

**Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, January 25**  
**2:00 P.M., Toyon Room**

| ITEM  | ACTION  |
|---|---|
| 1. Call to Order                            | Quorum present 1:57PM. Holcroft called meeting to order 2:00PM  |
| 2. Roll Call                                | <p><u>Senators Present</u></p> <p>Steve Batham (BSS)<br/>         Roseann Berg (PT rep '16)<br/>         Sara Cooper (BHS)<br/>         Cathy Denver (CNSL)<br/>         Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15)<br/>         Lauren Hickey (KA)<br/>         Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16)<br/>         Scott Lankford (L A)<br/>         David Marasco (PSME)<br/>         Kathryn Maurer (BSS)<br/>         Richard Morasci (LA)<br/>         Patrick Morriss (AS Sec'y Treas '15)<br/>         Rosa Nguyen (PSME)<br/>         Rita O'Loughlin (KA)<br/>         Simon Pennington (F A)<br/>         Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15)<br/>         Mary Thomas (LRC)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Present -</u></p> <p>Meredith Heiser (Faculty Association)<br/>         Kurt Hueg (President's Cabinet)<br/>         Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet)<br/>         Breeze Liu (ASFC President)</p> <p><u>Guests</u></p> <p>Kate Jordahl, COOL Chair<br/>         Katie Solari, Stanford Preparing Future Professor Program Guest<br/>         Judy Baker, Dean, Distance Ed</p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u></p> <p>Jordan Fong (F A)<br/>         Tobias Nava (CNSL)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u></p> <p>Allison Largent (Classified Senate)</p> |
| 3. Approval of Minutes:<br>January 11, 2016 | Approved by consent   |
| 4. Consent Calendar                         | <p>Commencement committee<br/>         &gt; Nick Tuttle (BSS)<br/>         Senate elections committee<br/>         &gt; Steve Batham (BSS), Simon Pennington (FA), Roseann Berg (PT)<br/>         Due Process Pool<br/>         &gt; Sara Cooper (BHS)<br/>         Transfer Workgroup<br/>         &gt; Cleve Freeman (CNSL)</p> <p>Approved by consent</p>  |
| 5. Unfinished Business                      |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Program Review feedback                       | <p>Senators provided constituent feedback on the Program Review Committee's invitation to program faculty for facetime with the committee. Some senators countered the misunderstanding in their divisions that the PRCs initiative is not an obligation but an invitation. There was some mention of inconvenience in scheduling, but the PRC tries to be flexible.</p> <p>On a separate matter, a Language Arts division representative shared a divisional perception that program review is disconnected from our real work. There is disagreement with the resource allocations that have come out of the process, in particular, denial of reassigned time to run the English department. The timing of the required reviews, annual and comprehensive, appears to differ from that required of DeAnza faculty. English faculty in particular would appreciate a more guided discussion, especially with respect to interpreting quantitative program data.</p> <p>It was pointed out we have an annual process for discussing program review issues that all groups, not just faculty, have agreed to follow. In particular, the invitation from the PRC was an attempt to address the misgivings communicated last year.</p> <p>With respect to interpreting quantitative data, even the math department has offered qualitative evidence critiquing the quantitative success metrics specified in the program review. It was also noted that, while recognizing the demands on Institutional Research, earlier data delivery to program faculty would help.</p>  |
| Online Course Standards<br>- check in         | <p>Representing the Committee on Online Learning (COOL) Kate Jordahl checked in with respect to the division-specific documents under development. She affirmed the stated preference of the Physical Sciences Math and Engineering (PSME) division to delegate authority for developing the standards to the departmental level, though she emphasized that each division should take ownership and engage in the discussions. The Business and Social Sciences division took BSS approach is that the division standards are what every department agrees on, departments can add to it.</p> <p>A part-time representative asked to please be considerate of the needs of part-time faculty. Publicizing early and posting online are very helpful. Jordahl stressed that all standards documents must meet the requirements of the Distance Education Addendum, available at <a href="http://www.foothill.edu/staff/Curriculum/documents/Distance_Learning_Application.doc">http://www.foothill.edu/staff/Curriculum/documents/Distance_Learning_Application.doc</a> Judy Baker confirmed that her office is willing to help make sure the division-specific guidelines are made readily available on the college website.</p> <p>The standards resolution charged divisional curriculum representatives to guide discussion and facilitate development of the standards documents, with a progress report made to the academic senate by February. <b>Senators are charged with obtaining from their curriculum reps a document reporting on the progress on the standards for presentation to the entire senate no later than February 17 for inclusion on the agenda for its February 22 meeting.</b></p> |
| OER policy, ASFC resolution, planning process | <p>Holcroft reported back on the status of the <a href="#">proposed OER Board Policy</a> we adopted at our November 30, 2015 meeting. District academic senate president Mayra Cruz presented the proposed policy to APM on January 15, 2016. Chancellor Miner reminded us of the process and of the concerns that such a board policy isn't consistent with the intended purpose of board policy. She suggested instead that we ask the board to adopt a resolution in support of the adoption of OER. Messina is also bringing the issue to the Student Equity</p>  |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
|                               | <p>Workgroup to consider whether appropriate to include OER language in the Board's current policy about equity.</p> <p>ASFC Liaison Breeze Liu shared the resolution passed by both student senates, ASFC at Foothill and DASB at De Anza, regarding Open Educational Resources (OER) in accordance with AB798. The resolution would task the Academic Senate with writing a plan to secure a grant under the law by June 30, 2016.</p> <p>It was noted that grant guidelines are not yet released, so it may not be logistically feasible to have a plan in place by 6/30/16 and that instead, "as soon as possible" might be preferable wording in any academic senate resolution. Holcroft clarified any plan must be joint effort between students, faculty, and administrators.</p> <p>The Student Equity Workgroup has identified textbook costs as an equity issue. Rather than pursuing an AB798 grant SEW could consider supporting faculty efforts to adopt OER materials through their block grant process.</p> <p>AB798 provides grant funding to faculty to research, curate, and create OER. The law's rationale is to incentivize OER adoption, since OER have been available for some time now but adoption has been slow. Many faculty have already moved to OER. The physics department is currently looking at an open source text, without a college-wide plan or grant. Math instructors, too, have adopted open-source materials.</p> <p>Faculty were reassured that there is no problem with articulation of courses utilizing OER. The Library representative offered assistance to faculty in developing course-specific online resource repositories through libguides, <a href="http://libguides.foothill.edu/faculty">http://libguides.foothill.edu/faculty</a></p> <p>Concern that an AB798 grant would only offer monetary support for up to 10 faculty would not be efficient, and may be inequitable to the many faculty who have already adopted OER without any compensation.</p> <p><b>Senators are charged with facilitating discussion of OER in divisions, specifically, to obtain feedback what it would take to get faculty to seriously consider using OER. With that feedback we can better determine whether writing an AB798 grant would be the most effective approach.</b></p> |
| OEI MOU – second read         | Motion to approve M Lankford S Schaefers. There was no discussion. Motion approved by consensus.  |
| Holiday observance resolution | <p>PSME representative David Marasco brought a holiday observance resolution to the body. He noted that for the District to celebrate Veterans Day on a different day than the Federal holiday (November 11, except when that day falls on a Saturday or Sunday) can be disrespectful to our veterans who find that celebrations and memorial events in conflict with college activities. Similarly, the District celebrates Cesar Chavez Day at a time that bears no connection to the California state holiday of March 31, sending the message to all, including Hispanics and union members, that this is a minor league holiday. The Faculty Association surveys faculty concerning holiday preferences, but a discussion might reveal different results.</p> <p>Some senators present expressed support and asked for guidance in initiating the discussion. It was noted some faculty might look no further than the immediate loss of a three-day weekend. It was suggested that perhaps division and department meetings are the place to bring the resolution and that face-to-face dialog is likely to be much more effective than an email.</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>One senator relayed student discussions he observed in class, how on Armistice Day in Europe, there's a minute of silence where everything stops, so why don't we do that here? The students supported celebrating Veteran's Day on the same day as Federal holiday, and the resolution asks.</p> <p>Is Chancellor's Advisory Council a place for this discussion? Skyline CC also dealt with this...keep fed holidays &amp; add 3 "flexdays"</p> <p><b>Senators are directed to share this resolution with faculty in division and department meetings, and to initiate discussions with feedback and second reading of the resolution at our next meeting.</b></p>  |
| Senate program review                   | <p>There was no revision of substance to the senate program review document, and thanks to the author, Carolyn Holcroft. Holcroft called attention to the resource requests: a stipend for the Career Technical Education liaison, an outdoor bulletin board for public posting of agendas and minutes, and professional development funds for up to 5 faculty to attend the Curriculum Institute in San Diego February 19. President's Cabinet Liaison Kurt Hueg expressed hope that all five faculty slots would be taken.</p>   |
| Education Master Plan draft for review  | <p>When this document next comes before the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC), President Carolyn Holcroft will be called on to vote on behalf of the Academic Senate. <b>Senators are tasked with sharing the document with their constituents and offering advisement to Holcroft before the next PaRC meeting on February 3.</b></p>  |
| 6. New Business                         |  |
| Senate and CCC representation structure | <p>Holcroft noted that as a body, our operation does not match the structure in our foundational documents. In particular, our constitutional voting structure based on academic "divisions" is not accurately reflected in our operational practices. "Divisions" are administrative in nature, can and do change, and are less academically-oriented than in the past. Faculty in Adaptive Learning have recently questioned the voting structure in the College Curriculum Committee (CCC), so there is the potential for difficulty should a contentious issue come before the body.</p> <p>It was suggested that the senate form a group to fundamentally rethink our voting structure and to generate suggestions. Secretary Patrick Morriss volunteered to form such a group.</p> <p>It was immediately acknowledged that organizational communications outside the college administrative structure might present difficulties. The group will take that under advisement.</p> <p>Senators are directed to send their ideas to Morriss, via email or in person during senate office hours in room 1929. Hours for the next two weeks are</p> <p>Wed Jan 27, 12-2;<br/>     Mon Feb 2, 10-11 and 1-2;<br/>     Wed Feb 4, 12-2; and<br/>     Mon Feb 9, 11-12 and 1-2</p> |
| Due process/grievance committee pool    | <p>Office of Student Affairs has requested that we recruit additional faculty to serve in the due process pool, and for all faculty in the pool to send a list of available times each quarter.</p> <p>With the addition today of Biology faculty member Sara Cooper, there are currently 25 faculty in the pool. Short notice of hearings is typical. Faculty in the pool are committed to posting their schedule in Outlook calendar. There was no support expressed for requiring faculty to submit their availability beyond using Outlook.</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Senators are directed to recruit additional tenured faculty to fill the pool, and senate officers are directed to provide divisional representatives with names of divisional faculty currently in the pool.</b></p>  |
| Accreditation update ASCCC Accreditation Institute opportunity     | <p>President's Cabinet Liaison Andrew LaManque presented the accreditation timeline leading up to the site visit in Fall 2018. With the upcoming Winter 2016 kickoff, PaRC tri-chairs will form teams to begin self-study. First draft of self-study due by end of Fall 2016.</p> <p>Our accrediting agency will still be the ACCJC, or perhaps its parent organization. Clarification that even if we have a new agency in place the standards will be the same, but we hope the process will be more transparent and fair. It was suggested that since we have a newly-formed SLO committee, now might be a good time to tie their work into Standard 2. We have much freedom in organizing our accreditation structure. We could make a self-study steering committee, or maybe use PaRC. There is much reflection already going on, and a desire not to duplicate efforts.</p> <p><b>Senators are asked to consider attending the Accreditation Institute Feb 19 in San Diego, mentioned above in the senate program review. Clarification that any five faculty could go with the expectation that they would be willing to actively participate in the accreditation process.</b></p> |
| 7. Committee reports   | <p>Committee actions since the committee report document was prepared:</p> <p><i>Committee on Online Learning</i><br/>Started looking at hybrid courses. COOL made guidelines based on existing state rules, there is now more guidance that may allow us more flexibility to support teachers teaching in different ways.</p> <p>Canvas migration meeting this Wednesday, considering potential standardization of homepage.</p> <p>Faculty wishing to use Canvas must complete training. Interested faculty should contact Judy Baker, dean of distance education, to get certified.</p>  |
| 8. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action) | <p>Props and kudos to the Professional Development Committee for last Friday's Professional Practice Exchange and to President Holcroft for initiating the process leading to the current structure for faculty leadership in our PD activities.</p> <p>There will be an active shooter drill Feb 9 10AM.</p> <p>Health services is surveying the campus community about our campus smoking policy. You may take the survey at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/FHDAsmoke">http://tinyurl.com/FHDAsmoke</a>. They say it takes four minutes, some who have taken it say two.</p> <p>Last weekend saw the last six performances of the Physics show. Total attendance has now exceeded 70,000. That's Levi's Stadium.</p>   |
| 9. Adjournment   | Meeting adjourned 3:58PM  |