

students to build a larger coalition. Six students comprise the effort right now, but hoping to grow organically. Abhi commented that the letter to the Senate is a living document.

One senator talked about discussions to give students have more than an advisory vote on the Board of Trustees and at our governance councils. Another senator commented about the word or mentioned that these are a dozen significant conversations that students have, another senator commented that student perspective is the best voice for change on campus.

Kathryn commented about the importance of having a dialog that was siloed. Kathryn then asked for constituent feedback, summarized here:

Mary Thomas (Library): commented that although she didn't get direct feedback from constituents, the students' letter is already informing our work:

- ◁ We are developing a guide to financial literacy resources.
- ◁ When considering a return to campus and how to respond to students who don't comply with safety protocols, we recognize that we need an alternative to calling the campus police.

Mary Anne Sunseri (P/T rep) shared the following points:

Comments of Concern:

- ◁ Interested in having a dialogue, but the letter does not encourage dialogue
- ◁ Do the students represent the entirety or majority of the student body? (Abhi addressed this)
- ◁ Mandatory training, quarterly review of all curricula are impractical
- ◁ Should we have only one focus for all classes taught at the college?
- ◁ perspective of the instructor?
- ◁ Anonymous letters: worried about punitive action
- ◁ Concern about faculty diversity and self-replication. Needs to be a state level and selection lottery.
- ◁ Opposition to reimagining campus safety if it means completely removing campus safety, as it will require elevated measures for self-defense (this was also addressed)

Comments of Support:

Tracee Cunningham (Counseling): shared that there was a lot of support for the letter. She also shared that there was concern about the Return to Campus discussions that not enough focus had yet been given to student services coming back.

Kerri Ryer (BSS) received a lot of feedback, much or most of it positive. She read a bulleted list:

- < There is some concern about viability of the ethnic studies classes, given low enrollment in past courses (example American government from a Black perspective).
- < Lack of funding for ES program
- < BSS has had a negative experience with past interdisciplinary curriculum projects that have been unsuccessful, so would like to see this go differently
- < Wondering about the inclusion of ethnic studies content in current offerings
- < Limited capabilities of AS ana 612 72 r0 g0 G3.o10 g0 2078Jt05(c)(d)-11()5(l)-4(i)-4(k)23inWThject5(

Kathryn suggested that our dialog could shape our response to the letter, and what is in our power to do as an Academic Senate? We can definitely consider authoring resolutions, both for items in 10+1 and in support of other actions outside of Senate purview. But are there other things we can and want to be doing as well?

in STEM, and that in a room full of students, how many are people of color or women in a STEM field?

Other questions included: how do we bring in the administration for the decision making.

There was a student comment that the Academic Senate can do much more than resolutions, but that resolutions do make a difference.

7. Ethnic Studies. Kathryn introduced the topic by asking for constituent feedback that may have been cut off at the Oct. 12 meeting, before hearing and update from the faculty leads, and finalizing the two new committees.

Donna commented that she heard from (adjunct?) faculty interested in teaching within the ethnic studies department. Also the ethnic studies class will be required for graduation. She said one comment was a question about whether or not a faculty member teaching the course had to a faculty member of color. There were some different perspective shared by the student authors of the letter, including the need to prioritize faculty of color teaching ethnic studies classes.

There were comments about a department or division being created for ethnic studies. There was a comment about the need to prioritize the formation of an ethnic studies division so it gets done this year.

David Marasco shared the written proposals to create the [two new ad hoc ethnic studies committees](#). The Steering Committee might meet on Friday afternoons. David invites anyone interested in joining the Advisory Committee to send him an email. Debbie Lee mentioned that this is a requirement for the CSUs, and thanked the faculty and curriculum body for their work to get this to happen.

8. Board policies. , in updating board policies and academic procedures , and moving things to the District Academic Senate, The Academic sory Council (CAC) and ultimately for Board approval. Changes may come locally from a need identified at one of the Colleges, or come from the State, and communicated to the Senates via Paula Norsell.

A required change came from California Community College League CCLC, based on a new title 5 requirement. This needs to be approved by the

December 5th Board Meeting. Kathryn asked for feedback on the credit for prior learning. There was a comment about the language being somewhat general, but that is required to get it through the board meeting quickly, acknowledging there are very important logistics to be

members of this task force were OK with the language of the BP/AP for now to have us be in compliance.

10. Kathryn spoke about the need to add two more meetings to get all of our work done this quarter. David Marasco moved that we add two additional meetings into the fall quarter, with the dates of October 5th (on a Wednesday) and November 11th (on a Friday). The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment asked Senate officers to look to see if P/T reps can get paid a bit more. 15 votes yes, 0 votes no.

11. Governance Updates. Kathryn reminded the group that this is now a standing item on every agenda to increase transparency about where campus decisions

DRAFT