

## **Foothill College Academic Senate Meeting – April 21, 2025**

Krause Center for Innovation (KCI) Room 4006

### **Item 1. Call to Order and Welcome**

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Academic Senate President Voltaire Villanueva, who welcomed everyone back after the spring break and thanked faculty for their ongoing work during a busy and transitional period for the college.

Villanueva briefly highlighted the agenda's key items, including continued discussions on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), the FW grading policy, campus safety, and updates on campus signage and wayfinding.

---

### **Item 2. Roll Call**

Attendance was taken and quorum established. See below.

---

### **Item 3. Adoption of the Agenda**

Villanueva asked for a motion to adopt the agenda.

- Motion to approve: Ben Kaupp
- Seconded by: Julie Jenkins
- Outcome: Approved by consensus

A reordering of the agenda was noted during the meeting. While the Institutional Learning Outcomes discussion was originally listed later, it was moved up to followed by campus signage discussions.

---

### **Item 4. Public Comment**

During public comment:

- Julie Jenkins shared that FA and the SMCCCD (San Mateo County Community College District) are actively working to support vulnerable student populations, citing recent advocacy efforts highlighted in an email from Tim Shively (FA President). She encouraged faculty to stay engaged and informed as these discussions continue at the regional level.

- Katie Ha mentioned that a list related to these efforts had been finalized, though no further details were provided in the meeting.

No other public comments were submitted or voiced.

---

### **Item 5. Approval of Minutes (April 7, 2025)**

Approval of Minutes – April 7, 2025

Villanueva opened the floor for feedback on the April 7 minutes.

- Ben Kaupp requested a clarification on language within the SLO discussion to ensure alignment with current policy language.
- There was a request that Ryer's name be taken out of the SLO framework document, as they preferred not to be listed in the associated materials. This was acknowledged and accepted.
- Motion to approve the April 7th minutes (with edits): Ben Kaupp
- Seconded: Eric Kuehn
- Outcome: Approved by consensus

---

### **Item 6. Consent Calendar**

The consent calendar included updates on faculty appointments for campus committees and liaison roles for BP/AP policy workgroups. Villanueva briefly acknowledged the ongoing policy reviews, especially around grading policies and academic standards.

- Motion to approve the consent calendar: Carolyn Holcroft
- Seconded: Katie Ha
- Outcome: Approved by consensus

Villanueva closed this section by thanking faculty for their continued service on committees, particularly during a time of multiple overlapping governance processes.

---

### **Item 7. ASFC Updates (Paulo Verzosa)**

Paulo Verzosa, ASFC President, provided updates on current student initiatives and upcoming events for the spring quarter.

### Upcoming Events

- Muslim Heritage Month will be observed in the upcoming weeks, with a range of events designed to promote awareness, cultural appreciation, and community engagement. ASFC is planning:
  - Cultural activities and tabling events to bring visibility to Muslim contributions and experiences.
  - Collaboration with student clubs to expand outreach and participation.
- Verzosa also mentioned ongoing club activities and highlighted efforts to increase student engagement in campus events, emphasizing the importance of student-led programming in fostering campus community.

### Student Elections and Candidate Debates

- ASFC is organizing candidate debates for the upcoming student body elections. Verzosa encouraged faculty to help spread the word and support student participation, noting that candidate engagement is essential for building leadership capacity within the student body.

### Proposal for Student Fee Increase

- Verzosa presented a proposal for a \$2 increase in the quarterly student body fee, which would help fund student programs and services.
- He explained that the increase would:
  - Expand funding for events, student organizations, and advocacy efforts.
  - Support ongoing efforts to enhance student life and inclusion initiatives.
- ASFC plans to survey students to gather input on the proposed increase before moving forward.

### Faculty Feedback & Outreach Requests

- Verzosa asked for faculty assistance in spreading awareness about ASFC events, suggesting that brief announcements in class or Canvas postings could make a significant difference in reaching more students.

- Faculty acknowledged these requests, and Voltaire Villanueva noted that he would coordinate with Stacy Gleixner to include ASFC updates in the weekly faculty emails.

Verzosa closed his update by thanking faculty for their ongoing support of student initiatives and reiterated ASFC's commitment to student advocacy and engagement throughout the quarter.

---

### **Item 8. Role and Responsibilities of the Academic Senate in Selecting the Commencement Speaker**

Patrick shared the historical and current role of faculty in the selection process for the commencement speaker. Traditionally, the Academic Senate assists by removing from consideration any faculty who have spoken in the past five years or who decline to be considered. The final selection is student-driven and conducted by ASFC. Senators affirmed that once ASFC makes a selection, the Academic Senate may formally reaffirm the choice. There was also discussion about the possibility of expanding the speaker criteria beyond faculty to include other employees, which may be revisited in the future. Senators were reminded that the process remains student-led.

---

### **Item 9. FW Grade Policy Discussion and Recommendation for Review**

Voltaire Villanueva introduced the item, continuing a conversation from previous meetings around the use of the FW grade (Failure to Withdraw). He noted that while the grade was originally created to address financial aid fraud, its ongoing use raises questions around equity, transparency, and impact on student records.

Patrick Morriss provided context for the policy itself, referencing Title 5 and the FHDA Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (BP/AP 4230). He emphasized that the FW grade is permissive, not required, and that institutions may opt to remove it entirely if they find it no longer serves its intended purpose.

Discussion covered several themes:

#### **1. Purpose and Origin of the FW Grade**

- The FW grade was introduced as a way to signal that a student stopped attending without formally withdrawing, especially in cases where financial aid fraud might be a concern.

- Some faculty expressed concern that the grade can misrepresent student intent, particularly for students who disengage due to personal, academic, or financial hardship.

## 2. Equity and Transparency

- A recurring theme in the conversation was equity. Several speakers (attributed and unconfirmed) noted that FW grades tend to disproportionately impact:
  - First-generation students
  - Low-income students
  - Students navigating institutional systems for the first time
- There was also discussion about how students often don't understand what an FW is, or how it differs from an F. In many cases, they are unaware that an FW has been issued.

## 3. Data Collection and Visibility

- One faculty member pointed out that if the college removes the FW grade, it may become harder to track non-attendance patterns, especially if there isn't a robust alternative process.
- Others argued that the data problem can be solved elsewhere, and shouldn't justify keeping a grade that may no longer align with the college's educational values.

## 4. Financial Aid Compliance and Accreditation

- Questions were raised about whether removing the FW might conflict with federal Title IV financial aid requirements.
- A comment was made that Colleges must still track last date of attendance for Title IV compliance, but that can be done without relying on the FW designation.

## 5. Alternative Approaches and Solutions

- Faculty suggested that a workgroup or task force might be a better next step—to take a deeper look at the policy, bring in Financial Aid staff, and ensure the change is made thoughtfully.
- There was consensus that student voices should be included in that conversation, especially those from ASFC or other student groups.

## 6. Comments on Student Understanding and Workload

- One speaker shared that faculty may not always be clear or consistent about when to assign an FW versus an F.
- Others noted that managing FW grades adds administrative work, especially when it leads to student confusion or appeals.

#### Motion and Vote

After a wide-ranging discussion, Patrick Morriss introduced a motion to:

“Recommend forming a workgroup to review and propose revisions to BP/AP 4230, including the potential removal of the FW grade.”

- Seconded by: Julie Jenkins
- Outcome: Motion passed by consensus

Villanueva confirmed that the workgroup would include representation from faculty, administration, and student services, and would report back to the Senate with proposed changes and impact assessments.

---

### **Item 10. Campus Safety Infrastructure Update (Chief Acosta)**

Chief Danny Acosta provided an overview of the ongoing upgrades to campus safety systems, focusing primarily on door locking mechanisms as part of emergency preparedness for potential active shooter scenarios.

#### 1. Overview of Door Lock Systems

Acosta explained that two primary approaches are being evaluated for classroom and office door security:

- Traditional key-based locks: These are the current standard in many campus spaces. While familiar to faculty and staff, they require:
  - Physical possession of a key.
  - A manual locking process, which may take longer in an emergency.
- Turn-knob or latch-based locks (no key required):
  - These allow the door to be locked from the inside by turning a latch or pushing a button.
  - Designed to be faster and simpler in the event of an emergency.

Acosta pointed out that both systems have limitations:

- Key-based systems can delay response time, especially if faculty don't have immediate access to their keys or forget them.
- Latch-based systems may introduce safety risks if a door is accidentally or intentionally locked when it shouldn't be, particularly in shared or multi-use spaces.

## 2. Faculty Concerns and Questions

Faculty raised several practical questions about how these systems would work in real-world situations:

- Hilary Gomes asked about room configurations where multiple doors are present, and whether one locking mechanism would control all access points.
- Another faculty member (speaker uncertain) expressed concern about accidentally locking oneself out, especially in science labs or rooms with specialized equipment.

Acosta clarified that any new locking system would come with training for faculty and staff, ensuring that:

- Faculty know how to operate the locks quickly in an emergency.
- Key overrides would still be available for emergency services or administrators.
- Safety measures would be standardized across campus to reduce confusion.

## 3. Broader Safety Measures

Acosta also referenced ongoing discussions about broader safety infrastructure, including:

- Camera systems (without going into detail here).
- Emergency drills and training to improve preparedness.

He emphasized that no final decisions have been made yet on door lock upgrades. The Campus Safety team is continuing to gather feedback, including from faculty, to ensure that any solution balances security, usability, and flexibility.

---

## Item 11. Academic Senate Elections and Vote by Acclamation

The following faculty have been voted in by acclamation in the respective positions:

- Executive Vice President : Stephanie Chan
- Vice President of Curriculum Ben Kaupp

- At-Large Part-Time Faculty Representative: Michael Chang

---

## **Item 12. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Framework and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)**

Allison Lenkeit Meezan, SLO Coordinator, gave a brief update on the SLO assessment framework and introduced a draft of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). These ILOs are designed to articulate broad learning goals for all Foothill graduates, connecting program-level outcomes (PLOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs) to the college mission statement.

Meezan presented the three proposed ILOs:

1. Critical Thinking:

- Focused on developing students' ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information across disciplines.
- Includes measurable outcomes like distinguishing credible sources, evaluating arguments, and solving real-world problems using reflective and innovative thinking.

2. Prepared to Thrive in the Global Workforce:

- Centers on collaboration, leadership, digital literacy, and cultural agility.
- Prepares students to adapt, lead, and communicate in diverse professional environments.

3. Engage in a Life of Inquiry:

- Encourages students to embrace lifelong learning, civic engagement, and ethical reasoning.
- Emphasizes cultural awareness, community involvement, and authentic advocacy.

Meezan explained that these ILOs were developed through campus-wide conversations between 2022 and 2024, incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and students. The workgroup sought to ensure that these outcomes reflect not only academic skills but also the broader attributes and mindsets that Foothill graduates should carry with them.

Faculty Feedback & Discussion



- Hilary Gomes commented that the structure of the ILOs seemed logical and asked how the measurable outcomes would be tied back to department-level assessments.
- Meezan responded that ILOs function as an overarching framework, connecting program-level reflections to the broader institutional goals. Departments would map their outcomes upward to show alignment but wouldn't need to assess the ILOs directly at the course level.
- A question was asked about whether the language in the measurable outcomes was flexible enough to adapt over time. Meezan acknowledged that the ILOs were designed to be living documents, and updates could be made through Senate review processes as needs evolve.
- Robert Cormia added a comment about the importance of integrating these outcomes into faculty discussions about pedagogy and assessment, particularly as instructional methods continue to adapt post-pandemic. Meezan agreed, noting that ongoing reflection and dialog are key components of the framework.
- Ben Kaupp asked about how soon these ILOs would be incorporated into program reviews. Meezan clarified that the goal is to pilot this framework over the 2025–2026 academic year, allowing for feedback and adjustments before fully integrating it into accreditation reporting cycles.

Meezan concluded the update by inviting further feedback on the ILO draft, which remains open for comments through the end of the academic year. She reiterated that the SLO Committee will continue refining the framework, ensuring it remains faculty-driven and responsive to campus needs.

---

### **Item 13. Campus Signage and Wayfinding Master Plan**

David Fisch from Foothill's Facilities and Operations, along with a lead architect from TVP Architecture, presented an overview of the Campus Signage and Wayfinding Master Plan. The team shared their excitement about redesigning the campus's signage system to enhance navigation, reinforce Foothill's identity, and create a more welcoming and intuitive experience for students, visitors, and the broader community.

#### **Goals of the Master Plan**

The signage strategy is intended to:

- Help users navigate campus spaces with ease, especially first-time visitors.

- Strengthen Foothill’s visual identity across entrances, buildings, and outdoor areas.
- Improve accessibility and inclusivity, ensuring signage supports people of all abilities and language backgrounds.

The team explained that the current system is fragmented and often inconsistent, which creates confusion for students and visitors alike. They emphasized the importance of moving toward a standardized, hierarchy-based approach, with primary markers, directional signage, building identifiers, and interactive wayfinding tools.

### Design Features and Concepts

The architects showcased conceptual renderings and preliminary design features, including:

- Campus “touchpoints”: Key areas where people naturally stop—like entry points, gathering spots, and decision points—would be emphasized through bold visual cues and landmarks.
- Color and material palettes: Selections would reflect Foothill’s natural setting and architectural style, blending warmth and clarity.
- Bilingual signage considerations: The team noted that future iterations may include language accessibility options, especially in high-traffic or service-heavy zones.

The architects also expressed interest in incorporating interactive signage tools like QR codes, campus apps, or digital kiosks to support real-time wayfinding.

### Faculty Questions and Discussion

- Several faculty asked how signage would address difficult-to-navigate buildings—particularly those with multiple entrances, or rooms not visible from the main corridor.
- A question was raised about how classroom numbers and building codes would be labeled for better clarity.

David Fisch responded that the team is conducting a full site audit, including building layouts, traffic patterns, and ADA compliance issues. The intent is to reduce ambiguity and make signage more predictable and helpful, especially for new students, prospective families, and event visitors.

Voltaire Villanueva asked about integration with emergency response systems, including room-level identification and wayfinding during evacuations. The design team confirmed

that they are coordinating with Public Safety to ensure that signage will support emergency protocols.

The presentation concluded with an invitation for continued faculty feedback, especially as the team moves toward the implementation phase. Draft designs and pilot signage locations will be shared in late spring or early fall, with an open forum planned for additional community input.

---

#### **Item 14. ASCCC Spring Plenary Resolutions Discussion**

The Academic Senate reviewed a selection of key statewide resolutions up for vote at the upcoming ASCCC Spring Plenary, with a focus on those with potential campus-wide impact. Faculty were invited to provide feedback to inform Foothill's voting delegate.

##### **1. Classified Participation in Statewide Governance**

Faculty expressed strong support for a resolution advocating greater participation of Classified Senates in statewide governance bodies. While Foothill has an engaged classified body, the resolution targets system-level representation and decision-making authority for classified professionals in areas intersecting with academic and professional matters. Faculty affirmed the value of shared governance models that include all stakeholders.

---

##### **2. Dual Enrollment Faculty Rights**

A resolution addressing faculty rights and compensation parity in dual enrollment programs prompted discussion around workload equity and instructional consistency.

Key concerns included:

- Disparities in pay and workload recognition for instructors teaching college courses in high school settings.
- The challenge of aligning statewide recommendations with local bargaining agreements.

Faculty generally supported the resolution's intent, emphasizing that dual enrollment instructors should receive equitable treatment and professional respect.

---

##### **3. Lab Faculty Compensation Equity**

A resolution focused on the disparities in lab and lecture compensation generated discussion around workload inequity. Faculty acknowledged that lab instruction is often undervalued in pay scales, despite being equally demanding.

Foothill faculty connected this resolution to ongoing local discussions about workload formulas and acknowledged that state-level standardization could strengthen efforts to ensure fairness and consistency across disciplines.

---

#### 4. Fraudulent Enrollment and FTES Monitoring

Faculty considered a resolution addressing fraudulent enrollment and its effect on FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Student) data and funding formulas.

Discussion highlighted:

- A growing trend of fraudulent student accounts statewide, which distorts enrollment data and creates resource allocation challenges.
- The need for improved monitoring and reporting tools, while avoiding overly punitive systems.

Faculty were cautious about unintended consequences, particularly for students facing access barriers or navigating complex systems. The resolution was seen as a starting point, but concerns were raised about ensuring student privacy and avoiding the appearance of surveillance.

---

#### 5. Transfer and Curriculum Alignment Language

A final item, brought forward from the floor, raised concerns about a resolution focused on transfer alignment and common course numbering. Faculty emphasized the need to preserve local autonomy in curriculum design while still supporting statewide transfer efficiency.

Language in the resolution appeared to overreach in defining local curricular obligations, and there was a suggestion that clarifying language may be needed before full endorsement. This sparked a broader conversation about the importance of transparent collaboration between local and system wide bodies in curricular planning.

---

Next Steps

Faculty agreed that the feedback collected would be carried by Foothill's delegate to the ASCCC Spring Plenary. The Senate affirmed its role in maintaining an informed and representative voice in statewide decision-making processes.

---

#### **Item 15: Officer & Committee Reports**

Will be reviewed at the next meeting.

---

#### **Item 16. Announcements and Good of the Order**

- Villanueva reminded faculty about the upcoming ASCCC Spring Plenary and thanked everyone for their input on the resolutions.
  - Villanueva also noted that faculty feedback on items like the SLO framework, ILOs, and FW grading policy would continue in upcoming meetings, along with other pressing topics like shared governance structures and policy alignment.
- 

#### **Item 17. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

The next Academic Senate meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 5, 2025.

Position	Executive Committee	
Apprenticeship	Nate Vennarucci	4006
Apprenticeship	Stephan Schnell	4006
BSS	Mona Rawal	Zoom
BSS	Kerri Ryer	Zoom
Counseling	Fatima Jinnah	Zoom
Counseling	Tracee Cunningham	4006
DRC/VRC	Ana Maravilla	Zoom
FAC	Eric Kuehnl	4006
FAC	Hilary Gomes	4006
HSH	Lydia Daniel	Zoom
HSH	Brenda Hanning	Zoom
KIN	Don Mac Neil	Zoom
KIN	Rita O'Laughlin	Zoom
LA	Stephanie Chan	4006
LA	Amber La Piana	4006
LRC	Katie Ha	4006
LRC	Destiny Rivera	Zoom
STEM	Jennifer Sinclair	4006
STEM	Ryan Pugh	4006
FA Rep	Julie Jenkins	4006
Ensuring Learning Coordinator	Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
Faculty Chair Teaching with technology	Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
24-26 Part Time Faculty Rep	Lynette Vega	Zoom
23-25 Part Time Faculty Rep	Michael Chang	Zoom
ASFC Rep	Paulo Verzosa	4006
Classified Senate Rep	Doreen Finkelstein	4006
Professional Development Coordinator	Carolyn Holcroft	4006
Faculty Serving Other Roles	Evan Gilstrap	4006
Dean of Equity	Ajani Byrd	Zoom
President's Cabinet	Stacy Gleixner	Zoom
Secretary/Treasurer	Robert Cormia	4006
Executive Vice President	Patrick Morriss	4006
Vice President of Curriculum	Ben Kaupp	4006
President	Voltaire Villanueva	4006
Senator Emeritus	David Marasco	4006