

Academic Senate Minutes February 10, 2020

Meeting called to order at 2:02 p.m.

The agenda was adopted by consensus. David Marasco will chair the election / nomination committee. Division reps please get the word out about positions that are open; Senate president, Secretary-treasurer, and one P/T faculty representative. Isaac clarified that at the last senate meeting, we agreed to approve COOL being the body to approve our local Peer Online Course Review (POCR) process, for the purposes of CVC-OEI process. The body agreed.

#### Public announcements:

Robert Cormia shared that a number of his students have recently corresponded with him about feeling ill, some fearing infection by coronavirus, and one student fearing that other students would view her illness as potentially being coronavirus. Robert urged faculty to be mindful with attendance, if that becomes a reason for a student with a disease, especially influenza, to come to campus while sick and potentially contagious. He also advised faculty to be aware and sensitive to students, especially Asian (Chinese) who may be stigmatized because of the outbreak of coronavirus in China.

Consent calendar - Radiologic technology search committee (Rachelle Campbell and Melissa Wu) and art history search committee (Kate Jordahl and Andy Ruble). The consent calendar was adopted by consensus. The minutes from the January 27th meeting were approved by consensus. Donna Frankel volunteered to be on the selection committee for the Alumni Hall of Fame event.

#### Regular business

- ASCCC outreach and potential visit
- C&C effort to assess effectiveness
- Faculty prioritization
- Student affairs office
- Equity strategic plan

Per senate request, Isaac has been in communication with ASCCC regarding a campus visit to find out about how other CCC campuses have address similar decision making concerns. ASCCC will send Cheryl Aschenbach (likely with a 2nd person). She will come to our n

party to help gather data/survey our campus colleagues about the governance structure, then the senate can maybe partner with C&C and add questions that would help us address our work re: campus decision making procedures.

David asked what we'd have to do to conduct a survey, and what it would take to get the survey going. This wouldn't be quick, it would probably take weeks (to work with the RP group). What, how, why, and who. Comment that we need to do it the right way, and not rush. We will have ASCCC attend our meeting 2/24, so we are making progress with our efforts re: campus decision making concerns. Information gathering will take effort.

### **Faculty prioritization discussion**

Procedurally, the last couple of years this (deans) meeting has had attendance from key faculty. Deans at the meeting initially present and advocate for a faculty position in another division. Paul Starer ment

Paul Starer proposed forming a task force regarding faculty prioritization procedure for future years. Mention of support for the idea of having a joint task force on the prioritization, and comment this would be great to be working with the administration on this effort. Comment that it might be helpful to plan for the prioritization to happen in November, and then work backwards from there (procedurally).

Motion was made that the Academic Senate work with the office of instruction to create a faculty prioritization task force. The motion was approved unanimously. Kathryn Maurer has been vocal about the need to do this, and would want to be involved. David Marasco volunteered to serve, so Isaac, Kathryn and David will serve on the task force. Kristy also offered to have some stipend money available if the work carried on into the summer.

Mary Thomas mentioned the existing rubric (faculty prioritization tool) is designed around instructional faculty, but not as much for the library. Sara mentioned the faculty prioritization tool also wasn't very focused for CTE. Comment that the current faculty prioritization tool isn't well designed to support student service requests.

Sara mentioned that faculty are somewhat confused about how the prioritization data (rubric) is being gathered and interpreted, and Kristy mentioned that the new program review data may be able to assist in this process; maybe we can have program review data automatically populate for prioritization use.

Sara clarified that faculty aren't always sure about why questions are being asked on the faculty prioritization tool. The needs of the campus shift from year to year. Amber La Piana received considerable input from division faculty regarding the current faculty prioritization tool:

The ethnic data for the English dept is inaccurate--it's collected by an algorithm that doesn't necessarily take into account bi/multiracial/ethnic identities  
There is a question about the rationale for grouping success rates for Native American, Asian, Pacific Islander, and white students together, with particular concern about misrepresenting and under-serving the especially vulnerable Native American population. There is also a concern with the "Asian" designation and a request that more specific designations be used for Chinese, Japanese and other "east" Asian countries as well as Indian, Pakistan, and other "south" Asian countries.  
Another comment had to do with the questions about "Service Learning," since President Nguyen has made a distinction between service learning and service leadership. Consistency would be appreciated--perhaps an institutional definition--as well as institutional support for service learning/leadership initiatives--perhaps a coordinator, especially if it is part of the criteria for prioritizing hires.

**Leticia Muldonado: Role of dean of student affairs office**

process, grievance process, student contracts, smart shop, student affairs, associated, leadership courses, new student orientation, commencement. Serves as a resource to students, staff and faculty. Leticia commented that many faculty want to know “how the loop gets closed” with various faculty / student affairs issues. Maxient is the reporting software, and faculty are interested in how to see the (non-confidential) outcomes of many interactions.

Leticia asked how to best communicate with faculty. As mentioned above, many faculty have requested ongoing communication from her office. She asked Isaac if she could have ongoing report outs at senate, and Isaac clarified that the senate is trying not to spend time doing ongoing report outs, as there are many discussion/action items that the senate is looking to focus meeting time on. However, Isaac thanked Leticia for hearing a faculty concern, and quickly contacting the senate re: how best to address such concern.

David asked if C&C could help create lists of faculty email

Scholarship readers - Jordan Fong volunteered. Kristy commented that Foothill representatives will be visiting the Santa Clara County jail, to see if any curricular partnerships could be made. Offer for faculty to join the visit. ESLL faculty are interested; request that they get in contact with Kristy for details.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.