

Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 6, 2016
2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

ITEM	ACTION
1. Call to Order	Quorum present 1:58PM. Holcroft called meeting to order 2:02PM
2. Adoption of Agenda	Approved by consent
3. Public Comments	Limited to 3 minutes each. Senate cannot take action or respond to items not on the agenda
4. Roll Call	<p><u>Senators Present</u> Micaela Agyare (LRC) Steve Batham (BSS) Roseann Berg (PT rep '16) Cathy Denver (CNSL) Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15) Lauren Hickey (K A) Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16) Kate Jordahl (F A) Scott Lankford (L A) David Marasco (PSME) Kathryn Maurer (BSS) Bruce McLeod (F A) Patrick Morriss (AS Sec'y Treas '15) Rita O'Loughin (KA) Katherine Schaefer (PT rep '15) David Sauter (BHS) Voltaire Villanueva (CNSL)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Present</u> – Karen Erickson (Faculty Association) Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet) Breeze Liu (ASFC President)</p> <p><u>Guests</u> Simon Pennington, Interim Dean of Fine Arts Katy Ripp, Kinesiology and Athletics faculty member and volleyball coach Mike Teijeiro, Athletic Director Teresa Zwack, Math faculty and tri-chair, Basic Skills Work Group Victor Tam, Dean of PSME</p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u> Joanne Lopez (BHS) Richard Morasci (LA) Rosa Nguyen (PSME)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u> Kurt Hueg (President's Cabinet) Allison Largent (Classified Senate)</p>
5. Senate Charge	Holcroft reviewed the 10+1 areas of Senate purview specified in Title 5. She emphasized that we should always be able to connect one or more areas on that list to each item on our agenda. She encouraged all faculty to complete the governance survey (look for link in email). The results of that survey drive summer senate activities.
6. Approval of Minutes:	Morriss did not make the minutes from the May 23 meeting available in time

May 23, 2016	for distribution with the current agenda. Consequently, approval of the minutes of the May 23 meeting was postponed until the first meeting fall quarter.
7. Consent Calendar	<p>Senate Summer Cabinet: Rosa Nguyen (PSME); David Marasco (PSME); Katherine Schaefer (PT, BSS), Bruce McLeod (FA)</p> <p>Director of Equity Programs hiring committee (summer work) Patrick Morriss (PSME)</p> <p>Faculty Senate rep for '16-17 Professional Development Committee (Tri-chair) Jeff Anderson (PSME)</p> <p>Faculty Senate rep for '16-17 Workforce Work Group (Tri-chair) Rachelle Campbell (BHS)</p> <p>Approved by consent</p> <p>College and District committees in need of a faculty member(s) to serve as Academic Senate representative(s): Professional Development Leave Committee Campus Center Council</p> <p>Academic Senate committees in need of faculty member(s) Academic Integrity Committee</p>
8. Unfinished Business	
a. Program Review Committee observations and recommendations (~2:15PM)	<p>Pennington observed that in 2014, there was agreement that the Program Review Committee was perfectly placed to make some college-wide observations, based on reading every program review & meeting with 11 different departments, big move toward transparency.</p> <p>LaManque shared recs previously presented to PaRC . Questions for senate: what priority should we assign to these recommendations? What about #2? #4 is an observation, subject to self-censorship. Let's not do that anymore. Faculty might want to get along with their deans.</p> <p>#11 ACCJC requires institutional standard, floor success rate. If there are departments with success rates lower than floor. ACCJC is permissive re: departmental floor.</p> <p>Some issues with administrative units with instructional responsibilities.</p> <p>Simon re:#11 context regarding benchmarks, it really helps to have average grades, success rates, and thoughtful interpretation. The discussion is what's really important.</p> <p>Carolyn, Andrew, FA, came to LA. One positive outcome that Scott doesn't see in the PRC recs: need more f2f time for PR generation, faculty and especially administrators. PRC heard that, rec #8. A cover letter</p> <p>Faculty sections in PR might generate more interest..."reflective practice," "bragging", "blue-sky" then setting benchmarks? maybe a great restructuring of the process? Get to the new president? Pennington expressed some support.</p> <p>Senators are asked whether Senate should weigh in? To think about prioritize the PRC recommendations? Whether we do or no, we will send a message. Reminder that PR is faculty purview. Feedback to officers, will be input to planning, IP&B, this is a faculty opportunity to help set the agenda.</p>

b. District Academic Senate President '16-'17	Foothill officers nominated Isaac Escoto. Nomination approved by consent.
c. Summer stipend and cabinet	M Jordahl S Maurer, motion carried.
d. Senate restructuring feedback	<p>English department faculty expressed some support for the academic restructure, going beyond the bandaid. BSS Division reps reported five or six very strong responses against executive committee authority to effect future restructuring, prefer to leave such changes as a constitutional matter requiring consent of the full senate body (all faculty). There was some concern raised with respect to having representation at Senate aligned other than by administrative division.</p> <p>It was noted that some faculty feel disconnected from senate. Among the adjunct faculty, some prefer a senate representative associated with their discipline, rather than with their employment status. It was noted that the current divisional representatives also represent part-time faculty as well.</p> <p>Again the point was made about senate representation of faculty serving outside the current divisional structure, the faculty orphans, as it were. Serving their needs was part of the impetus for examining senate restructuring in the first place, so some constitutional amendment appears warranted at any rate. It was pointed out that the Library once had two voting senate reps but now retains one without a corresponding separate administrative division. Continuing the Library's senate representation may not require amendment.</p> <p>Ad hoc committee is directed to draft constitutional amendment language for presentation to the executive committee, specifying that the Executive Committee comprises two Senators each from BHS, BSS, Counseling, FA&C, KA, LA, and PSME, plus one Senator representing the Library and two representing part-time faculty, and to provide for representation of faculty serving outside current divisions (either assign them to a division or allow them to choose). Will also solicit PT participation. It was suggested that this may be an opportunity to make the communication culture common.</p>
e. Elections	<p>Both Constitutional amendments passed. The Secretary is directed to reflect the changes in our Constitution.</p> <p>Elections for academic senate president and part time faculty representative (both 2016-18 terms) were not contested. Motion to accept Carolyn Holcroft as President and Donna Frankel as Senate representative for part-time faculty (M Batham S Lankford). Motion carried.</p>
9. New Business	
a. Basic Skills Initiative report (~3PM)	<p>Zwack and Tam spoke about the Basic Skills Workgroup.</p> <p>First priority item is to provide for embedded tutoring, the approximately \$100K funded by the Basic Skills Initiative is separate from general account. Embedded tutors are instructor-selected students (from previous quarters, e.g.) that come into the class for a quarter to help out.</p> <p>Second on the Workgroup's agenda is a concentration on third-try repeaters of Math 105, coordinated with the Early Alert program.</p> <p>Last summer was the fourth offering of the math summer bridge program to improve accuracy of math placement. The program invites students planning to take basic skills math classes in the fall to campus for two weeks during the summer. At the end of the two weeks, students retake the placement exam. Approximately 70% of summer bridge participants place higher, saving time on their ed plan progress.</p>

	<p>Participants also meet counselors and financial aid personnel.</p> <p>Last summer was the first English summer bridge. The English version is less placement focused, more about skill-building.</p> <p>The BSWG provided funding for professional development. Math faculty are encouraged to attend pathways conferences. Success rates in precollegiate math classes are about 50%. Pathways look at alternative ways for students to demonstrate proficiency.</p> <p>The Workgroup provided seed money for Human Library.</p> <p>Plans for next year are to continue existing programs, but not to expand. All the BSI money was spent. The Math summer bridge program will be offered earlier to meet the needs of student-athletes.</p> <p>The BSWG's work was well-received in Senate. There was applause, especially as it connected to the work of the Student Equity Workgroup. There followed some Q&A.</p> <p>When possible, courses with large achievement gaps are selected for embedded tutoring, but sometimes selected just by word-of-mouth. History 17 was offered as an example.</p> <p>With regard to embedded tutors in online courses, some Computer Science instructors supplemental instructors sign in to the course as guests.</p> <p>Senators are asked to share BSI plan with constituents and to bring any feedback to the senate planning retreat. Also please look for faculty interested in embedded tutoring.</p> <p>Document to follow from Zwack.</p>
b. Proposed Revision to AP 5060 (Academic Renewal)	<p>As currently constituted, "Academic Renewal" applies only to an entire quarter (Students using academic renewal have all their academic work in a given quarter disregarded.) This change would apply academic renewal to individual courses.</p> <p>This is a local policy at community colleges, it's up to transfer institutions to honor. The proposed change in policy demonstrates how we value second chances. Counselors think it's a good tool.</p> <p>Senators are asked to let people know of the proposed change. Necessary changes to Administrative Procedure are scheduled for a first read at the next meeting of Academic and Professional Matters.</p>
c. Reinstatement of priority registration for athletes (~3:15PM)	<p>Ripp and Hickey shared some of the academic demands placed on student-athletes. Generally need classes between 8AM and noon. Afternoon labs are often problematic.</p> <p>Missing out on registering for a convenient class causes particular difficulty for student-athletes, in the worst case leading to loss of athletic eligibility. Foothill-DeAnza leads the state in athletes losing eligibility, at least partly because of our academic calendar. Our student-athletes face two academic checks within each year. They can lose eligibility at the end of fall quarter and again at the end of winter. Student-athletes at other colleges only face loss-of-eligibility risk once within each academic year, at the end of the fall semester.</p> <p>It was noted that priority registration is a well-known perquisite among student-athletes considering which college to attend. Our coaches recruit, and often hear</p>

	<p>from prospects and their parents the specific question, "Do you have priority registration?" We are one of two colleges in the coast conference that does not offer priority registration to athletes.</p> <p>Teijeiro suggested a four-hour priority window, and described making it a priority for coaches. He estimated that 250-350 students could be served, their ed plans are on file. It was noted that student-athletes transferring from community colleges have not been as successful at the universities, at least partly because they must meet more NCAA rules even than five years ago.</p> <p>It was noted that students in many health programs face many of the same requirements as student-athletes. They, too, face loss of program eligibility.</p> <p>Reviewing the history of our registration priority policy, the 3SP allowed colleges to set their own priorities, subject to the legal requirements of first priority for Veterans, Foster Youth, and DSPS students. At that time we maintained a distinction between full-time and part-time students, giving higher registration priority to full-time students. Last year we reconsidered that distinction, as the decision concerning enrollment status is not always a behavior that is completely under student control, unlike, say, filing an ed plan. To remove the priority distinction between full- and part-time students has taken over a year. It was thought to be unfair to other groups if we were to spend less than that amount of thoughtful discussion.</p> <p>It was suggested that the data presented about student-athlete loss of eligibility was not on point, and that the proposed policy change would not address the stated problem.</p> <p>There was a call for transparency in our decision-making, so that we declare our reasons for any action.</p> <p>It was suggested that without the proposed priority, it's possible that student-athletes would select classes that may not always meet the necessary requirements and may not even be in their own best interest. The size of the affected population, some 300 students, was emphasized.</p> <p>The size of the allied health student population was offered for comparison. It was suggested that there may be some resistance to the proposed policy change from those students and their faculty program directors.</p> <p>The "rethinking" of registration priorities motivated by the 3SP was to move away from priorities based on group status and to move toward setting priorities based on behavioral cues. It was considered whether there may be a messaging issue here.</p> <p>Ripp pointed out that this year we've more accurately identified athletes. Teijeiro mentioned the team nature of loss of eligibility, losing one athlete can mean an entire team must disband, as has happened recently at DeAnza.</p> <p>It was suggested that the argument in favor of the proposal based on recruitment could be compelling, but the argument based on student success is not clear. Other students also face barriers. And since eliminating the registration-priority distinction between full- and part-time students has taken 18 months, the message we'd send if we were able to effect this change in a short time would be loud.</p> <p>There was a motion to acknowledge the need to modify our registration priorities on the basis of the athlete-recruitment need. M Jordahl S Maurer. In discussion it was acknowledged that we really haven't talked with anyone. Senators are asked to discuss this issue with constituents. Motion was not voted on.</p>
--	---

	Officers will attend Academic and Professional Matters and the Chancellor's Advisory Council meetings this Friday to discuss in that forum.
10. Committee reports	<p>COOL/Academic Integrity Committee collaboration Plan to make our own code of conduct, June 15 1PM Plug for canvas course review.</p> <p>Others attached</p> <p>Academic Integrity Committee</p> <p>Committee on Online Learning</p> <p>Student Equity Workgroup</p> <p>Professional Development Committee</p> <p>Assessment and Placement Ad Hoc Committee</p> <p>College Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Commencement Committee</p> <p>Planning and Resources Committee</p> <p>SLO Coordinators</p> <p>Academic and Professional Matters</p> <p>Chancellor's Advisory Council</p> <p>Others</p>
11. Announcements	<p>Limited to 3 minutes. Senate cannot take action</p> <p>a. Annual governance survey open 6/6 to 6/13. Imperative to urge faculty constituents to offer their input. Opportunity to give suggestions about program review!</p> <p>b. Senate planning retreat will be held at Bruce McLeod's home.</p> <p>c. The May budget revise and its impact on FHDA was announced.</p> <p>d. '16-'17 Academic Senate meeting dates Fall 2016: 10/3, 10/17, 10/31 (joint DeAnza), 11/14, and 11/28 Winter 2017: 1/23, 1/30, 2/13, 2/27, 3/13, and 3/27 (if needed) Spring 2017: 4/17 (joint DeAnza), 5/1, 5/15, 6/5, 6/19, and 6/23 (annual planning retreat)</p> <p>e. Breeze thanks senate for the opportunity, passes the torch to Ramiel</p> <p>f. BSS representative Batham announced that this was his last meeting as well.</p>
12. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned 4:06 PM