

## Academic Senate Minutes November 9, 2020

### DRAFT Minutes

#'s represent items numbered on the [Agenda](#)

1. Meeting called to order at 2:01 p.m.

2. Roll call

#### Executive Committee

Kathryn Mauer

Eric Kuehnl

Robert Cormia

Alexis Aguilar

Rachelle Campbell

Milissa Carey

Stephanie Chan

Tracee Cunningham

Jordan Fong

Donna Frankel

Mathew Litrus

Dixie Macias

Cara Miyasaki

David Marasco

Rita O'Loughlin

Mimi Overton

Kerri Ryer

Mary Anne Sunseri

Mary Thomas

Voltaire Villanueva

#### Senate Liaisons

John Fox (FA liaison)

Kurt Hueg

Carolyn Holcroft

Melissa Cervantes

Abhiraj Muhar

#### Guests

Laura Gamez

Laurie Scolari

Priya Vasu

3. Agenda was approved by consensus. The minutes from November 2nd were corrected to read student scholarships authorized at \$1,000 per category, \$500 per student. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. There was no public comment.

5. The consent calendar (Senate [appointments](#)) was approved by consensus. Amy Edwards was appointed to the search hiring committee Vice chancellor HR. Mary Thomas was added as Program Review Reader. There will be a Return to Campus study group - a few faculty positions will be needed for that.

6. Governance Updates:

1) C&C (Community & Communication Council): Faculty tri-chair Laura Gamez spoke about all the activities that C&C is working on, including an assessment of governance and working with R&R (Revenue & Resources) on Measure G funding projects. They are also tasked with providing more definition to service leadership. Kathryn asked about the scope of the governance assessment, if it was just focused on the four councils, or if it included all governance groups, such as the senates, and Laura said she wasn't sure. Kathryn also asked if there would be an opportunity for Academic Senate to review the assessment plan, and Laura said she would find out. C&C's next meeting is on November 20<sup>th</sup>.

2) DDEAC (District Diversity & Equity Advisory Committee): Jordan Fong shared an update from the DDEAC meeting with Dr. Joy DeGruy, as a follow-up to opening day, where he served as a proxy for Kathryn, who was unable to attend. There are plans for the year to do a Deep Dive,

empathy interviews, and conversations with students. There was also discussion about the creation of a Green Book, which would list faculty who best serve students of color. Jordan expressed his concerns that this could create a rift between faculty, and was not sure who would be deciding which faculty “make” the list, and which faculty wouldn’t, and based on which criteria. Jordan was interested in hearing what others thought about this idea. David Marasco and Carolyn Holcroft clarified that this would be a student-created list, and that Green Books already exist. David Marasco also mentioned that DDEAC was tasked with providing input to the Board of Trustees on their board priorities, which were approved last Monday.

3) Ethnic Studies: There was some movement on the ethnic studies conversation. David Marasco mentioned that Ben Armerding (LA CCC rep) thinks we could meet a December 1st deadline in Area D GE. A regularly scheduled meeting of ethnic studies group Friday afternoon at 2 p.m. Ask David M. for a Zoom link if anyone is interested in attending. Priya asked about the progress on the ethnic studies advisory committee, David Marasco offered that he is the logistical details contact.

7. Fall Plenary Update: Kathryn discussed some of the presentations at Fall Plenary, which had the dedicated focus of “Addressing Anti-Blackness & IDEAs (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity & Anti-Racism).” Kathryn will be going through the presentations, and bringing them forward in future meetings and other forums as well. Kathryn also mentioned that passing of some “historic” resolutions, including resolutions to support the addition of an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement at the CCC’s. Kathryn asked for a debrief of the joint meeting with De Anza Academic Senate, and a comment was made that it would be great to have even more joint meetings, and work on other things besides the resolutions.

8. Kathryn shared the [Treasurer’s Report](#), and explained how due to a number of factors we used to have an excessively large balance (over \$20,000 less than ten years ago), and past leaders had implemented an informal “spend down” plan, which included greatly increasing PT representation (from 1 to 2 reps), and increasing PT faculty rep stipends from \$300/quarter to \$750/quarter, and adding in the PT Faculty Appreciation Dinner. We are now at a time where we have reached the bottom of the spend down plan and can no longer sustain these expenses. There is even question if we think we can afford any funds for scholarships this year. Given no travel expenses associated with COVIDS, we can still keep scholarships.

There was a motion to approve \$2,000 for 8 \$250 scholarship, \$1,000 for transfer and \$1,000 for workforce. Approved unanimously (19 yes votes).

Kathryn mentioned that she will bring back the budget discussion at a future meeting, and will likely ask for volunteers to serve on a budget task force to look at our revenues & expenses.

9. Eric Kuhnel talked about the credit for prior learning (CPL) discussion that took place at CCC, and talked about some of the logistics and impact. Kurt commented this requires a broad look at what we’re going to add on to our existing CPL processes. Kathryn commented that this topic is both “new and big” and credit for prior learning (CPL) and competency based education (CBE). Kathryn commented that we have less say about whether this happens (changes required by

Title 5), but we need more discussion about when/how it gets implemented. A motion to approve the Board Policy for credit for prior learning was passed 17-0.

10. Kathryn acknowledged that we are not going to have enough time today to dedicate to discussing the student's letter, so she will bring it back next week, but she did want to allow for an opportunity for any division rep who was ready to share constituent feedback today to do so.

Alexis Aguilar shared the response from BSS faculty to the student letter:

- Only a few students wrote the letter who may not be representative of the student body as a whole.
  - Why has the administration not responded to the letter?
- Democratic processes not being followed such as the curriculum process
  - Faculty in Sociology department have not been approached
  - Sociology has Social Justice AD-T
  - No concern about what has already been done in terms of ES at BSS
  - Only a small group of faculty appears to be making the decisions
- No data driven analysis is being done to inform our policies and direction
  - We need to look at data about diversity and student success
  - A large majority of students in surveys rate Foothill as excellent and would recommend it to others, but faculty feel attacked by concerns raised in the student demand letter.
- Lack of collaboration
  - At a time of multiple crisis, and with the need to gain and increase faculty skills to respond to the needs of remote learning faculty is being demonized and feel demoralized
  - Some faculty are turning against each other to get what they want and are not following shared governance procedures. This is undemocratic.
- Lack of leadership
  - There is a lack of transparency in this process
  - Many employees are leaving Foothill because they're unhappy with what's going on.
  - There's no support from the administration, or they treat faculty like they are part of the problem rather than the solution
  - There's no acknowledgement of the extreme stress faculty are under. Faculty are working hard to serve students with concerns for equity and excellence, but are being attacked.

Mary Thomas shared the response from the Librarians:

- Generally supportive of the letter's intent, but one person was taken aback by the tone because it seemed like a list of demands rather than an opening for dialog.
- I didn't realize until our meeting two weeks ago that this letter only represented the views of the six students who signed it, and some of my colleagues were equally surprised. Probably other students feel this way, but the letter would carry more weight if it had broader support, so we appreciate there will be an effort to bring the ASFC in.

- Concern about paying for an Ethnic Studies department.
- The mandatory training seemed problematic to one colleague – Who would provide it? By what methods? How would it be enforced?
- Conversation about dismantling the police force – One colleague wanted statistics to back up the anecdotal evidence, but another confirmed they knew of both students and faculty who'd had problems with the police. In any case, this will affect library services, for example, how we'll enforce safety protocols when the library eventually re-opens.
- What kind of response are the students looking for since the governance bodies are mostly advisory?

Two of the student authors addressed a number of the above points, especially that the letter may have been seen as “harsh,” which is not the intention but also unapologetic as it is seen that it is high time that we addressed these issues. Other comments included that the intent of the letter is to generate dialogue and saying one doesn't have a response to some of the points can also be a response. There was also concern that why would a letter from a select set of students not be taken as seriously as a letter from ASFC, this in itself demonstrates an issue, if we wouldn't even be discussing the letter if we hadn't realized it wasn't coming from ASFC. How can a student be heard?

Kathryn talked about how important it is for Academic Senate to provide a forum for faculty to talk and speak among each other, and while we very much welcome students to be at the meetings and be present in these discussions she wanted to make sure to contextualize the discussion that we're having, but not necessarily hear all constituent feedback as the Academic Senate response. We will continue to discuss next week.

11. Melisa Cervantes gave a presentation on Equity 2.0. Talked about how there was a new [draft](#) shared in September, and now going division to division to talk to faculty about what's in the plan, using [Draft Issues for Faculty Discussion document](#). Equity 2.0 is a strategic plan rather than an equity plan. It's meant to lay out the issues as captured through many, many town halls, division meetings, governance meetings (working closely with E&E) and discussions with all campus constituents. It's in 2 parts. Part 1 is about the situation, and part 2 issues and goals. She discussed campus input on a number of the issues, and who the issue is a problem for. Equity 2.0 should be seen as a living document, yet we want to capture our current state by formalizing the plan as it currently stands and submitting it to the Board of Trustees at their December meeting. The Equity Office would like to receive some sort of formal approval from the Academic Senate for this submission. We can decide what we are comfortable with, if anything, such as an affirmation statement, a signature, a resolution, or something else.

Melissa is asking Division reps to check in with divisions about.

- Read and get reactions to the document, paying particular attention to Part 2
- Come back with ideas about how we can see Equity 2.0 as our plan as well, and how we see our partnership with the Equity Office going into the future as well.

Kathryn suggested that division reps may want to think about responses to the student letter in the context of Equity 2.0. Carolyn reminded this was a strategic plan, not an action plan, and many of the issues brought forward in the student letter require actions. Melissa mentioned that there is also an [anonymous feedback form](#).

12. Kathryn mentioned a few announcements

The withdrawal policy is back to normal for fall, this Friday 13th is the formal deadline to drop the class with a W. Tomorrow ASFC will have a town hall at noon to talk about the election. Students listen, learn, and level up (date and time?) follow-up discussion Thursday November 19th. Then a few Ethnic Studies webinars are coming up (Kathryn will send out info). She will also send info about the ASCCC Hayward award for nominations for prestigious faculty award.

Mary Thomas mentioned a new tool in Canvas called reading list, and an opportunity for faculty to earn professional development.

David Marasco reminded us we're are celebrating Veterans Day on Veterans Day (Wednesday)

13. The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.