1 Call to Order
n/a
2 Introductions
n/a
3 Public Comment
- Numerous people have expressed intense dismay re: AFT endorsement of Richard Holober over Tom Mohr--process was the focus. Everything was fine in following the process, but there was no professional courtesy. Essentially, the feedback was not solicited in a way and many feel unheard.
  - Monica: AFT did support Richard Holober, but not over Tom Mohr.
    - Hyla: But AFT could also endorse Tom Mohr? Monica: potentially, yes
  - Monica: only COPE members (who directly give money for political endorsement) money went to Holober's campaign. Every COPE member receives emails on the campaigns.
  - Paul Naas' letter on this topic: no thorough due diligence re: their stance on this decision. All candidates need to have the same opportunity to present themselves, and they didn't. Holober asked for an endorsement before Mohr, and that was the decision made; not fair. Need the opportunity to present their case to the AFT members in a well-publicized forum; instead, was done at last mtg of academic year when many fac are not paying attention. Formally requesting that the AFT 1493 EC suspend the endorsement and approach this properly.
  - Doniella: at the mtg, there was no mention of Mohr running; only knew of Holober. That is why the vote went as it did, seemingly democratically. It is fair to ask AFT 1493 EC to reconsider this; will bring this information and sentiment back to the EC. But please remain collegial in discussing this.

4 Senate Business
4.1 What is Academic Senate?
- AS Website, Agendas, Meetings
  - Meetings 2nd and 4th Thursdays, 2:10-4:10pm, 2-10
- Members
  - Each division has a representatives; check the site for more info
  - Curriculum Chairs and PD Rep serves
  - President, VP, Treasurer, Secretary
- What we do?
  - 10+1 duties
    - Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
    - Degree and certificate requirements
    - Grading policies
    - Educational Program Development
    - Standards/policies regarding student preparation and success
    - District and college governance as related to faculty roles
    - Faculty roles/involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
    - Policies for faculty professional development activities
    - Processes for program review
    - Processes for institutional planning and budget development
    - Plus one: other academic/professional matters

4.2 Faculty Survey results

- Results are on ASGC site --> mtgs
- Stats
  - 59 respondents
  - Transparency: divided opinions
  - Inclusion of fac/staff in evals of admins: very low, but many answered na
  - Need to eval admins anonymously: very high (48/59 v.imp.)
  - Should admins be able to select their own evaluators: none/minimal
  - Importance of ability to eval admins: very important
  - Decision-making rating: middle
  - Course offerings decisions: middle
  - Decision making re: course cancellations: middle-high, but many n/a
    - Doug Hirzel: we did have an agreement with previous VPI/Deans re: process-- but they are all gone. May need to revisit this with current admins, esp. with respect to FTEF allocations.
      - Hyla: Yes, in upcoming mtg we will revisit this process and address this
  - Decision making re: budgeting: many n/a, scattered responses
  - Access to info re: budget: middle, but many n/a
  - Explanations of why aspects of budget are not available to faculty: low
  - Institutional memory: scattered
  - Collegial working relationships btw Pres and fac: mid-high, but many n/a
  - "" btw VPs and fac: scattered and n/a
  - "" btw Deans and fac: high!
  - "" fac and fac: high
  - "" fac and staff: high
  - support for fac: mid-high
  - support from Pres: scattered, many n/a
  - how to improve support from Pres: high is decision-making processes
  - Support received from VPs: low, many n/a
  - how to improve support from VPs: everything
  - support from deans: v. high
  - how to improve support: many n/a, decision-making processes well represented
  - support from fac: high
  - hiring procedures: middle
  - appropriateness of VPs/Pres in 1st round interviews of hiring comts: scattered, many low and many mid
  - hiring priorities: high
- Will revisit this at early Sept mtg, and look for actions to be taken
  - Suggestion: future surveys, have an option for "Don't Know/Not Enough Information"

4.3 How to handle for action before AS meets?

- Go to meetings to make your voice heard
- In between meetings, division reps work with constituents (all fac in division)
  - for first mtg, how else do we capture that representation? Bring ideas
  - Overall, looking for guidance at critical points
    - Suggestion: Digital solution--alerts?
      - Need to hone this, figure out what is crucial
      - Including emails in the mtg minutes as part of public comment, getting things on the record
      - Hyla will solicit feedback re: helpful or not to hone topics in

- Suggestion: revisit policies that have already been established for certain things (i.e. grants)--remind admin that we have policies in place, so use them
- Suggestion: there is a re-training of admin needed--there is a culture of assumption of approval, so long as they go to all participatory governance bodies--need to reinforce the need for representatives to discuss with constituents and report back.
  - Added suggestion: need to revisit participatory governance representations so that the same people are not cross-populated onto all other groups
- Ideas: iterative process, but fit to bureaucracy

4.4 Future items for AS

5 Other Reports