Academic Senate Draft Minutes November 20, 2023

 # 1 Meeting Called to order at 2:02 p.m.

 # 2 Roll call (Cormia)

Officers	Location
Voltaire Villanueva	4006
Patrick Morriss	4006
Ben Kaupp	4006
Robert Cormia	4006
Senators by Division	
Apprenticeship	
Stephan Schnell	Absent
BSS	
Brian Evans	4006
Mona Rawal	4006
Counseling	
Tracee Cunningham	4006
Leticia Serna	4006
DRC/VRC/SRC	
Ana Maravilla	4006
Fine Arts & Communications	
Robert Hartwell	4006
Kate Jordahl Robert Hartwell (proxy vote)	Online as guest
HSH	
Rachelle Campbell	4006
Frank Niccoli	4006
Kinesiology/Athletics	
Kelly Edwards	Online as guest
Katy Ripp	4006
LA	
Ulysses Acevedo	4006
Rocio Giraldez Betron	online (address posted)
LRC	
Destiny Rivera	4006
Eric Reed Chrisanthy Penate (proxy)	4006
STEM	
Zachary Cembellin	4006
Sara Cooper	4006
Professional Development Coordinator	
Carolyn Holcroft	4006
Faculty Chair of COOL	
Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
Ensuring Learning Coordinator	

Stephanie Chan	Absent
Kerri Ryer	Absent
FA Rep	
Jordana Griffiths	4006
ASFC Rep	
Joshua Agupugo	Online as guest
Classified Senate Rep	
Adiel Velasquez	Online as guest
21-23 P/T Rep	
Roxanne Cnudde	Online (address posted)
22-24 P/T Rep	
Michael Chang	Online as guest
Advisory Members	
President's Cabinet	
Stacy Gleixner Kurt Hueg (proxy)	4006
Dean of Equity	
Ajani Byrd	Online as guest

David Marasco (guest-4006), Angela Su (guest-online), Clifton Der Bing (guest-online), Kelaiah Harris (guest-online), Valerie Fong (guest-online),

 # 3 Adoption of the agenda, motion to approve by Robert Hartwell, seconded by Brian Evans, the motion was approved unanimously.

 # 4 No public comment

 # 5 Adoption of the November 6th minutes as amended by Sara Cooper. Rachell Campbell is misspelled) Motion to approve by Sara Cooper, seconded by Ben Kaupp, the minutes were approved.

 # 6 Approval of the consent calendar (Voltaire showed the calendar, addition to program review council, addition to the student grievance pool.)

Patrick announced that a phase 1 candidate's TRC is being held up, needing an at-large member, please put out a call to division faculty. Motion to adopt the consent calendar was made by Patrick Morriss, seconded by Allison Meezan. The consent calendar was approved.

 # 7 Zero Textbook Costs (ZTC) Carolyn announced that the State is interested in helping faculty convert courses to zero-cost textbooks. There are many barriers to student success, especially textbook costs. The state is giving community colleges $200K to convert an entire program to zero textbook costs (no costs to the student for the program).

There are some logistical formalities before an award from the State can occur. Carolyn did a survey of departments to see who might be ready with ZTC, meaning at least one ZTC course.

Carolyn posted the link to a SmartSheet document describing the ZTC project: Foothill College ZTC Course and Program Mapping. Carolyn showed several courses that were (theoretically) ZTC possible. Carolyn reminded that degrees have core requirements, and the study validated at least one pathway, Carolyn also ran a report of how many courses were ZTC and part of a program. She then showed GE patterns, the upshot was that students could complete GE requirements with many courses that had ZTC. She then showed the Certificate Dashboard. She showed several core courses that were part of an ADT, and potential paths for students to take more than one.

Carolyn commented on some priorities, that if there are choices to make, CTE first, transfer second, certificate of achievement, etc. Over time, the ZTC possible courses would serve a large number of students. Carolyn shared that we have the funds ($200K) now and we have to make some choices about which courses to start (ZTC). There were comments about other costs, like calculators, instructional materials, etc. We would need to see if the courses chosen are connected into a path (to complete a degree). In prioritizing courses, do we choose courses serving the largest number of students, students of color, or close to being ZTC complete.

Sara asked in terms of prioritization, would we be following guided pathways? There are faculty in other colleges that are getting some or significant release to write a ZTC. Patrick asked about absorbing other costs, and about retention. Kate asked about software costs, and how we could absorb costs with a site license. We could also put copies of a textbook on reserve in the library, provided that we have a textbook on reserve for every single student, in every single section. Voltaire asked what are the next steps for us? Carolyn replied we should go back to division faculty to garner interest in ZTC. $200K requires us to get one entire certificate or degree up by December 2024. The ZTC effort could span from adopting OERs to writing an entire textbook.

 # 8 Foothill ISER (second read)

Kelaiah shared that we have been making minor updates to the ISER. There was a motion to approve the ISER with minor edits by Patrick Morris, seconded by Brian Evans. The motion was carried unanimously, and the Academic Senate reaffirmed the ISER.

 # 9 13-55: Strategic Vision for Equity Issue 7

Recruitment and retention cluster hiring would involve added attention and support, whether they be faculty of color or not. Voltaire commented that in a cluster hire, we could intentionally advertise that we're recruiting faculty to accomplish strategic goals for the College, such as 13-55. Kate commented that in doing some of the difficult DEI work, that we need to support those faculty, as would occur with a cluster hire. Ajani asked if the hiring announcement for faculty could include an understanding of the lived experience of minority or marginalized populations. Ajani commented that we shouldn't just be cluster hiring for some of the DEI work. Further, shouldn't all our faculty be hired (selected) for equity-minded work? David commented that it would be great to have these as minimum qualifications, but the State sets those goals.

Senators commented that this shouldn't be a one-time thing, it should be institutionalized. Ajani further clarified that we shouldn't make these qualifications just for cluster hiring. Patrick commented that when we are hiring on preferred qualifications, it should be what we're screening for. Patrick also commented that we are looking for beliefs, not particular bodies, that's what we're looking for. Kurt commented that we could (or should) use the diversity statement as a screening tool if it includes what we want. There was a comment that some diversity statements might be boilerplate and not useful.

Break at 2:59 p.m.

Item # 11 Student conduct and grievance procedures (Third Read)

Catlina Rodriguez addressed a number of questions that were brought up by faculty at the previous meeting. Catalina commented that for a first (minor) reported offense, a letter is sent to the student, and if they decide to accept responsibility, or meet with Catalina, their "registration hold" is removed. Catalina has the authority to give a "warning", which can be further discussed. Rachelle asked who defines "blatant cheating", for e.g. "with intent". Catalina commented that uploading test questions (to the Internet) is egregious, versus copying an answer from an unapproved source. A second warning, i.e. a repeat offender, which isn't common, then a hearing would occur. Angela Su asked what would happen if there wasn't agreement on what or wasn't egregious. Additionally, what happens if a student drops (or withdraws) to avoid an investigation? Catalina commented that every single student is an individual, and cheating can be different from student to student, and when "looking at the student as a whole" could determine if an offense is egregious or not. Can we work with the students to help them understand "the issue"? Catalina commented that she will often consult with a colleague for guidance. Kurt commented that a W doesn't "wipe out" the offense. Catalina shared that a student will have a note in their record about an academic integrity report. Voltaire read from the AP where egregious is mentioned.

Voltaire asked what he is seeking today is affirmation of the three APs so we can move forward. Voltaire commented that the De Anza Senate has approved these three APs. Rachelle talked about the seriousness of cheating in some applications, and especially in healthcare. Ben Kaupp motioned to approve all three administration policies and was seconded by Rachelle Campbell. A roll call vote was taken (see below) and the motion was passed.

#12 STEM Dean Search Committee Appointments

Five STEM faculty have submitted their names for the STEM dean search committee: Sara Cooper, David Marasco, Rosa Nguyen, Jeff Schinske, and Rachelle Campbell. Sara commented that this is an important issue for the STEM division and that this issue is very important to STEM faculty. Sara asked for clarification on the RAG (process) and wanted to make sure that division faculty had an opportunity to participate. Voltaire read the committee make-up from the Resource Allocation Guidelines, which provided little guidance on soliciting names, but who was responsible for appointing faculty. David commented on the importance of

the division dean to division faculty, that perhaps this is more of a "local decision" than one exclusively owned by the Academic Senate. Lety commented that as a counselor, it's important to have a good relationship with all academic deans, (and the role of counselors in what deans do). David advocated for more voices from inside the division in selecting a dean. Sara asked that we postpone a decision on the five faculty interested in serving on the committee, and it should be the voice of STEM faculty in selecting the people who best represent the faculty to serve on the selection committee for the dean. Ben commented that DRC faculty decided on the composition of their selection committee. Patrick also added to the thinking that STEM faculty should be making the selection choice of the faculty. Voltaire suggested that we can formally come up with a process for future searches in January. Voltaire expressed a concern that the hiring committee process is not delayed, and if there are no objections, the STEM faculty decide for this search and provide selected faculty to serve for the next senate meeting.

#13 COOL Resolution on Professional Development (First Read)

Allison moved for affirmation on the COOL resolution. Voltaire read the resolution. Alison commented that 90% of all courses use Canvas. Lety seconded the motion. The resolution was supported by acclimation.

#14 Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) Documentation Model (Second Read)

Robert Hartwell commented on considerable feedback from his constituents that "18 hours is a lot". Rachelle commented that "18 hours spent on RSI training is 18 hours not spent with students." Allison commented that the COOL resolution is a suggestion, a follow-on to AP 4105. Still, because this is a workload issue, COOL is putting this forward as an advisory model for FA. A comment was made that 6 hours a year isn't a lot of training. Ultimately this will be an issue for the Faculty Association. Kate commented that RSI is important and there are things still to be learned in this area. While faculty have strong opinions about the amount of work, this is important and could be part of accreditation, and RSI is very important to students. Sara commented that there's a lot of feedback from faculty and that even though our arguments are compelling, the Academic Senate shouldn't be making the decision for the faculty on this. Allison asked what was best for the students. Rachelle commented that she is listening to students. Is there a way to make the task so that the workload is more manageable? Voltaire commented we do need to make a decision. Brian asked if we pass this, can we amend this? Patrick moved (suggested) that we table this until the next meeting. Kurt commented that we're in a different world now, with federal oversight, and we need to document, and verify - these are all new requirements. Kate suggested that maybe we incorporate RSI training into other Professional Development. Robert Hartwell seconded. Rachelle commented that we should ask our faculty what is reasonable. By voice vote, we agreed to table the issue for this meeting.

#15 For the good of the order.

Voltaire commented that it meant a lot for faculty to be here in person and online today. It's week nine, we're almost there.

Joshua commented that he could do more with students and suggested an AFSC report at each meeting.

David Marasco - police chief's advisory meeting, met and discussed tension on campus due to the war in the Middle East, documents uploaded to the Academic Senate website. David commented that much of hate speech is constitutionally protected, and hard to suss out when it occurs or not. A suggestion that "how to respond to hate speech is not to respond to it".

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Roll call vote three APs

Voltaire Villanueva	not voting
Patrick Morriss	yes
Ben Kaup	yes
Robert Cormia	yes

Apprenticeship
Stephan Schnell	absent

BSS
Brian Evans	yes
Mona Rawal	yes

Counseling
Tracee Cunnngham	yes
Leticia Serna	yes

DRC/VRC/SRC
Ana Maravilla	yes

Fine Arts
Robert Hartwell	yes
Kate Jordahl	yes

HSH
Rachelle Campbell	4006
Frank Nicolli	4006

Kinesiology/Athletics
Kelly Edwards	yes
Katy Ripp	yes

LA
Ulysses Acevedo	yes
Giraldez Betron	yes

STEM
Zachary Cembellin	yes
Sara Cooper	yes

Professional Development Coordinator
Carolyn Holcroft	yes

Faculty Chair of COOL
Allison Lenkeit Meezan	yes

Ensuring Learning Coordinator
FA Rep
Jordana Griffiths	yes

ASFC Rep
Joshua Agupugo	yes

Classified Senate Rep
Adiel Valasquez	yes

21-23 P/T Rep

Roxanne Cnudde 22-24 P/T Rep	yes
Michael Chang Administrative rep	yes
Stacy Gleixner Dean of Equity	yes
Ajani Byrd	yes