Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 27, 2017
2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

ITEM	ACTION
1. Call to Order	Quorum present 2:00PM. Holcroft called meeting to order 2:00PM

2. Roll Call	<u>Senators Present</u>
	  Kay Jones for Micaela Agyare (LIB)
	  Jody Craig (KA)
	  Isaac Escoto (AS VP/CCC Co-ch '15)
	  Rachelle Campbell for Lisa Eshman (BHS)
	  Jordana Finnegan (LA)
	  Donna Frankel (PT rep '16)
	  Carol Josselyn (FA&C)
	  Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16)
	  David Marasco (PSME)
	  Kathryn Maurer (BSS)
	  Patrick Morriss (AS Secretary/Treasurer '15)
	  Rosa Nguyen (PSME)
	  Rita O'Loughin (KA)
	  Katherine Schaefers (PT rep '15)
	  Voltaire Villanueva (CNSL)
	
	<u>Liaisons Present</u> –
	  Andrew LaManque (President's Cabinet)
	  Ramiel Petros (ASFC President)
	
	<u>Guests</u>
	
	<u>Senators Absent</u>
	Kimberly Escamilla (LA)
	Bruce McLeod (FA&C)
	Jose Nava (BSS)
	Tobias Nava (CNSL) for Cathy Denver
	
	<u>Liaisons Absent</u>
	Faculty Association - not yet appointed
	Classified Senate – not yet appointed

3. Adoption of Agenda	Approved by consent
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. There were no comments from the public.
5. Approval of Minutes February 13, 2017	Approved as is by consent.
6. Consent Calendar	Scholarships readers: David Marasco, Sara Cooper Approved by consent College and District committees in need of faculty to serve as Academic Senate representative(s): Academic Senate committees in need of faculty:

7. Hiring Committee Appointments	There were no hiring committee appointments.
8. Unfinished Business	
a. Spring event honoring part-time faculty	Calendaring the event was prioritized. A Friday is preferred to avoid typical teaching assignments, in May rather than June, to avoid the weeks more crowded with social events at Foothill and so that it doesn't occur weeks after the semester schools let out. Friday May 19 was suggested and approved by consensus. There remain issues of logistics and funding. Through Pacific Dining, an on-campus event for 100 people might cost $1500, with no Champagne. Dues account funding may be possible, subject to senate approval. There was much support for the event in the divisions. Also looking at other funding options. As for timing, 5:30PM was suggested, perhaps with a reception with a speaker, with social time continuing until 7:30, perhaps followed by an off-campus after-party. Details will be worked out and brought forward at a future meeting.
b. Restructuring resolution – 1st read	The resolution was read, with an alternative resolved clause to include the Economic Development division. Holcroft indicated that there is outreach to ED in progress. If representation is desired, that division's representation could also be arranged, through the second resolved clause, to be set up like the library. LaManque clarified that even though the ED division curriculum committee approval runs through office of instruction personnel, any ED senate representative would represent faculty in that division. Specifically, that means faculty teaching in our apprenticeship programs. "Economic Development" is a term of Foothill administration and not meaningful to apprenticeship faculty. Holcroft asked senators to anticipate constiiuent questions, and to solicit feedback.
c. Resolution to amend constitution preamble – 1st read	New preamble fixes an error and grounds the justification for our academic senate historically. Morriss reported that Scott Lankford did the bulk of the drafting.
d. IEPI goals, ACCJC set standards: number of low-unit certificates awarded; program-specific targets	As a measure of our intstitutional effectiveness, it was pointed out that low-unit, non-transcriptable certificates are an important aspect of what we do. Maurer reported that the office of instruction had in the past asked the BSS division to remove such certificates from BSS curriculum sheets. Escoto reported that the issue is also under consideration with the college curriculum committee. Campbell reported that the BHS division currently offer six such certificates, and that a noncredit version is on track for approval by the state Chancellor's Office. The curriculum committee has raised questions of oversight. There is no clear authority for the college who sets policy, keeps track of student progress, and awards such certificates. If we dedcide that these certificates are important to our mission, we should decide how to count them. LaManque added that this issue can also tie to our Quality Focus Essay for accreditation on the issue of student pathways. Things that we decide are a priority should become goals. With a metric for low-unit certificates, we can marshall institutional resources. Regardless of any metric, the fact remains that the college awards low-unit certificates, so our processes should be explicit and transparent. Once that work is done, we could consider adopting low-unit certificates as an institutional effectiveness metric.

Acknowledging the thoughtful consideration that the college curriculum committee has already given to this issue, Holcroft proposed that, absent CCC opposition, we hold off on adopting low-unit certificates as an IEPI metric at least until CCC discussion and process development is complete. Faculty could use guidance on how these certs help students and what faculty can do to encourage them.

It was suggested that we track students' progress in math for the first two years. The idea is to identify value realized among transferring students who do not earn an ADT or other Foothill degree. Holcroft offered to research the issue and report back.

Median percent wage change in CTE programs got some interest. The Workforce Work Group is looking at percent wage change from program entry to exit. The Chancellor's Office has a "wage tracker" tool, but its current implementation has some limitations.

Beyond immediately raising wages, we may want to measure "opportunity expansion." Often, students completing work at Foothill become eligible for different jobs. We may want to look at how many jobs become available as a result of student's Foothill experience. Feasibility questions were acknowledged.

Program-specific targets with respect to the ACCJC set standards for accreditation were discussed. Some faculty had asked for department-specific standards on metrics such as student success. The current set standard for student success as measured by passing grades as a percent of census is 57%, computed as 75% of the most recent three-year average for all courses at the college. The set standard serves as a minimum benchmark for every program on campus, applicable to a program or department for a full year for all its courses.

The issue arises via a program review prompt: if a program falls below the set standard in a given year, program faculty are prompted to describe steps we'll take to bring the metric back up the the minimum standard. Due to typically lower success rates in math, for instance, it may be appropriate for the math department to have a lower floor than other programs on campus. The question becomes whether individual programs or departments should determine their own set standards for accreditation.

LaManque described the ACCJC process. If a given program does not meet the set standard on some metric, the ACCJC sends notification that the college will be under "enhanced scrutiny." The visiting team will pay attention specifically to that program with respect to that metric and the steps in progress or planned to bring the metric back up to the set standard. He suggested that a program with a lower metric than other programs may be enough to attract the accreditors' attention, even to the point of enhanced scrutiny.

There's a risk that floors that are set differently depending on typical success rates in certain programs could lead to complacency. For instance, allied health programs set for themselves a 75% floor, with a 90% expectation, and 100% goal. The 57% institutional goal doesn't come into play in those programs.

There was some mention of reexamining the program review process and prompt, so that a program falling below the floor indicates a need to focus institutional resourses rather than a need to fix blame.

	There was a search for advantages to a program if it were to have a lower set standard. There are acknowledged advantages to a higher set standard, as a push for improvement, to express how we value student success, etc. Which appears to argue for program-specific set standards. If there can be value to higher floors, why not lower? There was some discussion distinguishing floors and goals, and their different effects. It was suggested that trend analysis might help.

There was support for promoting a mindset that the set standard for student success is actually unacceptably low, and that the college wants to help any program near the floor. Further, once a program has reached a standard and demonstrated that meeting it is possible, that standard should now become our own, that we hold ourselves to.   We should shift focus from rationalizations of existing situations to planning for and implementing steps to improve.

It was suggested that when our institutional standard (57%) is an F+, it seems odd that there's a group of program faculty anywhere at Foothill that considers such a situation acceptable.

There was a suggestion to examine success rates online vs face to face as well.

It was offered that overall success rates have problems as metrics, because the aggregation process to the program level can mask a lot of variation. The general can hide the specific. It's possible that the students who persist through sequences that save us, when in fact success rates in our introductory courses might be much lower. Course–specific success rates may be more appropriate for identifying areas needing resources.

This discussion is really systemic.   Identifying courses with higher success rates can lead to robust discussions.   Some transcripts record the grade distributions along with the grades.

Holcroft indicated that our institutional set standards will be an item of discussion in the upcoming PaRC meeting. She urges senators to start discussions now, to stimulate faculty viewpoints on setting our floors and goals.

Senate has been asked to have feedback on course and degree completion rates, in view of setting a goal and determine a methodology.

Guest speakers are available to speak to these issues at any upcoming department and/or division meeting. |
| 9. New Business | |
| a. Mid-year assessment/reflection on Academic Senate Outcomes | Holcroft asked us to reflect on our progress toward the desired outcomes we set for ourselves for the year. She remided us that senate is charged with making recommendations to college and district administration concerning academic and professional matter, presented assembled action items from our meeting minutes so far this year, and prompted reflection on our progress.

In response to a question, Holcroft characterized discussion items as laying the necessary groundwork for when the time comes to make a recommendation.

She asked whether consitutients see any of the 10+1 areas of faculty purview that senate is not addressing? From our retreat, we know there are other items upcomimng, e.g. implementing COOL standards.

Our first outcome has been to facilitate communication with all interested groups. This year, senate has taken purposeful steps to meet this outcome, e.g., providing written committee reports, holding academic senate office hours, and creating a |

	Yammer group. It's important to clearly distinguish formal senate business (subject to Brown Act requirements) from the necessary but necessarily informal background communication. Senators are asked to check in with constituents about senate performance, and to highlight suggestions for senate action.
10. Committee reports	a. Compilation attached. b. Elections committee. Holcroft announced that she will not seek a third term as President next year. Escoto indicated interest in running for President at that time, so that he will not run for Vice President in the upcoming election. Senators are asked to solicit divisional curriculum experts who may be interested in this leadership role. c. Budget Town Hall A number of constituents offered feedback at the budget town hall. There was some encouragement concerning projected FTES growth rates based on improving retention. Student retention itself can help us meet budgetary goals while reinforcing institutional values. It was emphasized that this is one discussion, budget and mission are not separate issues. For instance, it's not possible to consider online course growth as a revenue generator without considering it's impact on our institutional goals of improving student success and closing achievement gaps. Maurer reported that President Nguyen approached her concerning using institutional research to identify students taking 3 or more classes in Anthropology, who are enrolled in Fall but not yet registered for Winter, to target for outreach. No individual department can email more than 50 students, but IR can. c. Counseling Division has trained 5 counselors in the use of Zoom for online counseling presence. d. Committee on Online Learning COOL asks us to please shout: ETUDES IS GOING AWAY! WE'RE NOT KIDDING! MIGRATE!! There are still a lot of courses left to migrate. Online quality and accessibility standards are in process, probabluy too much to do at the same time as final migration to Canvas. One sentator asked whether COOL might examine a question of how to identify disruptive student behavior in onlone classes, and what to do with a student who exhibits such behavior. What's the online equivalent to the in-person instructor removing a distruptive student?
11. Announcements	Limited to 3 minutes. Senate cannot take action a. PD brown bag event Thursday, March 2 from 12-1 in the Altos room. "Practical Uses for Disaggregated Student Learning Outcomes Data" b. ASCCC Executive Committee will hold their monthly meeting at Foothill on Friday, March 3 from 12:30-5:30PM in the Toyon Room. Visitors welcome.

	c. The February Rostrum from ASCCC is available.
	d. Students are asking for foothill.edu email addresses, ASFC is working on it with Vice Chancellor Moreau. May have different domain, like owl.foothill.edu.
	e. Look for an upcoming announcement re: trac-dat upgrade in April
	f. Still in need of faculty co-chair of SLO committee
	g. Senate meeting is scheduled tentatively in finals week, senators are asked to hold the time slot for an abbreviated agenda.
12. Adjournment	3:48 PM