

Foothill & District Academic Senate Minutes May 3, 2021

DRAFT Minutes

Part 1 – Foothill Academic Senate Meeting

#'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 Kuehnl (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
Rita O'Loughlin
Stephanie Chan
Tracee Cunningham
Voltaire Villanueva
Senate Liaisons

Carolyn Holcroft
John Fox
Josh Pelletier
Kristy Lisle
Kurt Hueg
Abhiraj Muhar
Guests
Dokesha Meacham
Hilda Fernandez
Isaac Escoto
Thuy Nguyen

3. Kathryn reviewed the topics for the day and the agenda was approved by consensus. The April 26th minutes were adopted by consensus.

4. No public comment

5. Consent calendar appointments – reviewed and approved [updated list of appointments](#).

6. Shared Governance Updates:

COOL committee updates: COOL is evaluating online proctoring software, as the Proctorio software license is nearing an end. COOL meets this Friday, 5/7 at 11 a.m. Anyone who is interested is welcome to attend, including students, and Kerri will share meeting info with ASFC.

Kathryn announced that the Advisory Council focusing on program reviews this month. COVID delayed presentations last year, and so we heard them in the fall, and they were fabulous. A desire to open them up to everyone, so all are invited. Info is on the Council website. Program review process is revamped with a real emphasis on quality improvement.

Ellen Judd: C&C voted to authorize the support of the senate ask to create a task force to look at changing the governance structure.

7. Senate Constitution: Kathryn reminded group of hard stop of April 5th for the Constitution Workgroup to propose amendments to the constitution that we could consider for this year, resulting in the decision to continue work with plans to propose more amendments next year as well. Last week talked through the new Senate officer (exec VP) and division representation, and looking for approval today of those items. Today also looking at the composition of the

executive committee to include voting rights for some of the liaison positions, for discussion today and approval next week. Final approval by the executive committee May 24th, will be followed by the election.

Kathryn commented that the election will include a P/T representative, exec VP and College curriculum positions. The Senate constitution states that officers can't serve on the Election committee, thus Robert Cormia will need assistance in running the election. Mary Thomas (co chair), Milissa Carey (co chair), and Matthew Litrus volunteered to serve on the Election Committee, to join Kerri Ryer and Donna Frankel. Appointments were approved by consensus.

There wasn't a lot of constituent feedback on the Constitution amendments to article 4 as written. Mary Thomas moved to approve the amended article 4 Rachelle Campbell seconded, Was approved unanimously. After asking for comments on section 2 of the constitution, there was a motion to approve the new amendment. Stephaine Chan first, David Marasco second. 13 yes votes, no nay votes or abstentions.

Discussion of composition of Exec Committee: Kathryn pointed out that all faculty are members of the Academic Senate; the Executive Committee is the body that represents them and is currently made up of the officers, division representatives, and at large part-time representatives. We also have a practice of including liaisons (listed on the agenda), but they do not have voting rights. The Constitution Committee proposes an expansion of the Executive Committee to include and give voting rights to the liaisons and to the faculty tri-chairs of the governance councils. The faculty voice would still be dominant, but the voices of students, classified staff, and administrators would be heard.

A question was asked about the motivation (process) for the change from liaison to full voting members? The Academic Senate has the role and responsibilities of bringing recommendations on 10+1 matters to the Board of Directors. A senator (David) asked if other colleges across the state have done this, and what did they learn? A concern was raised, for example, one administrator in our Senate could raise a motion and the other could second it. Bakersfield College has a voting student member. Our proposal is interesting. Kerri commented that it wasn't so long ago that part-time faculty were excluded from the Academic Senate, now their presence seems normal (and expected). One Senator asked if we (faculty) might get reciprocity on other governance committees. Kathryn commented that the role of Academic Senate is a very unique role in governance and reiterated that the senate will make better decisions by hearing from all stakeholders; she is not concerned about the lack of reciprocity.

Abhi (ASFC president) commented about giving voting rights to a student liaison, and was excited about this idea, but did make him wonder about reciprocity for a faculty vote at ASFC, but that it might be an advisory vote.

Josh Pelletier (Classified Senate President) is very appreciative of this extension of voting rights to the Classified Senate liaison, and will urge the Classified Senate to consider including a student and a faculty member when they revise their constitution.

John Fox (speaking more as faculty member than FA rep) thinks it's fine to give a student member voting rights without reciprocity because of the larger power relations on campus; the decisions of the senate affect students more than the decisions of the ASFC affect faculty.

Tri-Chair as voting members discussion: Kathryn expressed concern that the faculty trichairs would now have additional duties, which will add workload (and time commitment). One trichair commented the amount of additional work might make serving on an additional time commitment difficult. A senator further commented that because of the required time commitment, especially in the afternoon, it might preclude some faculty, e.g. lab instructors, from participating in the Academic Senate. The governance tri-chairs may not need to have voting rights, but there needs to be stronger communication and a formal connection with the senate.

Given time constraints, we wrapped up discussion, which will continue next week and hopefully be ready for action.

8. GP Onboarding Deep Dive:

This year Dokesha Meacham and Hilda Fernandez studied the student experience from first contact with the campus to enrollment in their first class. Grounding onboarding in the student experience. Six success factors framework. Becoming a student ready college.

Dokesha walked us through the many steps a student takes to apply, receive a welcome letter (that isn't very welcoming), do an orientation, make a counseling appointment, register, and pay for classes; too many clicks are required, and students get stuck. Now they're focusing on the welcome letter and orientation. They shared a [draft welcome email as a Google doc](#) and asked for feedback; deadline is May 14.

Some feedback given at the meeting, e.g. advice is a maximum of four clicks to get students where they want to be, link letter to counseling, and specific needs of students interested in applying to allied health programs.

Hilda asked senators if their divisions have videos to help promote some of the courses, and if so to provide feedback: [Videos Course Catalog](#)

For more information visit the [GP Onboarding Team website](#). Everyone is invited to an Onboarding Retreat on June 3, 2-4 pm.

9. President Nguyen joined the Senate to discuss the letter recently sent regarding (governance), Thuy asked that this be a dialog, and she would do her best to be a good listener, as well as respond honestly. John Fox read [a letter from FA in support the academic senate](#) into the record. The letter asserted that the Academic Senate is a requisite partner in governance and the Faculty Association (FA) is the exclusive bargaining unit.

Language Arts senator shared feedback from Language Arts faculty; they acknowledge the complexity and challenges of Thuy's position, but validated the concerns expressed in the letter, especially faculty who are part of shared governance. Thuy asked for examples. Senator replied that one case in point was around communication, confusion about who shows up in which gathering, for example, administrators show up at what was thought to be a faculty meeting.

Kathryn interrupted dialogue to point out that we have spent two years discussing faculty concerns; a lot of people are here today to hear Thuy's response to the letter, not continue to solicit constituent input. That assertion was reinforced by further comment, including that faculty are asking in good faith to move forward working with the administration in a positive way and also wanted to hear Thuy's response to the asks in our letter.

Thuy said that it is serious. The letter represents an unhealthy relationship that could be better, appreciated that the letter offers positive solutions and shows a desire to be in dialog. She said that a joint meeting with the officers would happen later in the afternoon, the Academic Senate will start receiving governance memos directly, the President's Cabinet will agree on a facilitator the senate is comfortable with for dialog between the administration and senate officers, the governance structure has to be redesigned so that senate feels our rights, responsibilities, and role are respected. She acknowledged that we may need a mediator to help us make this work, talked about how there are four steps with a new leader: form, storm, norm, perform, and we are in the storming phase. She also acknowledged that she did not come from the ranks of faculty in community college. She also talked about the critical role of faculty in equity work. She asserted that "if we do this right", the process of storming, norming, etc. will lead us to a better place. Thuy continued, she just really wanted to listen, rather than talk.

Senator stated his belief that power sharing is the heart of the matter; faculty do not feel their voices are being heard, and power is not shared in a way that reflects shared governance and collegiality. Thuy responded with "let's unpack my power and privilege and your power and privilege."

Carolyn agreed that power is the crux of the matter, but it's not about expertise, it's about collegial consultation and collaboration.

Faculty guest asked why we couldn't hear Thuy's response to the letter now, why wait for the meeting with the senate officers. Thuy answered that she was already addressing 3 of the 7 asks in the letter, a meeting with a facilitator will happen.

Kathryn pointed out that the ask from the senate was not for a joint meeting with the cabinet just to talk about the letter.

Senator stated that we want to be seen and heard. We want a direct response, and there's a chance to do that in the next few minutes.

Kathryn promised to report on the joint meeting at the next senate meeting.

Thuy hoped that the facilitated meeting would include more faculty than just the officers, plan is to meet every other week to dig into operational issues and address the letter.

14. Meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m. Next meeting is next Monday, May 10th