

## Academic Senate Minutes December 7, 2020

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

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

2. Roll call

### Executive Committee

Kathryn Maurer (President)  
Eric Kuenhl (Vice President)  
Robert Cormia  
(Secretary/Treasurer)  
Abhiraj Muhar (**absent**)  
Alexis Aguilar  
Brian Murphy (**absent**)  
Cara Miyasaki (**absent**)  
David Marasco  
David McCormick  
Dixie Macias

Donna Frankel  
Jordan Fong  
Kerri Ryer  
Mary Anne Sunseri  
Mary Thomas  
Matthew Litrus  
Milissa Carey  
Mimi Overton  
Rachelle Campbell (**absent**)  
Rita O'Loughlin  
Stephanie Chan  
Tracee Cunningham (**absent**)  
Voltaire Villanueva

### Senate Liaisons

Carolyn Holcroft  
John Fox  
Josh Pelletier  
Kristy Lisle (**absent**)  
Kurt Hueg  
Melissa Cervantes

### Guests

Laurie Scolari  
Katy Ripp  
Sam Connell  
Valerie Fong

3. The agenda was adopted by consensus. Minutes from the November 30<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved by consensus.

4. Public comment: Karen Chow asked if any announcement had gone out about flex days for Winter & Spring, and none has.

5. Governance Updates: Kathryn spoke about a bigger picture conversation between the Senate officers, Thuy and Simon, regarding the governance structure, and the role of Academic Senate. Kathryn commented that we're in a year of assessing our new governance structure as part of the mid-term report for accreditation, and it's an opportunity to look at how to take our governance structure to the next level; a "growth" moment. Moment of looking at how our governance is working. There is a governance survey that has been sent to the entire campus, important to complete it. Kathryn shared that it hasn't really been addressed in our new governance structure what should happen when 10+1 items are on an agenda for one of the Councils. It's not clear how our board policy and Academic Senate constitution integrate with the governance structure. The Senate Officers and Thuy have agreed to request a Collegiality in Action visit from ASCCC, which will take place either in January, February or March. This will be a presentation; all members of Academic Senate and others in governance councils and administration will be invited to attend.

One senator asked what was the context for the visit and these discussions. Kathryn explained that on a number of different occasions there have been differing understandings of what 10+1 items should come through Academic Senate for approval/recommendation, and which ones can be considered "approved" by Academic Senate via approval by a governance council, and also then what the role of Senate-appointed reps are on the governance councils. There are different board policies for the relationship of classified staff and students in governance than there are for faculty and collegial consultation with the Academic Senate, and it will be very helpful to get some more clarity as we go forward.

Kathryn then shared the Return to Campus discussion from Friday's R&R meeting (no R&R reps were present). The result of the R&R meeting was a vote to approve a fifth governance council, which would be called an [Emergency Operations Council](#). It would include 1-2 reps appointed from each senate, and 1 administrator, and staffed by an ex-officio operations team. It will meet for 60-90 minutes every other week during winter quarter. Kathryn said Thuy has now asked the presidents of each senate to approve, and Kathryn is seeking counsel on whether she can approve or if it needs Exec Committee approval. Kerri asked about jurisdiction and the time length of the council.

Advisory council also met on Friday. Approved a change to send Equity 2.0 to the Board in February, and not December. Kathryn also shared Advisory Council's discussion of faculty prioritization, and some of the challenges in how to create one ranking among different "types" of faculty positions, e.g instructional vs. student services. Advisory Council also debriefed the 2019-20 program review presentations, which they heard in October & November.

Kerri gave a COOL update, and said they're actively discussing many cool topics in COOL (haha), and reminded everyone that we should activate (not the same thing as publishing) our classes so that students will know they're in the right class.

6. Student letter - students wanted a formal response by December 11th, Senate executive would vote to approve the response to students. Kathryn mentioned that our student liaisons confirmed the student letter has been approved by ASFC. The ad hoc workgroup incorporated constituent feedback on [the document](#). Academic Senate recognized that the student letter highlighted barriers that might slow our response to equity work. Other issues were also raised, e.g. how to prioritize this work?

How do we foster a collaborative spirit in responding to the letter, as well as a lack of blame? Kathryn asked for responses and edits. Comments by senators expressed sentiments that the draft response was thorough, and very much appreciated how it handled complexity and clarity of the issues. No edits were requested.

Alexis Aguilar moved to approve the student letter and seconded by Jordan Fong, 15 yes votes, 0 No votes. The group empowered Kathryn to draft the response in the form of a letter to the students before the December 11<sup>th</sup> deadline.

7. Equity 2.0. Kathryn pointed out the link to the latest document, a phenomenal update to the last version. The senate will review the document and move to enact the strategies outlined in the document. The Senate's strategy is to treat today as a first read, our first meeting in January (1/11) as a second read, with really final opportunity with any extensive feedback that might be incorporated, in anticipation of a final vote on 1/25 in time to bring to the board for the February 1 board meeting. Would like to start review with Part 1, and then move into a deeper read of issues & goals of Part 2.

Donna Frankel discussed the experience of a black faculty member being on campus. But that the prejudice she feels as a P/T faculty member is much stronger than that of being black. There were comments about the practical and philosophical elements of the document, and comments about the systemic change framework.

There was a question about who the document was written for, and the challenge of all the different audiences that encompass "the campus community." Other Q&A focused on the

question of “why center race,” even when looking at other “populations” (disabilities, job class etc.), still disproportional impact seen with race. That said, Kathryn shared that she has been hearing feedback with a desire to continue the conversation of intersectionality of race and other factors that may lead to disproportional impact, e.g. gender, sexual orientation, class, disability, veteran, status, etc., and recognizes the value of centering our equity plan on race while not losing the campus desire to talk more broadly about equity.

Another question was raised about how to understand the part of the new Equity plan that discusses "structural change" (pp. 16-19). Some constituents voiced a desire for more particulars on how structural change would be enacted, and requested clarification/guidance on how to think about the extent to which this question could be addressed in the new equity plan, in its "strategic" scope. If these matters lie outside of the document's scope, then how does the plan foster continued discussion of these questions?

No other comments about Part 1.

Began discussion of Part 2 in the Progress section with issue #1. Many disciplines perpetuate the myth that they are “objective” and race neutral. There was discussion of epistemology of knowledge, and discipline content being created in oppressive structure. Many disciplines perpetuate and resist the challenge (assertion) of being race neutral.

There was discussion about faculty evaluation, performance evaluation, and the goal of improvement vs perfectionism. Carolyn commented that Title V is regulation, and educational code is law. Melissa said the equity office would look at the issue of part-time faculty participation, and that the document is addressed to the campus community.

8. (no discussion of Guided Pathways due to lack of time)

9. A few announcements shared for the good of the order.

10. Meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.