

Academic Senate Draft Minutes October 26, 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
Allexis Aguilar
Rachelle Campbell
Milissa Carey
Stephanie Chan
Tracee Cunningham
Jordan Fong
Donna Frankel
Mathew Litrus
Dixie Macias
Cara Miyasaki

David Marasco

David McCormick

Rita O'Loughlin

Kerri Ryer

Mary Anne Sunseri

Mary Thomas

Voltaire Villanueva

Mimi Overton

Senate Liaisons

John Fox (FA liaison)

Kurt Hweg

Abhiraj Muhar

Carolyn Holcroft

Melissa Cervantes

Guests

Priya Vasu

Mariam Touni

Jayme Albritton

Josh Contreras

Teresa Ong

Debbie Lee

Jeff Bisell

Katy Ripp

Valerie Fong

Christina Rotsides

Michael Chang

3. Agenda was approved by consensus. Minutes from the October 12th meeting were also approved by consensus.

4. Kathryn introduced the topic of the [Student Open Letter to Governance](#) and added the context that the student authors of the letter are here to present the letter in their voice, have an opportunity for us to ask questions of them and them of us. Then we will hear constituent feedback about the letter and begin to discuss ways Academic Senate may wish to respond. No motions for action are expected today.

Students authors of the letter introduced themselves and clarified that the letter is coming from a coalition of student leaders, but not from ASFC – yet. There is discussion at ASFC about making these broader demands. The students went over the letter and talked about their demands, and some changes/additions from the June letter that was sent to AS. For example, a change from “decolonizing curriculum” to “diversifying curriculum.” Abhi highlighted that a new demand (not in the letter last June) was financial literacy, as this is becoming an important topic. Students also discussed reimagining campus safety, with an emphasis on security for black and Latinx students.

Students suggested having “anti-racism” training every quarter. Students are asking for systemic change - and the group addressing the Senate today will collaborate with other

students to build a larger coalition. Six students comprise the effort right now, but hoping to grow organically. Abhi commented that the letter to the Senate is a living document.

One senator talked about discussions to give students have more than an advisory vote on the Board of Trustees and at our governance councils. Another senator commented about the word “demand” being a strong word, and that change can’t happen overnight. Another senator mentioned that these are a dozen significant conversations that students have, another senator commented that student perspective is the best voice for change on campus.

Kathryn commented about the importance of having a dialog that was “institutional” and not siloed. Kathryn then asked for constituent feedback, summarized here:

Mary Thomas (Library): commented that although she didn’t get direct feedback from constituents, the students’ letter is already informing our work:

- We are developing a guide to financial literacy resources.
- When considering a return to campus and how to respond to students who don't comply with safety protocols, we recognize that we need an alternative to calling the campus police.

Mary Anne Sunseri (P/T rep) shared the following points:

Comments of Concern:

- Interested in having a dialogue, but the letter does not encourage dialogue
- Do the students represent the entirety or majority of the student body? (Abhi addressed this)
- Mandatory training, quarterly review of all curricula are impractical
- Should we have only one focus for all classes taught at the college?
- In complaints to the Academic Senate about “incorrect lessons,” has the AS sought the perspective of the instructor?
- Anonymous letters: worried about punitive action
- Concern about faculty diversity and self-replication. Needs to be a state level and selection lottery.
- Opposition to reimagining campus safety if it means completely removing campus safety, as it will require elevated measures for self-defense (this was also addressed)

Comments of Support:

- Full support, especially of ethnic studies department
- Many senior students are from marginalized and under-represented groups; some great ideas for combining the communities
- Yes to ideas of diversifying curriculum, mandatory training, mental health, basic needs, and financial literacy, if there is compensation for training and course development
- Faculty pro-rated and open to access by all and take over hiring in both attainment, training, and certification of equity sensitivities

Tracee Cunningham (Counseling): shared that there was a lot of support for the letter. She also shared that there was concern about the Return to Campus discussions that not enough focus had yet been given to student services coming back.

Kerri Ryer (BSS) received a lot of feedback, much or most of it positive. She read a bulleted list:

- There is some concern about viability of the ethnic studies classes, given low enrollment in past courses (example American government from a Black perspective).
- Lack of funding for ES program
- BSS has had a negative experience with past interdisciplinary curriculum projects that have been unsuccessful, so would like to see this go differently
- Wondering about the inclusion of ethnic studies content in current offerings
- Limited capabilities of AS and shared governance to address the demands given that important decisions being made by the President alone with Board's pro-forma approval
- Training requirements be informed by the literature and funded appropriately for PT faculty to participate, fit with federal mandates, evaluation criteria for participation.
- Training not be mandatory because the literature suggests mandating does not work, shifting the culture so that all would like to participate is more effective
- Prioritization of the student demands in light of other important issues that also require our attention
- Suggest preparing a student survey of full student body to measure interest in ES
- Extend voting privileges of the two student trustees on the Board
- Make the Foothill Advisory Committee (perhaps all 3 gov com) an Executive Committee with voted-on decisions being binding rather than advisory

Dixie Macias (KA) had prepared written comments from his division that will be shared with the Exec. Committee and the student authors. He expressed concern that there are always two sides to issues, and wanted to make sure we're not viewing things one-sided. He also wanted to add that faculty in his division are interested in expanding discussion about return to campus.

David McCormick (LA) talked about broad support from his division faculty for the student letter. Other faculty suggested that this list (student letter) was a lot to accomplish, and a lot of complex logistics.

Milissa Cary (FA/Comm) spoke about broad support for the letter from her division. There is complexity and logistics to making things happen. Abhi suggested that things won't happen overnight, but that it is the right thing to do?

Stephanie Chan (LA) had a question to the students: How do the six members of the student coalition think about this letter vis-a-vis the will of the Foothill student body? If the letter is not intended to represent the student government or student body, then how would the coalition like faculty to think about the proposed changes if they are designed to affect all students? Have there been efforts to create college-wide student awareness and/or support for the letter's proposed changes? Students answered via conversations happening at ASFC.

Kathryn suggested that our dialog could shape our response to the letter, and what is in our power to do as an Academic Senate? We can definitely consider authoring resolutions, both for items in 10+1 and in support of other actions outside of Senate purview. But are there other things we can and want to be doing as well?

Cormia asked about “oppressive” curriculum in STEM. One student talked about her experience in STEM, and that in a room full of students, how many are people of color or women in a STEM field?

Other questions included: how do we bring in the administration for the decision making.

There was a student comment that the Academic Senate can do much more than resolutions, but that resolutions do make a difference.

7. Ethnic Studies. Kathryn introduced the topic by asking for constituent feedback that may have been cut off at the Oct. 12 meeting, before hearing and update from the faculty leads, and finalizing the two new committees.

Donna commented that she heard from (adjunct?) faculty interested in teaching within the ethnic studies department. Also the ethnic studies class will be required for graduation. She said one comment was a question about whether or not a faculty member teaching the course had to a faculty member of color. There were some different perspective shared by the student authors of the letter, including the need to prioritize faculty of color teaching ethnic studies classes.

There were comments about a department or division being created for ethnic studies. There was a comment about the need to prioritize the formation of an ethnic studies division so it gets done this year.

David Marasco shared the written proposals to create the [two new ad hoc ethnic studies committees](#). The Steering Committee might meet on Friday afternoons. David invites anyone interested in joining the Advisory Committee to send him an email. Debbie Lee mentioned that this is a requirement for the CSUs, and thanked the faculty and curriculum body for their work to get this to happen.

8. Board policies. Kathryn talked about the Senate’s role in updating board policies (BP’s) and academic procedures (AP’s), and moving things to the District Academic Senate, The Academic & Professional Matters (APM) Committee and the Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) and ultimately for Board approval. Changes may come locally from a need identified at one of the Colleges, or come from the State, and communicated to the Senates via Paula Norsell.

9. BP/AP’s on Credit for Prior Learning. A required change came from California Community College League CCLC, based on a new title 5 requirement. This needs to be approved by the

December 5th Board Meeting. Kathryn asked for feedback on the credit for prior learning. There was a comment about the language being somewhat general, but that is required to get it through the board meeting quickly, acknowledging there are very important logistics to be worked out by a District “task force” that APM will hopefully be convening soon. The proposed members of this task force were OK with the language of the BP/AP for now to have us be in compliance.

10. Kathryn spoke about the need to add two more meetings to get all of our work done this quarter. David Marasco moved that we add two additional meetings into the fall quarter, with the dates as outline in the [new schedule](#) being proposed. Mary Thomas and Donna Frankel seconded the motion. A friendly amendment asked Senate officers to look to see if P/T reps can get paid a bit more. 15 votes yes, 0 votes no.

11. Governance Updates. Kathryn reminded the group that this is now a standing item on every agenda to increase transparency about where campus decisions are being made. The Senate is looking for report outs from all significant committees on a rotating basis and/or by any group asking to present an emergent topic.

Eric (CCC) talked about the new ethnic studies course proposals now being discussed at the College Curriculum Committee, with process issues about how to address them in a decentralized curriculum structure. The other key item on CCC’s priority list right is the Distance Education Addendum, which must be updated for all classes by December before the break.

Kerri Ryer from COOL talked about all the activities they’ve been conducting. POCR (Peer Online Course Review) is starting up again.

Abhi talked about a resolution passed in (ASFC) a resolution against antisemitism

A student commented that some students had heard there might be some “in person finals” in fall quarter. It was immediately clarified (by Kurt Hueg) that there will be NO IN PERSON finals!

12. For the good of the order: get out and vote, get your flu shot, and don’t get pandemic fatigue!

13. Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.