

**Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, November 28, 2016**  
**2:00 P.M., Toyon Room**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1. Call to Order	Quorum present 1:57PM. Holcroft called meeting to order 2:01PM
2. Roll Call	<p><b>Senators Present</b></p> <p>Jody Craig (KA)          Kimberly Escamilla (LA)          Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15)          Lisa Eshman (BHS)          Jordana Finnegan (LA)          Donna Frankel (PT rep '16)          Carol Josselyn (FA&amp;C)          Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16)          Kathryn Maurer (BSS)          Bruce McLeod (FA&amp;C)          Patrick Morriss (AS Secretary/Treasurer '15)          Jose Nava (BSS)          Tobias Nava (CNSL) for Cathy Denver          Rita O'Loughlin (KA)          Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15)          Mary Thomas (LIB)          Voltaire Villanueva (CNSL)</p> <p><b>Liaisons Present -</b></p> <p>Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet)          Ramiel Petros (ASFC President)</p> <p><b>Guests</b></p> <p>David Ulate, district research          Simon Pennington, dean of Fine Arts &amp; Communication          Mike Teijeira, athletic director          Laurie Bertani, athletic counselor          Rich Hansen, Faculty Association president</p> <p><b>Senators Absent</b></p> <p>David Marasco (PSME)          Rosa Nguyen (PSME)</p> <p><b>Liaisons Absent</b></p> <p>Classified Senate – not yet appointed</p>
3. Adoption of Agenda	Motion to adopt M J Nava S Maurer. Approved by consensus.
4. Public Comments	<p>Members of the public may address the senate concerning items not on the agenda. Limited to 3 minutes each. Senate cannot respond or take action.</p> <p>There were no comments from members of the public.</p>
5. Approval of Minutes November 21, 2016	Motion to approve as written M Thomas S O'Laughlin. Approved by consensus.
6. Consent Calendar	<p>No consent calendar items this meeting.</p> <p>Academic Senate committees in need of faculty:          Academic Integrity</p>
7. Unfinished Business	

a. Draft AP 5300: Student Equity Administrative Procedure	<p>Second reading. Proposed AP codifies what we already do. No feedback from constituents yet but have not had much time to review. Discussion re: whether we need to delay action until constituents have had more time. Feeling from the room is that this is not controversial. Reminder that the Student Equity Workgroup will review the AP at their meeting tomorrow. Motion to direct officers to support draft language in APM meeting Friday approved by consensus (pending approval by SEW 11/29)</p> <p><b>Follow-up:</b> Holcroft to bring AP to SEW on 11/29; Holcroft/Escoto to relay level of faculty support at APM/CAC on 12/2.</p>
b. Hayward Award – select nominee (Rubric for review)	<p>Deadline for nominations is December 23 so Foothill must decide on nomination today. Donna Frankel announced that the candidate she'd nominated on 11/21, Alana Harper, declined the nomination but instead wished to nominate Donna.</p> <p>At this time nominees are: Lisa Eshman nominated Sandy Gregory (vet tech, nominated by Lisa Eshman), nominated Donna Frankel (KA, nominated by Alana Harper), Kathryn Maurer nominated Katherine Schaefers (anthropology, nominated by Katherine Maurer/BHS division).</p> <p>The two nominees present left the room. Eschman presented her information in support of Sandy Gregory, Holcroft read Harper's nomination letter in support of Donna Frankel, and Maurer presented information to support Katherine Schaefers.</p> <p>Senators agreed all three are strong candidates. Informal poll of those present evinced majority in favor of nominating Schaefers. Motion to put forward Katherine Schaefers as Foothill's nominee for the Hayward award M Maurer S Thomas. No further discussion, motion approved by consensus.</p> <p><b>Follow-up:</b> Holcroft to work with Schaefers to ensure nomination packet submitted to ASCCC by 12/23/16.</p>
c. Enrollment priority – review data	<p>David Ulate from district institutional research reported on enrollment patterns in the registration period. <a href="#">Data from 2013-14 and 2014-15</a> provides contrast for the impact of the priority-registration changes implemented in response to the student success initiative. Question about how priority enrollment status affects student registration behavior.</p> <p>Data does not include students looking for information ("shopping"), only counts those who engaged the registration system i.e. registered or attempted to register. Reports contain no information on student motivation.</p> <p>The takeaways are 1) more students registered earlier in the 2014-15 academic year compared to 2013-14, and 2) under the new enrollment priorities, the majority of students still did not take advantage of their given priority (but we have no information about why not).</p> <p>Discussion about impact of change in registration priorities on student athletes. Noted that most student athletes do receive priority by virtue of being in one of the other prioritized groups e.g. in a special population (top priority), a continuing full-time student (next after special pops). Clarification that student athletes used to be able to register right after the special populations, and before continuing FT. Many athletes are now in the continuing full time student group so although they still have the second-highest priority, they are "competing" against a larger number of students also in the same category.</p> <p><b>Follow-up required at this time:</b> None</p>

<p><a href="#"><u>d. Proposal to Reinstate Priority registration for athletes (5)</u></a></p>	<p>As background, the student success initiative and our student equity goals led us to redefine our priority registration policies to focus on student behavior rather than membership in student groups. Before then, many groups had registration priority, including for a time, faculty and staff (as well as honor students, Puente students, health career program students, etc).</p> <p>Comment that as we consider the question in front of us, looking for a registration priority change for a group, we should also consider possible unintended effects. If we support this change, we should be able to justify our support for this particular group rather than others.</p> <p>There was a suggestion to make priority registration windows longer.</p> <p>There is substantial overlap between our athlete population and our underrepresented populations. Prioritizing enrollment for athletes is in line with our college student success and equity goals.</p> <p>Simon Pennington and Laurie Bertani emphasized priority registration as a recruiting tool. Foothill is the only college without priority registration for athletes. Coaches recruit students to come to Foothill, and the lack of priority registration has been key in many college-selection decisions. Mike Teijeira estimates that we've lost at least 30 students specifically due to this issue. Former women's basketball coach Jody Craig emphasized that Foothill's priority registration policy puts our coaches and our school at a strong disadvantage in attracting students as athletes. Our lack of priority registration for athletes can make it hard to field a team. Speaking as a coach of our women's soccer team, part-time senator Katherine Schaefers added that she barely has enough players to field a team, a significant change from the full rosters she had before priority enrollment was taken from athletes.</p> <p>As an example, Evergreen College is currently very popular as a destination for soccer players. In addition to offering priority registration like all other Coast Conference colleges except Foothill, Evergreen's extensive support system is well-known.</p> <p>The question arose about where to draw the line. Other groups will likely also ask for or insist on priority registration. Recruiting appears to be the most compelling reason to consider athletes differently. Although scheduling difficulties and time-in-school constraints are not unique to athletes, athletes must complete courses under NCAA rules, with a 5-year clock to complete a bachelor's degree – there are no other student groups in this situation.</p> <p>BSS senator Maurer offered that these arguments are not new, and had been rejected by her divisional colleagues last year. There seems to be a perception of differential treatment. There was some discussion about this change as an expression of our values. There was also note that athletes give back to the college in valuable ways such as increased diversity, increased school spirit, and greater sense of community.</p> <p>Our faculty colleagues in Kinesiology and Athletics have brought a proposal to us. Question about where in priority list the athletes would go. There is a suggestion that it might be good to follow De Anza policies i.e. to create a registration priority to immediately follow the state-mandated groups and to precede the general registration priority of continuing students.</p> <p><b>Action required:</b> Senators are asked to bring the <a href="#"><u>proposal</u></a> back to their divisional colleagues for careful consideration and feedback. Reminder that senators were just involved in a long, thoughtful face to face discussion that</p>
---	---

	constituents were not privy to; as such they may appreciate hearing their senators' thoughts and perspectives on the discussion. Item will be on first academic senate agenda for the Winter quarter.
8. New Business	
a. Accreditation by ACCJC	<p>Rich Hansen, FA president, been on all the accreditation task forces. Although not currently participating in accreditation self-study, in past used to coauthor finance portions for De Anza self-studies.</p> <p>Accreditation via ACCJC is a problem for many colleges, Hansen is now convinced that we should connect with four-year accreditors. The ACCJC commissioners consistently do not seem to hear the critiques. The question is that at the end of this long process examining our relationship with our accreditor, can we see ourselves staying with ACCJC? According to Hansen, the statewide faculty union organizations said no. ASCCC also passed several resolutions this past plenary session along the same lines – a broad rejection of ACCJC. The upcoming meeting of CEOs in the Community College League of California has agendized looking at a path to a new accreditor.</p> <p>CEOs make the call, and they appear ready to move forward toward a new creditor, having rejected the idea of continuing with ACCJC. The four-year schools are accredited by WASC (the Western Association of Schools and Colleges), which is willing to work to learn how to accredit two-year colleges, but not to work with ACCJC. There are structural and continuity concerns with moving away from ACCJC, though they seem to be in the minority with the CEOs. The CEO board meets again in early December, where some formal action may be taken. The next accreditation workgroup meeting is scheduled for early January.</p> <p>According to Hansen, CEOs might be more likely to act if they knew that their faculty and boards are behind them.</p> <p>The question for us is, should senate make a motion and/or resolution in support of moving away from ACCJC? Many classroom faculty are not expert in the history of the difficulties and we rely on liaisons such as Rich Hansen to inform us. Holcroft also cautioned we should contact our own CEO, Thuy Nguyen, to hear her perspective. Senators also are asked to share information and gauge whether there is faculty support for formal action by the senate.</p> <p>Constituents may find the following memos to be helpful:  <a href="http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/July/Item-4.7-Accreditation.pdf">http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/July/Item-4.7-Accreditation.pdf</a></p> <p>and particularly pages 3-4 of this document:  <a href="http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/July/Item-4.7-Accreditation.pdf">http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/July/Item-4.7-Accreditation.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Follow-up:</b> Holcroft/Escoto to inquire with President Nguyen. Senators are asked to share information and gauge whether there is faculty support for formal action by the senate.</p>
b. District Master Plan	Not available in time. First reading postponed until first meeting of winter quarter.
9. Committee reports	<p>* Academic Integrity Committee</p> <p><b>Follow-up:</b> Senators, please share these two resources with faculty</p> <p>&gt; "The New Cheating Economy" in the Chronicle of Higher Ed,  <a href="http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-New-Cheating-Economy/237587">http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-New-Cheating-Economy/237587</a></p> <p>&gt; Brian Evans's draft screencast, faculty-to-faculty  <a href="https://youtu.be/pJdGfPI49fI">https://youtu.be/pJdGfPI49fI</a></p>

	<p>Brian and the AIC appreciate feedback.</p> <p>Please encourage faculty to use the Academic Integrity Report Form, <a href="https://foothill-advocate.symplicity.com/public_report/index.php/pid634204">https://foothill-advocate.symplicity.com/public_report/index.php/pid634204</a> even if the matter is handled privately and needs no follow-up from the Dean of Student Affairs.</p>
10. Announcements	<p>Limited to 3 minutes. Senate cannot take action</p> <p>a. Drop-in academic senate office hours Mon &amp; Wed 12:30 – 2PM, Tue &amp; Thu 11AM – 1PM, room 1929 (admin building breezeway). Call in to x7202 at those times, or leave a message anytime.</p> <p>b. ASFC passed resolution to get student email addresses at <a href="http://foothill.edu">foothill.edu</a>. For professional look on resumes, and good discounts.</p>
11. Adjournment	4:12 PM