

Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 23, 2015

2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

ITEM	
1. Call to Order	
The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m.	
2. Roll Call	
<p>Present: Roseann Berg (PT rep '16), Robert Cormia (AS Secretary Treasurer '15), Lisa Drake (BSS); Leeann Emanuel (CNSL), Isaac Escoto (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-chair '15); Craig Gawlick (Classified Liaison), Meredith Heiser (Faculty Association Liaison), Lauren Hickey (K A), Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16), Kate Jordahl (F A), Andrew LaManque, Scott Lankford (L A); Debbie Lee (PSME), David Marasco (PSME), Kimberlee Messina (Cabinet Liaison), Richard Morasci (LA), Tobias Nava (CNSL); Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15), David Sauter (BHS), Mary Thomas (LRC).</p> <p>Guests: Stephanie Tran (English), Judy Baker (Foothill Online Learning).</p> <p>Absent: Steve Batham (BSS), Josh Rosales (ASFC President).</p>	
3. Approval of Minutes: February 9, 2015	Action
MSA Marasco/Morasci.	
4. Consent Calendar	Action
Approved by consensus: ETC/Online Data Inquiry Tool Users Group: Lori Silverman	
5. Unfinished Business	
<p>a. Part-Time Faculty Leadership Inclusion donation from the President's Office (Discussion / Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of document: Presidential Support for PT Inclusion 2nd Draft. Schaefers reviewed the proposal • Motion to approve proposal as written (Heiser, Marasco). • FOLLOW-UP ACTION NEEDED: Senators please announce this opportunity to your division. First ten people to apply will have standing. 	
<p>b. SLOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO coordinator meeting update 	Discussion / Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division SLO Coordinators met (Roseann Berg, Katherine Schaefers, Kimberlee Messina, Craig Gawlick, and Fatimah Jinnah). • Berg reported that there was discussion of the SLO assessment cycle, increasing collaboration (e.g. a division without a SLO coordinator could invite a coordinator from another division to speak to them), and planning a professional development event for the spring (question about speakers who are experts at SLOs). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ FOLLOW UP ACTION: Holcroft to send query to SLO listserv to gather names of potential speakers • Senate discussion of desire for a faculty survey on what we need re: SLOs and SLOAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Must address the logistics of reaching part-time faculty. ◦ Messina suggested that the Office of Institutional Research could better create and manage a survey for faculty benefit. ◦ Brainstormed key questions: What help do faculty need from SLO coordinators? How could the SLO process be less of a bureaucratic task? What do faculty need in order to make the process meaningful? Do faculty know why SLOs are required and how they can be a tool for improving teaching and learning? ◦ Lankford, Schaefers and Thomas volunteered to work with OIR. Holcroft to submit formal research request to the Office of Institutional Research. • Suggestion that at beginning of each quarter, SLO coordinators send out summaries to their divisions. Goals are to keep SLOs on faculty radar, and provide easy way to share info among colleagues re: assessments, reflections, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ As a pilot for spring quarter, the Office of Instruction (Craig) will send out a TracDat report to each SLO coordinator/division. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLOs on CORs 	Discussion / Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of third draft of resolution, revisions specifically address the process of changing SLOs 	

<p>without having a major impact on the COR approval/management process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isaac confirmed that revising a SLO would be considered a minor change to the COR and would not trigger a new COR approval process. • Resolution was adopted. MSA Lankford/Lee. • LaManque said Office of Instruction will transfer SLOs to CORs in the spring, procedures and technology to be determined. (He expects a report from the webmaster on enhancing or replacing C3MS by this Friday). • Continued discussion about each division determining its own SLO assessment cycle. Confirmed that Service Area Outcomes are included in the conversation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ At the 2/9/15 meeting, senators were tasked to get feedback from their divisions. ◦ Two divisions supported the 3 years maximum period of time for a full cycle update. ◦ Motion that that each division Curriculum Committee will work with division faculty to determine the division's own SLO Assessment Cycle (up to a maximum of three years for every SLO for each course) and if it varies from the one year-cycle currently in use, communicate it to the Office of Instruction to be published on the SLO website. MSA Lankford/Marasco. ◦ ACCJC expects the results of the SLOAC cycle to inform program review; we do comprehensive program reviews every three years. • FOLLOW UP ACTION: Senators to communicate with division curriculum committees re: facilitating discussion and adoption of divisional SLOAC cycles. 	
• Adoption of Academic Senate AUOs	Discussion / Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of document: Foothill College Academic Senate AUOs 2nd Read. M/S/A to adopt AUOs Lee/Lankford. • FOLLOW-UP ACTION: Holcroft to update in TracDat. 	
c. VAWA Update	Discussion / Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marasco shared the link on college home page to our VAWA policies (it needs a better name than Title IX). • U.S. Senate will hear testimony on this tomorrow, and we hope to have more guidance about how we can comply. • Open enrollment presents a challenge for reaching all students, but the message for now seems to be that if we are making a good-faith effort to comply, we will not be penalized. • We need a district-wide solution, especially for students who take courses at both colleges. De Anza Academic Senate is interested in collaboration between the colleges and issue will be raised at next APM meeting, important to discuss not just training but also the law's requirement to punish offenders. • Topic is also being discussed at statewide Academic Senate. • Bottom line, we want to have effective training in place to protect our students. • FOLLOW UP ACTION NEEDED: Holcroft/Escoto to bring to APM 	
6. Reports of Officers	Information
a. President's Report (Holcroft)	Information / Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PaRC 2/18/15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget update from Bernata Slater – led discussion of Governor Brown's '15-'16 budget proposal and what it would mean for Foothill College <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Cautiously optimistic. Dependent upon May revise. ◦ Interest in inviting Bernata to senate after May revise. • Equity and Basic Skills Funding Priorities reviewed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Spending deadline for equity funds extended to December 2015. SEW will continue to review proposals as they come in. \$100,000 equity and \$30,000 of basic skills have not yet been allocated. • Accreditation Institute 2/20-21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top reasons for sanctions: BoT/financial problems, SLOs, and integrated planning. • The senate can't do anything about the Board's financial accountability, but we have responsibility for SLOs. • Some colleges are sanctioned for lack of integration, in particular when student learning 	

<p>and achievement assessments do not drive institutional decision-making re resources and planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details should be available on the website soon, and we will have more discussion. • Messina suggested resource requests in program review should be connected with the SLOAC reflection. Office of Instruction can share examples from departments that did this well. • From the AJCCC website we can see that several local colleges have been placed on probation or sanctioned, but deeper digging is required to find out why. • ESMP 2/11/15 – we are developing a new plan. More info to come. • BoT Meeting 2/9/15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas reported that several library faculty and staff attended the meeting to protest the downgrading of a senior library technician position at the circulation/reserve desk; the administration didn't consult with anyone in the library about this decision, and it was the opposite of what has been requested in the library's program review. The Board tabled the relevant items, and Kimberlee has formed a small work group, including library faculty and staff, to discuss the issue. Holcroft highlighted importance of attention to program review. 	
b. Vice President's Report (Escoto)	Information / Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read the Communiqué. • Course currency policy recommendation and repeal process. • Will continue to discuss AP credit in context of GE and major preparation; Isaac recommends that we look at the AP grid in the course catalog. Legislators are asking us to be consistent with other colleges and universities in California. We at least need to do a better job of explaining our policies when on the surface they seem to make things harder for students. 	
c. Sec/Treas. Report (Cormia)	Information / Discussion
7. Committee Reports	Information
<p>a. Academic Integrity (John Fox):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing Center: Thom Shepard from the Testing Center joined the committee, so there has been more conversation about cheating there. • According to the staff, they are not able to proctor all exams because they don't have enough staff, so the center may install security cameras; even if not regularly reviewed, would still have a deterrent effect. • Question about how students are cheating; they have to turn in their cell phones during the exam, but they may sneak in a second phone. • Messina suggested that the testing Center staff begin to think about how to make technical/process policy approaches to curbing/deterring cheating. There was strong consensus that we need to be stricter and have the testing center policies prominently displayed. • Could SSSP funding be used to hire a person to provide scrutiny during the exams? • Need to read testing center program review to determine if they asked for additional staff. • The physical layout of the testing center could be an issue. It was suggested that the Testing Center review policies and procedures (furniture placement, how shifts are scheduled, security cameras, posting the honor code) and that Academic Integrity Committee work with the Testing Center to determine what resources are needed to enforce policies. • Based on a report from the AIC, the Senate could resolve to recommend resource requests to the supervising administrator. Pat Hyland is working with Testing Center staff to address problem of fake IDs being used in placement tests. • Motion that staff in the center who witness violations of the honor code take responsibility for reporting violations to Pat Hyland with a CC to the instructor. M/S/A • Survey: Fox also reported results from AI faculty survey (to be presented at the ICAI Conference this weekend): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53% response rate. • Faculty believe plagiarism is more common than cheating on exams, getting help on an 	

assignment was not considered serious cheating, most other violations were considered serious, faculty have a lot of uncertainty about cheating on campus.

- In a survey of Foothill students, 48% of students said they will cheat if they can get away with it; in contrast, only 24% of faculty believe that students will cheat if they can get away with it; 61% of student admit cheating, but only 14% of students think it's a serious problem; 52% faculty think cheating is a serious problem
- b. Academic and Professional Matters (APM) – did not meet
- c. Assessment/Placement Ad Hoc – next meeting tomorrow, Feb. 24 1-3PM (Altos)
- d. Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) – did not meet
- e. COOL (Jordahl)
 - Next meeting tomorrow, 2/24 at 1PM in Bio Health Conference Room: addendum for COR approval, including a choice for hybrid, OEI and Canvas, divisions' responsibility for adopting online course standards.
 - OEI update:
 - In a thorough process Canvas was chosen as the common course management system. Judy and Kate will do a full presentation later, but for now, don't panic! Nothing will change yet.
 - Our current Etudes contract runs through June 30th. The process of transition at Foothill has not been discussed or decided, but if a decision is made by Foothill to change to Canvas, the Etudes contract will certainly be renewed for a minimum of one more year to allow for migration.
 - If you have questions, ask Judy, Kate, or Carolyn. FAQ will be available on the Foothill website.
- f. Student Equity
 - Next meeting Thursday, Feb. 26 2:30-4:30PM

8. New Business			
a. Campus Climate Survey results (2:15PM)	Info / Discussion		
• Elaine Kuo was not available. Postponed to next meeting			
b. Program Review Concerns			Morasci
Postponed			
9. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take actions)	Information		
a. OEI Update at next Senate meeting.			
b. Early Alert system demo April 9 (Starfish)			
c. DRC new accommodations approval/booking system, "Clockwork" to launch, update at next Senate meeting.			
d. Smarthinking data (online 24/7 tutorial service) – usage is slowly going up.			
e. Committee Needs: ETAC, PDL Committee (suggestion to hold meetings online) (meets Thursdays), Technology Trainer Hiring Committee (hope to hire by mid-Spring quarter), Instructional Designer Hiring Committee (hope to hire by mid-Spring quarter)			
f. FA: voting on salary on March 17 th and 18 th ; faculty needed to staff election			
10. Adjournment			
The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.			