

# **The De Anza Academic Senate**

## **Approved Notes of the meeting of April 29th, 2013**

**Senators and Officers present:** Anderson-Watkins, Bryant, Chenoweth, Chow, Cruz, Donahue, Freeman, Glapion, Hanna, Kryliouk, Larson, Leonard, McCort, Mitchell, Mjelde, Schaffer, Setziol, Singh, Sullivan, Swanner, Tiwana, and Truong,

**Senators and Officers Absent:** Guevara, Hamilton, Lao, Singh, and VonMatt

**DASB: FA Liaison:** Laurel Torres

**Classified Senate: Curriculum Co Chair:**

**Administrative Liaison:** Rowena Tomaneng

**Director of Diversity, Social Justice, and Multicultural Ed.:**

**Guests:** Letha Jeanpierre, Brian Murphy

**Faculty and Staff Development:**

[NOTE: Item numbers are reflective of agenda numbers in the order they are actually taken up at the meeting.]

**The meeting was called to order at 2:34, a quorum being present.**

**I. Approval of Notes and Agenda:** The agenda was approved as distributed. The notes of the meeting of April 22nd were approved as distributed with the removal of spurious language.

**II. Needs and Confirmations:** Hanna passed around the sheet for Senators to sign up for hours monitoring the polling place for the Academic Senate election. As of the meeting time no candidate statements had been received.

**III. Tech Task Force Survey:** Mallory Newell projected and went over the 15 question survey of faculty said to be an inventory of what is in hand and what is wanted.

**IV. De Anza Values Task Force Update:** An update of the 1990 statement, last used significantly in 2010, is timely. The existing document contains 20 statements and the goal of the current task force is to reduce the number to perhaps four or five broader statements without necessarily discarding the intent of the 20 statements. After the task force completes a draft, it will be widely circulated and presented for feedback. At the end of the presentation, Chow asked the group to consider hosting a “fun social event” at which faculty would be asked to respond to the draft and Newell announced plans to have a “Public Wall” where the draft plus comments would be visible to all and available for further comment.

**VII: Credit by Exam:** Chow asked for and received permission to take up the item early and out of order. She began by listing a series of abbreviations and explained them because these had apparently confused the discussion of the Item April 22<sup>nd</sup>. She then characterized her approach to the item as “starting over.”

At this point the item was interrupted by the appearance of guest presenter Letha Jeanpierre.

**VI. District Budget Update:** Letha Jeanpierre was present to give a comprehensive and detailed account of the college and District budget situation which, despite improving news from the State, was characterized as not good. She began by distributing two documents, one titled “2013-14 Budget Preview Chart” and one titled “B-Budget Analysis FY 2013-14. She then said that a new structural deficit has appeared from two sources. One is a continuing decline in enrollment, especially at Foothill College and the other a very long and growing list of items which have been funded year after year from fund balances instead of being line items in B budgets. The second of these two creates a misimpression of funds available for discussion since, although a large amount money first appears as fund balance, \$1.8M of it is already committed to the items on the list (which she read and which appeared to be populated entirely by non controversial demands for funds).

**V. Materials Fees Update:** Jeanpierre was also the presenter of this item. She distributed a document from Marissa Spatafore titled “Materials Fees Elimination and Alternatives received just before the meeting. The biggest surprise for most people was the revelation that “materials available solely or exclusively in the District” did not qualify for the use of materials fees. She and College President Brain Murphy made it abundantly clear that the action to stop collecting most materials fees was entirely a result of audit exceptions suffered by the college, one for excessive balances in materials fees accounts (meaning that, at a minimum, students were being overcharged) and one for not being able to tie the fees collected to materials distributed to the students who paid the fees. Both Jeanpierre and Murphy stated that they realized that it was a great concern on the part of faculty and that they were working with departments and divisions to find solutions including alternative means of delivering like content. Chow announced that she has begun and will continue to work with faculty to come up with an estimate of what costs might remain after alternatives are examined and adopted as appropriate.

**BACK TO VII. Credit by Exam:** Chow distributed a document created by her organizing and showing different policy and procedure language pertaining to credit by exam. As discussion went on it became clear that some in the group

wanted to proceed to action without further discussion, in part because the number of students affected was small while others in the group wanted to hear a full account and consider what sounded like an increasing number of factors to take into account. As the time for discussion was ending, it was suggested that Renee Augenstein be invited to speak to the issue of how many units of credit by exam were transportable from De Anza to various four year institutions.

**IX. ASCCC Spring Plenary Report:** The item was held over due to lack of time.

**X. Good of the Order** – Flyers for “Teaching and Learning Workshops for De Anza Faculty”, “Fly By Workshops”, and “frE uR tXbks!” were distributed.  
- Sullivan announced a blood drive Wednesday, May 1<sup>st</sup>.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4: 35**