Foothill College Academic Senate Minutes

## Februrary 4th 2019, 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)  Micaela Agyare (Library)  Hilary Gomes (FA/Comm)  Jordan Fong (FA/Comm)  Donna Frankel (PT rep 20’)  Robert Cormia (PSME)  Sara Cooper (BHS/FA Rep)  Tracee Cunningham (Cnsl)  Mimi Overton (SRC)  David Marasco (PSME)  Mary Anne Sunseri (PT rep for Winter/Spring 19’)  Amber La Piana (LA)  Rita O’Loughlin (KA/Athletics)  Don Mac Neil (KA/Athletics)  Natasha Mancuso (BSS)  **Liaisons Present**  Kristy Lisle (Admin rep)  Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development)  **Senators Absent**  David McCormick (LA)  **Liaisons Absent**  Chelsey Nguyen (ASFC President)  **Guests**:  Jennifer Sinclaire, PSME  Che Meneses, Fine Arts & Communication  Preston Ni, Fine Arts & Communication |
| 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: | ASdraftminutes1-28-18  Approved by Consensus |
| 1. Consent Calendar | Revenue and Resources Committee: Cheyanne Cortez (FA) (Part Time Rep)  Accounting Search Committee: Lisa Drake, Sara Seyedin, Tiffany Rideaux, Nick Tuttle.  Stephanie Chan TRC changes: Brian Lewis to replace Jordanna Finnegan (PDL) on Spring 19, then Jordanna will come back Fall 19, but Brian will then replace Allison Herman (PDL) for Fall 19.  Acting Dean of Fine Arts Communication Kinesiology and Athletics Search Committee: Don Mac Neil (KA)  **Approved by Consensus**  \*Communications Committee  Still need a faculty rep for the Communications Committee!  \* Marketing Supervisor  Faculty member needed! We need a faculty member (needs to have completed EO training) on this hiring committee. |
| 1. Unfinished Business (10+1 area(s) indicated): |  |
| a. Budget Reduction/Reorg Proposal | Budget\_Reorg\_Presentation\_Council - 1-18(1)  Escoto  This Friday, 2/8/19, the Advisory Council is being asked to vote on the College Reorganization plan.  Faculty feedback has consistently focused on wanting to be involved earlier on in the planning process for budget reduction/reorganization decisions. Faculty would like to be involved in collectively (alongside administration) in creating options to address budget reduction.  As of last Friday, a memo from the president’s office presented options for how to address the proposed classified staff position reduction portion of the budget reduction plan. The Senate officers had also created a list of options based on majority of feedback received on the budget reduction proposal, so as to provide guidance for today’s discussion, as well as to best advise President Nguyen, as well as provide guidance for faculty appointed to the Advisory Council.  For reference, these are the options referenced in the following discussion:  **PRESIDENTIAL MEMO**  **Option 1:** Eliminate Division Assistant Positions  • Accept reductions as proposed with current division employees going into their new roles starting July 1, 2019.  • In the meantime, Instructional Deans continue to work in division offices (part-time or full-time as recommended by study group)  • Revenue & Resources Committee (in conjunction with Community and Communication Committee) establish a joint study group: constituting faculty (full-time and part-time) representatives from the Instructional Divisions, classified professionals, and administrators to develop (preferably by June 2019, but no later than Dec 2019) a proposal to address division needs and build community while breaking down silos, including, but not limited to an Instruction Hub with Spoke model. Recommending a proposal for use of potentially vacant division offices (preferably by June 2019, but no later than Dec 2019); and if proposal requires major renovations, to revise college facilities master plan for funding.  • 3-year sunset to evaluate by January 2022 (prior to any major expenditure of any bond funds or moves)  **Option 2**: Keep Division Assistant Positions; Eliminate 5 Additional Faculty Vacancies & Decrease B-Budget  • Make up $524,000 reduction with elimination of 5 positions from SRP ($99,543 per position) = $497,715 – resulting in decrease of an equivalent of approximately 7 part-time faculty positions, 1320 Fund (approximately 60 class sections).  • Decrease $26,285 in B-budget, spread out among the 5 instruction divisions, student services division, and president’s office – constituting a decrease of $3,755 per division; OR eliminate the one scheduler position.  **Option 3**: Keep Division Assistant Positions; Eliminate and/or Reduce Program(s)  • Advisory Council convenes “Study Group for Program Elimination/Reduction” and presents a proposal for $524,000 in elimination/reduction (preferably by June 2019, though no later than November 2, 2019 for March 15 notices) with actual elimination/reduction implemented July 2020 (or earlier to relieve B-budget).  • Use B-budget and/or carry-over dollars (and one scheduler position elimination) for one year while going through program elimination/reduction analysis.  **SENATE MEMO**  **Option 1:**Oppose the creation of the Hub, however make up the funding otherwise saved by consolidating division offices by recommending we cut college programs, or use SRP (early retirement) savings to make up the difference (and not use funds saved from SRP to pay part time faculty to teach more course sections). Side note: these two alternatives to address budget reduction as related to the creation of the Hub are the most common we’ve heard discussed. If choosing this option, keep in mind we would need a specific mention of which choice a division would prefer to save funds (cut programs, or use SRP savings).    **Option 2:**Approve the creation of the “Instructional Hub,” but continue in discussions with our administrative colleagues so as to best recommend how the hub should function in order to best  serve students, and address faculty concerns regarding access/connection with deans. Faculty would also be involved in recommending how best to utilize division offices.    **Option 3:**Approve the budget proposal/reorg as is, with no recommendation for further action.  Comment:  We need to keep in mind that we do have other options besides the presidential memo options, or the options from our Senate officers. There has been a lot of feedback from faculty that has not been integrated into these options.  Comment:  If the “administrative hub” is less than 9% of the Budget reorganization, then what is the other 91% of the reorganization look like?  Clarification:  That information can be found in the “Budget Reorg Presentation Council” PDF up under the “Documents” section from our meeting on 1/28/19  <https://foothill.edu/gov/academic-senate/2018-19/jan28/BudgetReorgPresentationCouncil.pdf>  Comment:  Prefacing every discussion in Senate regarding the budgetary reorganization with “there is a lot here but…we need to make a decision quickly” puts pressure on faculty to ignore process issues, set a precedent, and ignore most feedback from the faculty.  Comment:  We have a $5million dollar hold-harmless for not meeting the State requirements for this year, but then we will get hit with meeting the new State budget requirements in the near future. We need to be realistic and say that we will be faced with program reductions. We need to see what program discontinuance looks like. We need to start having these discussions now. We do not want to make up the process as we go along, like we are now. We do not want to be blindsided.  Comment:  Let’s commit to drafting a resolution for a faculty response to the budget decisions process. How we think this should go and issues with it. We don’t just need a formal response, but actually draft a resolution  Comment:  What specific points do we make and who is going to work on this resolution?  Comment:  What are our thoughts on exploring a joint statement with FA? General agreement that this is a good idea.  Escoto:  What points would we want to address in this resolution?  Comments:  -There needs to be a formal process where faculty are involved in budget decisions regarding the college  -Help create proposals meant to address budget reductions and program elimination  -Help to figure out what are the issues about the process  **Senators willing to work on this resolution: *Sara Cooper, Kathryn Maurer, Jordan Fong, Isaac Escoto, Carolyn Holcroft***  Comment:  Note that this study group would be created with the understanding that this won’t help anything at the moment, but that it may help with process in the future.  **Constituent Feedback on the Presidential Memo and Senate Options**  PSME:  -Issues with taking people to be part of the governance process and paying them, when there are already people involved in governance who are not being paid.  -The department chair idea – Faculty chairs are chosen by administration, but we would like the choosing of the faculty to be represented in meetings to be by the faculty (through perhaps elections in the Senate).  Lisle: There are approximately 16 department chairs. This would be an estimated additional $40,000 in release time that would be incurred by the College with the new reorganization plan.  Fine Arts:  Want division deans to do the work for the divisions, not the faculty chairs.  Counseling:  In Counseling there is no Coordinator, so what would this mean for these Memo options?  BHS:  Is the Department Chair the right person to send to a Dean’s meeting? Perhaps have one or two division reps be the faculty representatives, instead of dep’t chairs. However, the decision to include faculty in Dean’s meetings is a positive step forward.  BSS:  “Help facilitate governance committee meetings” Perhaps this position would not necessarily have to be department chairs, but faculty who step up to this function. In this way, the release time wouldn’t just be relegated to the position of department chair.  Escoto:  If we do not have the dep’t chair attend Deans meetings, then who should we send?  Comment:  What if we had faculty vote for who we want our chairs to be? This might be a way to circumvent the idea that those faculty who are collaborating with administration are chosen by faculty.  Lisle:  Concerned about Deans losing their help in this reorganization.  Comment:  Dep’t chairs have current duties that used to belong to administrators. If we have faculty that have been voted in by faculty, that Dep’t chair would then be answerable to faculty, but also might not have the initial skillset of taking on administrative duties.  Lisle:  If would be good to have more consistent transition planning for administration, so that we can hang on to individuals with a competent administrative skillset.  Escoto:  It sounds like we would like more time to discuss how faculty might best be involved with the deans meetings, as referenced in the president’s memo.  Lisle:  March notifications for layoffs are upcoming. Foothill College needs to give our budget reorganization plan to the Board before then, which is why our timeline for voting is currently so short.  Comment:  Consensus on one of these recommendations does not look likely, as the options do not fully meet our constituent feedback.  Comment:  Should we make a statement on two items here?  1) A statement on the three options regarding the 9% of the budget reorganization regarding “the Hub.”  2) A statement on what faculty think about the entire 100% of the budget reorganization.  BSS:  The majority of the discussion in our division has been around the 9% “Hub”.  Counseling/SRC/Kinesiology:  The 9% “Hub” decision does not necessarily affect our division, but it will affect the bigger College.  BSS:  Regarding the rest of the budget reorganization, there have been many questions. What does it mean that 21 faculty positions would be eliminated in terms of impact on the College? How is our final budget going to look, versus our current budget regarding monies going in to different job pots on campus (administrative/faculty/staff). Lots of feedback on the Allied Health Science programs not having a true Dean, and questions re: if AHS would receive enough support.  LA:  The other 91% - It looks like the majority of cuts are coming to instruction and student services, why is this?  FA:  -Majority of faculty feedback in favor of Memo Option 1 and Senate Option 2.  -How would this affect Part-Time faculty innovations?  -How would this affect program eliminations?  -Ok with Deans relocating, but need set office hours for student and faculty contact. Perhaps have some sort of self-serve option for scheduling.  Counseling:  -We need an infrastructure to help support making petitions more efficient, and then a timely returning of those petitions.  -Recommend in favor of Memo Option 1, as the impact would not seem to disproportionately impact this division.  -Counseling still needs a seat at the table in budget discussions.  PSME:  -Really unhappy with process.  -We need to talk about Program Elimination. It is coming; we need to recognize this reality.  -We understand financially why moving to the Hub is advantageous. We need to find out the best way to mitigate any negatives that will occur. We would still like a connection/rapport with our Deans.  BSS:  -Frustration with not being involved in creating options.  -Majority of constituents oppose the creation of the Hub, with a minority in favor.  -Majority of those faculty over a weekend, who were able to give feedback, chose Presidential Memo Option 3 – “Keep Division Assistant Positions; Eliminate and/or Reduce Program(s)”  PSME  -Most of the feedback garnered in this short period chose Presidential Memo Option 1 – Consolidation into a “Hub”  -Majority talk about exploring Presidential Memo Option 3 – Program elimination in the future  BHS  -Similar to PSME above, with the addition of having faculty-chosen representation in Dean meetings.  BSS  -Frustrated with carrying a proportionately larger load of FTES and how class cancelations have been playing out.  -Faculty involvement with enrollment management needs to happen.  LA  -Feedback received in this short period of time focused on choosing Senate Option 1 – Opposing the creation of the Hub, and voting for Presidential Memo Options 2 and 3, leaning more towards Presidential Memo Option 3 – keep division assistants, eliminate programs.  KA  -Since Kinesiology wouldn’t be as affected by consolidation in to the hub (no loss of division assistant), leaning towards Senate Option 3 – approve the creation of the Hub.  Library  A majority of those able to give feedback would be for Presidential Memo Option 1  SRC  -Not as affected by the Hub decision, so will abstain from recommending.  Part-Time Faculty  -Memo Option 1/Senate Option 3, voting for the Hub, thereby keeping Part Time faculty jobs by maintaining funds in the 1320 budget.  Comment: Note that bigger divisions (Language Arts, BSS, PSME, BHS) garnered a high amount of support for exploring what Memo Option 3 – elimination of programs, would look like for the College.  Comment: Administration made these options. If faculty had been brought in earlier, the budget reorganization could have gone in a completely different direction. |
| 1. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated) |  |
| * 1. Part Time Faculty Celebration | Donna Frankel taking the lead on this year’s event. Last year, we held the event at Brittania Arms. This was an informal event, meant to recognize Part Time faculty and socialize.  General agreement on timing of the event during late April, early May. Format and timing worked well last year, agreement to keep the venue (Brittania Arms in Cupertino) and timing the same. Friday, May 3rd preferred, second choice Friday, May 10th. 5:30pmish start time. |
| * 1. AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates | DraftAP4100GraduationRequirementsForDegreesAndCertificates\_New  First Read  Hi-lights:  \*This Administrative Procedure is focused on outlining graduation requirements for degrees and certificates.  \*Credit by exam is our process for how to address non-credit courses counting towards graduation requirement. Our curriculum committee is discussing scenarios in which we would implement credit by exam for this process.  \*Courses that cover ethnic studies must be an option for graduation requirements for degrees and certificates.  Clarification needed for this portion of the AP. What does this mean? Do we have to offer courses with an Ethnic Studies specific TOPS code? |
| 1. Committee reports: |  |
| 1. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)   a. Financial Aid Workshops | a. Faculty prioritization meeting – do we have three faculty members to attend meeting so as to represent senate (senate VP is not able to attend). Yes, we will have three faculty from the senate attend the meeting.  b. Part-Time faculty event - Brittania Arms has responded that they would be willing to again host our event. |
| 1. Adjournment |  |