

## Foothill Academic Senate Minutes February 7, 2022

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

1. Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. Roll call

### **Executive Committee**

#### **Officers:**

Kathryn Maurer (President)  
Paul Starer (Exec VP)  
Eric Kuehnl (VP Curriculum)  
Robert Cormia (Sec/Treas)

#### **Division Senators:**

Alexis Aguilar  
Brian Murphy (absent)  
David Marasco  
Donna Frankel  
Ellen Judd  
Frank Niccoli

Jordan Fong  
Katy Ripp  
Kelly Edwards  
Kerri Ryer  
Kimberly Escamilla  
Mary Thomas  
Matthew Litrus  
Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera  
Milissa Carey  
Patricia Crespo-Martin  
Sara Cooper (absent)  
Stephanie Chan  
Tracee Cunningham  
Voltaire Villanueva

### **Extended Exec Committee**

Adrienne Hypolite  
Ajani Byrd  
Carolyn Holcroft  
Fatai Heimuli  
John Fox  
Kurt Hueg

#### **Guests**

Ben Stefonik  
Natalie Latteri  
Amy Leonard  
Isaac Escoto

3. The agenda was adopted by consensus. Approval of the minutes from January 24th, 2022 was also done by consensus.

4. On the resolution to continue remote meetings, Donna Frankel and John Fox made a first and second on the resolution to continue remote meetings. The resolution passed unanimously with one abstention.

5. Public Comment: None.

6. Kathryn mentioned a new District Distance ED Workgroup being formed by APM to draft the required AP 4105. Lene Whitney-Putz from Foothill will co-chair this new committee with a De Anza counterpart, and has put together a charter for the group. We need two faculty to serve on this committee. Kerri Ryer and Lene will co-chair a College workgroup looking at College policies on (remote) instruction, including drafting required language on regular & effective contact, and the proposal is to have two faculty from this college workgroup serve on the district committee. COOL is tasked with the responsibility to appoint faculty to these workgroups, and have the Senate approve the appointments.

The [appointments](#) were approved by consensus.

7. Kathryn reminded senators that an extra 30 minutes were scheduled for today's meeting to address many topics needing senate attention. She then reminded senators of the [priorities list](#) of topics we committed to back in fall, and then showed [a list of topics that are ready](#) to come to

senate, but did not make it onto this agenda, and ones she is hoping we can address prior to the end of winter, but we only have three meetings left (counting today).. Kathryn asked two questions: First do we want to meet some more, and if so, do we want to add new dates for additional meetings, and/or extend the meeting by 30 minutes? Second, what is the senate's desire in terms of order of priority?

Alexis Aguilar asked a question about the proposal for new senate committees, including Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and wondered if that were covered in the proposal for new committees. Kathryn affirmed that it was.

David Marasco suggested if we expand meetings in number and length, to ensure that P/T faculty are compensated and not held responsible for attendance. Kathryn reminded the senate that under the new compensation model PT senators are compensated for time, and not penalized for meetings missed. It is a good point that extra meetings could push the senators' time over the maximum allowable compensation, and we may need to seek out additional money to cover this, if possible.

Paul Starer moved to add two additional meeting dates for two-hour meetings in March, on the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup>. Kerri Ryer seconded. David Marasco clarified that we'd essentially be meeting on all the Mondays between now and the end of the quarter except for one holiday in February. The motion passed with 20 yes votes and 4 no votes. Kathryn reminded everyone of the proxy clause in the constitution if not everyone is going to be able to attend all additional meetings, and thanked everyone for their commitment to the senate and willingness to add additional meetings.

Regarding the question about priorities, Kerri Ryer mentioned that her division faculty wanted to have more discussion about and input into the faculty prioritization process. Ellen Judd talked about the importance of P/T faculty onboarding.

8. Kathryn thanked the Senate Elections Committee, Mary, Kerri and Matthew for their work, and turned over the presentation to Mary Thomas. This quarter we will have elections for President, Secretary-treasurer and one of the P/T senator positions. Mary asked that if faculty know of interested parties please come forward, nominations must be made by February 25th. Mary clarified that division senators are elected by the division, for two year terms, with no strict term limits. Kathryn mentioned that last year there were contested elections for Senate officers, and this is great, as it is a sign of a healthy senate. Kathryn urged everyone to step up and consider being nominated, even if you're not sure if some of us in these positions are running again.

9. Guided pathways meta majors - Natalie Latterie, Amy Leonard, Isaac Escoto

Natalie talked about finalizing meta-major groupings (sorting) and naming to bring to the College Curriculum Committee for approval based on responses they received from the divisions. Natalie showed the working draft of the group names. Natalie also showed recommended

changes in the draft resolution (going to CCC), the name “models” was changed to “groupings.” Kathryn asked if the GP Team could clarify what impact Meta Majors will have on the college. What do we expect will look differently once they are in place? She had heard talk about developing wraparound services specific to each meta major. Amy Leonard shared that yes, the next step would be to bring together the different programs in the meta majors to talk about needed services, e.g. tutors, mentoring, career development, short courses for students to explore careers or academic options within that meta major, etc.

Kathryn also shared that she wanted to bring back a question brought up at the last meeting about some programs wanting to belong in more than one meta major, and had found out that this is a practice done at other colleges. Natalie explained that they had received feedback from colleges that had put programs in multiple majors and this was not a good practice, and they said it was too confusing for students. Kathryn asked if this decision could be revisited by Natalie said not at this time. Amy talked about short courses for students to explore careers or academic options within that major.

10. Ben Stefonik and Kerri Ryer co-presenters on proposed changes to the J1 faculty evaluation instrument. Currently there are two J1 instruments, A1 for classroom instruction and A2 for online instruction. COOL has been talking about developing a third J1, the A3, for hybrid instruction, and have [drafted a proposal](#) and have gotten feedback from De Anza Academic Senate and now looking for Foothill Academic Senate. After senate feedback, they will approach FA, as this is a negotiated item. Apart from some name changes, and the third instrument for the new modality, there is also mention of the amount of time expected and compensation for faculty and administrators who perform the evaluations. Especially for fully online classes more than 120 minutes is needed to adequately understand the layout and operation of a course and complete the evaluation.

J1-A1 in person (or synchronous online)

J1-A2 online (asynchronous)

J1-A3 hybrid or mixed modality

Donna shared her experience in student demands for combined modalities of instruction – face to face and synchronous online in the same classroom, and this is likely the future we can expect to see. Kerri added that the definitions of hybrid came up at the De Anza academic senate meeting, and it likely needs to reference the proportion of time spent in each modality, and not only the modality. Paul commented that any innovation in the J1 would be helpful, and also that we should be asking students about quality of instruction as well as modality.

Ben clarified that there are four asks of senate, related to the [updated proposal](#):

1. What is your feedback on the proposed names?
2. Do you think the proposed A.3 instrument should be called "A.3 Hybrid Instruction" or "A.3 Mixed Modality Instruction"?
3. The draft instructions include specific modalities for each instrument. Do you think the instructional modalities are appropriately assigned to each instrument (i.e., the

instructional modalities listed in the draft instructions for the A.1, A.2, and A.3 instruments)?

4. What is your feedback about the proposed #11 criteria for the J1 A.3 instrument?

Kathryn will give some time for senators to get feedback from constituents and bring this back on a future agenda item.

11. Kathryn gave an update on the shared governance retreats that are going on. [A PowerPoint was shared](#). For the context, Kathryn reminded of the timeline of the external assessment of the governance structure done by the RP Group in May of last year, as well as the April academic senate letter to President Nguyen describing the challenges with governance, and the ask to create a shared governance task force. The task force began (summer 21) but then paused in mid-August when the mediation effort ran into problems. In fall an interim governance council was formed, but only had one meeting before Bernadine asked to pause it. Bernadine wanted to work on trust-building, and hosted the equinimity (horse) retreat in December, and now is hosting the small governance thought partners retreat with just a few representatives from academic and classified senates and ASFC. Kathryn and Kerri are representing AS, Paul was the third member but hasn't been able to attend. We have met twice, and have two more meetings scheduled.

Fatai talked through student messages around inclusion on governance. Students mentioned wanting a meaningful relationship with faculty, staff, and administrators. Students want to make an impact in practice and opportunities, as well as having a voice in the "governance process". Having effective presence without being overburdened.

Kathryn explained that the governance group has been working informally, without an agenda, and more in terms of asking and trying to answer questions, such as trying to define the purview of governance (as opposed to operations or academic and professional matters). The group clarified that a governance council would work more on something like strategies and guiding principles as opposed to anything tactical.

A proposal is on the table to start a governance council while continuing to hold periodic governance thought partners retreats periodically to further refine and develop our structure, and ultimately work on a handbook and onboarding. Membership of this new single council would be constituency based and mission based, with also ex-officio or resource members as needed based on the topic (e.g. finance, IR). Representatives from the senates, ASFC and various bargaining units, and mission based. The group has come up with six components of the mission: transfer, CTE, equity, empowerment, access and community. The ask to our groups is to check in to find out if this is a complete list.

Kathryn then showed some of the ongoing questions still being talked about, for example: how much ambiguity is tolerable? What is the difference between governance and (operations?) How can we ensure meaningful conversation without overburdening everyone?

Kathryn wanted to know what the senate thought about the proposal as well as the question about mission. Kerri mentioned that it was not clear if the president would be chairing this committee or not. She understood that Bernadine's role was not to act as chair of the council but rather as a consensus builder. A question was asked if this would be a decision-making body, by consensus versus voting, and are the decisions binding? Could they be overturned by the President? Kathryn explained that really the Board of Trustees are the final decision-makers, and they delegate authority to the Chancellor, who delegates to the college presidents. So in that sense, really the administration is the final decision-maker, although they need to ensure they are consulting collegially with the senate and having mechanisms for effective participation by all constituencies. Kurt commented that the 10+1 areas define where faculty have primacy, and other areas are participatory, where the decisions are made by the administrators.

Jordan asked what was meant by empowerment in the mission. Adrienne talked about the entire bucket of student activities, advocacy, service leadership, etc. as part of our mission to help students complete goals.

Ellen asked about what activities might be included in the charter of the group, for example, might it include a core value like sustainability? Kathryn explained that the mission wasn't the same as values, but assumed as a governance group would uphold the values of the institution.

Voltaire commented on students and where their cognitive thinking is especially in light of the pandemic, and the need to consider their well-being as part of our mission, and policies focused on the student's well-being.

Carolyn thanked Senate leadership for their efforts to help rebuild trust, but there is a lot of work to do, to rebuild trust. Need definition setting around our employees, students, goals, etc. We need intentional effort on the part of the administration. Kathryn asked the question (to Carolyn) if there is to be this intentionality, what does that look like? She also acknowledged that not everyone is comfortable with only the president representing administration, and even though there is a hierarchical reporting structure that doesn't mean everyone shares a monolithic vision speaking for the administration.

Adrienne commented that it's still not clear how this new governance space will look.

Ellen commented there are items that are important, that need to be handled, before we can say that trust has been rebuilt. When faculty feel their input is being asked for, and then acted upon with trust by the administration, that will go a long way in (re)building trust.

Kathryn asked would we be willing to begin this process, even with us not fully understanding what it is?

Donna commented that there are only two faculty attending these retreats, and two faculty is a small number. Adrienne commented that the affinity networks aren't represented on my

proposal, and we also talked about adding them in as members. Additionally, mission based representation does overlap with perspectives from faculty, staff, etc.

Kimberley asked who specifically would be a member? Kathryn answered that the only known individuals are Bernadine, Fatai, Adrienne and Kathryn, and not sure who is representing the unions. It's not clear who would be selected to represent the categories of the mission. Kathryn did comment that the Academic Senate would approve any faculty serving on this group. Carolyn commented that she wasn't comfortable (didn't feel great) going forward, that she would put proxy trust in Kathryn and Kerri, but to be cautious. Kathryn encouraged further comments, and she would bring updates with the process.

Kathryn asked for a quick green/red check in terms of support for us agreeing to move forward with the current proposal. The majority were comfortable but there were some nay votes and voices of concern.

12. Topic of faculty engagement and disengagement, Kathryn mentioned the Chronicle of Education article, and we tasked Paul to lead a discussion on this topic. Paul shared very challenging personal circumstances he had been going through including a very difficult conversation with a colleague, and then a health issue, then COVID infection, then the world and the country, and under those circumstances, very difficult to address the needs of the College.

These are challenges he could imagine many are facing right now, and there has been a push to get back to everything we were doing before the pandemic, and now we're often being asked to do something large and taxing, an instinct to go to confrontation and not collaboration.

Voltaire talked about the challenges for many students trying to come back, the collective trauma and PTSD from the pandemic. Cormia commented that we are here, and we are not here. David commented that the pandemic has caused many things to become more apparent, and there are many faculty who have been working to contract before COVID. He even found out one full-time faculty was working as a full-time faculty at another college. There are many faculty working on important things, but they are stretched to the limit. Cormia talked about the collective damage that has occurred because of the pandemic. John Fox mentioned that many people are doing different things, their priorities have changed, but they are still doing things. He also mentioned that many part-time faculty are engaged, and we need to foster and support them in that. John mentioned the feeling of community of belonging, and not on Zoom, how can we come together and do things, and feel like we are part of a community? Ellen mentioned the importance of being part of a community that you care about, how we care for our colleagues that aren't as much part of the circle. As a part-timer, she said she often wouldn't speak to anyone but her students.

Kathryn asked if there was a desire to continue this conversation at senate, or if senators preferred to take this conversation to other venues, like division meetings. Stephanie

acknowledged wanting to continue the discussion at senate; Kerri also commented in support of the dialogue. Kathryn said she would bring it back.

13. Kathryn said we're out of time to discuss the FHDA district vaccination policy, but Senators can provide input on the vaccination board policy (BP) by sending it directly to her, and she will share that input at CAC.

14. Announcements: There is an Accreditation Kick-Off event on February 11th event that she encourages all to attend, and an ethnic studies summit on March 4th.

15. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m

Next meeting is February 14th (Valentines Day)

#### Roll Call Vote Authorization of Remote Meetings

Kathryn Mauer	(not voting)
Paul Starer	x
Eric Kuehnl	absent
Robert Cormia	x
Brian Murphy	absent
Alexis Aguilar	x
Kerri Ryer	x
Sara Cooper	absent
Frank Niccoli	x
Tracee Cunningham	x
Voltaire Villanueva	x
Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera	x
Milissa Carey	x
Jordan Fong	x
Kelly Edwards	x
Katy Ripp	x
Stephanie Chan	x
Patricia Crespo-Martin	x
Kimberly Escamilla	x
Mary Thomas	x
Matthew Litrus	absent
David Marasco	x
Donna Frankel	x
Ellen Judd	x
Fatai Heimuli	x
Adrienne Hypolite	x
John Fox	x
Carolyn Holcroft	x

Ajani Byrd	abstain
Kurt Hueg	x

Roll call vote (Cormia) Vote to add two additional meetings in March

Kathryn Mauer	(not voting)
Paul Starer	x
Eric Kuehnl	x
Robert Cormia	x

Brian Murphy	absent
Alexis Aguilar	x
Kerri Ryer	x
Sara Cooper	absent
Frank Niccoli	x
Tracee Cunningham	x
Voltaire Villanueva	x
Mayra Palmerin-Aguilera	x
Milissa Carey	x
Jordan Fong	NO
Kelly Edwards	x
Katy Ripp	x
Stephanie Chan	x
Patricia Crespo-Martin	NO
Kimberly Escamilla	x
Mary Thomas	x
Matthew Litrus	x
David Marasco	NO
Donna Frankel	x
Ellen Judd	x
Fatai Heimuli	x
Adrienne Hypolite	x
John Fox	x
Carolyn Holcroft	NO
Ajani Byrd	abstain
Kurt Hueg	abstain