

Foothill Academic Senate Minutes February 14, 2022

DRAFT Minutes

#'s represent items numbered on the [Agenda](#)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. Roll call

Executive Committee

Officers:

Kathryn Maurer (President)
Eric Kuehnl (VP Curriculum)
Robert Cormia (Sec/Treas)

Division Senators:

Alexis Aguilar
Brian Murphy
David Marasco
Donna Frankel
Ellen Judd
Frank Niccoli
Jordan Fong

Katy Ripp

Kelly Edwards

Kerri Ryer

Kimberly Escamilla (absent)

Mary Thomas

Matthew Litrus

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera

Milissa Carey

Patricia Crespo-Martin

Sara Cooper

Stephanie Chan

Tracee Cunningham

Voltaire Villanueva

Extended Exec Committee

Adrienne Hypolite

Ajani Byrd

Carolyn Holcroft

Fatai Heimuli (absent)

John Fox

Kurt Hueg

Guests

Ram Subramaniam

Natalie Latteri

Amy Leonard

3. Kathryn reminded the senate that the opportunity to review and adopt the agenda is not only a formality, but intended as an opportunity for any member of the Executive Committee to ask for an item to be added, or ask for a change to an existing item. The agenda was adopted by consensus. The minutes from February 7th were approved by consensus (a change was made about the J1 brought up at the De Anza College).

4. Public Comment: None.

5. Consent calendar - Kathryn mentioned that we will be formally approving (not on consent) an appointee to the search committee for Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. COOL is still recruiting for faculty to serve on the local and district workgroups on online policy (distance ed), and would appreciate senate's help with recruitment. This group will be working on standards for online education, what are considered appropriate materials, regular and effective contact, etc. Sara Cooper moved to first, Jordan Fong second, to approve the consent calendar.

6. Kathryn shared one nomination for Vice Chancellor of Human Resources search committee, David Marasco, and asked David to share his interest in serving on this committee. David has long been involved in DDEAC and knows the importance of this position. Robert Cormia moved to approve his service, Millisa Carey seconded. Sara Cooper asked how many faculty will be serving and Kathryn clarified 1 from Foothill, 1 from De Anza, and 1 FA rep.

7. Kathryn announced that Paul Starer has resigned his position as executive Vice President of Academic Senate, effective immediately. Per the Senate Constitution, we read that this vacancy can be filled by an appointment confirmed by the executive committee to complete the term of service through the academic year, but we'll need to fill the remaining one-year term through general elections. We'll then ask the elections committee to post the position on the ballot for spring.

Donna Frankel mentioned Robert Cormia's service to the Senate and said he should be considered to fill this position so there is continuity of leadership. David Marasco mentioned Laura Gamez, runner up in the Executive Vice President Position last spring, and reaching out to Laura was agreed to by all, given our past practice of going to the runner-up. Kerri also agreed that this practice could also encourage more people to run in the elections in general. Robert Cormia suggested that Kerri Ryer should be considered for this position, given all of her leadership on COOL and other governance work performed by Kerri. Alexis commented that he thought that we should make this a two-year term in the spring election. Kathryn explained the rationale of staggering the President and Executive VP, and David reinforced idea it should be a one year term.

Consensus was to take the two weeks to consider what is the best next step, Mary Thomas would reach out to Laura Gamez to find out interest, and Kathryn will place this back on the agenda for next time.

8. Kathryn shared information about Friday's third session of the governance retreat with an [updated PPT](#). The first discussion was the scope of the single governance council, with it being focused on the mission of the college. With the proposed addition by senate last time of well-being, which was agreed to by all, the components are now transfer, CTE, equity, empowerment, access to the community, well-being, creating and serving community.

Kathryn then talked about membership on this council, and it being proposed as a combination of constituency-based versus mission-based. The group is struggling with how to appoint representatives to the different missions. She asked the group for help. Bernadine asserted that she represents the College and not the administration. There were comments about the impact of prior governance influencing perspectives.

Carolyn asked how the President would represent the College, and based on what values of representing the college? Kerri responded that the president would represent the broader mission of the College and not the constituency of the administration. Kathryn said those are good questions that were not answered and she would take them back to the retreat.

We then talked about the role of the president and who would chair or facilitate the meetings. Kathryn mentioned we had been using a trichair model (admin, staff, faculty, then quad chair adding students, but that may have been trying to address a problem that should have been addressed differently, like with a different leadership style, or with more understood operating

principles and guiding principles. The group at the retreat identified the need to identify operating standards, shared values, what consensus based decision making looks like, etc.

There is still a lot to sort out. Kerri commented more specifically the how, and the who, would be representing a position. A comment was made about this sounding a lot like the Roundtable of the past, and wondering what had worked or not then. Robert Cormia commented in his service on roundtable, it actually worked pretty well. Carolyn commented that the biggest reason we stopped using the roundtable was that we created too many committees, and people didn't know what they were supposed to be doing. Kathryn commented that she's really struggling with the "how" of mission based representation. Perhaps if she saw a name associated with the mission that might help.

Sara commented that rebuilding trust is one of the key issues that is keeping us from moving forward. Kathryn commented we all want to move on and move forward, and if it's any help to others to know this she is experiencing everyone at the retreat committed to the same, and willing to trust each other. Voltaire commented that the council should be careful not to get too big, and additionally that mission based representation shouldn't be siloed, e.g. equity should be the priority of everyone. Patricia asked if we could start with this structure and then see how it works. Kathryn commented that the proposal is indeed to start on a trial basis, but it's still not clear how it's going to work (e.g. appoint members) and that needs to be figured out first.

Jordan commented that shared governance can be chaotic at times, and the issues of trust that need to be rebuilt in our College. Further, every member of the council should "believe in" and address all the missions (and values). Voltaire commented that if we try this, and whether it works or not, we'll put effort into it, and not point fingers if it doesn't work.

Adrienne commented that if shared governance is the vision that we are trying to carry out, we'll always be faced with governance issues of constituency versus mission based, functional versus operational, etc. She asked if our experience is now overly influenced by the issues we have just been through? Sara commented that everything that we've gone through isn't all negative, and we're talking about what matters, and intentional about our concerns and priorities.

9. Ram Subramaniam came to talk about efforts to re(create) an [integrated planning committee](#) (IP). In the past it was IP&B, which was the integrated planning and budget group. It was mostly focused on program review. IP&B created a template we're using right now for program review. Ram commented that after going through two cycles of program review, there are many things that are working well, and some that are not working so well. The work didn't quite get completed with IP&B, but we're ready to "restart" program review. We still need to know who this group is going to report to. Ram said the group will start meeting weekly, and should have larger representation. He invites everyone to join him in this work.

Kathryn commended that we're in a fairly active period with a program review right now. The writing is done and now the readers are completing training and norming. It may be challenging

to get more faculty to volunteer right now. Ram said the group will continue with as many who can join. The group usually meets Tuesdays from one to two.

<break>

10. Kurt spoke about an effort to return the college divisions to the original configuration prior to the “hub” idea, which no one really seemed to like. Kurt mentioned some logistical and staffing hurdles and noted we are lacking enough deans to make the areas work. One was the STEM division, the other has been the combination of Fine Arts and PE, which never seemed to work. Kurt said a CTE funding source was identified, and in STEM, leaving Bio under STEM (PSME) but creating a new dean for allied health. The College is ready to open that position for search. Also working on a job description for separate PE and Fine Arts.

Kathryn asked about how this division restructuring might affect senate (and curriculum) representation. Sara commented that she had heard that Senate representation doesn't always (exactly) follow division representation, e.g. STEM with PSME, BHS, and allied health. David commented that the overall spirit is that faculty can decide how to represent themselves (in Academic Senate) etc. If division structure does drift too far from Senate representation, the Academic Senate (collegial conversation) should have a conversation with the administration.

Kurt commented that division restructuring (reorganization) was a priority for him. There are other (personnel) changes coming with retirements, etc. that are also impacting the Office of Instruction. Kurt will update the senate as things evolve.

11. Update from the Office of equity on the strategic vision for equity: Ajani showed a [PowerPoint](#) about the strategic vision of equity. How we (all of us) navigate a complex space around equity. He mentioned changing the campus culture around equity. Remove the Collegewide barriers around equity. Ajani mentioned three guide posts of accountability, assessment, and sustainability and creating SMART goals. Ajani mentioned creating think tanks and thought partners: groups of people coming together, throughout the year, not a standing body, and people may come and go and topics change.

Inflection points, focused versus broad approach, landscape analysis, program review, where is the work taking place, where is it not taking place. Commitment to our students through an equity lens. Resource allocation and budgets. How do you tackle a mountain, one step at a time?

Robert Cormia and John Fox commented they really loved the idea of think tanks, collaboration, and having a “collaborative direction” without being prescriptive.

12. Faculty hiring procedures. Kathryn presented [the document](#) we've seen before with the side-by-side of current procedures and proposed DDEAC language for the update. She shared that De Anza academic senate has finished their review and they have decided not to approve (or not approve) the whole document, but just focused on the student involvement piece. They

moved to restrict student involvement to a teaching demo, not as full members of the committee. Kathryn said we don't have to do the same, but we do need to be mindful that the next stop at APM will be to attempt to reach consensus across the district.

Kerri commented that we needed to have both Colleges behind the document, otherwise we can't really go forward. David commented that he supported the document as written. Kathryn commented that we have seen these documents since November, and need to act soon. Sara commented that she has shared it with constituents and basically can support as is. Patricia commented she'd like to have more time. We will bring this back on the 28th but that will be for action at that meeting. Kathryn clarified that the Academic Senate doesn't need to formally approve the document, just give Kathryn direction (for APM and CAC). David voiced a concern about language says it's DDEAC but there is language in there that was added later. Ajani mentioned still having concerns about the 8 unit restriction for students on hiring committees.

13. Guided pathways meta majors. Natalie Laterie shared that faculty from different departments have [voted on the groupings](#). She mentioned taking meta majors to the College Curriculum Committee for approval via [a resolution](#). Kathryn asked that the Academic Senate give an endorsement to this resolution, today, or wait until after the Curriculum Committee approves it, possibly at tomorrow's meeting (Tuesday). The executive committee did not endorse this now (there was silence) so Kathryn will bring it back on the 28th to take formal action.

14. Announcements on outreach events - it is important for faculty to participate in outreach events, for high school students and others.

15. Meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m. Next meeting will be February 28th, two weeks from today