

Academic Senate Minutes
October 31, 2011

Meeting Called to Order: 2:02 p.m.

Members present: Dolores Davison (President), Carolyn Holcroft (Vice-President/CCC Chair), Robert Cormia (Secretary/Treasurer), Katherine Schaefers (Adjunct Faculty), Teresa Ong (ADL), Russell Wong (ADL), Karl Peter (BHS), Eta Lin (BSS), Sam Connell (BSS), Tobias Nava (CNSL), Bruce McLeod (FA), Janis Stevenson (FA), Richard Morasci (LA), Pam Wilkes (LRC), Don MacNeil (KA), Patrick Morriss (PSME), Debbie Lee (PSME), Kimberlee Messina (Cabinet Liaison), Darya Gilani (Classified Liaison), Meredith Heiser (FA Liaison), Jorrell Dye (Student Liaison)

Members Absent: Fatima Jannah (CNSL), Dixie Macias (KA)

Guests: Bea Cashmore, Judy Miner, Victoria Taketa.

Agenda Approval: Agenda was approved by consensus.

Announcements: Trac-dat training Tuesday (November 1st)

Approval of Minutes from October 17, 2011: Minutes add Donna Frankel as a guest. Minutes approved with changes.

Consent Calendar: Approved.

Item 1: Rich Hansen addressed the senate regarding SB 1143. Rich has been doing statewide presentations to help inform faculty and other stakeholders about SB 1143 and its implementation. Rich circulated the California Community College Independents (CCCI) report. Rich stated that general feedback on the SB 1143 process has been a mixture of 'okay' to 'terrible'. Statewide academic senate (fall plenary) will be discussing this next week in San Diego.

The 'vetting' process has been six months of waiting before June/July meetings starting in summer on the response to the SB 1143 process. Implementation details are left out of the original response. The Chancellor's office website has much of the information about SB 1143 (see the tab for student success.) Rich spoke about the selection process for representation in the statewide process for giving feedback. Meetings went forward in spring through November into December - getting the final product (feedback) to the Board of Governors. Rich suggested that if the Senate shows leadership on this issue we can inform the FHDA Board as to our collective 'faculty position'. CCCI is not point-for-point but thematic. K12 is trying to set their graduation requirements to (community) college entrance requirements - the two should mesh without colleges having their entrance (bar) dictated by K12.

The terminology of 'central' vs. 'local' in assessment suggests a top down mandate. Faculty want a diagnostic aspect to the assessment exams (have something that was diagnostic to student readiness). This process is not going to be 'voluntary' in that if we don't follow what is "voluntary" we could face some problems (expand or elaborate here). There will be a requirement to follow assessment/diagnostics during counseling (CNSL50).

Much of this document/process was driven by a former BoG (Kaplan) who asked how college students

could succeed in courses (like history etc) when their basic (reading/writing/math) skills not adequate for college level work? This was also the impetus for basic skills initiatives. Some (education leaders) wanted to fund colleges based on student success versus student in seats. Rich discussed the 2x2 diagram of high access and high success, vs. low access and low success. California was found to be highly accessible to students, but with lower success rates.

Rich discussed previous years at De Anza when a large number of counselors were hired (with PFE money) to help students succeed, especially in math. It's deemed 'successful' if students matriculate, or achieve certificates. Foothill has not hired a large number of (fully qualified) counselors vs. simply having academic advisors. How we count counselors as faculty (50% rule) could also be problematic.

A senator asked how a student without basic skills or having the benefit of general education could make a decision on their major? Rich commented that this is a faculty driven model. This model will standardize for the traditional 2 year traditional student. Normalize to more fully engaged student (who will have the highest priority in registration). There may be a shift in priority registration to students that have an education plan. A senator commented that SB1143 doesn't recognize what a 'normal student' looks like. Another senator asked how we'd know that a student was succeeding, and the difference between academic and workforce goals, and how we (Foothill) could be polling students to ask what is going on (are they getting what they want). Incentivizing system behaviors that increase student success is the goal of SB 1143. Comments in Sacramento (Rich's group) that these actions would actually hinder student success.

Provide incentives to attend full-time (correlation between students who attend full-time and student success). The CCCI document was not a consensus document. Another requirement is for students to work in basic skills in their first year. Rich commented that the pattern of offering courses could have beginning courses fill fast but would that affect the ability to offer some of the more upper (division) courses. This is an example of the central planning nature of the effort having influence over local control. Rich commented that some of the people planning this process (SB1143) felt/thought we (faculty) only offered what we wanted, and were not interested in student success).

SB 1143 can help create alternatives to basic skills curriculum – but there was a question about how 'low' could colleges go (two levels below transfer math) which would not include basic math as an onramp to algebra. Would these courses end up in community education or 'adult education'? Rich commented that adult education has been cut by almost 80% in Santa Clara County. Revitalize and revisit professional development, and direct much of that professional development towards basic skills instruction. Rich commented that unused professional development funds from last year were taken back by the District rather than rolled over for the following year.

Strengthen the system office - develop student success score card - and a longitudinally comprehensive student record (system) at (myedu.com) consolidate (some) programs => system would set up success goals including a score card, where we could speak to percentage change in success (using ARC reports that are a result of PFE) colleges are in cohorts for ranking. FHDA can address disparities in achievement gaps between 'cultures' for example, addressing success gaps. We might only compete against ourselves in closing those gaps. Comments about outcomes based funding.

Colleges might be funded for accelerating student success and issues of quality when we try to accelerate learning. Much of this process is about how California will fund higher education (especially at CCs) going forward. CTE / workforce people are feeling that they are being left out of the process (compared to

basic skills). Statewide academic senate will show leadership on this issue. Changing majors for students might be a challenge in the 4th year; students might not finish degrees at CSUs if they get stuck in the wrong major.

Item 2: Rich Morasci brought forward a resolution to exclude ESL in the student success task force. Determine where ESL students do mirror the behavior of basic skills. If we brought the resolution forward it would mean that the issue would be debated at statewide academic senate. Rich said that learning a second language is not the same as proficiency in a first language (so ESL should not be part of basic skills). Rich will take the resolution back and work with Rita to get language ready for fall plenary debate/discussion.

Item 3: AASCCC resolutions. Dolores mentioned that some resolutions might be brought into the consent calendar process. There are a number of resolutions regarding student success, repeatability, and modifying requirements to the BoG waiver. There was a comment about more points of contact for students with faculty, but that we aren't funded for it. Much of the discussion is focusing around electronic as opposed to face to face support, in areas such as transcripts and counseling. Comment that is great to implement it, but what happens when your system goes down. The repeatability issue 'is going to be ugly' and if statewide senate is not able to come to a consensus/conclusion the BoG will do what they wish with this issue.

Foothill faculty have not been very vocal on repeatability, whereas De Anza faculty have been very vocal. There are some faculty that have asked if we are becoming junior colleges (grades 13 and 14) again? Repeatability and accessibility are of particular concern among some colleges in remote communities.

Item 4: Accreditation report came out - 4 recommendations and 5 commendations. We'll find out in January what the final outcome will be. There was a comment about program level assessment (and assessment of program level outcomes). SLO enforcement is on the way! A senator commented that program definition can be a bit tricky. Program definition can be a bit challenging. Getting faculty to reflect on their mission at the college, rather than 'how do I survive the next hour'?

Item 5: CCC committee report - voting on the prerequisite requirement will happen this week, with the results being brought to Senate. CCC is also having a discussion about interdisciplinary courses.

PaRC meeting - getting ready for accreditation. Hiring 11 new positions to keep the faculty obligation number. The hiring priorities (rankings) have been changed since November 2010. Top 11 positions have been listed and are available on the PaRC website. Intent is to post most of these positions soon. Changes in areas such as repeatability have impacted the rankings in KA. Comment about how ESL position has been moved around, and might have been in the top 11 with more consistent ranking (compared to the two above it that were approved).

APM - continuing the discussion on program discontinuance - comments talking with students before a program was discontinued, and how would program elimination affect classified staff. Notifying a sister college, and defining program viability.

Academic integrity committee met and is working on a new mission statement. Adding professional ethics might be a bit too much for now, but creating an environment of integrity might lead to bubbling up of professional integrity.

Smoking committee report out - AB795 was discussed, which will allow community colleges to issue citations with fines for violations of smoking regulations.

Item 6: Scholarships were approved \$3,000 for three scholarships for basic skills, transfer, and career workforce. A question was asked about the scholarship event, and how it might be made more inclusive. Resolution was approved.

For the Good of the Order: Be safe Trick-or-Treating!