

Academic Senate Special Meeting September 1, 2020

#'s represent items numbered on the Agenda

1. Meeting called to order at 9:33 a.m.

2. Roll call:

Executive Committee

Kathryn Maurer (President)

Eric Kuehnl (Vice President)

Robert Cormia (Secretary treasurer)

Cara Miyasaki (BHS)

David Marasco (PSME)

Donna Frankel (Adjunct faculty rep)

Stephanie Chan (LA)

Jordan Fong (FA/COMM)

David McCormick (LA)

Milissa Cary (FA/COMM)

Brain Murphy (APP)

Dixie Macias (KA)

Mary Thomas (Library)

Matthew Litrus (PSME)

Mimi Overton (SRC)

David McCormick (LA)

Senate Liaisons

John Fox (FA Liaison)

Kristy Lisle (Cabinet)

Guests

Amy Edwards

Carolyn Brown

Hilary Gomes

Christina Rotsides

Valerie Fong

3. Kathryn introduced herself as our incoming academic senate president for 2020-21, and that this is another special meeting, given that our regular meetings are only scheduled during the academic year. Given that this is summer, all members of the 19-20 and 20-21 Executive Committee have been invited, and of course all Senate meetings are open meetings. Everyone attending is offered the ability to speak. However, only current appointed members should propose a motion or vote if we do so at this meeting.

The agenda for the meeting was approved by consensus.

4. There were no public comments.

5. The minutes from August 25, 2020, were approved by consensus.

6. Consent calendar included appointees to the interim dean for language arts search committee: Kella Svetich (FA) Sam Fleisher (FA) David McCormick (FA), and Micaela Agyare (LIBR)

7a. Committee and task force reports:

Scheduling Task Force: Kristy Lisle gave an update of the scheduling task force, a group co-chaired by EVPI and Academic Senate President with faculty representatives from each division, that has been meeting weekly over summer, and is charged with developing a “return to campus” plan. The chancellor (Judy Miner) has said that we are completely virtual for fall quarter, with the exception of again a few Allied Health classes, who were also on campus for spring. The task force is developing a set of criteria for determining which classes might be able to return in Winter and Spring, based on scenarios of percentages of people allowed back on campus, i.e. a priority list of classes.

The task force has updated codes in the schedule, to identify various modes of delivery (e.g. synchronous vs. asynchronous online delivery and/or a blend of both). Our commitment is to return to campus, and thinking through how many courses, how many students, and the resources available. How do we return to campus? The rollout (return to campus) is going to be slower than we anticipated. Allied health classes over summer were a “pilot” for returning to campus. We did have issues with custodians being sick, but we did have a graduating class of dental assistants. We are paying for outside custodial help, as our custodians are sick. Where we are today is to come up with a criterion of who comes back. What are the added precautions in terms of plexiglass, PPE, and conscious health habits that we’ll need to institute in-person classes on campus?

A question was asked about what protocols would be in place to inform faculty and students that may have been exposed to someone that is, or might be COVID-19 positive. Joe Moreau is developing an app to support contact tracing.

Kristy emphasized that we should have a back-up plan for students who may not be able to attend in person, and continue in the class (alternative methods).

The current reps to the task force (may be shifting in September) are:

Isaac Escoto – Student Services

Kathryn Maurer - Senate, BSS

Sara Cooper - STEM

Mary Thomas - Library
Bruce McLeod – Fine Arts Comm
Amber La Piana - LA
Eric Kuehnl – Senate
Robert Cormia – Senate STEM
Warren Voyce - PE Athletics
Amy Edwards - FA
Milissa Carey – Fine Arts Comm

DDEAC and HRAC. David Marasco, the Senate appointee to the District Diversity and Equity Advisory Committee (DDEAC) gave an update on both DDEAC and HRAC (the District Human Resources Advisory Committee), as these two committees, chaired by Pat Hyland, meet together. At the 8/27 meeting there was discussion about opening day, one of the issues was the “nuts and bolts” of opening day, and talk of continuing to work with the speaker, Dr. Joy DeGruy, throughout the academic year. Another topic discussed was an issue of how EO reps are appointed, and developing a system to track appointments (one rep has served on double digits committees, and this does not seem appropriate, so looking for a way to ensure this doesn’t happen). Next topic was a resolution passed by the Asian Pacific American Network (APAN) of FHDA, with an Equity-focused agenda, and whether or not DDEAC wanted to consider adopting some similar language and/or assigned people to work on tasks identified in the resolution. Last, the group discussed the Full-Time Faculty Employment Policy and Hiring Procedures, which was updated a while ago by DDEAC/HRAC, but has yet to be formally approved/issued. It is coming, which will be a great improvement and we should finally have a “modern hiring policy,” as opposed to a patchwork of edits to a very outdated policy and procedure.

Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B). Kristy Lisle gave an update on IP&B, a study group of the Advisory Council charged with creating and implementing the new Program Review process. This group has been evaluating feedback shared by the first round of program review writers and readers, and making some updates to the template and rubric (although nothing significant at this point, as there is one more year in the “pilot”). A significant improvement will now be the ability for all faculty in a program to contribute writing to the template (last year it could only be the one designated writer). As we go into year 2, we need more program review readers. It is helpful if those designated for review next year (21-22) step up as readers for this year (20-21), so they can become familiar with the template, rubric and process. PGA is available for Program Review readers.

Bookstore Study Group/RFP. Kathryn shared information about an RFP (Request for Proposal) workgroup that is preparing (perhaps already finished?) an RFP to identify an outside vendor who would become our point of sales for all course materials at both Foothill and De Anza (targeted implementation end of February 2021). A study group of the Revenue & Resources (R&R) Council is still discussing what Phase II of the Bookstore plan would look like, which involves determining if any type of physical store should remain on campus. That study group is chaired by Bret Watson and Elias Regalado, and is still lacking faculty representatives.

Joint Advisory Council & Revenue & Resources Council (AC/R&R). This joint council has been meeting weekly throughout the summer, and has been tasked by President Nguyen with drafting recommendations for how to reduce Foothill's ongoing budget by \$4.025M. At the 8/31 meeting, President Nguyen shared that there were two options: AC/R&R come up with the recommended cuts by October 1, in time to hold town halls and receive input from the broader campus community, or AC/R&R could defer to the President to come up with the cuts by October 1, then to be shared in the town halls. Members of AC/R&R were concerned about the "either/or" approach, and insisted the best path forward was collaborative and shared. The council asked President Nguyen to return at the 9/14 (the next) meeting of AC/R&R to share a draft proposal of cuts, so the council could weigh in. President Nguyen agreed, but asked the senates (academic and classified) to continue work on drafting processes for program reduction or elimination, as she expects to need to rely on these.

One senator and rep to the Advisory Council discussed the overarching theme of equity, that both senates identified equity as the number one criteria when evaluating program strength/need, and also shared that in her experience with budget reductions at other colleges, kinesiology and athletics, and fine arts and communication division courses are often the first to be cut, although they are central to equity work and serving disproportionately impacted students.

7b. Program Reduction/Discontinuance Process

Kathryn shared the background of the document, and the charge by AC/R&R to develop processes for program reduction or elimination for purposes of budget cuts, and how we (in Academic Senate) defined the scope of our work as an instructional program (courses leading to a specific objective). Classified Senate has been working on a parallel process for non-instructional programs, although mostly adopted the same process and criteria. A group met last week to look at both processes, and decided more work is needed, and care should be taken not to have them be too separate. Right now, it is unclear how or if these processes are going to be used.

Kristy shared that she has had IR work on pulling data for any of the criteria that we have access to, although this does not include the qualitative data, and it will likely not be possible in the time frame, and with the reduced resources in IR right now, due especially to two of the four people in IR being evacuated. Kristy shared a spreadsheet with data that she has pulled so far for the full list of instructional programs at Foothill, and she will share with the group when she fixes on of the data columns that was pulled in error.

A senator requested that the ranking of the criteria in our draft processes be changed, to increase the priority of sustainable wages/labor market above enrollment and productivity. Kathryn mentioned that the senate summer cabinet had spent quite a bit of time figuring out the criteria, and establishing a process for voting/approving the ranking (via a survey), but she did

acknowledge that given this was summer, and the transition of senators, it could be appropriate to revisit these criteria and the ranking, if that was the will of the group.

Kathryn also mentioned that it could be prudent to wait until after the 9/14 of the AC/R&R before doing more work on this process, so our charge becomes a bit clearer. She also said it's going to be important for folks to understand that the ranking will mostly be a discussion guide, as it just isn't going to be possible to have all the data populated on a spreadsheet, and weighted by ranking to produce an actual list of ranked programs. It is also going to be important for Academic Senate to decide on a recommendation of "Next Steps" for our process, if it is going to be used. The last proposal on the table from the last meeting was that a "smallish" group of Administrators and faculty leaders be charged with doing the actual program evaluation using the ranked criteria as a guide. Kristy has led a group consisting of deans, FA and Academic Senate leaders to look at the first draft of the spreadsheet in preparation for potential discussion with De Anza about comparable programs. These were information-sharing meetings, rather than decision-making meetings. But we may want to consider a similarly structured group, if we get to the stage of implementing the process. It is important to be mindful, though, that no classified staff or students were part of that group, which may not be in alignment with the guiding principles for budget reduction approved by AC/R&R.

As a group, we struggled with how these criteria could be used with an (automated) decision support tool. There was a comment that we're looking at historic data for quantitative trends, qualitative trends are more difficult. There was a discussion about the role of international students. Robert commented on the challenge of mixing quantitative and qualitative data (and analytical approaches) for program evaluation, and what that process might look like.

Kristy commented about student success data, and the overlap between overload and traditional 1320 assignments. She mentioned impacts to the IR team, and the effort this might take. There was a comment about low numbers (n is small) that the data is suppressed.

Kathryn asked the group what will be the next steps in developing a decision support tool or process, and what Academic Senate should be contributing to the AC/R&R process and timeline. And when do we want to meet again?

There was a suggestion that we wait until IR returns a more complete / consistent set of data.

7d. Next Steps

The group asked for another special Senate meeting on September 15th, with a special focus on reviewing the suggested budget reductions that will be proposed by the College administration on Monday September 14th. The business of the Senate retreat will be postponed to a later date.

7c. Communication Plan

Kathryn commented that we did not get to the communication plan, on today's agenda, reps should communicate with division faculty

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m., next meeting is Tuesday September 15, 2020, 9:30 - 11:00 a.m.