

## Academic Senate Draft Minutes August 25, 2020

Meeting called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Roll call:

Isaac Escoto (President)  
Eric Kuehnl (Vice President)  
Robert Cormia (Secretary treasurer)  
Kathryn Maurer (President-elect)  
Cara Miyasaki (STEM/BHS)  
David Marasco (STEM/PSME)  
Donna Frankel (Part time faculty rep)  
Robert Hartwell (FA/COMM) - not attending  
Amy Edwards (FA liaison)  
Stephanie Chan (LA)  
Jordan Fong (FA/COMM)  
David McCormick (LA)  
Milissa Carey (FA/COMM)  
Sara Cooper (STEM/BHS)  
John Fox (BSS)  
Dixie Macias (PE/Athletics)  
Mary Thomas (Library)

Guests:

Josh Pelletier (Classified Senate President)  
Christina Rotsides (STEM/PSME)  
Carolyn Brown (FA/COMM)  
Hilary Gomes (FA/COMM)

Public comment - acknowledgement of impact of fires on our staff, and recognition and thanks for the efforts by Cal Fire in the CZU August Lightning event.

Agenda was adopted by consensus, Minutes were also approved by consensus (Mary Thomas abstaining). There was nothing on the consent calendar.

AC/RR meeting updates - Isaac mentioned that President Nguyen shared that in addition to the \$4.25 M reduction this year, an anticipated reduction of an additional ~ 400K dollars from the Student Equity and Achievement funds (SEA)

Mention about a non-instructional program reduction/discontinuation procedure and criteria document, built off of the instructional version of the document created by the academic senate. Categorical include SEA (Student Equity and Achievement).

Josh Pelletier (Classified Senate President) talked about classified staff taking the document from the Academic Senate and editing it (as mentioned above). Josh commented that all bargaining units will be involved in the budget reduction conversations, so it's good to have a classified voice discussing these documents and ideas.

There was a comment about why we removed the strategic vision portion from the program reduction/discontinuation criteria, and as part of the response AC/R&R will set aside time at the next Monday morning meeting to discuss strategic goals of the College.

Kathryn asked who will be leading the strategic visioning discussion, how will that look like? Isaac answered that this wasn't clear. Sara commented that Thuy was asked to be more involved with sharing her strategic vision for the college.

Comment about cuts in non-instructional funds as well. One approach, suggested by Brian Evans, was to evenly cut costs all across campus, but that idea wasn't met with enthusiasm.

There was a meeting to form a study group to talk about the future of the bookstore, potentially a "hybrid model" (physical and web presence). The district is putting together an RFP (request for proposal) for vendors to offer what that might look like. There is representation from De Anza, and our faculty, to ensure that students and faculty will have what they need for student success.

There were comments about departments going over to OER, and how that would inform discussions about the bookstore. Will we make it easier for faculty to adopt books and other learning materials? We need a vision of a "future college" to help drive this decision.

### **Program Reduction Process Discussion**

What have division senators heard from their division faculty? There was a comment about the movement (impulse) to move towards a basic aid funding model, and how is that integrated into the program elimination model?

There was a comment from one senator about "pushback" not to reduce instructional faculty, and reference to Tim Shively's letter. Isaac commented that administration has not stated we are being intentional about moving to basic aid status. Isaac added that continuing to cut sections has a negative effect on enrollment, which has made some folks question whether the district is intentionally moving towards basic aid.

There was a comment that we're not quite sure if we (faculty) are getting a completely honest answer on the question about Basic Aid from the FHDA-CCD administration. There was a

question about what program reduction might look like with a total \$4 million budget reduction at Foothill. Isaac commented that we're still soliciting feedback. There was further comment that it's been difficult to get a consistent set of numbers (data and facts) about the budget reduction process. Further comment that whenever "we" ask about basic aid, we are told that enrollment decline (and not budget reductions) are driving us towards basic aid.

Kathryn commented on three different steps to get to the budget reduction process.

Step one: why these cuts, and why this magnitude?

Step two: if cuts are real (necessary) what are efficiencies that we could deploy, including consolidation?

Step three: after all approaches to efficiency and consolidation have been exhausted, then and only then go to program reduction and/or elimination

Isaac mentioned our request to create an enrollment management committee. There was a comment that Basic Aid could mean serving fewer students, but that might actually bring better outcomes for our students, i.e., a lower student to instructor ratio.

Comment (question) that basic aid and student enrollment are not the same as our current situation. We are in "hold harmless" mode that protects us from budget funding reductions, even as enrollment declines. But right now, getting more students wouldn't immediately help us out, we'd need years of good enrollment to bring us back up, and we're actually heading towards basic aid with decreasing enrollment. But even if we get to basic aid, we wouldn't be deep enough into basic aid to see benefits from lower class size. We would need to go much lower in enrollment to realize benefits from basic aid status and fewer students (it's a ratio).

Need to talk about next steps for the instructional document. What do we do next (procedurally)? Comment that we could fine tune the document to death - and what is the makeup of a larger committee to look at the document, and will there be a place at the table for students?

Turning to the "consolidation effort", a question was asked about the makeup of "that afternoon group." A question was asked, what data might you be able to get from IR? Kristy took the document as a data request and did a run through Institutional Research (IR). It was then asked who's in the room? Instructional deans, Teresa Ong, Lene Whitley-Putz, Senate officers, two FA reps, but no classified staff.

There were a number of questions - what is the consolidation group doing? There were a number of questions about what was going on in the consolidation group. What is the goal/outcome of the group?

Comment that the consolidation meeting has been mostly brainstorming, just to prepare for a consolidation meeting with De Anza, which has yet to be scheduled. There was comment and

concerns about what has been discussed, but praise for what the deans have brought to the meeting.

If we do end up having to make deep cuts, this small group could be a starting point, and the conversations that are taking place are productive in considering consolidation. There was a question about where athletics fits? Comment that the “afternoon group” shouldn’t be discussing program reduction of any type, but is a great place to be talking about consolidation efforts, feasibility, etc. We should not be charged with coming up with any kind of list.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next meeting is September 1st 9:30 to 11:00 a.m.