

Academic Senate Minutes March 1, 2021

DRAFT Minutes

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

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

2. Roll call

Executive Committee

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

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

Kurt Hueg
Abhiraj Muhar
Guests
Katy Ripp
Sam Connell
Laura Gamez
Amber La Piana
Rosa Nguyen
Amy Leonard
Debbie Lee
Simon Pennington

3. The agenda was adopted by consensus. Minutes from the February 22nd meeting were adopted by consensus.

4. No public comment

5. [Skipped consent calendar]

6. **Senator feedback on governance.** There was a question to senators about any feedback they have received regarding governance. Alexis Aguilar shared a short survey he did for his division (BSS). ~ 60% agreed there's shared governance, but ~ 40% did not. About 50% believe that their voice is heard, the rest not as much. 46% though governance was operating fairly.

Further thoughts on shared Governance at Foothill included the difference between part-time and full-time responses. There was a comment that decisions sometimes get made without faculty input. Some voices felt there wasn't trust and transparency. Some thought a decision making process with egalitarianism tends to slow down decisions. The topic of mutual trust keeps coming up. A part-time rep stated that most divisions would respond in a similar way for part-time inclusion.

A senator from Language arts shared that there's a lot of history for this conversation, Complex questions, some faculty felt they were being made out to be scapegoats. From counselling, a faculty mentioned that they really don't understand how decisions were being made. From PSME, with some exceptions, faculty have pulled away from governance. From the library, recognition that faculty's voice in shared governance was through the Academic Senate, and the tri-chairs in the governance council. There were also comments about the comments in the

chat during the collegiality meeting, as resentment that classified staff and students don't have much of a voice in the process. KA suggested that we need a way to bridge KA faculty who are somewhat separated via a literal bridge from the center of campus. (Farima) asked who would be asking P/T faculty what their thinking was. Kathryn commented that there are appointments for adjunct faculty on governance councils and Academic Senate. There was a comment that there was an adversarial relationship with the administration that needed to be deescalated.

7. Governance Rep feedback. David Marasco (PSME) was asked to read a letter from Patrick Morris, faculty tri-chair of E&E. (A copy of that was read into the record) comments that the President doesn't listen to faculty when she doesn't want to. A vote of no confidence would be strong, but perhaps not useful. Patrick suggested that the Senate might withdraw from governance committees. David suggested this was consistent with many faculty feeling the need to withdraw from governance,

PT faculty to governance suggested there were conversations that go in the administration but not shared with faculty. Many faculty feel that they don't have the time to put in hours per month to stay engaged in governance. Looking for ways to have input, but not spend hours and hours in meetings. Comment by P.T rep that adjunct faculty don't have the time to participate in meetings, or that their voices were heard (or mattered). P/T faculty often feel left out.

FT rep to governance council asked for clarification of our meeting goals, what is it that we're doing today? Are we taking motions?

Kathryn commented that the complexity of the discussion was very hard. We need to have a longer discussion to take in, think and analyze, and then what do we want to do about it? No action today – motions will be entertained on the 15th.

Another rep to governance asked what the role of advisory council is? There was a comment about the administration wanting to "socialize" ideas, then discussion that doesn't lead to productive resolution.

8. Liaisons/Guests feedback. A senator asked for clarification of the decision making process, who is doing what (role), and what is consultation and what is not consultation? Comment by another faculty (serving on a committee) is that while there is discussion, there's a lack of process.

Faculty member in attendance commented that many disheartened faculty have elected not to participate in the (political) process, something stronger is needed. Do we take it to the trustees? And faculty haven't heard from the administration about what they will be doing to "repair the relationship".

Senator spoke about the lack of engagement by faculty - "we're trying to figure out in the Senate" how to improve the lines of communication.

Rep to governance wanted to address the question of why haven't we heard from the administration? It could be that C&C is evaluating the effectiveness of the governance council. It was noted that the councils only meet for two hours on a Friday afternoon once a month.

Student commented that all of this is a lot to process, there may be a lack of understanding about who does what in the governance structure. There was a comment that the student letter shared everything (concerns), but before we withdraw our members, we should stop and get

some help, perhaps voice concerns at the FHDA-CCD BoT meeting, but (and) to be careful that any actions faculty take now interrupt the services that student need.

9. Open Discussion/Analysis: Kathryn went over the topics. One big one was a greater understanding of how shared governance works, who does what, etc? Also what is the relationship between the Academic Senate and the governance structure. We could decide to look at what Title V says our role is, then compare it to what we have (at Foothill) but that might not help if it isn't agreed about Academic Senate and Title V, at Foothill with the administration or other constituents. Again, a comment was made that a radical move (like withdrawing appointments to governance) by faculty might have a deleterious impact on the college (accreditation). There was a comment that the informal survey (Alexis) showed only 25% of faculty felt their voices were being heard. Further comment that faculty are so busy, that if they don't see a need to participate in shared governance, what could prompt us to stay involved?

There was an analogy to climate change - if you don't see an impact today, then why act now?

(Abi) suggested that we try to determine what our powers are as individual groups, and then proceed to the administration? Kathryn asked if administrators had any comments?

(John Fox) mentioned a year ago that BSS called for a faculty only meeting to discuss these (or similar) issues, and that was helpful. Kathryn responded that Academic Senate couldn't do this as our meetings are public. Fox clarified that this was a suggestion to division representatives.

Kristy Lisle commented that the preliminary results of the governance survey would be available sometime in May. Simon Pennington concurred.

Kathryn asked for a 2 minute break, and then returned to the meeting to have a deeper Senate conversation.

Kathryn has asked about the "what's next" as we transition into the Constitution Topic. We'll put this on the agenda for March 15th, and entertain motions then. We can consider things like drafting resolutions, going to the BoT, and/or APM, or other.

10. Senate Constitution Workgroup Update. Kathryn shared [a PPT](#) with the workgroup update. commented that we're updating the Constitution to reflect changes already made, and we're also seeing the need to discuss a number of other issues per the charter. representation. Kathryn presented the topics for the constitution. What is the role of a non-senate appointed faculty on the governance councils?

There was further comment about setting a piece in our charter about how we compensate for P/T reps, do we need to stay in alignment with De Anza's Academic Senate. We have a target of an early June election, the executive committee makes recommendations that the entire faculty have to vote on.

Kathy Perino (FA) commented that the FA has negotiated the minimum amount of release time for senate in the contract, but Foothill and De Anza doesn't have to have the same number and they can and do give more. The Constitution group has been looking at internal documents, the Constitution group is bringing two proposals forward for discussion. The beginning of a deeper discussion item, The first item is the need to develop a constitution and a bylaws document, The Constitution is more policy oriented, and the bylaws document is more procedures, The constitution is more rigid (2/3 vote) but the bylaws are easier to change. Also the need to reflect

on the constitution every 3 years. The Constitution looks at the name and purpose. And the second big item is representation, and who can speak for the Academic Senate. Comments that bylaws changes requiring elections are very slow to update, and that some very good bylaws documents offer some very good examples (College of the Canyons). Second big idea is to reference in the constitution that the College Curriculum Committee operate as a fully autonomous committee (with their own bylaws document?) that mirror what the Academic Senate requires (representation). And lastly we're recommending that that Academic Senate add a fourth officer, to split the VP position and curriculum committee. Curriculum committee rep is an officer of the Senate. But that the CC chair focuses only on Curriculum, and not be distracted by VP positions (operations of the Senate). Also will get input on COOL (distracted and lost that thread). This is not a proposal yet, the last thing is about division area representation. (Kerri) commented that some Academic Senates represent faculty by number, others by service area (function).

11. **Senate budget topic** - Cormia showed the [Senate budget numbers](#) through the end of this academic year. Our current budget reflects ~ \$5,000 in annual revenues from faculty dues, the majority of which go towards the part-time faculty stipend (\$750 per P/T rep per quarter). We are currently spending about \$3,000 more a year than we're taking in, ~ \$2,000 to student scholarships and \$1,000 to plenary expenses. The plan for sustainable funding of the part-time rep positions is to secure funding from the College, similar to the officers release time.

12. [not addressed]

13. Announcement by Cormia that educators can get vaccinated but may require a combination of patience and persistence.

14. Meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m. Next and final meeting of the quarter is March 15, 2021