

Academic Senate Minutes
October 17, 2011

Meeting Called to Order: 2:02pm

Members present: Dolores Davison (President), Carolyn Holcroft (Vice-President/CCC Chair), Robert Cormia (Secretary/Treasurer), Katherine Schaefer (Adjunct Faculty), Teresa Ong (ADL), Eta Lin (BSS), Sam Connell (BSS), Tobias Nava (CNSL), Fatima Jinnah (CNSL), Bruce McLeod (FA), Janis Stevenson (FA), Richard Moraschi (LA), Pam Wilkes (LRC), Don MacNeil (KA), Dixie Macias (PE), Patrick Morriss (PSME), Debbie Lee (PSME), Kimberlee Messina (Cabinet Liaison), Darya Gilani (Classified Liaison), Meredith Heiser (FA Liaison)

Members Absent: Karl Peter (BHS), Jeff Bissell (KA), Russell Wong (ADL)

Agenda Approval: Agenda was approved by unanimous voice vote

Announcements: A reminder about serving requirements student grievances hearing panel; Dolores will send out list of current faculty pool by email

Approval of Minutes from October 3rd 2011: Minutes were approved with changes including notes from Carolyn Holcroft.

Consent Calendar: Approved with amendments as follows: Londa Larson will chair Sandhya Rao's TRC in Chemistry (PSME)

Item 1: Faculty handbook (Davison) (100 pages - online - no need to print) Changes will be made in real time on a document posted online. This process was started two years ago, and many items are now out of date (such as telecourses). The handbook isn't a negotiated item, so any items that are negotiate through FA are not included in the handbook. Goal is to have the handbook editing process complete by November. Senators made suggestions about items that might be missing - should be forwarded to Dolores by email. Faculty can email comments directly to Dolores or work through their senators.

Item 2: - District program discontinuance administrative procedure (Holcroft).

- Foothill's procedure will be separate from the District-level document. District procedure approved unanimously by voice vote. Carolyn introduced the current draft of Foothill's program discontinuance/suspension procedure being revised within IP&B. Stressed that IP&B is the venue for editing the procedure, any faculty member welcome at meetings, or can send feedback/suggestions to Holcroft via email. IP&B just finalized the annual program review document and currently working to revise the comprehensive program review template, and working to make sure that potential program discontinuance policy is informed by data from the program review documents. At last IP&B meeting senate representatives were assured that there would be no additional programs (beyond those already named last year) considered for reduction (elimination) this academic year. A senator asked how the phrase 'extreme financial hardship' would be defined, as the document as written suggested that processes defined in program reduction could be set aside in the event of extreme financial hardship. The phrase 'all reasonable opportunities' refers to an inclusion process for faculty to address issues mentioned in program review that could lead to program reduction. Goal is to finalize Foothill Program Discontinuance Procedure as soon as possible and certainly before the end of this academic year.
- Kimberlee Messina spoke to clarify the process of reductions that occurred last year (faculty, classified, and administrators). The College budget news a year ago was far direr than this year (9.2 million vs. 3.3 million dollars projected deficit). Everything (programs) that came to the senate last year is still on the list of possible reductions, however the significant decrease in expected State budget cuts will cause our College cuts less than what was mentioned. A comment was made that

the district language in the document discussed here is very broad, and needs to have specific clarity.

- There were questions about the 'two quarter window' to address issues related to curriculum, enrollments, etc. and concern that this couldn't possibly be enough time to fix problems. Holcroft stressed that the time window was intended for faculty/admin to agree on goals/benchmarks, and a plan to improve, NOT to completely solve problems in two quarters.
- A question was raised about what type of documentation would be created to 'document' a warning process. Would there be a 'watch list' created such that divisions have a formal warning if they are in trouble and might be headed for elimination. Another question was raised about who and how the program elimination decisions would be made. Holcroft said that if the program review process works as intended and faculty are engaged, potential problems would be identified and both faculty and administrators would have many opportunities to communicate openly about program status, goals, areas that need improvement, etc.
- Goal is that going forward methods/process of program elimination will be transparent and include both administration and faculty. There was further discussion about discontinuance (which is in Title 5) versus suspension and/or hiatus (both terms used by Judy Miner last year). No formal mention of suspension/hiatus in Title 5. Concern that this could accidentally/intentionally create a "backdoor" process to eliminate a program since if a program isn't offered for two years then we are legally required to remove it from the catalog and it is effectively eliminated. Senators continued to ask about the term 'extreme financial hardship' and the impact of budgets versus enrollment driven program elimination decisions.
- Darya commented that in addition to the three year cycle for comprehensive program review, there might be an 'out of sequence' comprehensive program review. Also exploring option of having a designated program review committee and considering what their charge would be, and what role it would have in discontinuance procedure. Further discussions were made about the timeline for getting the program review and discontinuance documents completed - and the stated intention was within this academic year.

Item 4: Academic Integrity Committee (Morris) brought up the issue of 'faculty professionalism', suggesting that often cheating and plagiarism isn't just about students, and that the behavior of both the faculty and institution is important. Specifically, envisions creating a campus culture where the default behavior is one of integrity. Patrick suggested that a culture of integrity could benefit students who are attempting to transfer to another college if Foothill gains reputation of integrity. Morris suggested that (as a college) we rewrite the honor code to include academic and professional integrity. Patrick suggested incorporating professional integrity, beyond the last update from AAUP, and that we call the (academic integrity) committee to meet and rewrite the charge of the academic integrity committee. Patrick suggested that the respect students have for faculty, curriculum and the institution is correlated with the degree of 'compliance' with expected norms for cheating, plagiarism, etc. Much that faculty can do in order to discourage cheating "up front." A suggestion was made that the academic integrity committee review the literature on student behavior/integrity etc. that would inform a more current version of the policy. Specifically, change the charge of the committee to include faculty professionalism as part of academic integrity. Faculty professional integrity could also drive faculty (professional) development. Group (committee) will meet next Monday at 2 p.m.

Item 5: SB1143 Task force and recommendations (Holcroft).

- Statewide academic senate seeking feedback about SB1143 taskforce recommendations. Upcoming series of webinars, Davison will forward info via email. Foothill academic senate meeting on October 31st will be entirely devoted to SB1143 and the proposed resolutions to be considered at Fall Plenary meeting on Nov. 3-5. There was conversation about general education conducted in our courses (employer input about critical thinking, communication, writing) further comment about changing the mission of California community colleges in the ed. code. Performance based funding for students was removed from list, considered a victory by ASCCC. There are comments that this is a budget (cost) driven process with some good ideas, but enough bad ideas that this

legislation needs to be corrected or not passed. The Board of Governors is scheduling a meeting in January to go over this. Must begin implementation by March 2012. SB 1143 came on the heels of 1440 (transfer degrees and transfer model curriculum) and gave so much attention to it that not enough time may have been spent on SB1143. Having faculty involved in this process would also be helpful in creating a more productive dialog with the legislature.

- There are colleges that have mandatory flex days that are not faculty development.
- Some discussion of the repeatability recommendations (Appendix C) of resolutions packet. Repeatability task force had issues with PE etc, and will be bringing forward two different resolutions for fall plenary. (PE, performing arts, CTE,) recommendations would change repeatability of certain courses at Foothill. The current suggestion is to limit a student's participation in PE to 8 semester (12 quarter) courses in the repeatability requirements. How many courses in a discipline can you take?
- Repetition rules also just changed, students may not attempt to take a course more than three times (transcriptable notation). This will affect our add/drop process and W date (which must be a District policy) beginning Winter 2012 quarter. There are financial aid and Visa implications. Three-course limit (repetition) is now law, and is separate from the repeatability task force.
- A senator mentioned Carolyn's resolution and asked if there was "a move" to increase communication with high schools regarding aligning their core standards to our classes. What is the ongoing status of the relationship between community colleges and high schools?

Financial aid has asked us if we can approve financial aid earlier in the year so that they have more time to advertise this scholarship, and thus more students will apply for them.

We will bring that forward on October 31st 2011.

For the Good of the Order: Patrick Morriss announced that he will run for Academic Senate President in spring 2012, and that having a contested election (versus an election by executive acclamation) might be a good thing.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:03 p.m.