

**Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting Draft Notes
May 14th, 2 P.M., Toyon Room**

ITEM	Notes and Attachments
1. Call to Order	Escoto called meeting to order 2:04pm
2. Roll Call	<p><u>Senators Present</u> Isaac Escoto (AS President) Katherine Schaefer (AS Secretary Treasurer) Rachelle Campbell (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-Chair) Robert Hartwell (FA) Jordan Fong (FA) Tobias Nava (CNSL) Mimi Overton (SRC/DRC) Brendan Mar (PT rep) Valerie Fong (LA) Jay Patyk (BSS) Micaele Agyare (LIB) Tracee Cunningham (CNSL) Donna Frankel (PT rep) Robert Cormia (PSME) Natasha Mancuso (BSS) David Marasco (PSME)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Present</u> Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development Coordinator) Bill Ziegenhorn (FA Liaison for Spring) Kristy Lisle (Cabinet liaison)</p> <p><u>Senators Absent</u> Rita O’Loughlin (KINS/ATHL) Dixie Macias (KINS/ATHL) David McCormick (LA)</p> <p><u>Liaisons Absent</u> Danya Adib (ASFC President)</p>
3. Adoption of agenda	Approved by consensus
4. Public comment on items not on agenda (senate cannot discuss or take action)	
5. Approval of Minutes:	ASDraftMinutes4-30-18 Approved by consensus
6. Consent Calendar	
7. Unfinished Business (10+1 area(s) indicated):	

<p>a. Guided Pathways Update</p>	<p>Escoto gave an overview on where we are with Guided Pathways.</p> <p>Valerie Fong and Ben Armerding taking the lead on Guided Pathways conversations around campus. The conversations will begin with two “Brown Bag” sessions.</p> <p>The first session will focus on what we want out of Guided Pathways. The goal is to involve as many people, from as many areas of campus as possible. The session requires no prior knowledge on Guided Pathways. Please let your constituents know about this first session: Wednesday the 23rd from noon-1pm in the Altos room</p> <p><i>If those who would like to attend could indicate their interest on the Professional Development Calendar (links below), that would be very helpful for the room count and organization.</i></p> <p>First session: http://events.constantcontact.com/register/event?llr=pje5aedab&oeidk=a07efctzui192e81c9a</p> <p>Second session: http://events.constantcontact.com/register/event?llr=pje5aedab&oeidk=a07efctzup0be7e4e2b</p>
<p>b. New “W” Grades</p>	<p>Commentary: Is the “WF” necessary between census and the 8th week of the quarter? If after census, but before the W deadline, could a student who stops attending just be considered “W”? The “WF” might not be necessary. After census, the “WF” is helpful to the student to indicate that they failed for non-attendance. Concern that the “WF” grades could be detrimental to the student for transfer/future transcript purposes.</p> <p>Comment that Admissions and Records needs to know the reason a student fails. As this is the main goal, why would we assign a “WF” before the census deadline? We would already be able to mark down the date of last attendance without assigning a “WF”.</p> <p>Escoto will follow up with Admissions and Records</p> <p>Additional question for follow-up: What situations and categories would necessitate a “WE”?</p> <p>For the sake of consistency, we would assign the following grade patterns: WE – “Emergency Withdraw” WF – “Fail Withdraw” WM – “Military Withdraw”</p> <p>The body agreed that we can move forward with “WE” and “WM” grades, though we’ll need further clarification on what situations warrant a “WE” grade.</p>
<p>c. Full Time Faculty Hiring Procedures</p>	<p>FT_Faculty_Hiring_draftFHsenate4_30_18</p> <p>Full Time Hiring Draft document overview by Escoto.</p> <p>On pg. 11 of the FT Faculty Hiring Draft, wording was inserted in regards to follow-up questioning during interviews.</p>

	<p>In an interview, sometimes there are follow-up questions that are asked. In the Draft, it has been explained that the “follow-up” questions are only for clarification purposes only. From pg. 11 -“Follow-up questions directed to the candidate during the interview must only be done in order to clarify an answer given.”</p> <p>Comment: It may be best to create examples of clarification questions vs. follow-up questions.</p> <p>Comment: Pg. 8, there is a statement regarding increasing the number of available positions due to the outstanding nature of candidates. Do we want to keep this in our procedures?</p> <p>General sense that senate reps feel this is not a good practice, and should be taken out of the document.</p> <p>Comment: The above scenario usually happens during times of budget surplus.</p> <p>Comment: This would allow a decision be made that allows candidates to jump the line and show favoritism or bias in the moment. This would take away a position from the department that would be next in line for a position hire. This would not reflect our values within our shared governance process.</p> <p>Comment: It seems we have rules for feast times, and rules for famine times. We should have rules that apply in both scenarios.</p> <p>Comment: The Draft does reflect reference checking happening after a candidate is chosen.</p> <p>Comment: On top of pg. 8, wording was inserted that if the President negates the hiring of the recommended candidate by the committee, the President should communicate the why for this decision back to the committee.</p> <p>Comment: On the bottom of pg. 7, under #2 in “Responsibilities” we may want to strike the wording “...at the College President’s direction...” To indicate the President should have this as a given duty, instead of possibly indicating it as a discretionary duty.</p> <p>Comment: We amended wording to include sending out the screening criteria and the preferred qualifications at the same time, in order to capture as wide a selection of candidates as possible. This will hopefully encourage those individuals who may select-out of the process early on, to apply for the position.</p>
<p>d. Governance Redesign Update</p>	<p>Foothill College Governance Handbook 2018-19 v17</p> <p>Escoto presented an overview of the Governance Handbook Draft that has recently come out of the Governance Redesign Committee discussions.</p> <p>The Classified Senate, Curriculum Committee, and Academic Senate will continue to exist.</p> <p>All other current committees will cease, and four new overarching committees will be created. The final names of these committees have not yet been</p>

decided, but will follow the structure of our Educational Master Plan. These new four committees would include the following categories: Equity and Education, Community and Communication, Resources and Revenue, and a Campus Committee. These committees would not be hierarchical and would all report directly to the President.

On pg. 9, under “Operation of Committees” The make-up of the new committees will include 12 individuals: 4 faculty, 3 classified staff, 3 students, and 2 administrators.

The reasoning behind including more faculty than other constituency representatives is that faculty have as a primary job duty, to inform administration on 10+1 related topics. The reasoning behind fewer administrators would be the presence of additional ex-officio administrative personnel within the meetings.

Within the four faculty representatives, the governance committee debated on making one of the seats mandatory for PT faculty. There would be pros and cons to this. A pro would be guaranteed representation of PT faculty within governance regardless of future Senate circumstances. A con would be what would happen to our representation if we could not find a PT faculty to serve. For example, if no PT faculty was found to serve, the fourth seat would remain vacant instead of being backfilled by a FT faculty member.

Comment: We would need to explore additional compensation for PT faculty representatives to fairly incentivize participation.

Comment: We could look at revamping and expanding our Senate communication structures to create a better sense of community and connection to the Senate. In this way, we could garner interest in Senate service for part and full time faculty.

Comment: Concern that the chairs of the committee are not facilitating the meetings. Seems to be overlap between facilitators and chairs. Concern that the facilitators meet monthly, but the chairs do not. As is currently set-up facilitators would meet separately, outside of the committees. On pg. 11, “...there may be a monthly meeting of facilitators to share information across committees (this will also provide a backup just in case a facilitator can’t make a meeting).”

Clarification, on pg 12 of the new Governance Handbook, it states “An agenda setting meeting that includes the chairs, facilitators, and recorders will take place before each committee meeting.” Would still be helpful to clarify in “Facilitators” section that agenda setting is led by chairs, in collaboration with Recorders and Faciliattors.

On pg. 14, there is a proposal for a “Year 1 Phase-in” for Program Review.

Comment: Program review needs to be more clearly addressed in the handbook. Specifically closing the loop of communication with the programs to provide feedback and allow for programmatic improvements. The programs that are currently in the yellow and red need to know earlier what they need to do.

	<p>Question: After this transition year, what would we like to do with Program Review?</p> <p>Follow up: pg 27 addresses program review transition proposal.</p> <p>On pg. 28, there is an overview of the different committee agendas and topics. We need to understand the roles of each of these committees and begin to appoint representatives to each.</p> <p>Comment: From the perspective of the English department, there are certain campus-wide topics where we would need a person to be directly involved. For example, if one of these committees is discussing AB705 and none of these committees has an English faculty, how are English faculty to be represented?</p> <p>Comment: A campus-wide innovation in our communication structures might help to solve this general concern from a range of specialized constituencies.</p> <p>Comment: We are looking to shift our communications style to a more electronically innovative method.</p> <p>Comment: An immediate partial solution to the above issue might be available. For example, if a chair of the committee would see an issue on the horizon that would need certain department or faculty expertise, they would invite that expertise ahead of time.</p> <p>Comment: Would there be an hourly commitment for each committee?</p> <p>Answer: As of now, it is postulated at 3-5 hours per month – under “Time Commitment Required” on pg. 37. Concern that this number is low, as participation in committee discussion as well as reading material/preparing for a meeting may be more time.</p> <p>Comment: We need to be able to incentivize PT faculty for participation on these committees.</p> <p>Administrative comment-We also need to be mindful of overspending within these upcoming budget deficit years. We do not have enough monies for release time for chairs, or others who have not been traditionally compensated.</p> <p>In two days at the PaRC committee will discuss program review procedure, a well as do a first read of the new governance handbook.</p>
<p>8. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated)</p>	
<p>a. Faculty Graduation Speaker</p>	<p>Commencement Faculty Speakers Nominations 2018</p> <p>The ASFC has forwarded a list of faculty who have been nominated for graduation speaker.</p> <p>As per past Senate policy, those faculty who are tenured would be eligible to speak. The Senate will discuss next year whether it would be appropriate to allow for non-tenure faculty and/or part time faculty to be considered to be a speaker.</p>

	<p>Below is feedback re: received faculty commencement speaker list.</p> <p>Business and Social Sciences Lawrence Lew is not-tenured, Natasha Mancuso is not-tenured, Nick Tuttle is on leave, John Fox spoke recently</p> <p>Fine Arts Jordan Fong is not-tenured</p> <p>*Make a note for full names and names spelled correctly Wendy Jen (sp?) Need to confirm that Leighton Armitage was what was meant by “Armitage” on the document. Katherine Schaefer is not tenured, is a part time faculty. Lauren Velasco is in Fine Arts (not BSS) Daniel Nghiem is not tenured.</p>
<p>b. Strategic Objectives 18/19</p>	<p>StrategicObjectives2018-19DRAFT</p> <p>The above draft presents the Annual College Strategic Objectives from Pres. Nguyen for next year.</p> <p>Feedback Requested: Please take a look at this document. This will be presented to PaRC on Wednesday.</p>
<p>9. Committee reports</p>	<p>Escoto will send these out shortly</p>
<p>10. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Part Time Faculty Symposium b. Latino Heritage Month c. Service Leadership Survey 	<p>a. PT Faculty Symposium DeAnza Fireside room 9:00am-4:30pm Put on by the Senates of Foothill and DeAnza, in partnership with the Faculty Association. Please let your PT faculty know and encourage them to attend. Agenda here: http://fafhda.org/home_news_pdfs/2018/april/FHDA-PT-Symposium.pdf To register, please email: goodwinmaryellen@fhda.edu</p> <p>b. Latino Heritage month is currently going on. Please have a look at this month’s activities and encourage your students to attend. Heritage month page: https://foothill.edu/heritage/lhm.html</p> <p>c. Please have a look at and fill out the Service Leadership Survey to share your perspective on the importance of service leadership activities for our students. Survey here: https://www.research.net/r/FCCSLI</p> <p>d. After this year, Rachele Campbell will be ceasing duties as Academic Senate Vice President. Benjamin Armerding (English Dep’t) has stepped up to serve. During our next Senate meeting, we will vote to affirm his appointment.</p> <p>e. Foothill College has an upcoming dance recital “Love 2018”, on Friday, June 1st from 7-10:30pm in Smithwick theater. Please check out the event on the Campus Events page: https://www.foothill.edu/events/?sr=2&rec_id=5599</p> <p>f. We need a faculty member to serve on the search committee for the Dean of Online Learning position. Please announce to your constituents.</p>

11. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned 4:01pm

Distribution:

Rachelle Campbell (AS Vice President/CCC Facult Co-Chair), Katherine Schaefer (AS Secretary Treasurer), Isaac Escoto (AS President), Valerie Fong (LA), David McCormick (LA), Natasha Mancuso (BSS), Jay Patyk (BSS), Micaele Agyare (LIB), Jordan Fong (FA), Robert Hartwell (FA), Vacant (BHS), Vacant (BHS), Robert Cormia (PSME/Workforce Liaison), David Marasco (PSME), Tracee Cunningham (CNSL), Tobias Nava (CNSL), Donna Frankel (PT rep), Mimi Overton (SRC/DRC), Brendan Mar (PT rep), Carolyn Holcroft (Professional Development Coordinator), Rita O'Loughlin (KINS/ATHL), Dixie Macias (KINS/ATHL), Danya Adib (ASFC President), Kristy Lisle (Cabinet liaison), Bill Ziegenhorn (FA Liaison for Fall)

CC: Jim Nguyen (De Anza Academic Senate President/Spring Quarter), Thuy Nguyen (College President), Tim Shively (FA President), Erin Ortiz (Classified Senate President)