

Foothill Academic Senate Minutes May 9, 2022

DRAFT Minutes

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

1. Meeting called to order in Room 4006 (KCI) and Zoom at 2:03 p.m.

2. Roll call

*indicates attendance on Zoom

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*

Kerri Ryer*

Kimberly Escamilla*

Mary Thomas*

Matthew Litrus*

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera
(absent)

Milissa Carey*

Owen Flannery*

Patricia Crespo-Martin*

Stephanie Chan*

Tracee Cunningham*

Voltaire Villanueva

Extended Exec Committee

Adrienne Hypolite*

Ajani Byrd*

Carolyn Holcroft

Fatai Heimuli*

John Fox*

Kurt Hueg (absent)

Guests

Clifton Der Bing

Susie Huerta

Lene Whitley-Putz

3. There was a minor change to the agenda, a request from ASFC to bring to the Academic Senate the nominations for faculty commencement speaker. Cormia first and Frankel second moved to accept the modification, the agenda as modified was approved by consensus.

The minutes from April 25th were approved by consensus (Ellen Judd first and Milissa Carey second).

4. Every 30 days the Academic Senate must have a reaffirmation of remote meetings under AB 361 to allow quorum to be reached in person and online. Donna Frankel first and David Marasco second moved to approve. The motion for reaffirmation of remote meetings passed unanimously with one abstention (see roll call vote below).

5. Clifton Der Bing (Psych Services) made an announcement about a SOGI workshop to enhance awareness for LGBT students, and especially transgender students. PGA is available (Tuesday June 7th, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.) in Toyon and hybrid/online.

Tracee Cunningham, sitting on the commencement committee, reminded us that it would be great to have faculty in person at commencement, so students know that we are supporting them. Order regalia by May 25th.

Kimberly Escamilla read a statement by Amber La Piana. While she was pleased to see change in governance to become more inclusive, there are constituencies still being left out.

Governance requires participation, some get PGA, but some work for free, or even have to pay for caretakers (children), e.g., faculty who are parents. She also mentioned that governance isn't fully representing disabled (students) or didn't include enough disabled students. Much of Return to Campus has been "ableist."

Susie Huerta commented she was in full support of the statement written by Amber.

6. The consent calendar includes additional appointments to the new governance structure (Mission I'm Possible) and the new scheduling task force that is forming. There are still openings on the technology task force. David commented that Sarah Parikh will be replaced by Sara Cooper (on the scheduling task force). David moved to approve, Voltaire seconded, the consent calendar was approved by consensus.

7. Fatai Heimuli (ASFC) - ASFC has nominated two commencement speakers, one faculty and one staff. The top four nominees for the faculty speakers (excluding those who have spoken in recent years): 3rd place tie (Kerri and Voltaire), 2nd (Cleve Freeman) 1st place Allison Hermon. Motion to approve nominees by David and Voltaire, speakers were approved. The nominees will be approached in order of votes cast by the students.

8. Nomination and approval of the District Academic Senate. Carolyn spoke to an [FAQ document](#) that explains what District Academic Senate does, and mentioned that it increases our vote at ASCCC plenary. The District Senate is all FHDA-CCD faculty. The document was prepared to help explain what a District Academic Senate does, and how we can use it.

Kathryn clarified that Districts are required to have an academic senate, in most multi-college districts there are local academic senates as well. Local senates need to be approved by the District academic senate. The District AS President co-chairs along with the Chancellor the Academic & Professional Matters Committee, which is where collegial consultation with the senates occur on all board policies and administrative procedures that are part of 10+1. Kathryn explained that the District Academic Senate President alternates between the two Colleges. This last year was Karen Chow (De Anza) before was Isaac Escoto (Foothill). Kathryn asked that we find a nominee. Voltaire formally nominated Kathryn Mauer and David seconded. Carolyn clarified that we have had a past practice to first reach out to everyone who is eligible (anyone who served as an officer in the past 5 years), but this is not in writing. No other names came forward. Kathryn suggested we tidy up this document. Kathryn's nomination for district academic senate president was approved by consensus.

9. Presidential search: Kathryn brought forward [a document](#) shared with our senators, and Kerri had presented a PPT about the content for presidential search. Carolyn asked if we could revisit the questions that Kerri had put into email about what assumptions we're making about prior experience (e.g. having been an administrator or a student). Kathryn added the questions to the document. Frank commented we should have something about sustainability mentioned in the search document. Frank suggested looking at the campus through the lens of sustainability, and interviewing (or asking questions) to ensure a candidate at least has a knowledge of

sustainability. Carolyn commented that everyone would state commitment to sustainability, but we need more specifics about how to demonstrate that value.

Kerri shared that the first two questions are a starting point, and asked must a candidate have that experience, and what experiences might be important (for example, social justice)? Janie Garcia commented that these questions could be very helpful in the process of creating interview questions. Carolyn commented that just because a candidate had been a college faculty, it doesn't clarify which qualities that brings, and we should be specific about that. Donna commented on the need for the President (candidate) to have made sound hiring decisions in the past. Kimberly commented that the questions as worded should be able (possible) to pull different approaches to answers, and that past experience doesn't guarantee future performance. Stephanie also commented that we should have an open ended approach to being able to get the information we need without having to rely too much on any one question (checking boxes). If we prioritize topics like race and social justice, we might not get the results that we need. Brian talked about the importance of apprenticeship and partnerships. (20% of our student body is apprentices).

Kathryn commented that these discussions are important, but she would recommend we do not remove the concept of minimum qualifications, e.g. having experience as an administrator and/or tenured faculty in higher ed, but we treat those as minimum and build on from there explicitly what values we're looking for with that experience.

Carolyn commented that it is very important that candidates be deeply respectful of persons and ideas that are very different from their own. David clarified that the candidate should be deeply respectful of community college students. David also underscored the importance of understanding and empathy. Experience as a community college instructor is different from a university experience. Further discussion revolved around the importance of managing groups with different needs and competing interests. Additions were made to the document.

Kerri showed a PPT shared with her, highlighting the importance of understanding racism, importance of equity, importance of interdisciplinary collaboration, importance of student services. Comments were that this document was very thoughtful. Kerri asked if it was possible to combine both documents? Kathryn welcomed anyone to combine both into the one. Carolyn commented about two parts of the discussion, what qualities are we looking for, and how does this mesh with the job description. Kathryn suggested that we finalize this input at the next Academic Senate meeting and hand it off to the search committee.

10. Online equity affirmation - first read of the [draft resolution](#). The meeting was handed over to Carolyn and Kerri. Carolyn started off by asking if this was the first time that Academic Senate has seen Online Equity Affirmation, and it was confirmed it was. Carolyn commented that this is a lot, on a first read. Carolyn commented that the document has been seen and circulated for a number of years, it has come up at COOL, in a number of contexts. It has been approved by COOL, bringing it to the Academic Senate is the next natural step.

Kathryn asked how we get constituent feedback. Kerri suggested that we bring the document to our divisions, get feedback and spread the conversation. Voltaire suggested that the document was (is) thoughtful and intentional, not just for online courses. Lene (online learning) added that one of the values of the document is to provide guidance to faculty, but not prescriptive actions. What do faculty need to do in designing their courses, ideas for faculty, collaborators, and institutions? Take some of the onus off of individual faculty for development, and do some things together.

Carolyn explained that the document contains and distills a lot of conversations that have happened on campus, and for faculty designing courses (for online pedagogy) Carolyn pointed to a table in the document, not punitive or prescriptive.

Kathryn commented that we have a draft resolution with four “Resolves,” which ask us to adopt the OEA, share it with faculty, ask it to be included in the online faculty handbook and training, and be incorporated into the DE addendum process in our curriculum processes. Kathryn asked Eric if he could explain what that might look like, and if it’s a possibility.

Eric explained that in order for a course to be offered in an online modality, it needs an approved distance education addendum, and what this resolution vaguely asks for is that faculty creating courses or going through Title V review, might be directed towards this document as part of the completion or review of the DE Addendum. It would ensure faculty will at least know that this document exists. Eric commented this would be easy enough to integrate into the online addendum.

There was a comment that this document is valuable because it has specifics of what an individual faculty can do without the rest of the system being involved. Kathryn said this will come back for a second read, or more if needed or requested by the senators.

11. Kathryn explained that this is the first conversation of some very dense documents: equity action plans to support the Strategic Vision for Equity (SVE) we approved last year. Ajani talked about a presentation made last quarter, about how to go from a plan to action. Kathryn talked about today’s discussion being mostly about understanding the plan framework, and how we’ve tried to identify the specific issues and goals from the SVE where the academic senate, CCC or COOL are named explicitly and/or are areas of our purview, and then identify actions we’re already working on and/or committed to, and finally decide what else we’d like to see on there. Kathryn also explained that there are columns to track the status, and how we would know if the action were “complete” (the measure of success being completion, not whether or not the action actually made an impact on our equity goals).

Kathryn explained that the first document combined both Exec and CCC, but COOL has been working on their own separate document. Kerri commented that their plans has been approved at COOL (Friday May 6th) and COOL is going forward with using the document.

Kathryn asked that the members of the executive committee, of course informed by faculty input, take leadership in how this document and process unfolds. Ellen asked if it was possible to add to the document, and Kathryn said absolutely – that is going to be the next step. Ellen commented on the underutilization of the tutoring center.

Stephanie commented on the need to get students involved in talking about these issues and identifying actions. She also shared that the Foothill Connect (pilot project) is very relevant.

Kathryn asked for more comments, the objective was to ask for a process for planning, how do we want to contribute to this discussion?

Ajani shared that this will benefit from collective involvement, and using a template like this is helpful. He also said conversations will need to take place about what is a campus wide goal versus a local goal. You can start a lot of things at a local level, but also touch many areas of the campus. Carolyn commented what we have on the agenda today is the academic senate plan, as a body, but different areas of the faculty may have different approaches. So what should (executive) take on as a leadership body? Ajani commented on the importance of identifying 2 or 3 things that are very important. This could take longer than a year, it could be a two year cycle. Carolyn asked faculty to think about what areas of faculty purview in equity they need help with, and need the Academic Senate to help with.

12. Carolyn wanted to remind faculty that if they use OER in their class we should be entering that into Follet, so students see low or no cost, it could be something that students see and would enhance a decision to enroll in a course. Student enter adoptions (or indicate OER or no materials) using the Bookstore/Follet app in MyPortal.

13. Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m. Two meetings left this academic year. Next meeting on May 23rd.

Academic Senate Winter 2022 Roll Call Vote - Reaffirmation of remote meetings

Roll call (Cormia)

Kathryn Mauer	(not voting)
Eric Kuehnl	x
Robert Cormia	x
Brian Murphy	x
Alexis Aguilar	x
Kerri Ryer	x
Frank Niccoli	x
Tracee Cunningham	x
Voltaire Villanueva	x
Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera	(absent)
Milissa Carey	x

Jordan Fong	x	
Owen Flannery	?	
Katy Ripp	x	
Stephanie Chan	x	
Patricia Crespo-Martin		x
Kimberly Escamilla	x	
Mary Thomas	x	
Matthew Litrus	x	
David Marasco	x	
Donna Frankel	x	
Ellen Judd	x	
Fatai Heimuli	x	
Adrienne Hypolite	x	
John Fox	x	
Carolyn Holcroft	x	
Ajani Byrd	abstain	
Kurt Hueg	absent	

DRAFT