee Reports

- Committee reports were postponed and will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

14. Announcements for the Good of the Order

- The application window for the SLO Coordinator position is closing soon; faculty were encouraged to apply or share the opportunity with colleagues.
- Faculty were reminded about the Cupertino City Council meeting taking place on Tuesday, which will include discussion on Foothill's student housing project. Concerns were raised about a local ballot measure aimed at blocking the apartment purchase proposed for student housing.
- David Marasco shared that the Foothill Physics Show performed at Hartnell College, continuing its outreach to students from Title I schools.
- Brian Evans will be leading an upcoming Global Consciousness and Leadership event, encouraging faculty to promote student attendance and engagement.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

The next Academic Senate meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 19, 2025.

Position	Executive Committee	
Apprenticeship	Nate Vennarucci	Zoom
Apprenticeship	Stephan Schnell	absent
BSS	Mona Rawal	Zoom
BSS	Kerri Ryer	absent
Counseling	Fatima Jinnah	absent
Counseling	Tracee Cunningham	4006
DRC/VRC	Ana Maravilla	absent
FAC	Eric Kuehnl	4006
FAC	Hilary Gomes	4006
HSH	Lydia Daniel	absent
HSH	Brenda Hanning	4006
KIN	Don Mac Neil	Zoom
KIN	Rita O'Laughlin	Zoom
LA	Stephanie Chan	4006
LA	Amber La Piana	4006
LRC	Katie Ha	4006
LRC	Destiny Rivera	4006
STEM	Jennifer Sinclair	4006
STEM	Ryan Pugh	4006
FA Rep	Julie Jenkins	4006
Ensuring Learning Coordinator	Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
Faculty Chair Teaching with technology	Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
24-26 Part Time Faculty Rep	Lynette Vega	4006
23-25 Part Time Faculty Rep	Michael Chang	4006
ASFC Rep	Paulo Verzosa	4006
Classified Senate Rep	Doreen Finkelstein	4006
Professional Development Coordinator	Carolyn Holcroft	Absent
Faculty Serving Other Roles	Evan Gilstrap	4006
Dean of Equity	Ajani Byrd	Zoom
President's Cabinet	Stacy Gleixner	4006
Secretary/Treasurer	Robert Cormia	4006
Executive Vice President	Patrick Morriss	4006
Vice President of Curriculum	Ben Kaupp	4006
President	Voltaire Villanueva	4006
Senator Emeritus	David Marasco	4006

