

Draft Minutes, Academic Senate, January 12, 2026

1. Call to Order, Villanueva

Villanueva called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call, La Piana

Present: Chan, Chang, Davison, Gilstrap, Gleixner, Gomes, Gray, Herman, Jama, Kaupp, La Piana, Lenkeit Meezan, Mar, Middleton, Mudge, Nguyen, Peters, Rideaux, Santillan-Nieto, Thao, Thompson, Tripp Caldwell, Villanueva

Zoom: O'Loughlin, Ripp, Scolari, Vega

Lenkeit Meezan proxy for Davison; Chang proxy for Vega

3. Agenda Adoption

Approved by consensus.

4. Public Comment

N/A

5. Approval of 12.01.25 Minutes, La Piana

Jama moved to approve; Kaupp seconded; approved.

6. Approval of Consent Calendar, Villanueva

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate:

- Kinesiology/Athletics: Rita O'Loughlin (Winter 26)
- Language Arts: Allison Herman (amendment)
- STEM: Kyle Taylor (Spring 26) (amendment)

Hiring Committees:

- FT Humanities Instructor: Brian Tapia, Steve Batham, Jordan Fong (EEO)
- FT Career/General Instructor: Leticia Delgado, Jue Thao, Debra Lew, Maritza Sandoval Jackson, Mimi Overton
- FT Financial Aid/General Instructor: Leticia Delgado, Jue Thao, Debra Lew, Maritza Sandoval Jackson, Mimi Overton
- FT Communication Studies Instructor: Lauren Velasco, Ché Meneses, Hilary Gomes
- FT Media Instructor: Kristin Tripp Caldwell, Judy Walgren (Phase 3), Eric Kuehn

- FT Computer Science – AI Instructor: Eric Reed, Bitu Mazloom, Mike Murphy

Program Review Readers:

- At Large: Robert Cormia, Dolores Davison (amendment), Jeff Schinske (amendment)

Thao provided context for why both hiring committees for counseling consist of the same people, which has to do with workload.

Gilstrap moved to approve with amendments; Mar seconded; approved.

7. ASFC President Updates to the Academic Senate, Nguyen

- Concluding activities for Welcome Week
- Hosting activities for Jewish Heritage Month
- Prepping for February activities, including Lunar New Year and a dance

8. Classified Senate Updates, Santillan-Nieto

The Community of Learning series, a continuation of the onboarding series, begins next week and will feature PD workshops on various topics for classified professionals. Open to all employees.

Classified Senate continues with planning for a joint professional development event with De Anza on March 20th, hosted by Foothill, and tentatively titled “Here We Grow Again: Collective Renewal for a Thriving Campus Community.”

The next Classified Senate meeting is Thursday, 1/13/26.

9. AI Fellows Selection, Villanueva

Villanueva read the following prepared statement in response to queries he received about the selection process:

I’d like to thank everyone for circulating the call for applications and to everyone who applied. We received more applications than there were positions, which we take as a sign that faculty are eager to help shape the AI landscape of our campus. We understand that it is disappointing for those who submitted applications and were not selected, so we’d like to provide a bit of insight into the selection process.

We opted to anonymize the applications, though we did take into account information regarding divisions, departments, and programs to accommodate a range of perspectives, experiences, and disciplinary expertise, as best we could.

We used a rubric to individually rate responses to each of the application questions and then combined our ratings. The applications with the highest scores based on the combined ratings were selected.

Thanks to everyone for engaging in these ongoing conversations and for taking the time to apply. We hope that the institution will be able to offer additional opportunities for more faculty to participate in the future.

10. Blueprint for Success: Collegewide Perspective and Faculty Role, Villanueva & Gleixner

Villanueva reviewed the purview of Academic Senate, 10+1, with an emphasis on the role Senate can play for strategic planning and our day-to-day work, and how that is in conversation with or guided by the Blueprint for Success (BPS), an intentional, action-oriented document that will shape the next five years of our work at Foothill.

Senate will give updates on progress toward the goals and objectives articulated in the BPS, which deans will also be communicating at the division level. Villanueva notes that faculty expertise is important for shaping the campus and asks that we invite and encourage colleagues to participate in these ongoing conversations.

Gleixner confirmed that updates will be provided and added that seeking suggestions and recommendations from Academic Senate will be part of the ongoing implementation process.

Blueprint for Success Background:

- Originated in MIP-C subcommittee, informed by consultants and quantitative data about the campus and surrounding area
- Includes
 - 2 Transformational Goals
 - 4 College Goals
 - 16 Objectives
- Emphasis on growing existing endeavors in sustainable ways rather than new developments.

Presentation included intersections for Senate to consider:

- equitable student success + employee satisfaction/professional growth
- existing programs + scaling + center success of underserved students
- objectives that span existing divisions and roles + align with CCC 2030 + district strategic plan

A Canvas resource site for the campus is in progress.

Question about whether the BPS takes into consideration noncredit classes for older adults, given that success for an 18-year-old college student looks different than success for an 80-year-old.

Gleixner responds that objective 2.1 from the BPS does address this and notes that the campus is increasingly serving an older adult population, given the aging population of our service area and our commitment to serving our service area.

Gleixner invites the body to the BPS implementation launch on 1/28/26 beginning at noon on 1/28/26 in the Campus Center Dining Hall. Invitations have been sent to the campus via Outlook.

Villanueva remarks that the BPS feels different than previous education master plans because of the input invited from faculty and staff rather than top-down direction. Reiterates call to encourage colleagues to participate in helping to shape the coming years on campus. Notes that he and Santillan-Nieto are working on goal 4, building a culture of engagement and taking into account previous comments about how what engagement looks like on campus may vary given the different demands on employees in different roles.

Chan asks whether faculty need to focus on the district-level vision or just focus on the campus for now. Villanueva notes that Gohar Momjian, Vice Chancellor for Strategy, Institutional Effectiveness and Engagement, will be attending the next senate meeting to discuss the chancellor's priorities and Foothill's alignment with the district's plans. Gleixner says that some things make more sense to be considered at the district level.

Break.

11. Academic Integrity, Villanueva

Villanueva recalls discussion last quarter of the Academic Integrity Committee in response to issues and concerns that have emerged because of automation and agentic tools, though notes that while discussions of each overlap, academic integrity is a distinct topic on its own.

Relying on the archive of academic senate minutes dating back to 2011, Villanueva presents a historical perspective on the culture of academic integrity at Foothill and the founding of the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) based on the institution's previously stated values. Asks whether it is time to revisit and perhaps revise the previous charge of the Academic Integrity Committee.

Davison was the Academic Senate President when the AIC was initially formed as a subcommittee of Academic Senate. She explains that there was a move toward a greater understanding of academic integrity that shifted from a punitive mindset to a more educational focus. Comments that it may be time to update the charge based on the institution's new mission and values as well as conversations occurring around the J1.

Discussion of AIC membership beyond faculty (students and student services), examples of academic fraud on campus and online, the increase in labor related to academic integrity because of automation and agentic tools, and the issue of class size and discerning student intentions related to this labor.

Discussion of previous and potential scope of AIC, similar efforts on campus, and possibility of working with De Anza.

Villanueva asks representatives to get feedback from division colleagues about interest in reviving AIC and potentially serving on this subcommittee of Academic Senate.

12. Credit for Prior Learning, Kaupp and Gilstrap

Gilstrap describes CPL workgroup, led by Teresa Ong, and broad scope of work that falls under CPL: AP, IB, credit by exam, portfolio assessment, industry certification. Workgroup is currently focused on determining CPL process for assessment and faculty role for determining whether SLOs/competencies have been met. Group is discussing possibility of faculty stipends, rubric development, assessment, the potential for an increased number of requests for CPL and accompanying workload. Also working on determining which program(s) it would make sense to start with before more widespread adoption.

Questions and concerns about district repeatability, alignment with De Anza, and modalities of assessments.

Gilstrap notes that we can determine at a local level how CPL works for campus/district; not state mandated, but as a district, not as advanced as others in terms of CPL processes. Explains that CPL is more oriented for the career track; CSU accepts CPL but each individual campus determines how credits are distributed. UC does not accept CPL.

Discussion of how CPL could potentially inform program review and resource allocation through an increase in certificates.

Comment about how dental hygiene and respiratory care already have CPL for BS students, which may be more straightforward because it is based on career experience. Figuring out the logistics of documentation, licensing, and assessment is important from the counseling perspective.

Villanueva notes that there is an ASCCC opportunity for the campus to have a CPL liaison, which requires participation in certain activities and comes with a \$1000 stipend.

Kaupp notes that it is important to remember that there are parallel conversations happening about CPL, one about logistics and one about a philosophical shift, both of which need to be considered. CCC will be focusing on both.

13. Officer, Chairs, Coordinator & Committee Reports

Villanueva solicits feedback for APs and BPs being reviewed by Academic and Professional Matters for a second read.

Chan returns from PDL to her role as Executive Vice President; thank you to David Marasco for filling the role during fall quarter.

Kaupp reminds body of the next CCC meeting.

Davison mentions a glitch with SLO reflections for pod leaders and chairs and notes that the ASJCCC report is going to the board for approval.

Lenkeit Meezan provides an update on the TwT, which has been working on documenting effective teaching practices for hybrid courses, as well as guidance on accessibility and RSI for J1B and J1C evaluations.

14. Announcements and for the good of the order

Gleixner announces campus watch parties for Addressing the Challenge of Agentic AI (Friday, January 30th) and Accessibility in Online Learning (Tuesday, February 3). Invitations via Outlook have been sent.

Gleixner offers congratulations to Amber La Piana for being offered the position of Acting Dean of Language Arts & Ethnic Studies during spring quarter.

15. Meeting adjourned.