

## Academic Senate Minutes February 8, 2021

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

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

2. Roll call

### **Executive Committee**

Kathryn Maurer (President)  
Eric Kuenhl (Vice President)  
Robert Cormia (Sec/Treas)  
Alexis Aguilar  
Brian Murphy  
Cara Miyasaki  
David Marasco  
David McCormick  
Dixie Macias  
Donna Frankel  
Farima Fakoor  
Jordan Fong  
Kerri Ryer  
Mary Thomas

Matthew Litrus  
Milissa Carey  
Mimi Overton  
Rachelle Campbell (absent)  
Rita O'Loughlin  
Stephanie Chan  
Tracee Cunningham  
Voltaire Villanueva  
**Senate Liaisons**  
Abhiraj Muhar  
Carolyn Holcroft  
John Fox  
Josh Pelletier  
Kristy Lisle (absent)  
Kurt Hueg

### **Guests**

Anthony Cervantes  
Warren Voyce  
Isaac Escoto  
Hilda Fernandez  
Fatima Jinnah  
Dokesha Meecham  
Natalie Latteri  
Amy Leonard  
Teresa Ong  
Debbie Lee  
Laurie Scolari  
Priya Vasu  
Simon Pennington  
Valerie Fong

3. Kathryn asked that Exec approve an additional item re Chancellor's Executive Order be added to the agenda. She also asked that the group allow for the Collegiality in Action Debrief to go for as long as needed, even if that meant not getting to all the agenda items. The agenda with changes was adopted by consensus. Minutes from the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved by consensus.

4. Public comment: None.

5. Consent calendar: There was approval by consensus for appointments to the Dean of Equity Search Committee on the consent calendar

6. Kurt Hueg read an announcement from the State chancellor's office, effective through the end of 2021. Students can choose to go pass/no pass at any time in the quarter. However, students are advised to consult with a counselor prior. NP grade will not count against the student on probation. Anthony Cervantes announced that the Excused Withdrawal (EW) is still available without documentation. Contact Anthony Cervantes for questions related to any part of the order. This information will be posted on the admission and records, and a communication plan to students is being prepared.

7. Part-time representation - One candidate Farima Fakoor, PT Faculty in Accounting from BSS. Farima read a short statement about her background, and working in BSS. She's also a full-time faculty at Golden Gate University. Kurt Hueg acknowledged her service to BSS. A motion to approve her replacement for Mary Anne Sunseri for the remainder of her term was unanimous.

8. Shared Governance Updates

5th Council: Return to Campus: Warren Voyce (senate appointed faculty tri-chair) gave an update about the first meeting of the Fifth council on Thursday 2/4 - gathering information from a number of groups working on return to campus, e.g. COVID Scheduling Task Force, all in one place. The council is a Governance organization, and may need some "action steps" to make progress on the back to campus effort. The return to campus planning recommendations will integrate with the District's return to campus efforts. The goal is for everyone to feel that their voices are heard in the effort. The fifth council will have the same 12 member structure.

Advisory Council: Kathryn reported that President Nguyen issued a memo authoring the initiation of two searches for full-time, tenure-track faculty, one for Ethnic Studies and the other in Humanities. She explained that while AC gave her a recommendation for Veterinary Technology in the number two position, this was because AC understood the program was not viable without the hire, and they were able to resolve this situation with part-time appointments, so Humanities, not fully loaded with one full-time faculty currently would come before in the prioritization. AC also did a short debrief of the Collegiality in Action visit, and then spent most of the meeting talking about the assessments of the reorganization that took place in response to budget cuts from three years ago, particularly the need to assess the Student & Faculty Resource Center (a.k.a. "the hub") and the request from President Nguyen that we create a new V.P. of Student Services (currently only have an AVP), and change the Executive Vice President of Student Services & Instruction back to Vice President of Instruction only. Both items were unresolved.

Revenue & Resources (R&R): Cara Miyasaki (faculty tri-chair) shared an update from the Feb. 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. There was a presentation by Elias about the bookstore, which will be going to a vendor model. There is one employee at the bookstore who will move to another position at the bookstore. There was a presentation about carry over funds, setting aside \$200K for equity. A question was asked about the vendor model, which was explained as "outsourcing" of the bookstore. The bookstore is in the red (loss) by \$300K per year. The vendor model protects the College from a loss, and provides the College with a piece of the profits. Separately, a conversation about the carryover funds has been building. The College is asking departments and divisions to "give up" 10% of their carryover funds (B budget) There was discussion about the use of these funds to buy critical equipment and other consumables, and how would these carryover funds be used. R&R will be preparing a survey to send out to programs to ask them what they think.

#### 9. Collegiality in Action Debrief

Kathryn reminded everyone of the rationale for the collegiality in action that she presented in the [presentation given to senate on January 11](#). She read through Academic Senate's rationale for the requested visit:

- Clearly identify how decisions are being made, who is making them, when they have to be made; and what information they're relying on to make those decisions;
- Ensure decisions with a "10+1" scope and/or legal mandate for inclusion of the Academic Senate are being "brought" to Senate – avoid conflict from sense of infraction/intrusion into faculty primacy and conflict from exclusion of faculty (Senate) in any 10+1 decisions;
- Strengthen shared/participatory governance and stakeholder involvement in decision-making
- Correct the misrepresentation of Academic Senate's role in governance, and the role of Senate-appointed reps on the councils.

Kathryn reminded the group that the only way to request the visit was both the president of the college and the president of the academic senate to request the visit together, although Thuy had stated at the 1/11 senate meeting that she didn't want to make the request (for a collegiality visit) but did it to "accommodate" Academic Senate. This may have led to a lack of appropriate communication about the purpose and nature of the visit to everyone who ended up being invited. Very likely more information needed to have been shared in advance of the presentation/visit.

Title 5 and Ed Code (the Law) and accreditation standards require collegial consultation between administration and the academic senate through appropriate governance structures, and the "visit" validated our perception that our current governance structure isn't accurately integrating Academic senate in decision making. But Kathryn acknowledged also that there were two meetings going on. Kathryn shared that she wasn't happy with the use of the chat to that extent during a presentation, as it could be disruptive of active listening, disruptive and disrespectful to the speaker, and interrupt the dialog. We should probably work on as institution how to norm our behavior on chat. That said, Kathryn mentioned her appreciation for what was being said in the chat, especially the comments being made about disempowerment of student and classified employee voices. It also highlighted some really conversations we likely need to be unpacking – around things like what does expertise mean? Kathryn shared that as a new senate officer, she's learning how to do this role, but needs senators (and faculty) to help her in this learning process, and know how to lead through challenging conversations like this one.

Senators then shared feedback they've heard from constituents. One was about trust, and being to speak up, some was related to the Fifth Council. A faculty shared the presentation by David Morse and Larry Galizio was "riveting". Some content was very interesting but somewhat "preachy". Surprisingly, it seemed like equity wasn't mentioned. There was a comment about "staying in your lane" in the chat that wasn't uniformly understood.

Erik suggested that the Senate officers likely didn't do a good job explaining (framing) what we wanted from this meeting. There was a comment that the concerns by faculty didn't come up in the meeting, especially with respect to (leadership) by the administration. Perhaps too many people were invited? It seemed that 90% of the meeting was lost and didn't address the reasons that the Academic Senate wanted to hear the state perspective. People didn't know about Title V, and how Title V was going to be used.

A constituent commented that it wasn't very clear what this meeting was going to be about. There was a comment that a lot of the chat was disrespectful. It's obvious that we have trust issues among our faculty, and this needs to be addressed for us to achieve our goals.

Abhi (student) commented that the meeting was about accountability, but all meetings need to include accountability. Abhi further commented that the College administration and all Senates need to work together to hold administration accountable.

A senator commented that after the meeting we seemed to have gone backwards – not even to ground 0 but even less than that, and was saddened that 10+1 was seen as a dirty word. We need to leverage our power, and also hold ourselves accountable.

Another person who identifies as a faculty of color mentioned how troubled she was with the conflation of faculty expertise and white supremacy/privilege. Power is not a zero sum game, and certain constituents (e.g. faculty) don't have to lose power for others to gain power. This is a

troubling dynamic right now. How are we looking at needed discipline expertise, e.g. with ethnic studies, but then critiquing faculty expertise? This is too incongruous and destructive.

There was a comment that 10+1 isn't going to save us, it's going to sink us. We (faculty) want our opinions to be sought and valued regardless of whether or not they are technically in 10+1 and using a legal document will backfire on us. As the speakers admitted, faculty can make an argument for any issue being in 10+1, and administration can make arguments that any given issue is not within 10+1. She also reminded that in our initial grievance letter last Winter, none of the issues we raised were in the 10+1. If we truly want our voices to be respected, let's do something radical and lead by example. Let's give staff and students a voting seats at the Academic Senate table, and model how to inclusively and respectfully include everyone in decision making without centering purview.

A rebuttal was that if the Academic Senate wants to really use its power, we go straight to the board of trustees, which is not "collegial". There was dialogue about how the various stakeholders are working together (collectively) to make our voice known. Further comment that the governance structure is illegal, and perhaps we should withdraw our participation in governance and have (it) report to us (all the senates and student government or academic senate for 10+1).

A senator shared the need for collegiality. Abhi commented that the temperature of the meeting has gone way up, and would hope academic senate doesn't withdraw from working with all constituencies. Kathryn commented that this discussion isn't over; and we need to make sure were running right, and not risking accreditation and other effects of a structure that does not work well. She invited anyone who is interested to reach out to her for one-on-one conversations about where to go next.

10. Equity 2.0 resolution - office of equity called this a living document. Right now there is no leadership in the Office of Equity so nothing is clear about a communication plan, or next steps. We did a second read of our resolution, and there was a motion (1<sup>st</sup>: Ryer; 2<sup>nd</sup>: Carey) to adopt the resolution with the proposed change of wording from Equity Strategic Plan to Foothill College's Strategic Vision for Equity. The vote to support the resolution passed unanimously.

11. Guided Pathways: The GP Team was unable to stay due to the extension of the earlier discussions so this discussion and 2<sup>nd</sup> read of the resolution was postponed until the next meeting. The new faculty lead for the Communications Team, Amy Leonard, was introduced and welcomed.

12. OER Discussion. Feedback was given to the survey, and the committee approved sending it out to faculty, and giving them until the end of the month to complete it, which means results will be reviewed at the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting (last meeting of the winter quarter). There were various comments about the quality of OERs, and what the library already has to offer.

13. Announcements:

Abhi (for students) Black history month, and a town hall next Wednesday with the PSA contest. Kathryn announced Brian Evans (economist) [Evelyne Keomian will be speaking on 2/16](#).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. Next meeting is 2/22/21