



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Academic Senate

<https://foothill.edu/gov/academic-senate/> | Office: Admin 1929

Meeting Minutes

Date: May 6, 2024
Time: 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM
Location: Krause Center for Innovation room 4006 (or via Zoom)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM by Senate President Voltaire Villanueva

2. Roll Call

Roll Call was conducted by Secretary/Treasurer Robert Cormia

Officers	Location
Voltaire Villanueva	4006
Patrick Morriss	4006
Ben Kaupp	4006
Robert Cormia	4006
Senators by Division	
Apprenticeship	
Stephan Schnell	absent
BSS	
Brian Evans	4006
Mona Rawal	4006
Counseling	
Tracee Cunningham	4006
Leticia Serna	4006
DRC/VRC/SRC	
Ana Maravilla	4006
Fine Arts & Communications	
Robert Hartwell	4006
Kate Jordahl	online
HSH	
Rachelle Campbell	4006
Brenda Hanning	4006
Kinesiology/Athletics	
Dixie Macias	online
Rita O'Loughlin	absent
LA	
Stephanie Chan	4006
Rocio Giraldez Betron	online (address posted)
LRC	
Destiny Rivera	Laura Gamez / proxy / 4006

Eric Reed	4006
STEM	
Sara Cooper	4006
Brenda Hanning	4006
Professional Development Coordinator	
Carolyn Holcroft	4006
Faculty Chair of COOL	
Allison Lenkeit Meezan	4006
Ensuring Learning Coordinator	
Stephanie Chan	4006
Kerri Ryer	absent
FA Rep	
Julie Jenkins	4006
ASFC Rep	
Joshua Agupugo	Online
Classified Senate Rep	
Adiel Velasquez	absent
21-23 P/T Rep	
Roxanne Cnudde	absent
22-24 P/T Rep	
Michael Chang	4006
Advisory Members	
President's Cabinet	
Stacy Gleixner	4006
Dean of Equity	
Ajani Byrd	4006
Guests	
David Marasco (senator emeritus), Fatima Jinnah (online), Evan Gilstrap (articulations)	

3. Adoption of Agenda

Item #13 2024-25 academic schedule postponed for the next meeting due to absence of presenter Kurt Hueg
Motion: Adopt agenda with above described amendments Robert Hartwell first, Leticia Maldonado second
Result: adopted by consensus

4. Public Comment

Chris Chavez from the Office of Retention mentioned that surveys were sent to faculty regarding the tools for referring students for help. He shared that the faculty seemed to appreciate the referral tools and process.
CJ Toledo, a Foothill College student, commented on a walkout that occurred last Wednesday, noting faculty support and referencing similar protests around the country. He emphasized the importance of feeling safe while exercising protest rights and highlighted the need for education about the conflict in Gaza. Additionally, he suggested that bringing in speakers could help raise awareness on the issue.
Janie Garcia, a classified employee, addressed an email she had sent to members of the Academic Senate concerning the "Resolution for Peace and Safety." She noted that a draft of the resolution had been circulated on March 9th. Janie raised concerns that outside members of the public had commented on the resolution before it was officially released. She further claimed that the Academic Senate had effectively silenced the resolution following input from the community.

Shama Wahba, a student at Foothill College, commented on the 10+1 elements of the Academic Senate's purview, emphasizing that safety on campus is integral to student success. She expressed concern that removing the resolution from the agenda, under the pretext that it is not within the Senate's purview, contributes to a feeling of decreased safety among students.

Fatima Jinnah, from the counseling faculty, discussed the Peace and Safety resolution, noting that the authors had made requested changes, citing two specific instances where modifications were implemented. She commented on the title of the resolution and mentioned other related emails to faculty members. Fatima also brought up a point of order raised by the Academic Senate and referred to a similar resolution brought forward by the Santa Clara Office of Education. She highlighted that several other colleges have introduced similar resolutions and mentioned a message from the Parliament regarding this matter.

Hilda Fernandez from the English faculty addressed the necessity of bringing the topic of the Peace and Safety resolution into public comment due to the lack of opportunity for discussion within the Academic Senate. She highlighted the success of the ethnic studies programs and the significant contributions made by faculty of color. Hilda commented on her experience of being "tokenized" by the college and emphasized that equity should be actively pursued ("equity should be a verb"). She requested not to be tokenized in the future and advocated for the new resolution to strongly emphasize equity.

Evan Gilstrap, articulation officer, discussed the common course curriculum and suggested that participants join the disciplines listserv for better communication. He mentioned upcoming dates for "supercharged events," which he believes could provide effective input to this process.

Patrick Morriss recommended that everyone read Suzie's letter to the Academic Senate, along with the "point of order." He noted that there was a significant release of tension when the point of order was accepted, and Voltaire was overruled. Patrick read an excerpt from Dr. Martin Luther King's *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*, highlighting its relevance, including the text: "I must confess that over the last few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in the atride toward freedom is not the White citizen's Councilor or the Klu-Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice. He also commented on the palpable reduction in tension following the vote.

5. Approval of Minutes

April 8 Meeting:

Sara Cooper suggested a change on page 7 which will be corrected.

Patrick Morriss requested clarification on the 12-9 vote concerning the point of order. Voltaire clarified that the official vote count was 12-8, explaining that one voting member, who was present via Zoom, did not have their address posted as required by the Brown Act, thus their vote was not counted.

Motion: Adopt minutes with above described amendments

Ben Kaupp first, Eric Reed second

Result: adopted by consensus. Rachelle and Laura Gamaz (proxy for Destiny Rivera) abstained

April 22 Meeting:


Ben suggested a correction to the minutes regarding the term RSI, clarifying that in our context, RSI does not stand for Repetitive Strain Injury.

Lynette Vega was recognized as the incoming part-time representative. She inquired

whether RSI considers the technological challenges faced by some older students. Ben confirmed that accommodations are available for noncredit older adult offerings.

Carolyn requested clarification on the hiring and equity committee mentioned in the April 22nd minutes. She was informed that it is a committee at the district level.

Motion: Adopt minutes with above described amendments

Leticia Serna first, Ben Kaupp second 

Result: adopted by consensus.

6. Consent Calendar

Allison noted that there are now two faculty representatives on the technology committee, which focuses on hardware, software, and policy issues. She emphasized the significance of the District technology committee. The Tech committee meets on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month, and Allison also mentioned the Educational Technology Advisory Committee (ETAC). Rocio added that she has been attending ETAC meetings, representing the college as part-time faculty. The Academic Senate will recognize and approve this service.

Kate noted a few changes within the TRCs (Tenure Review Committees): Voltaire is joining the TRC for music, replacing Fatima who is stepping down. Additionally, David Morasco is serving as the Equal Opportunity representative on the search committee for the Assistant Police Chief.

Motion: Adopt Consent Calendar with above-described amendments

Ben Kaupp first, Leticia Serna second

Result: adopted by consensus.

7. ASFC President Updates

Student elections saw a slight increase in participation this year. During the elections, students also voted on faculty nominations for commencement speaker. Joshua shared his thoughts on the earlier resolution and discussed the importance of finding a location for important student conversations and the drafting of a future resolution by ASFC. He also provided an update that the open gym project is progressing well.

8. Commencement Update

Mona provided an update from Catalina in Student Services, announcing that the commencement event has been rescheduled to Friday, June 28th at 10 a.m. at the library quad. Daphne Small commented on the new time, expressing hope that it will be cooler.

The deadline for regalia is set for May 26th.

Students have made their nominations for faculty speakers. The list of nominees for faculty commencement speaker was noted to be quite extensive. Sara proposed a motion to conditionally approve the list of nominees, provided that none withdraw before noon on May 13th. Senate representatives were asked to inform nominated constituents of their nomination.

Motion: Conditionally approve the list of nominees, pending the nominees not withdrawing before noon on May 13th

Sarah Cooper first, Ben Kaupp second

Result: conditionally approved by consensus.

9. Fostering Collaborative Futures

Reflecting on the events of the April 8th meeting and the Peace and Safety resolution,

Leticia remarked that there was no discussion about what "ten plus one" entails before acting on the point of order concerning the resolution. She shared the challenges of being a person of color in the United States and emphasized that global events influence the environment at Foothill College, as we do not live in a vacuum. Expressing hope for future dialogue, Leticia also referenced Cindy McCain, Director of the UN World Food Program, discussing the famine and humanitarian crisis in Gaza.

Voltaire discussed the resolutions presented at the ACSCC plenary, highlighting the issues of purview (10+1). He noted that within our district, the Senate has become the primary forum for these conversations as there are no other venues addressing them. He acknowledged that the resolution has generated tension within the Academic Senate. The process of figuring out how to facilitate this conversation is ongoing. Voltaire also mentioned that Foothill College has had many observers as we faced challenges in navigating this issue, which has established a precedent within the state.

David Marasco pointed out that if there were enough votes to end discussion, there were also likely sufficient votes to defeat the resolution. However, he noted that as a result of the procedural vote, there is no clear mechanism in place to facilitate these discussions, leading to uncertainty about how to handle political conversations when they arise.

Stephanie raised concerns about whether the decision to avoid discussion was made too hastily, noting the lack of a means to facilitate it. Voltaire responded by acknowledging the inconsistent application of Robert's Rules of Order. He emphasized that there should be a mechanism in place to allow faculty to actively participate and speak during meetings.

Allison commented on her initial intent to join the Academic Senate to address issues related to technology and education. She noted that the resolution in question had consumed an enormous amount of time and that the public comment session was particularly intimidating. She affirmed the necessity of the conversation but suggested that it might be more appropriate in a different venue.

Julie Jenkins observed that the decision regarding the resolution was made rapidly, pointing out that from the onset, there was a failure in achieving meaningful dialogue. She highlighted that while individuals spoke to each other, they did not truly engage with each other. Julie emphasized that for broader support, everyone needs to see themselves reflected in the resolution and advocated for modeling dialogue among participants.

Eric Reed echoed these sentiments, acknowledging Alison's concerns about the inefficiency of the proceedings. Although many of his constituents opposed the resolution, he suggested that a more inclusive dialogue might have led to a more acceptable outcome.

Sara acknowledged that the faculty who authored the resolution sought to address a specific issue, but the conversation was not allowed to take place. She suggested that power and privilege might have been used to avoid this necessary discussion. Despite the potential support or opposition to the resolution, the opportunity for dialogue was missed. Sara also brought up the broader topic of equity, questioning whether there was enough courage to engage in conversations about equity or injustice in this instance. She mentioned that defining the 10+1 scope narrowly to focus only on administrative procedures would be a waste, implying that broader, more impactful discussions should be embraced.

Voltaire acknowledged the voices and emotions expressed during the discussion, recognizing the grief experienced by many participants, and the ongoing narrative surrounding power, privilege, and oppression. He reflected on how these issues challenge our identities and values daily. While suggesting that the conversation might pause for now, he left open the possibility of revisiting these crucial topics in the future.

Leti emphasized the importance of ensuring that the community does not perceive that the Academic Senate was pushed out of the conversation or that community actions led to a "victory". She stressed the necessity of maintaining the integrity of their discussions.

Voltaire reiterated the importance of continuous improvement, affirming that the Senate owns the space for these discussions. He acknowledged that they had allowed their space to be overrun, highlighting the need for better management of their discussion environment.

Patrick expressed gratitude to Voltaire for his leadership on the topic and mentioned Voltaire's re-election on April 8th, highlighting the irony that he was subsequently overruled on a point of order shortly thereafter.

Lynette Vega suggested a need to clearly outline the events of the April 8th meeting, including how it was disrupted and strategies for getting back on track.

Additionally, Foothill student CJ Toledo thanked the Senate for at least hosting the conversation, acknowledging the importance of having the space to discuss these issues. Ben acknowledged that the upcoming resolution discussion might be of interest as it will directly address this need.

Fatima described the public comment session in late March as very intimidating, detailing a confrontation that occurred between members of the community and some faculty and students after the meeting had concluded. She noted that there were concerns about the public presence and threats of personal violence during this incident. She asked for an apology for how the situation was handled.

Voltaire reminded the body that he sent an apology on March 19th and offered to read it.

10. Resolution on Sustained Dialogues (First Read)

Ben Kaupp shared that he had been contemplating this topic for quite some time, noting that the last resolution highlighted the Academic Senate's lack of readiness to handle dialogues of such magnitude. He mentioned the Sustained Dialogue Institute, based in Washington DC, as an organization specifically designed to train others in the facilitation of such dialogues. Voltaire added to the discussion by suggesting supplemental reading and discussing the tools that the Sustained Dialogue Institute could provide to support their efforts. Ben clarified that the figures included in the resolution are placeholders.

Stephanie raised concerns from some of her constituents, questioning whether the new resolution was a response to the previous one, and why the authors of the earlier resolution were not consulted. Ben explained that the resolution was proposed due to the lack of capability within the group to handle difficult conversations effectively, but that it should not be seen as a response to the prior resolution but rather to the handling thereof.

Ajani questioned whether a formal resolution was necessary to proceed with the effort. Patrick confirmed that expenditures did require a resolution.

Eric expressed the need for training within the Academic Senate but voiced concerns that it might lead to moving all political discussions out of the Senate. Ben acknowledged that the initial wording of the document had limitations and encouraged all participants to actively engage in editing the document, taking collective ownership as a body.

11. BP/AP 2410 (Second Read)

Kathryn noted that much of the administrative and faculty work is governed by Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP), highlighting that the district, including both De Anza and Foothill Colleges, is significantly behind in updating many of these policies and procedures. She added that the Faculty Association (FA) also reviews many of the AP/BPs that affect faculty. Kathryn clarified that anything related to academic and professional matters is reviewed by the Academic Senate, while issues impacting working conditions are reviewed by the FA.

Motion: Approve BP/AP 2410

Patrick Morriss first, Ben Kaupp second

Result: approved by consensus.

12. AP 5110 Counseling (Second Read)

No discussion.

Motion: Approve AP 5110

Ben Kaupp first, Patrick Morriss second

Result: approved by consensus.

13. AY 2024-25 Schedule Planning

The discussion has been moved to the next Academic Senate meeting. Please send any questions ahead of time to Voltaire, who will forward them to Kurt for consideration.

14. Vision Statement Update

The Vision 2030 initiative includes a review of the mission and vision statements, which has been ongoing since fall of 2023. A proposed vision statement was presented, and campus feedback is currently being reviewed this week. Feedback on the vision statement is needed by next week. Ajani has also commented on the vision statement.

15. Constitution & Bylaws Revision (First Read)

Six amendments have been proposed. Patrick highlighted a concern regarding representation, noting that two faculty members are currently not represented. The amendments pertain to constitutionally outlined membership, duties, committee work, and procedures. The proposal includes moving some items from the constitution to the bylaws to allow for more nimble operations and adjustments.

16. For the Good of the Order

Carolyn announced for the good of the order that guest speaker Angela McKee Brown will be present on Wednesday, May 22, from 12-1 PM. She will discuss how joy can be used to promote justice and liberation.

Ben announced the launch of a website for stakeholders in the education of neurodivergent students. He encouraged everyone to visit the site at ttwnest.org to learn more and engage with the resources provided.

17. Close of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM by Senate President Voltaire Villanueva