

Foothill Academic Senate Minutes December 6, 2021

#'s represent items numbered on the [Agenda](#)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m. Kathryn welcomed everyone to the last meeting of the fall quarter, and apologized for holding the meeting during finals week. We normally try not to do that, but this quarter, with everything that has happened, we really needed the time to move forward with our priorities for the year.

2. Roll call

Executive Committee

Officers:

Kathryn Maurer (President) –
in person

Paul Starer (Exec VP)

Eric Kuehnl (VP Curriculum)

Robert Cormia (Sec/Treas)

Division Senators:

Alexis Aguilar

Brian Murphy

David Marasco (absent)

Donna Frankel

Ellen Judd

Frank Niccoli (absent)

Jeff Bissell

Jordan Fong

Katy Ripp (absent)

Kerri Ryer

Kimberly Escamilla

Mary Thomas

Matthew Litrus

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera

Milissa Carey

Patricia Crespo-Martin
(absent)

Sara Cooper

Stephanie Chan

Tracee Cunningham

Voltaire Villanueva

Extended Exec Committee

Adrienne Hypolite (absent)

Ajani Byrd

Carolyn Holcroft

Fatai Heimuli (absent)

John Fox

Kurt Hueg

3. Agenda was adopted by consensus. Minutes from 11/22 adopted by consensus (Judd abstained).

4. Public Comment: Allison Meezan and Sally Baldwin addressed the senate about the PO CR project. Allison urged faculty to enroll in the PO CR project. Sally entered [a schedule](#) into the chat. With the new reality of hybrid classes and flipped classrooms, the PO CR process elevates teaching in hybrid and the traditional classroom. Many faculty have already gone through it and highly recommend it. They asked senators to please help spread the word among their constituents to get faculty to enroll for the Winter quarter.

5. The [appointment document](#) on the consent calendar was approved by consensus (Ryer moved, Judd seconded).

6. Reaffirmation of [Resolution Authorizing Remote Meetings \(Under AB361\)](#). Villanueva moved to pass the resolution by consensus, seconded by Frankel. The motion was approved unanimously

7. 2nd read of [draft resolution on Ensuring Inclusivity of Academic Senate Meetings and Events Post COVID](#). Ellen Judd commented that for part-time faculty participation, the virtual option is very important. Kathryn asked if there as any constituent feedback, or requested amendments to this resolution, or possible opposition. Ellen asked if anything hasn't gone as well with remote meetings? Thomas commented that she has actually been surprised that the substance of the

remote meetings has been comparable or better. Allison Meezan commented that the COOL committee did hybrid meetings before COVID, and found that hybrid meetings were difficult, multiple screens for online people. Urging the administration to prioritize hy-flex equipping of rooms. Kathryn commented that as chair at the November 22nd senate meeting, which we ran for the first time in a hybrid format, that she found it harder to run than fully remote meetings, but said she hadn't yet run a fully in person meeting, but had attended them as a senator. In her opinion she thinks that it's easier to run a meeting that is all physical or all remote, although acknowledged that we may just be lacking the needed technology and training to make this work well. She mentioned having attended De Anza's demonstration of their new hy-flex classroom last Friday, and thinks we may just need practice. Carolyn Holcroft commented that with the right technology and training it is very easy to run hybrid meetings.

Paul Starer moved to approve the resolution, Kerri Ryer seconded - a roll call vote was done, which passed with two abstentions (Hueg and Byrd - advisory votes).

Roll Call:

Kathryn Mauer n/a

Paul Starer Yes

Eric Kuehnl Yes

Robert Cormia Yes

Brian Murphy Yes

Alexis Aguilar Yes

Kerri Ryer Yes

Sara Cooper Yes

Frank Niccoli absent

Tracee Cunningham Yes

Voltaire Villanueva Yes

Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera Yes

Milissa Carey Yes

Jordan Fong absent

Jeff Bissell Yes

Katy Ripp absent

Stephanie Chan Yes

Patricia Crespo-Martin absent

Kimberly Escamilla Yes

Mary Thomas Yes

Matthew Litrus Yes

David Marasco absent

Donna Frankel Yes

Ellen Judd Yes

Fatai Heimuli absent

Adrienne Hypolite absent

John Fox Yes

Carolyn Holcroft Yes

Ajani Byrd abstain

Kurt Hueg abstain

8. Return to Campus/Emerging from the pandemic. Kathryn explained that this topic was meant to be an opportunity for us to collectively debrief some of the recent meetings and events related to Return to Campus, including Friday's Emerging from the Pandemic event at De Anza, as well as being an opportunity for senate to hear constituent feedback about our November 8 return to campus brainstorming document. In addition, there are now significant enrollment concerns affecting our district but especially Foothill, that are likely also related to this topic. Bernadine had actually asked to speak to senate today about some ideas related to the enrollment issues, so suggested she start.

Bernadine started with giving an update on return to campus plans. She shared that all the services that were online are still online, and plan to stay online, always giving the students that

option. That said, we are also starting the planning to bring back more and more services to campus. The Admissions and Records building will be fully open by January.

Bernadine wanted to “plant an idea” about the students that aren’t here, or the students that don’t know about Foothill College. Bernadine asked if you think about Foothill, can we be a College of many campuses? Foothill, Sunnyvale, campus abroad, and serious field trips to (Washington DC) MLK and Vietnam Memorial, etc.

Paul Starer asked about the enrollment declines, what might they be tied to, and if we could return to 85% in person in Spring, would that help? Could we have a college for non-credit, a college for the workforce? A non-credit, pre collegiate, compete with language campus for pre collegiate students? Think in the Oxford model of Colleges of thought? Are we out there trying to be distinct? In the pandemic, our competition rose to the occasion, and may have taken some of our online enrollment.

Bernadine commented that our enrollment is 30% below last year. We had a lot of fraudulent enrollment last year, that could be some of the 30%. Which modality did we lose students from?

Kurt commented that F2F classes have shown a steep increase, obviously from last winter, as last winter it was all online. Perhaps now we’re just seeing softness online. We are offering just slightly fewer Now we’re seeing fewer sections offered, but we still could be in double digit decline.

Bernadine commented that Winter is going to be slow in enrollment, but Spring could be a “blossoming” of enrollment, and we’re also concerned about student success rates. We can attract more students, but we also need to be more successful (student success).

John Fox commented that field trips are a GREAT idea, but we would need College support, which has not been there in the past. Bernadine commented that field trips would be supported by this administration. Bernadine also commented that students do attend these (non-traditional instruction) events.

Tracy Cunningham commented that she was ready to start work on this. Cormia mentioned NASA education opportunities, and Bernadine commented about internships and opportunities with Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

Kathryn then turned to the debrief from the events last week. She shared that on Thursday Judy’s Consultation Task Force met. Kathryn commented that the consultation task force was formed a year and a half ago from looming budget cuts, but now the task force is looking at issues related to return to campus (emerging from the pandemic). Kathryn mentioned that the draft memo attached to the agenda was discussed, and a new one is forthcoming from Judy.

Bernadine commented that our RTC issues are different from De Anza. They want something more prescriptive, such as the 85% mark, and in phases. Our campus is looking at the content

of the courses that should be coming back, and getting students the education they need, whatever the modality. We need to offer the right courses at the right time.

We might hear that Foothill is doing it one way, but De Anza is doing it differently. Bernadine asserted that our “edge” might be the personal touch that students get.

Kimberly asked if there had been any economic analysis done of the effect of the pandemic on our students. We (Foothill) serve a lot of economically challenged populations that might be more impacted by the pandemic. Kurt commented that David Ulate in Institutional Research was asked to dig deeper into the data, but we don’t know any more yet.

Kathryn talked about the precariousness of “really wanting to be on campus” but also facing enrollment issues, and students may want to see more class offerings on campus, before returning, and so we may need to plan to invest in on campus classes, knowing that they might not get the enrollment we want to see, but it’s an investment for the future to draw students back, something like investing in a new business.

Kurt commented that we don’t want to throw out a lot of classes that might not get enrollment, and acknowledged it’s a major challenge to build a schedule for Spring.

Sara seconded what Kathryn had said. A lot of the biology faculty are back physically and that has helped to rebuild community in the classroom itself, but the campus is dead and it’s really hard when nothing is open and no one is around. If we had lots of classes back we could draw more students, but we need to build a holistic or more complete set of offerings for students to make that successful.

Kurt commented that staff will be back in person in winter, but this is a test to develop a more robust offering in spring. Sara commented that we need to ensure that we have a solid and sustainable physical presence. Ellen commented about the importance of creature comforts like food, places to eat and study, places to meet with other students, which are very important to students.

9. Kathryn reminded the group that a few weeks back Carolyn Holcroft had presented part 1 of what will likely be a multi-part segment on professional development. In part 1 Carolyn had shared the results of the districtwide professional development survey that was done after district opening day. Today’s topic will focus on the professional development landscape at Foothill. Carolyn shared [a PPT on PD Processes at Foothill](#). She talked about flex funds and flexible funding from the State, and requirements for a PD committee. Who decides what PD gets offered? Often it’s about feasibility and how much it costs. She referenced an opening day survey on PD, College planning documents, strategic planning for equity. She talked about a BLM series, and minding the achievement gap series.

If there is money required (there usually is) we need to be very careful about the funds. Dean or supervisors often weigh in on what training would occur that might be displacing instruction that

day? You need to identify the outcomes and be really clear about that. There needs to be an assessment. Even without money, it does require a chunk of time. What are the pots of money?

The District has money, even if the Colleges don't. Flexible calendar program. They pay for things like the District opening day. Online learning sometimes has a budget for professional development, as does the Office of Instruction (flex funds).

The Board of Governors will award funds to a District, who has filed a statement to the State that asserts each College has its own advisory committee for professional development. The whole thing around the "committee" is nebulous, in 2013 we didn't have a formal committee for PD.

Carolyn commented that at this moment we don't know what the "college governance" structure is. The FHDA-CCD BoT will primarily rely on us (faculty) to make recommendations on professional development. Appendix H4 of the agreement, is a form that any faculty can use to ask their dean or supervisor to participate in PD in lieu of a day of instruction. Carolyn mentioned many pots of money that also come with a list of requirements.

Kathryn talked about the need to have a larger conversation about professional development, how the opportunities are developed and shared, so everyone has the same information.

Lene talked about grants (like the Power Grant) that went to a lot of different places. There was a lot of money for getting peer reviewers (for POOCR). The online learning office has leaned on Carolyn to an extreme, but have desired a more formal mechanism for feedback of professional development. Lene commented about the pivot to online instruction and how much we leaned on Carolyn.

Donna commented that P/T faculty have often been told there is "no money" for PD, but actually there is.

Brain Murphy talked about professional development for their adjunct faculty in apprenticeship, and wondered what money might be available. Carolyn offered to help him figure that out.

Paul Starer made additional comments about the teaching and learning center, and possibly pulling professional development activities into that. There doesn't appear to be a central spoke for the professional development wheel.

Kathryn said that given the time, and the complexity and high need of this topic, she would bring this topic back in winter. In the meantime, she hoped everyone would share Carolyn's PowerPoint with constituents, and come back in winter with more questions and ideas.

10. OER. Kathryn reminded the group that we passed a [resolution in June advocating for institutional support for faculty to adopt OER](#), and to compensate faculty for developing and integrating OER resources. At that same meeting in June, we also looked at a [second resolution](#)

[to integrate OER adoption in the curriculum process](#), but decided to wait to consider approval until the curriculum committee could review/approve, which they did back in October.

Carolyn gave an update about a pilot program for providing a stipend for faculty to do the work of identifying OER. Faculty can do this by themselves, or using a template from the State that Carolyn described as helping faculty walk through the hoops of OER (especially evaluation and assessment). It is a challenge (hard work) to remix and adopt OER, and customized learning objects. We may not be compensating appropriately, so she decided to stop the program. We'll need to decide what is next.

Kathryn asked if the group would be willing to extend the meeting by 15 minutes to continue the discussion, but given the number of senators who were not going to be able to stay, she said that we will bring this topic back for the January 10th meeting, to make decisions about the stipend program, and also look at the resolution. She did ask senators to inform constituents before the break about this discussion, however, and especially the resources that the library offers to help locate OER. Mary Thomas shared [the link to the library resources](#) in chat, and Carolyn shared the link to the [OERI site](#). Paul underscored the importance of OER for our students, and the cost of textbooks (exceeding) registration costs.

11. Mary Thomas shared a link to the [library's page of "best books of 2021"](#) and will be gathering Foothill favorites.

12. Meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Next meeting is January 10th 2022