

Academic Senate Minutes November 18, 2019

Meeting called to order at 4:01 p.m.

Agenda was adopted by consensus

Public comment - library is migrating to a new system over the winter break

Minutes were approved by consensus

ACEFA - District committee looking at implications of different types of academic schedules (quarter, semester, shortened semester, etc).

Consent calendar was approved by consensus

- BP/AP 3518
- Counselling resolution
- Guided pathways
- Faculty hiring prioritization
- Academic renewal policy

Feedback from child abuse reporting was discussed, motion to approve the BP/AP 3518, motion was passed unanimously. There was a comment that we should consider training. Confirmation that the district is planning to conduct child abuse training as needed.

Counseling department - testing and assessment center

President Thuy Nguyen addressed the Senate regarding the testing and assessment center, and the counselling resolution. Thuy stated the resolution is moot, as the administration is not going forward with the move of the testing and assessment center to the 5000 building area this year, which was/is largely about personnel. She also mentioned this resolution is not part of the 10+1 (Academic and Professional Matters), and therefore this resolution/discussion does not belong at Senate. Thuy commented that the counselling department didn't approach her regarding the testing and assessment center, and that she is disappointed in how this was handled. Thuy would like the group to deliberate on the resolution, and however it is resolved, she will still have a conversation with the counselling department. Senators from various divisions commented that their faculty did support the counselling resolution. Thuy mentioned that the college is in a better place now than it was four years ago. There was a comment by a faculty member that they felt the College is not in a better place now than four years ago, which was criticized by President Nguyen. Thuy mentioned that the assessment center supports two categories of students (accommodated testing, and general population of students for placement related support), and a goal of the move was to bring assessment closer to DRC.

The thought was that since there is a staffing need at the assessment and testing office, DRC staff could help support.

A faculty shared that Thuy's comment that the rationale for the conversation not belonging at Senate didn't make sense, and Senate does have the right to discuss it.

Thuy's response was/is that this is a personnel matter, not a 10+1 matter, so it is not part of Academic Senate. Thuy felt the body didn't have the complete information needed to have a fully informed conversation.

Isaac asserted there is overlap with 10+1 in this resolution as the physical location of the testing and assessment center can have a potential impact on the student experience/success. Counseling believes housing as many student services in one location as possible (or as close as possible to each other) would support student success. In response to the statement that counseling faculty didn't approach administration prior to bringing forth a resolution, counseling reps noted Counseling wasn't approached either for their thoughts prior to making the decision to move the testing and assessment center. The dialog moved to a concern about trust on the campus right now, and that faculty are being informed about decisions after the decision is well down the road, or are often not being brought in as early as many would like in helping address a need. Faculty feel powerless, and not sure about where to go for dialog about how decisions are being made. Senate reps commented that Senate is a place where these conversations should go on. Thuy was asked, what is the role of the Senate, if this is not where things like this can be discussed? When is the right time to be having this discussion? Before the decision is being made? Thuy asked the Senate when and where is the right time to be having this conversation? Thuy asserted that we need to be able to have dialog on difficult issues, especially including Equity 2.0.

There will be a future agenda item to create time and space for a deeper dive into the decision-making process on campus. Comment that the counselling resolution reads to "please stop the decision-making process, that didn't include counselling faculty". Thuy asserted that she is building a leadership team (organization) to be both vulnerable and courageous, and this can (and will) include faculty. Thuy commented that Senate has a lot of power, but to be cautious, as this power can send a very strong message. Senators commented that they (finally) feel like they are being heard and this is an opportunity to start a conversation. Thuy commented to be mindful that there are counsellors in different places, be mindful that the role of assessment center is changing, and to be mindful that we are voting on something that is moot, and the resolution transcends a larger group of counsellors. Thuy suggested that the resolution (vote) may have arisen because some (counselling) faculty had asked for support by the Senate.

Isaac commented that we can bring the resolution back for another read, amend it, or take action on it.

Comment that if we act on the resolution it becomes part of a record. Thuy asserted to Robert Cormia (Secretary-treasurer) that the move of the assessment and testing center has been

stopped, and that this should be part of the public record. Thuy asserted that after refurbishing the building with assessment and DRC, that the two groups would be proximal, and that would serve students better. But there's also the larger question of Counseling's role (functions and organization) as related to AB 705.

There was a motion and a second to approve the resolution as written. Further discussion. Kristy Lisle commented that whether the resolution passed or not, we have staffing challenges ahead. Kristy commented that she had made some errors during the process of resolving the staffing issue. Kristy also commented that the decision to move the counselling assessment center was very complicated, and we are going to have to make some decisions, and shared there were pieces that she didn't fully understand. We're now having a conversation about. How are we going to come together to make a decision, how do we make change, continue to be innovative, and make everyone happy isn't going to be possible.

Comment that we might want to step back and look at the resolution more carefully, and look at the resolution and change the form of it. Comment that the process has gotten complicated, but the resolution did get us to a point where we are having a larger conversation. This discussion has risen to a very serious level, so let's have one about how we are going to have a larger conversation about trust and decision making. One Senator commented about the message that not acting on the resolution would take. For the counselling department this (action on a resolution) would need to be a firm statement that we will commit to having the conversation that we need to have.

This conversation (campus decision making processes) is a priority so it will be put on the agenda for the next meeting. At what point is this part of the bigger picture? A counselling representative mentioned that the counselors did want to have a vote on this specific resolution, independent of any larger concerns discussed.

There was dialog about changing the resolution to describe what really happened (course of events). Comment that the first resolved is a moot point, so it needs to be turned into something that better fits what the process was. A vote was taken, and the resolution as written, failed (1 yay (counseling department), 10 nay (the rest of the representative bodies)). Thuy commented that the message (from the dialog) is clear, even without a vote. She then commented that at a rotary meeting earlier, a community member commented about our great work with students.

Guided pathways, academic renewal, constitution issue, and faculty prioritization

A counseling rep commented that this is a process, and thanked the Senate for having a platform for discussion.

Katie Ha and Rosa Nguyen (two of the three Guided Pathways faculty leads) showed a slide presentation about guided pathways - and an overview of the four columns. Community

colleges all act differently, but we have common goals to support our students. Guided Pathways efforts include three different teams, meta majors, onboarding and communications. The study group (steering committee) meets once a month, guided pathways teams meet weekly or biweekly for work. Definitions of teams: onboarding, when a student first makes contact with Foothill. Application assessment, education plan, etc. Once students embark on this process, they are not always sure where they are. Katie described the communications team, which is tasked with communicating updates and needs regarding GP, to the campus (website, general communication, blog, etc). Rosa and Katie are on PDL in the spring, and additional faculty are needed for the effort. Mike Mohebbi is also a part of the small group efforts.

Meta Majors: will create 7-15 met majors by the end of the year. Met majors does overlap with curriculum committee, but the curriculum committee already is busy, but perhaps GP and CCC can collaborate. Mapping and sequence. Have the map be communicated with counselling department. The State calls guided pathways a 5 year project, we are about halfway through the time period. The goal is to have the results of this process be integrated into the campus student process and experience.

Faculty hiring prioritization - not sure how many hires we will get from the District this year. The goal is to prioritize 10 faculty positions, and have a pipeline of positions ready for whatever funding is available. It's important to understand what the ranking criterion are. Isaac Escoto and Paul Starer talked about a list of departments that have requested faculty positions, pulled from the budget request form. IR has been requested to provide data for the prioritization process. There was a question about what criteria we are looking for (rationale). Paul Starer will send the criteria that is being looked at. There was a question about who other than the executive team could attend the faculty prioritization process? One participant from last year expressed that they couldn't quite follow everything that was done. This will come back for further discussion. Request for discussion at the next meeting to include faculty prioritization criteria, and for the existing criteria list to be sent to senate reps when possible.

Senate Constitution

Isaac sent out a draft of the constitution to be looked at. There will need to be a constitution working team to meet every couple of weeks before the election in spring, in order to lead efforts re: updating the constitution (deciding what may need to be changed, bringing those changes for discussion at senate, making changes to the constitution for voting purposes). Isaac made a start (in the draft) of where we could start. Donna Frankel volunteered for the constitution task force, as did Robert Cormia and David Marasco. Comments that we should pull some of the rules out of the constitution, like the AP and BP. Rules and By-laws should be separate from the constitution so that when a change needs to be made, we don't have to

change the whole constitution. While discussing the constitution and election timeline, Isaac mentioned that he will not be running for another senate president term. He feels that it's important for the democratic process to include changes in leadership (he's been a senate officer for coming up on 7 years)

Academic renewal policy, AP 4240. Most students that have failed a course can attempt a retake but those that want to retake a course that's been deactivated don't have that option. In the implementation of AB 705 changes, many basic skills courses have been deactivated/no longer offered. The proposed updates to the policy include: one year (instead of two) needing to have passed for the quarter that includes courses the student would like to take out of their GPA, courses that have been deactivated are not to be counted towards the student's GPA/academic probation, nor will a petition to remove deactivated courses from the students' GPA count against their one allowed petition for academic renewal.

There are a number of parameters to be looked at, including some of the mechanics of GPA calculation. There needs to be a period of "resilience and growth" between a rough quarter, and coming back up to speed with their academics. If we were to change the policy on our side, it's still up to the colleges and universities students transfer to, to decide whether they will honor these changes in GPA calculation. Question regarding if it's possible to apply this policy (for deactivated course situations) to all affected students. In discussions with A/R leadership, it is not feasible to somehow change everyone's GPA that has taken a course that is now deactivated. It will be important to widely communicate the potential for this policy to help students, assuming it passes both campuses.

Meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.