Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting, and Joint Meeting with De Anza College Academic Senate DRAFT NOTES

##  Monday October 30th, 2:00 P.M., Toyon Room, 3:30 Council Chambers (Room 2018)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **ACTION** |
| 1. Call to Order
 | Quorum present 2:01PM. Escoto called meeting called to order at 2:02PM |
| 1. Roll Call
 | Senators Present**Isaac Escoto** (AS President ‘17)**Rachelle Campbell** (AS Vice President/CCC Faculty Co-Chair ‘17)**Katherine Schaefers** (AS Secretary Treasurer ‘17)**Valerie Fong** (LA) **Kimberly Escamilla** (LA)**Sam Connell** (BSS)**Micaele Agyare** (LIB)**Jordan Fong** (FA)**Robert Hartwell** (FA)**Lisa Eshman** (BHS)**Rosa Nguyen** (PSME)**David Marasco** (PSME)**Donna Frankel** (PT rep ‘16)**Brendan Mar** (PT rep ‘17)**Cathy Denver** (CNSL)**Tobias Nava** (CNSL)**Rita O’Loughlin** (KIN/ATHL)Liaisons Present**Kristy Lisle** (Cabinet Liaison)**Amy Edwards** (FA Liaison for Fall)**Carolyn Holcroft** (Professional Development Coordinator)Guests**Mayra Cruz** (District Academic Senate President)**Tracee Cunningham** (Counselor, UMOJA)**Thuy Nguyen** (Foothill College President)Senators Absent**Natasha Mancuso** (BSS)**Maureen Macdougall** (BHS) |
| 1. Adoption of agenda
 | Approved by Consensus |
| 1. Public comment on items not on agenda (senate cannot discuss or take action)
 | A request was brought forth regarding the process on obtaining keys for faculty. Lisle clarified that the problem had been recognized, and that a solution was in the works. |
| 1. Approval of Minutes: 10.16.17
 | *See Attachment: AS\_Draft\_Minutes\_10.16.17* Nava brought up a correction to the Minutes, under CCC GE Subcommittee Area II. This area should be notated as “English” and not “Math and English”***With changes, approved by consensus*** |
| 1. Consent Calendar
 | Tenure Review Committee:Owen Flannery to replace Jody Craig (no longer at Foothill) on Matt Stanley’s TRC (Phase III)Academic Integrity Committee: Rachel LancasterCollege Curriculum Committee: Leeann Emanuel (SRC), Ben Schwartzman (SRC)CCC GE Subcommittee: Area I – Kella SvetichArea IV – Fatima JinnahStudent Equity workgroupKatie Ha, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Suzie Huerta, Bill Ziegenhorn**Transition to Work (TTW) Position****We need an At-large search committee faculty member for this new position****Workforce workgroup****We need more faculty to join!*****Approved by consensus*** |
| 1. Unfinished Business (10+1 area(s) indicated):
 |  |
| a. Senate Scholarship | *See Attachment: AS\_scholarships\_1718v2*Changes from Previous DraftBased on feedback from last week, Escoto edited the Scholarship document, adding in ESLL and clarifying wording under Minimum Qualifications #3Discussion The goal of this scholarship was again examined, specifically how would we define a Basic Skills student, and how long would someone need to be in Basic Skills in order to qualify for this scholarship.Marasco observed that the quarter during which the scholarships are reviewed may not be as focused upon in the decision. For example, if scholarship applications are reviewed in Winter quarter (the deadline for most College scholarships, including ours, are in February) and decided upon in Spring, Fall courses are primarily taken into account.Marasco also offered that if a student is mostly taking workforce or other course types, and takes only one Basic Skills course, we might examine if this would be in keeping with the spirit of the scholarship. Proposed Changes/Corrections based on discussionNava commented that wording regarding Basic Skills computer classes should be omitted from the document, as they no longer exist.Marasco pointed out that doing away with Spring courses, as counting for the scholarship from the previous year, will be more equitable to first year students.Holcroft highlighted the inclusion of the Special Instructions section. In the past year, this section had been removed, as these instructions are already part of the application and unnecessary. Will remove this section scholarship criteria.Escamilla and V. Fong expressed support for having the requirements state a student must be enrolled in and then complete one (instead of two) quarters. This would make more sense for students that only need one basic skills course. The current scholarship language also already suggests that a single course would qualify “Basic Skills consist of a course, a course of study, or an organized sequence of courses…”Escamilla proposed a correction of the wording under Minimum Qualifications #3 to read: “…during at least one quarter of the Academic Year…” ***Approved with corrections: Holcroft/Nguyen*** |
| b. Treasurer Report | Schaefers gave an update on the Dues Account. We hold a current amount of:$18,396.61 |
| c. Final Exam Schedule | *See Attachment: FinalExamSchedule\_V3*Another draft of the schedule was presented to the Senate. Of note, the Tuesday only noon hybrid and Thursday only noon hybrid courses now have a slot.Connell requested clarification on if online classes who have a proctored Final should have a written slot on the schedule. Currently Math, Economics, and English are noted with times. There are also Anthropology online courses that need an in-person proctored Final.Proposed Changes/Corrections based on discussionMarasco noted that face-to-face classes trump online in-person proctored Finals, so the online classes would need to have an advisory that the final may be changed if it conflicts with a face-to-face course.The body was in agreement that Anthropology would need to be put on this schedule, along with the already specifically noted Math, English, and Economics.Nava brought up the need for Sunday courses to also be mentioned in the schedule. There is no specifications for Sunday, only Saturday. The body was in agreement to change the “Saturday” notation to “Saturday/Sunday”.There was a request for more dialogue between faculty and deans if a course is proposed out of the current Finals scheduling block, as the spots are now completely filled.***Approved with changes: Frankel/Hartwell*** |
| d. Leadership Council | Escoto lead the body in a discussion regarding the two available Part-Time positions on the Leadership Council. Four part-time faculty expressed interest in serving on the Leadership Council from various constituency groups over the past few weeks. The Council currently has two openings for Part-Time representation.Three options were discussed amongst the body to choose representation:1) Have the Secretary/Treasurer be one representative, then a blind lottery for the other seats2) Have the President choose those two with the most experience in governance to move forward3) Have the Senate vote on who to move forward, based a statement from each of the four candidates.This third option was deemed most equitable by the body. The statements would need to include:a. Why serving on the Leadership Council would be important to the candidateb. What experience the candidate would bring as a representativeAdditionally, candidates would need to be available for meetings of the Leadership Council.Meetings will be held (so far) on:Nov 6th 3:30-5pm; Nov 20th 3:30-5pm; Dec 4th 3:30-pm**The deadline for submission of statements will be tomorrow early in the afternoon, with two candidates chosen via an electronic vote by the evening.** |
| 1. New Business (10+1 area(s) indicated)
 |  |
| * 1. Joint Meeting with De Anza Senate
 | *See Attachment: Resolutions\_Packet\_F17\_Thursday11-2-2017*Twice a year, the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC) hosts a Plenary session (once in the Fall and once in the Spring). These sessions are meant to determine State-wide Academic Senate policy through the adoption of Resolutions, crafted by various faculty and faculty groups from across the California Community Colleges. Prior to each Plenary session, each College is given a list of Resolutions that will be up for voting. For a comprehensive list of these, please see the above attachmentBoth Foothill College and De Anza College need to determine whether or not to support each of these resolutions, so that the voting members from each College may cast their ballots accordingly at the Plenary session.District Academic Senate President, Mayra Cruz, opened the discussion on Plenary resolutions with an introduction to the Role of the DAS. The District Academic Senate President has a third vote during State-wide Academic Senate Plenary sessions. The other two votes our District is allotted are represented by the Academic Senate President at Foothill, and the Academic Senate President at De Anza. If the Foothill and De Anza Senates are split on whether to support a resolution, the District Academic Senate will abstain from voting. The DAS is also responsible for facilitating discussions between the two Academic Senates, and helping to reach consensus if possible.The resolutions that are of interest to the De Anza and Foothill Senates include:17.03 17.04 10.01 10.02 4.01 14.01 15.01 1.01 1.01**Both Academic Senates were unanimous in supporting this Resolution** 4.01A clarification was requested on the purpose of this resolution.Cruz clarified that when State-level initiatives regarding transfer, it is good that the State-wide Academic Senate officially shows their support for transferring students. A request was made to remove the “non-profit” language in the Resolution’s second Resolved paragraph. In the following discussion, a point was made that removing this term could point to us forming strengthening relationship with for-profit colleges, which may not be our goal.**The Senates agreed to ask for clarification on the 4th Whereas language: “…with private and out-of-state institutions” …and the 2nd Resolved language: “…private non profit and out-of-state-institutions…” As these two statements do not consistently indicate the bodies in question.**10.01Background information was presented on this resolution. There was feedback from Apprenticeship faculty from across the state, that Apprenticeship faculty are not fairly represented on state wide senate committees. This resolution mentions a procedure whereby Apprenticeship Faculty were consulted, and then decisions were made based off of this consultation. It was noted that there was not a clear consensus on the outcome of the mentioned meetings with apprenticeship faculty representatives.The goal of this resolution is to make sure appropriate representation happens at the State Academic Senate level. If the Foothill and De Anza Senates were to support this resolution, it would mean that we would also support amending Title 5 min quals for Apprenticeship faculty.Feedback directed to DAS Mayra Cruz from Santa Clara county Apprenticeship faculty constituents, coalesced into a desire to not support this resolution. The reasoning being that Apprenticeship faculty agency would be challenged. Apprenticeship faculty would like to maintain the responsibility for deciding minimum qualifications for their faculty hires. This Resolution would also require additional qualifications to be met by Apprenticeship faculty, beyond what is already practiced, without consideration for how these additional requirements would affect particular fields.A discussion ensued on whether or not to support this Resolution. It was mentioned, and supported that it should be up to each Apprenticeship discipline to figure out what they’d need as far as minimum qualifications for their faculty.Clarification was given that this Resolution comes from Apprenticeship disciplines’ need to hire more faculty, and from the State Academic Senate blocking hiring choices that Apprenticeship faculty deem appropriate.Campbell observed Apprenticeship faculty are being looked at just like Career Technical Education faculty were 10 years ago. This resolution seems to be creating an “us vs. them” dynamic**Escoto mentioned that the Foothill Academic Senate officers would gather feedback from our constituent Apprenticeship faculty, and then forward on our recommendation to DAS Cruz.** 10.02Discussion re: how this resolution sounds friendly, but we’ve heard from apprenticeship faculty that they are unhappy with the direction the min qual conversation has been headed. Not clear direction on how to vote. 14.01**Both Academic Senates were unanimous in supporting this Resolution** **Cruz requested both Senates to take a look at** **15.01 and 17.03 and 17.04 and to forward any comments** |
| * 1. UMOJA Mentorship Program
 | Kimberley Escamilla (UMOJA Coordinator) and Tracee Cunningham (UMOJA Counselor) introduced the newly formed UMOJA mentorship program, currently running this Fall through Spring. Our UMOJA program is in its second year. The program is made up of a learning community with about 40 students, who are taking courses as a cohort. In the program, a faculty member would be matched with an UMOJA student, with the student being able to choose their mentor after a meet and greet social.UMOJA is currently seeking faculty mentors!\*PGA credit will be offered as incentive for training. Working on PGA credit for service as a mentor throughout the year.\*This would be a mentorship, a teacher – student relationship would not be expected.\*Two training sessions available for mentors:Tuesday, November 14 from 2-4pm in room 6505-or-Wednesday, November 15 from 2-4pm in room 6505\*There will be between 6 and 8 meetings per quarter\*Events for mentors and mentees will occur on campus throughout the year.\*Faculty who sign up would work with students Winter and Spring 2018.**Please let constituents know of this Mentorship Opportunity – Full Time and Part Time faculty are welcome to become mentors****Look for the flyer in your email, including the above details** |
| * 1. BP 5010
 | *See Attachment: Draft\_BP 5010-formerly 5000-AdmissionsandConcurrentNerollment\_Rev\_*Background on the Academic and Professional Matters (APM) Committee: This is a Committee formed of the FHDA Chancellor, the two College Presidents, the two Vice Presidents of Instruction, the District Academic Senate President, and the President and Vice President of each College’s Academic Senate. The Committee is charged with joint development of academic and professional matters (10+1 issues), particularly those that have district wide policy implications or where decisions at one campus may significantly affect the other campus.BP 5010Legally required policy reviewed due to a request from APM for a dual enrollment policy Recommendation to replace current policy language from 1999 with updated CCLC languageThe Academic and Professional Matters Committee made the following changes in this Draft:\*Updated language to comply with current law\*Changed wording to students “18 and above” instead of “Over 18”\*The wording didn’t allow for each College to do things differently. The new wording allows each College to make their own rules on the age of students eligible for dual-enrollment**Please disseminate to constituents.****If anything jumps out, feedback is requested** |
| * 1. AP 4235
 | *See Attachment: Draft\_AP 4235 Credit by Examination\_Rev* AP 4235This Administrative Procedure is in regards to updating our rocedures concerning Credit by Examination (Challengeable Courses) and Advanced Placement Examinations. In this draft, the Academic and Professional Matters Committee included specific language regarding the “Credit Hour”**Please disseminate to constituents.****If anything jumps out, feedback is requested** |
| * 1. AP 4020
 | *See Attachment: Draft AP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development\_New* AP 4020This Administrative Procedure is in regards to adding language that would define the term “Credit Hour” for policy/accreditation standards, among clarifying procedural steps for program and curricular development. **Please disseminate to constituents.****If anything jumps out, feedback is requested** |
| 1. Committee reports: Please see attached
 |  |
| 1. Announcements (limited to 3 minutes, Senate cannot take action)
	1. Professional Development Day 11.17.17
	2. Legislative Liaison
	3. Accreditation Next Steps
 | a. The next Professional Development Day is on November 17th, 2017PGA credit is available for Full-Time faculty, and Part-Time faculty (for step advancement)b. We need a Legislative Liaison to for our Senate to keep an eye on Legislative Listservs for anything that might affect issues under Academic Senate purview (the “10+1” areas):*See Attachment: AccreditationVisitNextSteps* c. Accreditation went well! Please see the above document for what we did well, and what the Accreditation team has recommended for us. |
| 1. Adjournment
 | Meeting adjourned 4:07 |