

Academic Senate Approved Minutes November 9, 2020

#'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

Alexis Aguilar

Rachelle Campbell

Milissa Carey

Stephanie Chan

Tracee Cunningham

Jordan Fong

Donna Frankel

Mathew Litrus

Dixie Macias

Cara Miyasaki

David Marasco

Rita O'Loughlin

Mimi Overton

Kerri Ryer

Mary Anne Sunseri

Mary Thomas

Voltaire Villanueva

Senate Liaisons

John Fox (FA liaison)

Kurt Hueg

Carolyn Holcroft

Melissa Cervantes

Abhiraj Muhar

Guests

Laura Gamez

Laurie Scolari

Priya Vasu

3. Agenda was approved by consensus. The minutes from November 2nd were corrected to read student scholarships authorized at \$1,000 per category, \$500 per student. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. There was no public comment.

5. The consent calendar (Senate [appointments](#)) was approved by consensus. Amy Edwards was appointed to the search hiring committee Vice chancellor HR. Mary Thomas was added as Program Review Reader. There will be a Return to Campus study group - a few faculty positions will be needed for that.

6. Governance Updates:

1) C&C (Community & Communication Council): Faculty tri-chair Laura Gamez spoke about all the activities that C&C is working on, including an assessment of governance and working with R&R (Revenue & Resources) on Measure G funding projects. They are also tasked with providing more definition to service leadership. Kathryn asked about the scope of the governance assessment, if it was just focused on the four councils, or if it included all governance groups, such as the senates, and Laura said she wasn't sure. Kathryn also asked if there would be an opportunity for Academic Senate to review the assessment plan, and Laura said she would find out. C&C's next meeting is on November 20th.

2) DDEAC (District Diversity & Equity Advisory Committee): Jordan Fong shared an update from the DDEAC meeting with Dr. Joy DeGruy, as a follow-up to opening day, where he served as a proxy for Kathryn, who was unable to attend. There are plans for the year to do a Deep Dive, empathy interviews, and conversations with students. There was also discussion about the creation of a Green Book, which would list faculty who best serve students of color. Jordan

expressed his concerns that this could create a rift between faculty, and was not sure who

10. Kathryn acknowledged that we are not going to have enough time today to dedicate to discussing the student's letter, so she will bring it back next week, but she did want to allow for an opportunity for any division rep who was ready to share constituent feedback today to do so.

Alexis Aguilar shared the response from BSS faculty to the student letter:

- Only a few students wrote the letter who may not be representative of the student body as a whole.
Why has the administration not responded to the letter?
- Democratic processes not being followed such as the curriculum process
Faculty in Sociology department have not been approached
Sociology has Social Justice AD-T
No concern about what has already been done in terms of ES at BSS
Only a small group of faculty appears to be making the decisions
- No data driven analysis is being done to inform our policies and direction
We need to look at data about diversity and student success

- The mandatory training seemed problematic to one colleague – Who would provide it? By what methods? How would it be enforced?
- Conversation about dismantling the police force – One colleague wanted statistics to back up the anecdotal evidence, but another confirmed they knew of both students and faculty who'd had problems with the police. In any case, this will affect library services, for example, how we'll enforce safety protocols when the library eventually re-opens.
- What kind of response are the students looking for since the governance bodies are mostly advisory?

Two of the student authors addressed a number of the above points, especially that the letter may have been seen as “harsh,” which is not the intention but also unapologetic as it is seen that it is high time that we addressed these issues. Other comments included that the intent of the letter is to generate dialogue and saying one doesn't have a response to some of the points can also be a response. There was also concern that why would a letter from a select set of students not be taken as seriously as a letter from ASFC, this in itself demonstrates an issue, if we wouldn't even be discussing the letter if we hadn't realized it wasn't coming from ASFC. How can a student be heard?

Kathryn talked about how

Kathryn suggested that division reps may want to think about responses to the student letter in the context of Equity 2.0. Carolyn reminded this was a strategic plan, not an action plan, and many of the issues brought forward in the student letter require actions. Melissa mentioned that there is also an [anonymous feedback form](#).

12. Kathryn mentioned a few announcements

The withdrawal policy is back to normal for fall, this Friday 13th is the formal deadline to drop the class with a W. Tomorrow ASFC will have a town hall at noon to talk about the election.