Faculty of Color to Board of Trustees

The following letter, signed by 37 Foothill College faculty of color, was submitted to the Faculty Association for publication in the FA News. It was one of many testimonials that informed the Board’s decision not to renew the contract of Foothill President Thuy Nguyen. Moving forward, the organizers of the letter urge Foothill faculty to emerge from our silos, and to work together with students, classified staff members, and administrators to rebuild our college into one where expertise from every constituency is recognized, valued, and implemented to provide the best learning environment.

Happy Halloween
outcomes for our students.

Dear Board of Trustees:

We write and speak to you as Foothill College faculty of color supporting a vote of no confidence in President Thuy Nguyen. In doing so, we address harmful narratives that ignore the equity efforts of both faculty of color and white faculty on campus while creating a damaging tension between student leaders and faculty.

We appreciate and understand the desire for organizations such as the NAACP, VAPW, and others to support Thuy as a professional woman of color in a position of power because we recognize that institutional inequities, racism, and unconscious bias are a reality that so many women of color in leadership roles face. However, we reject the idea that this vote of no confidence is a result of such realities.

This vote of no confidence is a direct consequence of nearly three years of good-faith, exhaustive, ultimately unsuccessful attempts by the Academic Senate to communicate with and find understanding with President Thuy Nguyen.

For those unfamiliar with the structure and role of Academic Senate, it is important to note that the Academic Senators represent various faculty constituencies throughout campus, and it has recently added voting roles for students and classified staff; the voice is not just the select few who hold positional power in the senate.

We understand that President Nguyen has cultivated powerful mentor relationships with some of Foothill’s exceptional students; we value unquestioningly the reality of those experiences. We note that the student leadership experience and the faculty experience are not mutually exclusive; however, President Nguyen can and has treated these two constituencies differently. Just as we honor the students’ truths, we ask them to do the same for us, and reflect upon the future of an educational institution where the faculty no longer trust this president.

There exists a narrative that the faculty and Senate stand in the way of equity at Foothill College. This narrative silences multiple voices of faculty of color as presented in this letter, their equity work, and that of their allies. An example is the transformative move forward of the recent establishment of Ethnic Studies. Senate leadership worked closely with both faculty of color and students to navigate the processes, leading to a program that will be a cornerstone to decolonizing the curriculum, and essential to equity at Foothill.

Fundamentally counter to President Nguyen’s account of a no-confidence vote as a deployment of racial privilege and power, all of the principal faculty of color who have painstakingly and successfully written and guided the Ethnic Studies curriculum are signers on the no-confidence resolution, and on this letter.

Many faculty of color who are in support of this vote of no confidence in President Nguyen have struggled with the decision because we do value the cultural wealth that Thuy brings to the table, and as stated earlier, we recognize the ways women of color must face so many inequitable realities in the professional world. Many of us have worked with Thuy in more positive contexts as well. But ultimately, it is her refusal to come to the table and dialogue meaningfully with Senate leadership and be accountable to her actions that lead us to this unfortunate conclusion. As faculty dedicating our lives and professional energies to equity and success of all students, we respectfully offer this letter as a means to document a more accurate narrative about this vote of no confidence.

President’s Report
A Slow Return on a Forward Investment
Tim Shively

Given the reports the Faculty Association routinely hears from other California Community College faculty unions in the Bay Area and around the state about grappling with the unilateralism, insularity, and opacity of their institutions, the question might be legitimately raised as to whether CCC Districts really care about their employees. Foothill-De Anza, for its part, definitely CARES, though primarily about its students, to judge from a precursory look at the quarterly reports of the Colleges’ Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds (HEERF) grants they actually received and spent. As De Anza proudly trumpets from its “CARES Act Reporting” webpage, out of the $3,617,629 allocated to the College on April 25, 2020 for Emergency Financial Aid Grants, “As of April 24, 2021, the College has distributed $3,617,629,

including $1,756,817 to 2,473 students in academic year 2020-2021 and $1,860,812 to 3,038 students in academic year 2019-2020”.

(Emphasis in the original). Foothill similarly tout its assistance to students, noting that “We fully intend to use at least 50% of the funds received under Section 1804(a)(1) of the CARES Act and at least an equivocal amount from the HEERF II (CRRSAA) allocation to provide emergency financial aid grants to enrolled students. We also are using our HEERF III (ARP) student allocation to provide emergency financial aid grants to enrolled students” and further declares that “The total amount of HEERF I, HEERF II, and HEERF III funds expended to students as of 10-05-2021 is $3,599,639.00”.

This is all very fine and good: many students with basic needs (food, living space, medical care) as well as technological challenges (without adequate bandwidth, functional computers, training for using technology) have been assisted, and even if this aid doesn’t resolve their dilemmas, it certainly helps in the short-term. Would that all District finances were reported so transparently!

The institutional portion of the CARES dollars, on the other hand, paints a very different picture of the colleges’ expenditures which, considering that the adage “faculties working conditions are student learning conditions” has never been truer than under COVID, makes the “students first” rhetoric wear a bit thin. Located inconspicuously down at the bottom of the same web page without any fanfare, the De Anza institutional quarterly reports show that of the $3,617,629 allocated for the same period as the student funds (i.e. expiring on April 30, 2021), the College spent only $1,196,965 And, in the most recent quarter ending Sept. 30, 2021, the College reported a new infusion of funding: $26,501,627, expiring on March 31, 2024.

While the fact that both Colleges have handled their reporting duties so differently (Foothill even “updating” some of its quarterly reports to coincide with its own, internal, fiscal quarters) may be attributable to the Feds, who allocated monies to individual colleges rather than Districts, it is nonetheless reflective of local guidelines regarding public health at our Colleges. Although we do now have District-wide vaccination and mask mandates for all on campus activities (and I, for one, am glad that we do), the District’s laissez-faire posture towards establishing additional District-wide policies and procedures about returning to campus, essentially permitting each of the Colleges to
develop its own plans, is a recipe for potential disaster. While we have 90 faculty at De Anza and 142 at Foothill teaching on campus this quarter, up considerably from summer, and more slated to return to campus in Winter, the further and faster we approximate a return to normalcy, the more we potentially place both students and employees at greater risk. Don’t get me wrong: FA is an advocate of returning to in-person instruction—to whatever degree pedagogically and economically feasible—provided we can give faculty and students a reasonable assurance of their safety in doing so. But while we would like to inspire confidence in faculty that they can and should return to campus (I’m doing so in Spring myself), there is still a lot that needs to be done before we can approach a model resembling the “before times.”

I’m not going to go too far into the weeds here with rehearsing past mistakes (for those interested, see my article on Athletics in the September 30 News. But I would like to consider the District has and has not implemented). This is not even getting into the questions on both campuses have posed about instructional protocol and reporting procedures relative to COVID and the additional burdens this places upon them. While what follows is not exactly a Maslowian hierarchy (and by no means exhaustive), I hope we can all agree that (1) vaccination is the single most efficacious step we could and have taken towards preventing the least severe illness and death of our students and employees. The medical and religious exemptions (particularly the lack of clarity around the criteria of religious exemptions) give me pause for thought, but I’m assured by my STEM colleagues that the 49 Foothill and 40 De Anza religious exemptions issued thus far represent a minimal risk relative to the District population as a whole. And both colleges have rigorous testing requirements for those who are granted exemptions. But in addition, both Colleges (and the District) ultimately also have a responsibility towards addressing vaccination hesitancy. Just as with any other equity initiative, it’s not enough to simply say “vaccinations are available on campus”—we must continue to do outreach targeting the specific populations reluctant to be vaccinated and put the resources into place that will help persuade them that it’s safe and is not only in their own interest but that of the larger community.

(2) Masks. Apologies to my libertarian colleagues, but, again, I am glad the District has shown zero tolerance for not wearing masks indoors or outdoors regardless of vaccination status while on campus. It’s a small inconvenience which, again, may protect both you and those you come into contact with. Half, masks are practically a fashion accessory these days, and instructors can request special transparent masks which facilitate, for example, hearing impaired students or instructors in reading lips as well as microphones to help the less “outspoken” among us project. And in combination with the Optimum HQ check ins, this is a pretty good layer of protection—even better when employees are aware of additional equipment they can request for their workplaces, such as face shields, plexiglass barriers, air filters (see below)—all courtesy of CARES funds. The recent De Anza “Town Hall” on the subject of returning to campus was very helpful in this regard, referring faculty to webpages and other resources at their disposal. It would be even more helpful if both colleges proactively provided lists of such equipment available to all prospective on campus instructors, so that they could communicate their needs to Future Deans and get things in place before the start of the quarter. Nonetheless please try to be patient with your Deans—they are often in as much of a pinch for solid information as are the faculty.

(3) Ventilation. Both colleges claim to have addressed this consideration, but it’s not something the District community as a whole has seen much direct evidence of. We’ve not, after all—at least most of us—HVAC experts. Accordingly, on May 2, the heads of all of the District Bargaining Units sent a letter to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and both College Presidents demanding that, among other things, they provide the following information:

- Documentation of HVAC system testing completed for individual areas of all campuses (Central Services, De Anza, Foothill, Sunnyvale) including what types of testing have been completed. If testing is ongoing, please provide a timeline for completion of this testing.
- How (and criteria used) you’ve identified the number of HEPA filters we’ll need for each phase of returning to campus along with an inventory count of how many HEPA filters are already installed, currently available but not installed, on order, or plan to be ordered.

To the best of my knowledge none of us were ever given a direct response to our queries, though each college has made declarations about upgrading filters and the availability of portable HEPA filters. This is a great start, but we know that medical grade filters are incompatible with some of the older HVAC systems in certain corners of our campuses (for example, De Anza’s L-Quad), and many current on campus instructors I’ve spoken with had no idea that such equipment was even available. Here, by contrast, is an informational video produced by one of our neighboring districts for its employees.

Which leads us to (4) Social Distancing, perhaps the most challenging “tool” for the District to address in that reducing population density in our classrooms arguably comes with additional cost. My understanding is that thus far both colleges have resorted to scheduling classes in the largest available classrooms, which is facilitated by the smaller number of in-person classes scheduled during the Fall quarter. However, some classes (e.g. science labs) are unable to shift to other locations due to the special features of specific rooms required for their disciplinary needs (stills for Ceramics, Autotech and Aquatics), for which the Colleges should take additional measures. One possibility that the District does not appear to have thoroughly considered (at least judging from their lack of action at the negotiating table) is reducing class sizes, even on a temporary basis. Think about it: even with everyone in the classroom vaccinated and masked, with upgraded HVAC and additional, portable filtration, packing ‘em in like sardines purely in the interest of productivity undermines the other preventative measures. I mean, fire codes notwithstanding, some of our classrooms were far too full pre-pandemic—and that’s not even taking on the pedagogical implications of class size and the equity functions thereof. Interestingly enough one of the categories for eligible CARES spending, prominently featured on the reporting form is “Costs related to operating additional class sections to enable social distancing, such as those for hiring more instructors and increasing campus hours of operation.” However, to date, a total of only $45,658 has been spent at De Anza for such expenditures (Exactly what it was spent on remains unclear, as nothing is written under “Explanatory Notes” for any of the entries). Perhaps more is on the way from that new $26M infusion? Perhaps Foothill can be persuaded to follow suit? Even if we need to create additional sections to carry the same requirements, I certainly haven’t heard many part-time faculty complaining about having too many class assignments.

Even as FA and the other unions have attempted to address some of these concerns and others related to returning to campus, negotiations have been hampered (intentionally or not) by the colleges’ separate practices, and trying to get them to agree on the need for a single, uniform protocol (we negotiate District-wide, not with the individual colleges). We’ve made some progress on Contact Tracing and other fronts (see Amy Edwards’ article in this issue). But with De Anza continuing an “opt-in” protocol for Winter, and Foothill continuing an “opt-out” protocol for Winter, and De Anza deciding to do, and Foothill encouraging” more faculty to return, even by being more flexible about cancellations for on campus classes, it’s been increasingly difficult to get the two to meet. The District itself has been prone to citing CDC and County health guidelines as their “standard,” albeit not consistently (again, see my September article on Athletics). And given that the County has the second highest vaccination rates in the state at 74.8%, and is accordingly poised to eliminate indoor masking mandates altogether, the District may not find “justification” in criteria which go beyond these standards. Instead, the Board of Trustees itself recently returned to in person meetings as an apparently preemptive effort to “set a good example” for employees. But as County guidelines themselves note, “Lifting a local indoor mask mandate would not prevent businesses, nonprofits, churches or others with public indoor spaces from imposing their own requirements.” Accordingly, there is nothing preventing the District from taking extra precautions to insure the safety of its students and employees.

Recently, the District has availed itself of the expertise of a number of personnel to assist them in their return to campus. Beyond Facilities employees and others whose employment is directly linked to providing the District with expert analysis (without HVRC), Allied Health instructors have been instrumental in crafting the policies and procedures of the District’s first forays into returning to campus instruction. And (finally) our Nursing and Health Technologies Staff have been permitted to assist with on campus vaccination efforts. And who could forget the amazingly awkward presentations of Drs. Cooper and Ryan.

Let’s be frank: neither District nor senior College Administration has any particular expertise in pandemics, virology or even health. It’s time, past time, that the District recognized it is in all of our best interests to work together as equal partners as transparently and collaboratively as possible to address our challenges on the COVID front. Let’s allow the employees on the ground, who are directly impacted by the Colleges’ and District’s decisions and work directly with our students, to have a say in the crafting and implementation of regulations. As we move inexorably towards Winter and then Spring, let’s do our part not to make this April “the cruelest month” with another pandemic wave, but more of a celebratory development.
Negotiations Update

Interim Chief Negotiator

Amy Edwards

I am struggling to write these negotiation updates while there is so much more in the hearts and minds of faculty right now, especially at Foothill, yet persist I must because deadlines loom as time forges ahead. 1 do, as I know most of you do, look forward to getting back to the jobs we signed up for and love: teaching our students and striving to help them succeed. In the meantime, let’s get updated on our current negotiations:

Compensation

FA is spearheading the data analysis regarding amounts owed to each faculty member per our previously negotiated remote work payments. While faculty who worked full time for all 4 quarters (Spring 2020 and the entire 20-21 academic year) will receive $2300, load factors for both part-time faculty and full-time faculty who took any leaves during this period, are still being calculated. We are working to ensure this payment will make it into our November paychecks.

The District will discuss potential counterproposals to our other compensation proposals regarding payment for some Fall coaching faculty as well as FA’s 2021-22 salary proposal with the Board at their November 1st meeting. It is our priority to complete these negotiations by the end of Fall quarter.

Return-to-Campus Concerns

Negotiating return-to-campus procedures is slow, partially because each campus had different protocols in place, and FA has been emphatic that certain policies be extended across both campuses to ensure everyone’s safety. There have been challenges and triumphs in establishing these processes.

As many of you know, faculty teaching on both campuses were required to either upload vaccination documentation or apply for an exemption. Of course, the challenges were in getting the uploads completed despite some confusion about the Pyramed system. Combined efforts in messaging from administration and FA led to our 98.6% compliance for those who are working on campus this quarter. To avoid future delays, we encourage everyone to upload vaccination documents or apply for exemptions now, even if you don’t know when you will be teaching face-to-face again.

FA also requested a District report of the numbers of vaccinated or exempted faculty and students on each campus this fall. The results are an impressive 98.6% vaccination rate across campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>De Anza</th>
<th>Foothill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching face-to-face</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in face-to-face courses (head count)</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>3632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with approved medical exemptions (not related to in-process vaccinations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with approved medical exemptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with approved religious exemptions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with approved religious exemptions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As many faculty inquiries have included questions concerning the verification of vaccinated students in our classrooms, our negotiation team has asked for that specific information. The District has maintained that this is confidential information, yet in a recent meeting with other community college union leaders, FA learned that many Districts are able to provide vaccination details specific to class rosters. Our attorneys have also confirmed that this information is not confidential, so FA will continue to push administration to provide this information to teaching faculty who may, in turn, feel safer in both teaching and extending classroom activities to include group work.

FA is still working to secure consistent protocols across campuses to ensure everyone’s safety. Here are some of the significant successes in that regard:

- Notification of Positive COVID cases:
  - FA has secured a guarantee that faculty on both campuses will be notified of any positive COVID cases in their classrooms, even if the students are not identified as a “close contact” (defined as within 6 feet, for 15 minutes or longer, indoors or out, masked or unmasked). This was not in the original plans at either campus for reasons that are unclear to us.

- Testing for those with Exemptions:
  - Thanks to persistent inquiry, FA has been informed that Health Services at both campuses are tracking required testing for students with approved exemptions. These students must upload proof of a negative COVID test into Pyramed within 72 hours prior to each campus visit.
  - Students who fail to comply are dropped from in-person courses.
  - Human Resources tracks the test results for all district employees.

- Contact tracing:
  - Contact tracing protocols are followed in response to all positive COVID cases on both campuses. Persons who tests positive will be contacted by the Foothill Contact Tracing Team to identify close contacts who will, in turn, be informed of required actions.
  - Even faculty teaching online should report any positive cases, as students may be attending in-person courses as well.

- Social distancing:
  - While social distancing is not required by current county public health guidelines, campus administrators are working to schedule classes in larger rooms when possible.

- HVAC system standards:
  - While Foothill employees have been told that all campus buildings pull in 100% fresh rather than recycled air, many questions about the building status at De Anza were unanswered at the town hall last week. Attendees were informed that these questions would be forwarded to Joel Cadiz, the district contact for these inquiries. We hope to report answers to these questions soon.
As always, we will update you regularly, but please don’t hesitate to reach out with any and all questions about negotiations.

Particularly for Part-timers
by Raymond Brennan

Many Part-time faculty are still having problems with the Employment Development Department (EDD) denying their unemployment claim outright or requiring a phone interview before they will determine whether to honor an application for unemployment benefits. (To give a sense of how backed up EDD is, people filing now are being given phone interview dates in March of next year.)

There are a couple of strategies you can use when filing for unemployment benefits to obviate this problem in the future. First, when filing for unemployment, when asked if you have a “reasonable assurance” of future classes, be sure to answer No. All Part-time faculty are offered classes on a contingent basis, which, by law, does not constitute a reasonable assurance of a class.

The law that allows this answer is the Cervisi v. Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (1989) decision. If you have the opportunity to cite this law on any drop-down menu when filing for unemployment, do so! All EDD personnel have now been trained to recognize the Cervisi case as a reason not to challenge your claim.

Also, when asked if you are a member if a union, the correct answer is also No. The Faculty Association for Foothill - De Anza is a Collective Bargaining Association, not a union. Answering this question correctly will save you having to suffer a spate of drop-down menus. Remember, when asked for your supervisor, give your dean’s name, of course, but when asked for your employer’s phone number be sure to give the correct number. For De Anza faculty, that number is 408-864-8711. For Foothill faculty, that number is (650) 949-7625. These numbers are for the campus personnel offices, and the staff in these offices know about the Cervisi decision and how to appropriately respond to EDD inquiries.

Finally, if you are having any issues with EDD, the best way to get them resolved expeditiously is to contact goldman@faccc.org. Stephanie Goldman is working with a partner at EDD, and the two of them can usually resolve any issue you may have within 48 hours. If you contact Stephanie, provide a brief narrative of the problem, and be sure to attach any documentation you have.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at brennanraymond@fhda.edu.

FA: Equity Unleashed
By Karen Erickson

Prompted by Foothill’s Strategic Vision for Equity (2021-25), De Anza’s Student Equity Plan (2019-22), and several years of equity-focused conversations during Executive Council meetings, FA has doubled-down on both its commitment to support equity efforts across the District and its active participation in the innovation and implementation of equity actions. To that end, in Spring 2021 FA created its own Equity Task Force.

As a faculty union, to be sure, we primarily serve faculty employees at FHDA; however, our interests intersect with other employee groups as well as students, who are always at the center of activity as faculty. We are too closely linked in our goals to pretend that one group does not profoundly influence another. Our campus demonstration of equity, both the way we treat each other and the way we are treated by the institution, is the model students see daily. It seems nearly impossible to engender student equity, that is, to convince students that we have equity at the forefront of our district vision, without modeling faculty-equity or at least our efforts to improve our own equity behavior.

At our rollout sessions, several recurring themes surfaced:

- the call to diversify the FA Executive Council and its leadership;
- the need to expand outreach efforts in all faculty recruiting and hiring, internally as well as externally;
- the urgent charge to pursue Part-time faculty equity;
- the desire and obligation to determine and establish equitable practices in the evaluations’ process and tools.

From an honest assessment of our equity needs came progress. Workgroups formed to address these fundamental equity demands. This academic year, we have three, focused workgroups gathering biweekly, each to achieve a specific end in support of the ultimate goal of building an equitable workplace for our faculty of color and other marginalized populations.
1. **Survey/Outreach/Recruitment Workgroup:**

   We are currently surveying faculty equity perspectives on each campus; studying those results will lay the foundation for ameliorating individual, cultural, and structural equity.

2. **Evaluations Workgroup:**

   After reviewing literature on the impact of bias in evaluations of faculty of color, this group is now interrogating the tools (J1/J2) and processes (Article 6/6A) of faculty evaluations. Revising the criteria of evaluation to promote equitable outcomes will remove barriers to achieving tenure or reemployment preference (REP). This group also includes representatives from the Academic Senate from both campuses.

3. **Intersectionality Workgroup:**

   Engaging in an intersectional analysis of faculty recruitment, retention, and morale will help identify ways that both the union and administration can improve outcomes for, and the morale of, all marginalized groups.

   Studies show that diversity itself brings educational benefits, including improved racial and cultural consciousness, improved critical thinking, higher commitment levels of political and community service, and a greater number of educated citizens. However, our campus goals, goals that FA embraces, of infusing equity and inclusion into all our ranks, are central to extracting the plurality of benefits of diversity in higher education, in our communities, and in our private lives.

   Karen Erickson (Foothill) and Jim Nguyen (De Anza) are the current co-chairs of the FA Equity Task Force. Please reach out to either if you would like to share your experiences, participate in the equity work, ask questions, or discuss concerns. We’d love to hear from you!

---

**Complete your Vaccine Upload Now!**

FA is encouraging all faculty to upload their vaccine information right now, even if you are unsure about when you will be teaching on campus again. Since everyone will need to do this eventually, let’s be proactive so we don’t need to race to get it done right before the start of a quarter. There were some uploading issues for those that are teaching in Fall quarter that we think have been addressed by these updated instructions.

1. Access [MyPortal](myportal.fhda.edu)
2. Under the "Staff" applications, look for the "PyraMed--Health Services for Employees" tab; click to access.

   Follow the directions under "COVID-19 Vaccination Documents - Students and Employees." For detailed instructions, visit the district directions for [uploading your document](https://example.com)

   In addition to the confirmation that your upload was successful, you will receive an email verification from Human Resources within one week of your upload, which will serve as proof that the District has received and verified your documentation. Once you receive that email, you are all set to return to campus!
Upcoming Deadlines

2021

- Dec. 3: Part-time faculty file intention to change salary column starting in the Winter Quarter with campus Personnel Office (Appendix B.1, C, E, G).
- Dec. 10: Full-time faculty submit Early Retirement Incentive Notice to District Human Resources Office (20.4).
- Dec. 31: Part-time faculty submit completion of requirements documentation for column change starting Winter quarter to campus Personnel Office (Appendix B.1, C, E, G).

2022

- Jan. 18: Article 18 faculty meet with the appropriate administrator to determine their reduced contract schedule (18.8.1, Appendix W).

Find the Contract, Articles, and Appendices Here

Important Resources

- AAUP: American Association of University Professors
- ASCCC: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
- CACCI: California Community College Independents
- CFA: California Faculty Association
- CFT/CCAC: Community College Council of the CFT/IAFT
- CPF: California Part-Time Faculty Association
- CTA/CCA: Community College Association of the CTA/NEA
- FACCC: Faculty Association of California Community Colleges
- CalPers: California Public Employees’ Retirement System
- CalSTRS: California State Teachers’ Retirement System

FA Thanks and Welcomes our new members!

Shirin Jamali, DA Planetarium
Hazel Manarang, DA Nursing
Vivian Rollinger, FH Child Development
FA News is normally published nine times during the academic year by the Foothill-De Anza Faculty Association, an independent California corporation certified by the California Public Employment Relations Board as the exclusive employee representative for the faculty of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. Letters and articles from District faculty are invited. Ph: 650.949.7544
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