

Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, January 30, 2017
2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

ITEM	ACTION
1. Call to Order	Quorum present 1:58PM. Holcroft called meeting to order 2:01PM
2. Roll Call	<p><u>Senators Present</u> Micaela Agyare (LIB) Kimberly Escamilla (LA) Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15) Lisa Eshman (BHS) Donna Frankel (PT rep '16) Carol Josselyn (FA&C) Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16) Kathryn Maurer (BSS) Patrick Morriss (AS Secretary/Treasurer '15) Jose Nava (BSS) Rosa Nguyen (PSME) Katherine Schaefer (PT rep '15) Voltaire Villanueva (CNSL)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Present -</u> Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet) Ramiel Petros (ASFC President)</p> <p><u>Guests</u> Amy Calgaro, Stanford Lisa Ly, Institutional Research Judy Baker, Dean of Distance Ed Adrienne Hypolite, Owl Scholars Ben Stefanik, Professional Development Committee Kathy Perino, Faculty Association</p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u> Jody Craig (KA) Jordana Finnegan (LA) David Marasco (PSME) Bruce McLeod (FA&C) Tobias Nava (CNSL) for Cathy Denver Rita O'Loughin (KA)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u> Faculty Association Classified Senate</p>
3. Adoption of Agenda	<p>Holcroft asks to add two agenda items. Two hiring committee appointments (Item 7), and a request for from Campaign for College Opportunity collegecampaign.org (Item 10c).</p> <p>Amended agenda approved by consent.</p>
4. Public Comments	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.
5. Approval of Minutes January 23, 2017	<p>Rephrasing paragraph re: priority registration. Corrected departmental designation for Kay Thornton.</p> <p>Minutes as amended approved by consent</p>

6. Consent Calendar	<p>COOL: Patricia Crespo-Martin (Language Arts) Approved by consent</p> <p>College and District committees in need of faculty to serve as Academic Senate representative(s):</p> <p>Hiring committee for full-time faculty member in Communications.</p>
7. Hiring Committee Appointments	<p>Instructional Services Coordinator: Elaine Piparo (CNSL) Villanueva indicated that Piparo does not intend to serve on the committee senate confirmed her to last week (classified position, Senior Program Coordinator, 3SP), and that the hiring committee for this position is where she intends to serve.</p> <p>There was some discussion of faculty serving on administrative and classified hiring committees. Board policy and administrative procedures are permissive on this issue, subject to collegial conversation.</p> <p>Dean of Student Activities: Daphne Small (director, student activities), David Marasco (PSME)</p> <p>It was asked that another faculty member, either discipline faculty or counselor, be appointed to this position. Holcroft will bring the request to administration.</p> <p>Appointments approved by consent.</p>
8. Faculty representative to the Online Education Initiative	<p>Kate Jordahl has taken an interim administrative role with the OEI, so is no longer serving as faculty representative. To replace Jordahl as faculty representative on the OEI, Dean of Distance Education Judy Baker solicited interest broadly. In consultation with senate leadership, Baker and Jordahl recommend Heidi Gentry-Kolen (CS) for the position. Baker noted that all those faculty indicating interest were adjunct.</p> <p>Gentry-Kolen's appointment approved by consent.</p>
9. Unfinished Business a. Student Success standards (set standards, IEPI goals)	<p>Lisa Ly, acting college researcher, continued the discussion of institutional effectiveness metrics. Ly drew the distinction between those IEPI metrics subject to standards (minimum values) and goals (aspirational values).</p> <p>Maurer asked clarification between standards and goals, in particular, the level of accountability. LaManque indicated that all programs should at least meet the standard, and should be taking action to either reach the goal or explain the reasoning for choosing not to do so.</p> <p>There was much discussion of whether we should use a 3-year or a 5-year average as a benchmark for our metrics. Ly indicated that the longer time frame allows for more stable planning, the downside being that what happened five years ago may not be indicative of where the institution is or wants to go. Speaking from her experience on the Program Review Committee, Maurer offered support for the 5-year average, emphasizing the greater amount of data going into the averages we see for planning.</p> <p>There was also much discussion about the time-to-completion metric, the median time to completion of a degree or certificate. Ly shared that the time-to-completion is computed for first-time recipients of Foothill degrees as the time between the date the degree is granted and the date the student first registered for a Foothill course.</p>

There are admitted shortcomings in this metric. For instance, taking a class while still in high school, or changing majors, or taking extra classes outside an ed plan, or taking time off from school, or many other common actions, could lead to an extended time-to-completion. Our data on time-to-completion are observational, and as such contains no indication of cause or reason for the time measured. Yet there is much literature concerning institutional actions associated with lower time-to-completion, and hard to imagine that student interests would be poorly served by reducing the time it takes to complete a course of study. We know there are things we could be doing but don't.

LaManque asked whether we're free to choose this metric, or whether this is required by IEPI. Ly replied that the choice is ours. IEPI has offered these metrics, should colleges find them useful.

A question came up about reasons to select a non-required metric. Holcroft and LaManque offered that many non-required metrics are relevant to the goals we've set for ourselves in our Educational Master Plan. We choose our own metrics and goals, so it makes sense to use all those required, then look at what other metrics would help us with our EMP goals. The State Chancellor's Office does not hold us accountable for either our metrics or our goals, but our accrediting body (currently ACCJC) would no doubt ask us about it if we miss a target we've set for ourselves. In that case, we'd need to show what we're doing to move toward the goal.

It was argued that time-to-completion is a student-centered goal worthy of our attention, and that it is closely tied to our goals with respect to student equity as well.

There was a question about resources, as in, if we choose additional goals that require additional resources to meet, can we use the goal to support a resource request? LaManque shared that the portion of our accreditation Quality Focus Essay concerning pathways is on point, and that resources flow through that process. Holcroft indicated that choosing a metric is a college decision, not simply faculty senate, as the commitment is institutional.

It was urged that we get student input about time-to-completion, and acknowledged that no clear way to do so reliably is evident. Connecting to student-identified desires is important, yet hard to identify. There are cultural effects already baked into expected time-to-completion; it may not occur to students that it's even possible to finish sooner. But any reduction in median time to completion would only work in students' favor.

In Accounting, for instance, 16 students earned degrees with a median time-to-completion of 8 years, so half the degree-earners took over 8 years to complete their degree. Nava pointed out that Accounting faculty do not see the same students in our classrooms for 8 years.

Lamanque suggested that, while far from a flawless indicator, time-to-completion can be informative. And there are many different measures available if we prefer others. Ly offered other metrics as well, like basic skills participation, change of major, percent of students taking courses outside their ed plan, and others. The Federal standard is "150%," meaning it's reasonable to expect a "two-year" degree like an AA to be completed in no more than three years. Counselors in particular can use

There are many unanswered questions, and time-to-completion can raise some of them. Other metrics may also be appropriate. Time-to-completion sheds no

	<p>light, for instance, on a significant portion of our students, those leaving Foothill without a degree or cert.</p> <p>Senators are asked to share time to degree with constituents, to ask for thoughts on a time-to-completion metric, and to ask if there are other institutional effectiveness metrics of interest to faculty.</p>
b. Senate elections	<p>Elections will be held this spring for the positions of Vice President and Curriculum Committee Co-Chair, Secretary-Treasurer, and one Representative for Part-Time Faculty. Our task is to identify and confirm an elections committee of three sitting senators. Rosa Nguyen and Donna Frankel submitted their names, and another senator will be named later.</p> <p>Senators are asked to help recruit candidates for the three positions.</p>
c. Spring event honoring part-time faculty	<p>Request to postpone discussion of this agenda item to the next meeting was approved by consent.</p>
d. Starfish implementation	<p>Adrienne Hypolite, Coordinator for the Early Alert program, described how the new Starfish system will facilitate coordination between instruction and student services, targeting interventions in favor of student success. Hypolite created the Owl Scholars program, currently limited to students in basic skills English, ESL, and Math courses due to personnel and resource limitations.</p> <p>Starfish is integrated into MyPortal, and allows service to all courses. It assembles a list of all students associated with a given faculty or staff member in one place. Faculty or staff are then able to identify specific students they think might benefit from an intervention, and select a reason for the identification. Specific services and accountability standards are then triggered. The right student services professional will contact the student based on the reason for the identification.</p> <p>Beyond those basics, Hypolite and her colleagues can develop discipline- or other-specific interventions. When faculty identify a need, raising a flag in Starfish can facilitate the communication necessary to find a way to meet it. Ultimately, the system can help students develop their own support. It's also possible to use the system to send kudos to students.</p> <p>This year, Hypolite and her colleagues will pilot the Starfish system in the basic skills courses where the Owl Scholars program is currently operating. She has identified faculty to work with in that regard, and will ask for senate approval. Owl Scholars will continue its followup case-management model during system implementation.</p> <p>Hypolite anticipates a one-year rollout timeline to full implementation. Close to launch, she'll return to share what's been learned from the pilot, offer instruction, and take questions.</p> <p>Senators are asked to let constituents know of the coming Starfish system.</p>
e. S'16 resolution re: compensation for part-time faculty for professional development	<p>Ben Stefonik of the Professional Development Committee discussed action on the senate's resolution (Spring 2016) concerning compensation for adjunct faculty to attend professional development events at Foothill.</p> <p>Stefonik reported meeting with college administrators and representatives of the Faculty Association to discuss funding this resolution. That group decided to request funds through our program review process. A request for \$50,000 was written into the program review prepared by the Vice President of Instruction, with a</p>

	<p>slight modification in the terms of payment. After consultation with part-time instructors, the payment scheme was modified from a \$500 stipend for ten documented hours of professional development events to \$50 per hour up to a maximum of \$500 per academic year.</p> <p>In the interests of transparent decision-making, the funding request will go through the program review process so that the Operations and Planning Committee can prioritize it with the other requests from around campus. A decision from OPC, subject to PaRC approval, will be known by March or April.</p> <p>In response to a question, Stefonik indicated that these funds would be allocated for events at Foothill only, not to be counted as part of any other professional development compensation scheme.</p> <p>Online workshops from Foothill would count (perhaps offered through CCC Confer), but not from third-party vendors. The professional development committee considers face validity as a criterion for determining which events are eligible for compensation. Events focused on teaching and learning through an equity lens, for instance, would likely qualify. Canvas training will not be compensated, nor will the reflective writing project.</p> <p>There was some discussion of departmental retreats for all faculty, perhaps to develop a program of departmental retreats, to be focused on teaching and learning for professional development, with compensation through this program for all part-time faculty in attendance.</p> <p>Senators are asked to share information about the program, and to solicit ideas for a faculty departmental retreat.</p>
10. New Business	
a. SLO Committee leadership needed	Request to postpone discussion of this agenda item to the next meeting was approved by consent.
b. FT faculty evals	<p>At the last Senate planning retreats (Spring and Fall 2016), there was discussion of course quality for face-to-face classes, in parallel with ongoing discussions of course quality and instructor presence in online courses. It surfaced anecdotally that not all divisions are regularly evaluating full-time faculty.</p> <p>Representatives from three divisions shared that regular evaluation of full-time faculty was not getting done in their respective divisions. There has been much administrative turnover, and that may be at least one reason.</p> <p>Kathy Perino reported that the Faculty Association has brought the issue to negotiations, and pointed out that ultimately, it's an administrative responsibility. She pointed out that the full-time faculty applying for Professional Achievement Awards are evaluated by both an administrator and a peer on a four-year cycle. About half of full-time faculty participate. So the full-time faculty not being officially evaluated are those who do not participate in PAA and those who have earned all four awards.</p> <p>A point was raised that if the J1 evaluation form is to be a vehicle to improve course quality, training is needed in how to best use that instrument for that purpose. Context and followup are essential.</p> <p>There was an additional point that peer reviews can be a powerful tool for quality improvement, and acknowledgement that a voluntary process wouldn't result in uniform faculty participation the way the existing structured and required evaluation process would.</p>

	<p>There was some sympathy expressed for administrators with a large number of evaluation responsibilities. It was suggested that perhaps a better way to move the course-quality discussion forward is through peer evaluation, possibly through professional development. As a starting point, the college senates and the faculty association could join in a request to administration concerning evaluations of full time faculty.</p> <p>Senators are asked to gather information on current practices in their divisions, and to suggest ways for the senate to assist. Officers will coordinate the issue with the Faculty Association and the District Academic Senate.</p> <p>For reference, division/department policies to ensure regular (3-year cycle) evaluations of full-time faculty (in accordance with FA Agreement Article 6) fall under academic senate purview per California Ed Code 87663(f) Faculty Evaluation.</p>
c. College Campaign	<p>Holcroft received a request for academic senate demographic information from the Campaign for College Opportunity (collegecampaign.org). Maurer will send a survey to senators and bring the results back. Then we can decide whether and how to respond.</p>
11. Committee reports	<p>a. APM/CAC (Escoto, Holcroft) The proposed new policy and procedure on academic renewal had its first read at the Chancellor's Advisory Council.</p> <p>b. CCC (Escoto) Divisional representatives got list of courses not taught in four years. Such courses will be deactivated so that they don't appear in the catalog. The rationale is that if a student sees a course in the catalog, they should be able to take it.</p> <p>CCC requests that faculty involve the curriculum committee early in the program creation process, as an informational item. CCC believes that early guidance can head off problems later.</p> <p>c. Program Review (Maurer) Program review committee members have completed normalization training for those rating program reviews. The training in how to evaluate a program review is meant to enhance consistency across raters. The committee is looking at comprehensive reviews, and prioritizing those reviews done out-of-cycle due to a less than green rating on last year's comprehensive review. The committee plans to finish its work by the end of March.</p> <p>d. District Academic Senate – District hiring procedures for full-time faculty (last reviewed 1991) are under review by the District Academic Senate along with an administrative group and a classified staff group. At least one more meeting is required to complete work on the faculty document. The three groups will forward their work to the District Human Resources Committee for consolidation, after which any proposed changes will be returned through the shared governance channels. Interested faculty are invited to participate in the redrafting. Contact Holcroft.</p> <p>Others attached</p>
12. Announcements	<p>Limited to 3 minutes. Senate cannot take action</p> <p>a. COOL meets Wednesday. The committee is looking for the status of all divisions' online standards. It's essential that all division representatives be present.</p>

	<p>b. There are three upcoming town hall meetings regarding the District's budget, convened by Chancellor Judy Miner. Please make every effort to attend one (or more) of these. Discussions likely to include areas of faculty purview. Feb 22, 12:30-2:00 Hearthside Room, Foothill Feb 23, 12:30-2:00 Room 124, Sunnyvale Center Mar 7, 12:30-2:00 Conference Rooms A/B, De Anza.</p> <p>c. ASFC will sponsor an event a response to the President's executive order banning travel from seven countries. See "Impacted Muslim Students Tell Their Story," this Thursday, Noon – 1 in Appreciation Hall. Petros indicated that Foothill has students from every named country, and this event is a chance to put a face and a story to a country name.</p> <p>If you know of students interested in sharing their story, please put interested studetns in contact with Ramiel Petros.</p> <p>d. Academic Senate Office Hours for Winter quarter Mon & Wed Noon – 2PM Tues & Thurs 10:00 – 11:30AM Room 1929 in the administration building breezeway. An officer will be available for discussion of senate-related issues. At other times, leave a message for your Academic Senate at x7202</p>
12. Adjournment	4:05 PM