

Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 13, 2017
2:00 P.M., Toyon Room

ITEM	ACTION
1. Call to Order	Quorum present 2:00PM. 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) Rachelle Campbell for Lisa Eshman (BHS) Carolyn Holcroft (AS President '16) David Marasco (PSME) 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)</p> <p><u>Guests</u></p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u> Jody Craig (KA) Jordana Finnegan (LA) Donna Frankel (PT rep '16) Carol Josselyn (FA&C) Bruce McLeod (FA&C) Tobias Nava (CNSL) for Cathy Denver Rita O'Loughin (KA)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u> Ramiel Petros (ASFC President) Faculty Association - not yet appointed Classified Senate – not yet appointed</p>
3. Adoption of Agenda	Approved by consent.
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>No public comments today.</p>
5. Approval of Minutes February 27, 2017	One revision to minutes re: committee report of COOL. Approved by consent.
6. Consent Calendar	<p>Scholarship Readers – Tilly Wu, Benjamin Schwartzman, Anita Vazifdar, Laurie Bertani, Alexis Donato, Clifton Der Bing, Andy Lee</p> <p>Jordan Fong (Graphic Design) Tenure Review Committee – Robert Hartwell (MUS) to replace Carolyn Brown</p> <p>Approved by consent</p>
7. Hiring Committee Appointments	None today.

8. Unfinished Business	
a. Update: Spring event honoring part-time faculty	Campus dining center reserved for evening of May 19. Holcroft and Schaefer are working on the program, currently looking for speakers. There is a great need for volunteers to setup and staff the event, scheduled for 5:30-7:30PM. Senators are asked to spread the word about the event and encourage constituents to attend this celebration of our part-time professional colleagues.
b. Restructuring resolution – 2nd read	<p>Apprenticeship faculty have indicated desire for senate representation. There is support for the resolution from the BSS division. Library representative asked to strike the words "collegial agreement" from resolution, leaving the reason for there being one senator representing the library to be "by custom and practice."</p> <p>Faculty from the former Adaptive Learning Division and now organized under the Disability Resource Center within the Counseling Division have been more concerned with curriculum committee representation rather than senate representation. There was some desire to hear from other faculty from the former ALD who are now organized into Kinesiology and Athletics.</p> <p>Resolution will return for a third read at the next meeting, with the Library's suggested change.</p>
c. Resolution to amend constitution preamble – 2nd read	Motion to adopt the resolution M Marasco S Nava. There was no discussion. Motion approved by consent.
d. Constituent feedback re: Senate progress to date	<p>BSS division representatives reported positive feedback on the document as is, and brought forward three ideas for possible senate attention.</p> <p>1) There is a desire for shared physical space on campus, for students and for faculty. Issue falls under the Facilities Master Plan and is subject to shared governance decision-making. The latest information can be found on the PaRC website. The current faculty lounge in 1900 is underused. It was suggested that the location is a problem, that it feels like a cold space, not like a pleasant gathering space. Some learning communities have a requirement of shared space, but have yet to have such space designated. It was thought that the issue may fall under senate purview through "processes for institutional planning."</p> <p>2) It's been noted that class seatcounts vary across divisions, and even differ for the same course between the colleges (for instance, Cultural Anthropology at Foothill has a seatcount of 50, while the DeAnza course operating from the same course outline of record has a seatcount 40)*. The Faculty Association recently completed a three-year project on load rebalancing, and Lamanque offered that even though that work produced winners and losers, different campuses with same course should have same load and seatcount. It was noted that productivity concerns driving higher seatcounts can conflict with our college mission and goals of increasing student success and closing achievement gaps. The senate interest appears to be with the curriculum impact of seatcount, and possibly with "policies regarding student preparation and success." Holcroft offered to invite FA to a senate meeting. Faculty can also bring the issue directly to administration. Officers are directed to invite FA reps for future discussion</p> <p>3) There was an expressed a desire for a clearinghouse of some sorts for faculty participation in committees. Contractual service obligations of faculty are very specific. A cultural shift may be a more effective change agent than any contractual requirement, for instance, it was noted that the portions of job descriptions dealing with service to the college are evolving away from an invitation to service and more toward a collegial expectation. There was some mention of overload assignments that provide some faculty with opportunity to</p>

	<p>work more for pay while committee service is paid implicitly to all. There was a request to consider drafting a letter from the Academic Senate to the deans concerning overload assignments and their relationship to service to the college, and immediate recognition that FA has an interest in any such communication.</p> <p>There was a suggestion to create a list of full-time faculty along with their service to the college, and to publicize the list, particularly on the senate website. That might be a simple matter for senate-appointed work, but it was noted that the senate is not necessarily aware of the large volume of work that takes place within departments and divisions. Some colleges have a faculty annual report form. FA also has a template. It was suggested that perhaps the most appropriate place for such a list is in the program review, so that it would be evident which faculty serve on five committees to another's one or even zero, while the other faculty member works two overloads. It was offered that while it may be a place to start, a simple list of committees does not always indicate workload, for example, service on tenure committees is easy to document but not often overly time-consuming. There's also a quality impact.</p> <p>It was suggested that the senate consider a motion to recommend to the Program Review and Institutional Planning & Budgeting Committees to incorporate into the program review template a section in PR about FT faculty service to the college.</p> <p>No action was taken today. Officers noted the three issues, to be included in planning for future senate action.</p> <p>* Correction: the quoted seatcounts were later discovered to be incorrect. Seatcounts for Cultural Anthropology at Foothill and DeAnza are the same.</p>
9. New Business	
a. Resolution – Dental Hygiene Baccalaureate degree: credit for prior learning	<p>The first students in Foothill's Bachelor of Science program in dental hygiene began their studies last fall. In addition to the native BS degree program, there is a much demand for a program for holders of AS degrees in dental hygiene to complete a BS degree. The resolution under consideration to permit dental hygiene faculty to award upper-division units for upper-division competencies demonstrated by AS degree holders who complete the licensure requirements of clinical practitioners. The model for the unit awards is an executive order from the Cal State Chancellor's Office to all CSUs with similar bridge-to-Bachelor's degree programs for holders of AS degrees in Nursing, on the basis of the requirements of the NCLEX licensure exam.</p> <p>ASCCC has worked with CSU about setting parameters about the new community college BS degrees. That's one reason we chose the IGETC and CSU-Breadth general education requirements: they were well-recognized and accepted. Credit for "prior learning" is less well-accepted. There is currently a cap on units awarded for competencies demonstrated outside of academic coursework.</p> <p>There was a question of how this would fit into graduation requirements. The curriculum sheet for the completion degree shows an additional 40 quarter units of upper-division work in addition to any unit awards. The unit awards would in effect count toward up to 25 quarter units of upper division general education. CSU nursing programs specifically award GE credit, not credit for any nursing clinical practicum. It was noted that both nursing and dental hygiene programs have external accrediting agencies combining their curriculum who would not allow BS recipients to earn credit for any upper division clinical courses without taking those courses.</p> <p>It would be difficult to map the GE credits awarded under any such program to</p>

	<p>specific general education courses, because upper division dental hygiene course work has general education outcomes embedded in its curriculum. It might be nice to see such a mapping, but it may not be possible to produce.</p> <p>There is an issue of fairness here. Nursing programs, which have much the same standards and often even the same courses as dental hygiene, allow for this kind of credit. Why should dental hygiene students be required to complete additional coursework for the competencies demonstrated by their licensure, as nurses do?</p> <p>The ASCCC Area B meeting is next Friday, and we won't have a second read before then, so our officers will submit this resolution to the Area meeting to judge interest on sending it to ASCCC Spring Plenary. It would help at that meeting if our reps could say that "our faculty are behind this." We'll also have our joint meeting with DeAnza before that meeting.</p> <p>Phyllis Spragge, DH program director, arrives, and addressed the question of the unit mapping. She assured that no units would be awarded until the end of the program, after completion of forty units of upper division work. If resolution is not adopted, a candidate for a completion degree would need to complete the additional 25 quarter units in upper-division general education work.</p> <p>Upper division general education courses at Foothill include healthcare/lifespan, communication & multicultural issues, and research methods and statistics. There is also a desire to enable students to move on to a Master's program in Dental Hygiene, and articulation questions are currently being addressed. There is much interest in this completion degree program.</p> <p>There was a question about students entering our program without completing the clinical licensure exams. Spragge pointed out that there are none because clinical licensure is a program prerequisite: this degree is offered only to holders of AS degrees in clinical practice. Students learn the skills necessary to pass these exams in either a clinical or didactic setting, and all degree holders, AS or BS, must pass the exam to get a job.</p> <p>To a question that we would appear to be awarding upper division units for completing an admissions requirement, it was noted that in effect, the external licensing agencies are certifying competencies that are part of this BS degree.</p> <p>This credit-award model exists for nursing, it makes sense to apply it to dental hygiene. There was a brief suggestion to compare our program requirements to other dental hygiene programs instead of nursing. UOP, Loma Linda, and USC all have such programs, but comparing our program to a private school's may not be as convincing to CSU faculty than comparing to a related model that they've adopted themselves.</p> <p>Senators are asked to seek feedback from constituents.</p>
b. EduNav counseling faculty update	<p>EduNav is a tool counselors use to help students. At last board meeting, the district approved a three-year \$500K contract to adopt EduNav.</p> <p>The EduNav program can put ed plan creation on autopilot, subject to the inputs that a student enters. For instance, given a choice of major and placement results, EduNav can populate an ed plan based on Foothill's course offerings. It can be a great thing, but counseling faculty have seen ed plans that have students moving from four levels below college level math to college-level ready in two quarters, since we offer Math 230 and Math 108. Counseling concern over a current lack of necessary customization ability for student ed plans.</p> <p>The system has known bugs, for instance, it doesn't recognize courses from other</p>

	<p>colleges, Transfer Agreement Guarantees are not always updated, the ADT in Early Childhood Education not yet implemented, some general education requirements are not yet coded properly and can give students a mistaken view of their remaining requirements for their degree. And there are others. Counselors have been in conversations with the software vendor, and reached a point where the vendor was not able to continue to make suggested changes, until a contract was accepted. Concern over the human component (possibly from A/R that will be necessary in order to make system adjustments, nuanced student plan changes, and overall banner integration support.</p> <p>The vendor promises to make the system work for our students after the contract is signed remind counseling faculty of similar issues raised and promises made with respect to DegreeWorks, which in the end were not addressed. Counseling faculty are more than willing to work with the vendor to fix issues impacting student success, but until those things are fixed, there is reluctance among counseling faculty to fully embrace EduNav.</p> <p>Counseling faculty have been working on this for a year and are willing to continue to do so. Technical inaccuracies remain, and faculty are clear that in their judgment, full system implementation should not be implemented until those issues are resolved. Counseling faculty would feel uncomfortable with pressure (administrative or otherwise) to enact EduNav prior to important technical inaccuracies being addressed.</p> <p>There will be a student interface to EduNav, so that students can create an ed plan without talking to a counselor. If it really worked as promised, it would be excellent. For instance, unlike DegreeWorks, EduNav interfaces with assist.org.</p> <p>A big part of where the mentioned concerns come from, is that a program like this is originally meant to be used at a university, where variations in course sequence, courses taken at other campuses, and many other variations, are not common. By nature, community college student ed plans are much more nuanced than an average ed plan at a university. The complexity of our student situations, requires a large amount of customizability necessary in order to best prepare our students for success.</p> <p>Counseling faculty will consider what action would be most appropriate for senate to take, and return with a specific request. One desirable outcome might be the creation of an identified EduNav implementation team, with faculty representation on behalf of senate, and a dedicated person assigned to deal with student-success issues.</p> <p>Senators are asked to keep constituents informed.</p>
10. Committee reports	Compilation attached.
11. Announcements	<p>Limited to 3 minutes. Senate cannot take action</p> <p>a. Area B meeting Friday, March 24 at Chabot College</p> <p>b. Congratulations to our newly-tenured faculty colleagues! Jeff Anderson & Eric Reed from PSME, and Katie Ha, Allison Herman, & Sam White from Language Arts. Welcome to all five!</p> <p>c. Workforce Workgroup is putting together surveys for graduates of our CTE programs. CTE program directors are asked to forward any suggested survey questions to Rachelle Campbell.</p>
12. Adjournment	4:00 PM

