

Academic Senate Draft Minutes January 22nd 2024

1 Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m.

2 Roll call Cormia

2023-2024 Executive Committee January 22, 2024

| 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) | online |
| HSH | |
| Rachelle Campbell | 4006 |
| Frank Niccoli | absent |
| Kinesiology/Athletics | |
| Katy Ripp | online (office) |
| Rita O'Loughlin | online |
| LA | |
| Stephanie Chan | 4006 |
| Rocio Giraldez Betron | online (address posted) |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| LRC | |
| Destiny Rivera | online |
| Eric Reed Chrisanthy Penate (proxy) | online |
| STEM | |
| Sara Cooper | 4006 |
| vacant | N/A |
| Professional Development Coordinator | |
| Carolyn Holcroft | absent |
| Faculty Chair of COOL | |
| Allison Lenkeit Meezan | 4006 |
| Ensuring Learning Coordinator | |
| Stephanie Chan | 4006 |
| Kerri Ryer | absent |
| FA Rep | |
| Julie Jenkins | 4006 |
| ASFC Rep | |
| Joshua Agupugo | absent |
| Classified Senate Rep | |
| Adiel Velasquez | online |
| 21-23 P/T Rep | |
| Roxanne Cnudde | online (address posted) |
| 22-24 P/T Rep | |
| Michael Chang | 4006 |
| Advisory Members | |
| President's Cabinet | |
| Stacy Gleixner | 4006 |
| Dean of Equity | |
| Ajani Byrd | absent |

Guests: David Marasco (4006), Evan Gilstrap (4006), Lené Whitley-Putz (online), Fatima Jinnah (online), Clifton Der Bing (online),

3 The agenda was adopted by consensus. Ben Kaupp motioned first, Robert Hartwell seconded.

4 Public comment: Fatima Jinnah announced that Allies for Peache & Justive in Palenstine are starting a [reading group](#). The book is titled "Mornings in Jenin," and open to everyone. Stacy announced a last-minute request for a panel to be held on Wednesday for the Stanford DARE Program. Twenty-four graduate students are coming to Foothill for the event. Faculty are asked to come and share with Stanford students why they teach at a community college. Sara Cooper expressed a concern (from the biology department) that they were just asked what they want to teach in the academic year 2024-2025, a year ahead, with a deadline of February 1st. The concern expressed was insufficient time to prepare a thoughtful schedule, one year in advance.

5 Approval of the minutes from January 8th (minutes as amended). Motion to approve by Stephanie Chan, seconded by Robert Hartwell, approved by consensus, absentia by Brian Evans.

6 Consent calendar: Karen Erikson was added to the consent calendar for Vet Tech, Angela Su is added to both search committees (HSH). Voltaire mentioned vacancies to the COOL committee. There is still a vacancy for the STEM executive committee. Eric Reed mentioned the need for faculty to serve on the Affordable Housing working group. Rita mentioned Don MacNeil on the curriculum committee, representing Kinesiology for winter. The consent calendar was adopted by consensus, Brian Evans motioned first, seconded by Sara Cooper.

7 Voltaire shared that Joshua had shared those textbook costs of \$60-\$90 were expensive for students, ideally \$0 - \$50 would be better.

8 RSI

Allison mentioned thoughtful input to the RSI discussion. Allison shared that RSI documentation is required by the Federal Government; the question is how we will document it. There is a discussion of what quality teaching is and contact with students. There is an initial training and online (asynchronous) as currently modeled. The second part involves a six hour peer discussion cohort modeled on POQR. For faculty who have completed training such as POQR or Humanizing STEM or have completed a new J1B evaluation with an MT in the criteria addressing RSI and accessibility, they could "test out". All faculty would need to complete documentation.

Allison said she hopes we're voting today on which option to go with. It was commented that RSI is for pure online right now, with mixed messages for hybrid. There was some faculty feedback regarding low-unit courses. There was an additional comment that for HSH, Allied Health, there are several rotating low unit (1 unit) courses, and all will need RSI documentation. Sara shared feedback that the proposed plan currently in front of the body goes beyond what is required by accreditors and the government. The proposal from the STEM division was that deans would collect the syllabus, and there would be a statement about RSI and a communication plan. Or we could build a community around online documentation (COOL) in a

culture shift with training. STEM faculty feedback was to submit the required paperwork and move to more training if the culture shifts. Sarah Williams wrote an [alternative plan](#) that decouples the regulation from the culture shift. And that the Dean would be required to have syllabi submitted for each course for each quarter, which could involve COOL, to ensure that RSI is evident.

Lené commented that if we only went with a statement in a syllabus, that isn't enough for the Federal RSI documentation requirement. More than an assertion is needed, there must be evidence that RSI has occurred. Rachelle suggested that since faculty are evaluated every three years, the J1 process should prove, not just document, that RSI has occurred. Voltaire commented there could be a power dynamic involved if an administrator versus a faculty (peer) does the evaluation. Rachelle mentioned a peer review process, outside of the contract, that provides an honest critique of teaching. Julie also commented about the power dynamic in a teaching review. Sara commented that the real problem with this plan is that it is an evaluation with a regulation layered on top of it, and faculty might not want to be "genuine" in their participation (sharing RSI plans). Faculty being evaluated would work to meet an obligation, and we should separate a regulation (RSI) with the culture building around effective teaching.

Allison commented that instructors are not participating in PD, we have programs (like POOCR) but faculty aren't participating in it. She asserted we're not holding our peers accountable. Voltaire asked and Allison qualified, that accessibility is not part of RSI. Voltaire asked for more detail of the RSI requirement; we need to document that the RSI asserted in a communications plan occurs. Allison reminded the Academic Senate that in the fall, we adopted a resolution that stated that online teaching is different which requires ongoing professional development on effective pedagogy. Lené added that out of the culture shift, we will have meaningful conversations that also need the RSI requirements. She reminded that online students, especially students of color, do better with quick and ready feedback. How do we support each other in our professional development? Kate shared that the training discussed here is a reasonable amount of effective training that will have a positive impact on online teaching.

Julie commented that we're addressing the need to build skills up, and we should provide opportunities for faculty to build up these skills, and probably not through subjecting them to more required training. Brian commented that it was still unclear to him what the definition of a minimum or required amount of RSI.

Sara commented that the more she dug into the RSI topic, the amount of work required in this plan is far above what is required. She further commented that the "problem" with our online teaching (as discussed by students on opening day) might be due to other things than RSI.

Lené commented that every campus will take different approaches to meeting State and Federal requirements for online teaching, and if you look at the regulations, there isn't a single checklist of what is needed. Ben commented there is evidence that we do need to address this

requirement. Are we doing a resolution to show what we will do with RSI, or that we will do RSI? Allison replied we're giving input to De Anza and providing guidance to FA.

Rachelle shared that on one side, we are trying to create activities to hold faculty accountable, but we don't have that "authority." If we're doing something to hold faculty accountable and improve teaching, it needs to be done through a J1. She commented it's too "fuzzy" as is. There was a comment that the J1 process isn't a good tool for holding faculty accountable. The process we're presenting here is either the J1 or the one we suggest here. Voltaire shared there are a lot of options in this (amendment). We still have an additional conversation to have with De Anza. It would be good if we could arrive at a consensus prior to meeting with De Anza on February 26.

9 Low-cost textbooks

Carolyn provided input to the discussion via e-mail mentioning \$40 as low cost at De Anza. Statewide Senate for students suggested \$30. Rachelle asked what the benefit or impact of a lower or higher number for target book cost would be? Voltaire commented that students want to see a number for transparency, Rachelle commented Foothill is \$50, students want \$30, maybe we end up at \$40. Josh shared that most students want cheaper. Ben suggested parity with De Anza (\$40) might have a benefit. Brian shared that expanded rentals has a benefit to students, Cormia commented that rentals have an environmental benefit. David Marasco commented that amortizing textbook costs still has an impact on student expense, especially when many students don't complete a sequence. Michael Chang commented that his students have access to many books and other student support tools from an online offering. Voltaire further supported rentals. David questioned having a cost for exams and quizzes. Sara commented that we should ask our students what they prefer, rental or ownership. Rachelle commented that some topics change over time, and resources might not be applicable (outdated) in a number of years.

Ben commented that from a curriculum standpoint, all CORs must have five year or newer textbooks, and thus keeping books forever doesn't make sense. Voltaire reaffirmed the need to have Joshua's (student voice) in this conversation.

10 13-55 plan

Patrick mentioned taking input from divisions to collect and share what everyone is doing across campus. Patrick suggested that what he shared be taken as a "first read." Patrick commented that on February 5th, he'll have something more to share.

11 Supporting faculty hiring positions

Patrick commented that he brought some of the questions from the document into an administrative hiring process and had good feedback (they were all well received). Sara, first and seconded by Ben, motioned to direct the officers to provide faculty appointed to hiring committees with a copy of Equity-Minded Faculty Hiring Practices by Wood & Harris (Dec 2023), as exemplifying the Senate's position on faculty hiring. The motion was carried unanimously.

#12 - Program Viability

Voltaire mentioned that back in 2012, during budget cuts, one of the means of evaluating program viability was "program review". In the previous senate, Kathryn Mauer led an ad hoc committee to work on the issue of program viability. Voltaire solicited participation in a newly formed ad-hoc group, and David Marasco commented that the 2012 process was written to address what happened during the CTIS dismemberment, and it would behoove us to have tools in place long before we ever have to use them. While we may not know what it looks like, we should have the process in place before we need it. Rachelle commented that the program review process was punitive, and the process may look different to an administrator versus the faculty. Cost is just one factor, what students do with the program is very important. Patrick commented that we need to come up with criteria of what should be a flag for activity. This process of program viability is something being discussed at De Anza as well; student services should also be looked at. Lety mentioned there are programs that should not have been revived. Patrick commented that the ad hoc committee should have a sunset. There was a comment that we also need staff and administrators. Patrick, Voltaire, Lety, Robert, and Rachelle are also willing to help.

#13 For the good of the order - David Marasco mentioned the Physics show, which finished this week with the 200,000th attendee. Jule Jenkins announced the FA Open House on Thursday from 12-1:30 p.m.

Voltaire announced that at the next Academic Senate meeting will address AB 1111 common course numbering, we'll bring back bylaws (constitution), and maybe credit for prior learning.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.

The next meeting is Monday February 5th.