

Academic Senate Minutes January 27 2020

Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m.

Roll call

Isaac Escoto (present)  
Eric Kuehnl (present)  
Robert Cormia (present)  
Carolyn Holcroft (present)  
Kathryn Maurer (present)  
Amber La Piana (present)  
Maria Dominguez (present)  
MaryAnn Sunseri (present)  
Mary Thomas (present)  
Jordan Fong (present)  
Kristy Lisle (present)  
Tracee Cunningham (present)  
Voltaire Villanueva (absent)  
Lisa Eshman (present)  
Sara Cooper (present)  
Matthew Litrus (present)  
David Marasco (present)  
Mimi Rae (present)  
Donna Frankel (present)  
Rita O'Loughlin (absent)  
Dixie Macias (absent)  
David McCormick (present)  
Robert Hartwell (present)

Guests:

Taylor Robinson  
Kallie Hilsabeck  
Elise Robinson  
Rosa Nguyen  
Melissa Cervantes  
Simon Pennington

Thuy Nguyen

The agenda was adopted by consensus, and the minutes were also approved by consensus

The consent calendar included BP 4240; which had additional clarifying language about faculty equivalency being granted on the district level (when equivalency is granted for faculty at one campus, it applies at both Foothill and De Anza).

We are very close to having program review readers for all the divisions, we still need one at large reader for humanities, as well as a Language Arts reader for Spanish. The consent calendar was approved by consensus.

Agenda prioritization:

- Only three more Senate meetings this quarter
- Key Academic Senate topics: election, budget and finance, constitution
- Equity 2.0 plan and Asilomar retreat
- Peer Online Course Review (POCR), CVC-OEI
- FW grade, what does it mean?
- Program discontinuation, should we form a study group?
- Part-time communication

Agenda prioritization – senate constituents have advocated that Senate prioritize decision making processes discussions on agendas. Isaac posted a list of discussion/action items that also need senate attention. He reminded us that we have only three meetings left this quarter. For the Senate constitution, we have a number of items, including the half-vote/full-vote part-time faculty issue. We need to form an election committee, with open seats for president, secretary-treasurer, and P/T faculty rep.

There will be an Equity 2.0 retreat down in Asilomar this Friday/Saturday. We don't want to have the Equity 2.0 plan reach a point where it needs to be approved, and we feel it didn't have enough faculty input. Senate finances and scholarships need to be discussed. We need to decide how the FW grade should impact program review data (should FW grades count as non success? Should they count as Ws? Their own category?). Some faculty have raised the issue that we do not have a current program discontinuation process. Comment that such a process needs to be created well ahead of a time when it might need to be used. Peer Online Course Review (POCR) is being developed, and we need to have local approval of POCR.

Comment that we need to add to the list, a discussion/update on enrollment numbers/trends, and for a discussion re: how course seat counts are determine. Isaac added that CCC will lead discussion about seat counts. Comment that we need to loop back to the faculty prioritization tool and process. Comment that program discontinuation creation may need to be done by a task force/study group.

Comment that meeting time needs to be used for discussion / action items, versus informational items. Program discontinuation needs to be thought about well in advance. Part-time communication support. Comment brought up the importance of the equity plan.

The decision-making process. CVC-OEI item is also going to become very important, especially as the OEI grant ends at the end of spring.

Isaac reminded the senate that we need to prioritize agenda items so that the senate officers know how to prioritize meeting time/agendas. It's up to us what we want to prioritize, and what we'll address in the future.

Agenda items the body asked to be prioritized: decision making processes, program discontinuation discussion, communication support for part time faculty reps, Equity Plan 2.0, faculty prioritization.

#### Decision making process

- How do we decide what form our communication with the President should take?
- What 3rd party resources are needed? ASCCC? Dr Solano? David Morse?
- How do we pay for it? What are the advantages of each resource?
- What are the options for Academic Senate to describe our concerns to the President and administration? Memo, letter, resolution, or a bill of particulars?

Decision making process. As requested, Isaac contacted ASCCC. ASCCC asked what we'd like. How do we want them to help us. Isaac also reached out to the RP Group, and was connected with Dr Al Solano, who has helped other CCCs with institutional planning, guided pathways, etc. There could be overlap between efforts to assess our governance and improving our communication and decision making processes. The RP group could help with gathering data (surveys, interviews, etc), then Dr Solano could help the college unpack the data we collect. Isaac also contacted David Morse, English instructor from Long Beach City College, and former president of ASCCC. Has integrity and has worked with Community Colleges. How do we pay for this? Maybe use money that governance committees have from the PRT (Planning Resource Team) process? Isaac mentioned looking at the options. Some of these processes might be moving more slowly than the speed of progress we'd like to see. Planning and communicating with 3<sup>rd</sup> party/outside vendors takes some time. Jordan (faculty tri-chair of Community and Communication) clarified that C&C's charge is to discuss how to assess our governance structure, and that decision making processes is a different item that the senate is discussing. Need to be clear about the different roles the different bodies have (this is in response to a comment that maybe the senate and C&C can both work with the RP group in regards to **how** we gather constituent data, need to be careful not to conflate C&C and senate's separate responsibilities). C&C will discuss how they'd like to approach their charge of assessing our governance structure.

Comment that maybe we should ask both ASCCC and also another entity to help assess and address our decision making concerns. Isaac shared that we want to be mindful not to duplicate efforts among different bodies. We want to avoid having our colleagues being asked the same questions by different bodies. We need to be respectful and not ask separate bodies to do the same work.

Isaac mentioned that if we work with an outside (3rd) party, this won't be a fast process. David brought up the need for a thorough job, not one that is fast with unrealistic solutions. We need to come up with a course of action to address decision making processes that works for us, and not quickly try and force actions that have been used elsewhere. We need to have a realistic timeline that allows for the proper communication and planning for this to work.

If we work with outside groups, senators requested that Academic Senate be involved in the planning of information gathering efforts. Kathryn asked if we need a formal motion to direct our officers to continue working on securing a third party to help us address/plan next steps for decision making processes. Isaac shared that it's clear the senate body wants the officers to continue 3<sup>rd</sup> party efforts, therefore a motion isn't needed. The body agreed.

Isaac asked the group, how we would want to address (construct) formal communication regarding how our constituents feel about how big picture decision making processes have been done. What we say and how we say it are the among the most important. Senate or a governance committee could write a memo to an office, to a person, or post on our website. Resolutions are another method. State of the Senate, where the Senate is coming from. A bill of particulars is another method, where a body lists what they would like to see happen. A memo is the shortest, a letter longer, a resolution will have specific writing, and a bill of particulars is more formal about specific asks.

Lisa shared that a division faculty requested that a survey of all faculty be taken to gather information and feedback before any final decision is made on direction by academic Senate. That would provide very concrete data. There was a comment that these methods of communication are very "structural". Isaac commented that if we're not clear about what we're asking for, our position wouldn't be strong.

Discussion about how best to spend senate time/efforts. Comments that working on communication that makes reference to the past, might not be the most helpful in terms of addressing such concerns, and planning for the future. Comment that it would still be helpful to be clear about how many faculty would have preferred that the campus handle decisions that were made. Overall consensus that our time/effort would be best served in focusing on next steps re: how best to plan out decision making processes we'd like to see, rather than spending time creating formal communication that looks back.

Decision making points that many faculty felt didn't adequately involve faculty early enough in the process: faculty prioritization, budget, campus restructuring, priority of resources, cutting classes. Part of the difficulty (with items in this list) is the speed at which information moves, and

how many different initiatives/efforts can often happen at the same time. Comments that a laundry list (trees) isn't as important as the forest, that there is an "overarching theme" here. Isaac asked that we decide how (where) we are going. Overall agreement that we need to look forward, and use our time in planning how to best address decision making processes in the future.

#### Updates from President Nguyen

Thuy announced Lunar New Year, and coming back from a meeting in Sacramento to speak with Academic Senate. She spoke about the previous Senate meeting, and about a meeting she held with the counselling division, then about decision making, and communication. Thuy welcomed communication with faculty, especially the counselling faculty, and discussed the decision around the assessment move, and the importance of being able to have uncomfortable discussions. She stated that stopping the move of the assessment center didn't stop the need to have the move in the first place. The discussion included the impact of AB 705 and the impact on the assessment center. Thuy described a hiring move in progress that should alleviate some of the difficulties. The next issue was communication, and she said that she's listening right now, and that if the Senate wants to send a letter, okay, but continuous dialog is better than a parliamentary process. The Parliament will have items for communication. Decision making seems to be a big issue for faculty, and where our point of frustration is, and specifically that we want to be involved early in an inclusive way. Thuy commented that for the budget reduction process, in years one and two, not too much change, but that there was communication with the unions during years one and two, but in year three, ACE asked not to release the list position reduction. Thuy wanted to release the list. When Judy Miner was faced with a similar set of decisions, she waited until the bumping process started (bumping analysis is a 2-3 month process). The other reason was that the FHDA-CCD board hadn't yet voted on the SRP (Supplemental Retirement Plan, and budget saving).

Thuy pointed out that the budget cutting process at Foothill and De Anza was very different. At Foothill, it was a "share and react process", but at De Anza, the method was to go directly to campus governance, which resulted in very specific program cuts. The Foothill method involved a deliberation process. Thuy asked if Foothill would prefer the process adopted by De Anza? Thuy suggested that the approach to follow the path of working with ACE was the best way. Thuy talked about an 8-9% cut in budget (\$6M) that resulted in only 0.5 classified staff being cut. But, there was significant pain in what we did. Thuy then talked about using outside people to help with internal process, and she mentioned working with David Morse (training) up and down the State. She commented that David Morse and Dr. Solano were both very skilled.

Comment that the take from Thuy was that Thuy felt the decision making process was "okay" but there could be room for improvement. Thuy commented that decision making has a foundation of trust and communication. One was to have guiding principles, and the other was to minimize impact. Thuy commented on program elimination, that it would make sense to create a process ahead of ever needing to use such a process, but that she didn't want to put

out any kind of message that we were considering program elimination at this time (because we aren't).

Comment made that when we look at decision making processes, the De Anza approach and the Foothill approach are not the only ways to go about decision making. Comment that finding somewhere in the middle in regards to how De Anza and Foothill went about budget reduction can also be an option.

Comment made referring to specific decision making points (hiring, prioritization, etc.) Thuy mentioned that she made faculty prioritization a shared governance process. She mentioned that in the past, some loss of (categorical) positions would be automatically rehired, without having a governance review. She talked about the importance of having an outside 3rd party help research and inform the college about how we're working, especially with the decision-making process. There are other regards about the counselling decision that were good to review. Thuy ended that she really wants to be of service, and is very open to getting input that will help her be a better leader.

Isaac asked how administration felt about having a 3<sup>rd</sup> party come in and help facilitate a process for us to create decision making processes. The senate is asking that we work to bring a 3<sup>rd</sup> party for help; where are admins on this? Thuy said she would prefer we address this concern internally, but would understand if the academic senate would want to bring a 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

Announcements:

Ben Stefoni requests that faculty announce the Research Symposium, a poster and presentation session in May, to all of our students.

Our next meeting is Monday February 10th. The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.