

Academic Senate Minutes February 24, 2020

Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m.

Roll call:

Isaac Escoto (present)
Eric Kuehnl (present)
Robert Cormia (present)
Carolyn Holcroft (present)
Kathryn Maurer (present)
Amber LaPiana (present)
Maria Dominguez (present)
MaryAnn Sunseri (present)
Mary Thomas (present)
Jordan Fong (present)
Kristy Lisle (present)
Tracee Cunningham (present)
Voltaire Villanueva (present)
Lisa Eshman (present)
Sara Cooper (present)
Matthew Litrus (absent)
David Marasco (present)
Mini Rae (present)
Donna Frankel (present)
Rita O'Laughlin (present)
Don MacNeil (present)
David McCormick (present)
Robert Hartwell (present)
Katie Ha (Supplemental Learning/Engl/ESLL. Zoom)
Leonardo Blas (present)

Guests

Cheryl Aschenbach - Secretary ASCCC
Mike Mohebbi Workforce Development Program Coordinator
Melissa Cervantes - Dean of Equity and Inclusion
David Ulate - Director of Institutional Research

Fatima Jinnah - CNSL

Cleve Freeman - CNSL

Deborah Lew - CNSL

Agenda was approved by consensus - the 2/10/20 minutes were also approved by consensus

Announcements: There is only one EEO training scheduled at the moment - will be tomorrow. We're still looking for one or two faculty members for the District Budget Advisory Committee. We are looking for candidates for President and Secretary-Treasurer of Academic Senate. This comes with release time. We are looking for candidates for the Part-Time rep for the Senate, this is a compensated position.

Search committee for Anthropology is being formed. A Transition to Work search committee is also being formed. Kristy Lisle mentioned there potentially could be two more retirements this year - though not yet public. Communications, Accounting and Library are the next positions in terms of how faculty positions were prioritized. Consent calendar was approved by consensus.

Main topic: Decision making

- Cheryl Aschenbach - Secretary of ASCCC joined our meeting.
- Discussed working through campus issues
- 19 Colleges have had CIA visits - Collegiality in Action (representative of ASCCC and a representative of the League (CCLC).
- 10+1 gives guidance, but faculty Senates can be more active than that
- There are a number of strategies and remedies, stronger communication and request for possible participation in administrative meetings and processes
- A Vote of no Confidence is difficult, and can backfire on faculty
- Senate moved/voted to form a study group to come up with options the senate can take in response to continued concerns of campus decision making processes, and overall concern about morale; these options will include a Bill of Particulars

Decision making process - as a campus, we realize that there's a need to include faculty earlier when decision points come up that involve the 10+1, and/or faculty related work/responsibilities. Isaac spoke with Cheryl Aschenbach - secretary of ASCCC in preparation of her visit to our campus, and shared decision-making concerns expressed at academic senate meetings.

Isaac commented that at prior senate meetings, the body agreed that our efforts would best be used helping create a new campus wide decision-making processes.

Cheryl started out by sharing her understanding was that our faculty were brought in late (later than many would have liked) or not at all with respect to certain decision-making situations. Cheryl commented that the conversation we're having isn't unusual, there are 19 CCC CIA

(Collegiality in Action) visits to talk with faculty, and colleges, having these conversations. The senate conversation at the college of the Siskiyous is very similar to ours. The 10+1 is one place of purview, when things happen on our campuses, what is operational versus what is planning, etc. Faculty don't necessarily have final say on operations, or finance, but still would like to have a connection with these decisions being made, as faculty input could be helpful. Occasionally, faculty on other CCC campuses have a seat at the President's cabinet, as it can be a place to hear things, give input, etc. Sometimes the topics include grants, with very tight timelines. This is one approach to getting a heads up about possible efforts/initiatives that could benefit from faculty support/involvement.

Kathryn commented that she was very curious about the 19 CIA visits Statewide, and with so many colleges experiencing this, was or is there some attempt to bring statewide senate into the conversation about what is going on at these colleges? John Stankas (ASCCC President) usually speaks at the League conference; that is one opportunity for ASCCC to connect with the League. However, Cheryl wrote down a note to check with ASCCC and see if they'd like to work towards some sort of action meant to address the multiple needs across our system, related to the issues necessitating CIA visits. Maybe work with the League on these types of issues that keep coming up?

Mike Mohebbi asked what type of solutions work when things like this come up? Cheryl commented that keeping communication open between the Senate and the administration is important. David Marasco added that we're well past the point of "minor repair" and that we are at a point of having lost trust. It can be words or actions, but trust has to be rebuilt. Conflict resolution, and build on that. Show through action that you are listening.

How do we know that progress has been made? To see evidence that communication has improved. Also, faculty should be engaged and prepared. The Senate has to be organized, if a Senate is fractured in any way, it makes it difficult for the ASCCC to have strong conversations with a College. A case study would be helpful. There are a couple colleges that might be considering a vote of no confidence, but probably not this year.

Isaac referenced a comment Cheryl made about faculty sometimes sitting on admin council/cabinet meetings. Maybe this could be an option for us to explore, so as to have faculty in the room early when campus need/initiative initial discussions happen. An example of having folks in the room so as to help timely communication, we have liaisons on senate, meant to specifically keep an eye out for certain topics of discussion.

A counselor commented that there were a significant number of faculty that took the (early) retirement offer which cost us institutional knowledge. A concern was stated that with low enrollment, we could lose even more people (faculty and staff). Cheryl responded that with many people hiring in at the same time, there often are waves of retirement that also occur. Cheryl talked about the need for faculty to "step in and step up" keep morale strong, otherwise discontent can build.

Comment that sometimes Senate reps don't hear from division faculty, but some faculty have stated (there was a quote from a BHS faculty) a 3 or a 4 on a scale of 1-5 that a certain type of action by senate is needed. The scale of the need for and type of action as explained was, 1. Do nothing, 2. Invite to a meeting the person/position with which folks have concerns, 3. Private meetings so as to share ongoing concerns directly with the person, 4. Public statement from the academic senate, 5. Vote of no confidence.

There was a question about what resolutions look like at other campuses. Cheryl commented that at her College, if the Senate has a firm statement to make, they have a formal mechanism in which to do that (not usually by a resolution). [Collegiality in Action](#) (CIA) is meant to "help districts and colleges successfully implement state law and regulations that call for effective participation by faculty, staff, and students in district and college governance"

CIA visits are only done if a joint request (Senate President and College President) for a visit is submitted.

There was a question / comment that in the case at Foothill College, having a conversation before the resolution (back a few months) might have been helpful to lower the shock of the resolution coming. Sara commented that we (faculty) have asked, a number of times, to be more included (earlier) in conversations. Looking at policies and processes, try to find ways (not examples that would be a checklist) faculty involvement is clearly defined in various campus activities. Comment that the Foothill Senate should try to find that formal path to action, but not to make it so formal or so scary that it creates a line in the sand. Carolyn commented that we as a college are good with Title 5, but that faculty are saying that they want to be valued. Part of this is maintaining positive relationships.

There was a comment that our college president responded to the resolution in the fall quarter much stronger than the many attempts to build trust through conversation. There was a comment by a Senator that we have had many people leaving Foothill College, and a number going to De Anza. There was a question about how a vote of no confidence can backfire? It can make the relationship between the faculty and administration, and the board of trustees and faculty more strained. It also is a risk if a Vote of No Confidence is put out but fails, that the Senate can look weaker.

A question was asked to elaborate more how a vote of no confidence can be used against faculty. For a Vote of no confidence (or this process) to work, faculty need to have an avenue to speak directly with the Board of Trustees. Board members can be asked to participate in on campus meetings. Board members are publicly elected officials, and do serve the public.

Sara commented that many of our faculty have "checked out" of the governance process, and/or campus conversations, and it is very disheartening to faculty to see how "checked out" many colleagues are. Some faculty can be taken aback by the tension in a conversation about the campus problems, while other faculty will feel comfortable in asserting their frustration.

There was a comment that in the past, FHDA-CCD board members were invited to meetings, but declined. It isn't a comfortable thing for board members to attend some of the meetings where difficult issues are discussed. A senator commented that before we invited a Board member in to attend (listen in) to a meeting, we should definitely inform the College president.

Carolyn commented that from her perspective as a Senate and District Senate president, direct communication with the FHDA-CCD board by faculty is frowned upon. Isaac asked the Senate how they would like us (officers and Senate) to move forward?

Kathryn commented that there are many things for faculty to be celebrating (interested in) such as the Equity 2.0 plan. She asked Isaac if there are any recent examples relevant to senate campus decision making process discussions. Isaac commented that the counselor department expressed frustration with how a counseling division leader was appointed, due to the resignation of the current counseling dean. Counseling faculty were not given an opportunity to submit interest to fill the position in the interim while a search committee is formed for the permanent counseling division dean position. Since this was an interim position, counselors would have expected that the dean's position would be advertised to faculty for about a week before filling it. Cheryl asked CNSL faculty if the process of replacing a dean was followed? Though there isn't a counseling division specific process written down, usual process they have always followed is to allow counseling division faculty an opportunity to show interest, prior to a leader being appointed.

The counselors met with president nguyen to share their concerns and frustration with how this decision was made. Comment that CNSL faculty have mentioned several times that they'd like to be involved in counseling/student services related decisions. For CNSL faculty, it was felt that while there may not have been formal process written down in regards to how an interim leaders should be appointed, it would have been very much appreciated if the CNSL faculty were included in the conversation prior to action being taken.

Comment that the [Guidelines for Temporary Replacements](#) (Section XI) is all written down, and published. Isaac mentioned that it was clarified to the counseling division that the interim division leader is not a dean/administrative position, but still faculty. David commented that we need to contact FHDA personnel services that we need a timeline on the process for replacing the dean. Kathryn commented that there are other examples of administrative appointments for interim amounts of time that have not been consistent with following processes as outlined in Section 11. Donna commented that many things aren't running correctly. Comment that the "this isn't a typical case, so this process isn't a typical" response was common.

There was a comment by a Senator, that it appears the President isn't making an effort, that we (faculty) bring something up, we get a response that things will change, but then they don't (reference to decisions still being made without inviting input).

David Marasco commented that we should take the temperature of the divisions, where are we in terms of making a decision, from a 1-5, in terms of what we are going to do? Kathryn

commented that we are there right now, let's decide what we want to do. Are we at a 1, 3 or a 5? On a scale of 1-5

1. Do nothing
2. Continue to invite the President to senate meetings
3. Continue senate officer meetings with the President (to share concerns)
4. Public statement from Academic Senate
5. Vote of no confidence

A Palo Alto Daily online article re: Measures G and H had a posted comment by someone in the community that said Foothill College faculty would consider a vote of no confidence after the March 3rd election. Clarification that this is not true, and the senate has not made any decisions as to any sort of formal action (other than continued discussions in various capacities). Sara spoke about many faculty having their heads down, due to mistrust and low campus morale.

Comment that a vote of no confidence sounds like it's not very wise, and we should be very careful about what we're saying. Carolyn suggested that this would be a good time to put out a Bill of Particulars. The Senate writes a Bill of Particulars that clarifies the actions/outcomes the academic senate would like to see, and if not, clarify the type of action it would take. Kathryn commented that we need a Bill of Particulars, or something like that. Kathryn moved that we form a **study group to draft options of a formal Senate response to the current challenges with regard to decision making and communication**. The motion was passed unanimously. David Marasco, Sara Cooper Jordan Fong, Voltaire Villanueva, and Kathryn Maurer, will join the three Senate officers, Isaac Escoto, Eric Kuehnl, and Robert Cormia for the study group/task force. The goal is for the study group to report back at the next senate meeting.

Lots of folks don't know what else to do. They've tried to come to meetings, talk individually.