

Academic Senate Approved Minutes March 18th

2024 # 1 Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m.

# 2 Roll call 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	4006
HSH	
Rachelle Campbell	4006
vacant	vacant
Kinesiology/Athletics	
Katy Ripp	Online (as guest)
Rita O'Loughlin	Online (as guest)
LA	
Stephanie Chan	4006
Rocio Giraldez Betron	online (address posted)
LRC	
Destiny Rivera	4006
Eric Reed	Online (as guest)
STEM	
Sara Cooper	4006
vacant	N/A
Professional Development Coordinator	
Carolyn Holcroft	4006
Faculty Chair of COOL	
Allison Lenkeit Meezan	Absent

Ensuring Learning Coordinator	
Stephanie Chan	
Kerri Ryer	Online (as guest)
FA Rep	
Julie Jenkins	4006
ASFC Rep	
Joshua Agupugo	Online (as guest)
Classified Senate Rep	
Adiel Velasquez	Online (as guest)
21-23 P/T Rep	
Roxanne Cnudde	Absent
22-24 P/T Rep	
Michael Chang	4006
<b>Advisory Members</b>	
President's Cabinet	
Stacy Gleixner	4006
Dean of Equity	
Ajani Byrd	4006

### # 3 Adoption of the agenda

Item #11- Progress on local general education requirements was removed. The agenda was approved by consensus.

### # 4 Public Comment

Kate Jordahl will give a private tour of the photography exhibit in the lower floor of the KCI following the meeting today.

### # 5 Approval of Minutes from March 4th 2024.

Stephanie Chan motioned to approve, and Ben Kaupp seconded, the minutes were approved by consensus. Rachelle Campbell abstained.

### # 6 Approval of the Consent Calendar

There was an opening on the search committee for Vice Chancellor of Business Services. Kathy Perino, Foothill math faculty and FA chief negotiator, was recommended by the Senate officers. The Tenure Review Committee (TRCs) will move onto the next phase in Spring 2024. Zach Cembelin was removed from TRCs as he is acting Dean of the STEM division, Kate Jordahl is moving onto Judy Walgren's TRC. Robert Hartwell motioned first, seconded by Ben Kaupp, the consent calendar approved by consensus.

### # 7 ASFC updates to the Academic Senate

None.

### # 8 Recognize Tenured Faculty

Ana Maravilla and Julie Jenkins were granted tenure and acknowledged the hard work and support of Carolyn Holcroft.

#### **# 9 Foothill College 2030 Update.**

Suzy Quezada mentioned the values that have guided the mission of the 2030 vision group and shared concepts being discussed in drafting a vision statement. Tracee Cunningham also mentioned the work in progress. Suzy mentioned that the group is tasked with gathering feedback, and a cross-section of campus is represented on the vision group and the educational master plan group. There is a communication plan that will report this to the campus soon in the spring.

#### **# 10 Elections Committee Update**

An announcement was sent out to all faculty for the three positions: President, Secretary-treasurer, and Part-time faculty representative. One faculty statement for secretary-treasurer has been received. If no other interest is received by March 29th, the positions will be elected by acclamation.

#### **# 11 Progress Regarding Local General Education Requirements**

Removed.

#### **# 12 Commencement 2024**

Daphne Small mentioned Catalina Rodriguez's work in Student Services. Daphne Small, Director of Student Leadership is requesting faculty to service on the Commencement 2024 committee. She mentioned helping select speakers, the time of day, and possible rescheduling of the event to avoid the infamous Los Altos heat. Catalina announced that she is looking for someone from the Academic Senate to join the planning committee. The committee will discuss possibly having a keynote speaker. Committee meetings are on Thursday morning, over Zoom. Senators, please solicit faculty from your division.

#### **# 13 Proposal to Equip FHDA Police Officers with Tasers**

David Marasco presented in the reasoning being the lack of a step between a baton and a service weapon. In the history of FHDA-CCD, a discharge of a service weapon has never occurred. The police department is soliciting input from faculty. Sara Cooper asked if there has been a change in threat level where tasers might be required. There was an additional question about why we need Tasers. Rachelle commented that the use of a Taser might be higher because the propensity to use a gun is less. There was a question about mistaking a gun for a Taser, and a question about how we would handle a cardiac event if the use of a Taser triggers an unforeseen (cardiac event).

#### **# 14 Facilities and Measure G Update**

Bret Watson presented on the movement on measure G projects. With the De Anza event center not moving forward, there was an opportunity to move funds into other projects. We went back to a list of projects, including \$175 M in projects now with \$300 M of potential projects. We have a building, grounds, and sustainability committee; we have a new list of prioritized projects. We came up with three: Dental Hygiene and Dental Assisting Center, STEM Center, and the Smithwick Theater. Bret shared that much input came from the college and Foothill might get 15-20M. While the process was fast-tracked, there was a good deal of information. Hilda

commented that there should be more time spent discussing the allocation of funding given the amount (millions) of dollars being spent. Too often, we scramble on a process and then don't arrive at the best answers. Bret commented on the various projects that require input. David commented that we still need locks on our doors to lock them from the inside. Sara commented that it would be appreciated to get an update on security, and we keep asking about door locks. When do we act on them?

## **# 15 Resolution Recognizing Sustained Peace and Safety for All Students**

"Voltaire Villaneva stated that the proposed resolution represents the views of its authors, not necessarily the Senate or all faculty. The Senate's role is to consider the resolution, discuss it, and ultimately vote on whether to approve it or not. There is significant community interest and presence at today's meeting.

Voltaire asked for patience, compassion, and grace as the Senate navigates this emotionally charged topic, with the ultimate goal of making a decision that best serves students, faculty, and the institution as a whole.

Voltaire outlined the procedure for public comment, alternating between speakers in favor and against, both in-person and online. Each speaker will have one minute to comment. Robert's Rules of Order were reviewed, including motions to limit or end public comment.

The sequence of the meeting will include an update from the resolution's authors, public comment, reports from Senators on feedback from their divisions, thoughts from Executive Senate members, and contributions from other faculty members. The Senate will then deliberate and determine the appropriate course of action regarding the resolution.

Voltaire thanked everyone for their engagement and dedication, expressing confidence that by working together with mutual respect, understanding, and grace, the Senate can arrive at a decision that reflects their values and best serves the community."

Resolution author's updates: Patrick Morris, math faculty, mentioned the suggestions from the last meeting. Changes were made in the 'resolve' section, and content was added to the 'whereas' clauses. A motion was made for public comment, with Ben moving first and Patrick seconding, to limit public comment to 25 minutes for non-faculty, students, and members of the community. There was opposition to the motion, and it failed. There are only 27 in-person speakers signed up thus far. Each speaker will be allotted one minute per person unless a motion is made to end public comment.

Below is a summary of the discussion from those in favor and those against the resolution:

### **In Favor of the Resolution**

Supporters of the resolution included academic community members advocating for social justice and human rights. Highlights from their arguments are as follows:

- A leader from the student social justice organization expressed solidarity with Palestine, emphasizing the importance of speaking out against atrocities.

- Another student leader highlighted the violence against Palestinians in Gaza and the occupation of territories.
- A student continued to support the resolution by reading from a social justice statement and addressing students' historical oppression.
- An advocate from the college community argued for equity, dismantling racism and oppression, and supported a humanitarian ceasefire.
- A student government and social justice club member argued that the resolution aligns with the best interests of students.
- The editor of a campus publication and a participant in campus art activities mentioned the significant devastation witnessed and supported the resolution.
- Several students shared personal observations and experiences related to the conflict, emphasizing education, solidarity, and the impact on the community.

### **In opposition to the Resolution**

Opponents of the resolution raised concerns about its content, implications, and the broader impact on the college community. Their points include:

- A current student warned of potential consequences and cited violence at another institution following a similar resolution.
- Speakers criticized the resolution for potentially ignoring the diversity of the college community and questioned its impact on student safety.
- Some individuals accused the resolution of containing falsehoods and promoting antisemitism, asserting it was filled with hatred.
- Concerns were raised about the resolution's potential to create an unsafe and exclusive environment, with multiple speakers citing personal or familial experiences of antisemitism and violence.
- Critics also argued that the college should remain neutral on political issues, particularly those related to the Middle East conflict.
- Several speakers suggested that the resolution could lead to increased violence on campus and suggested the resolution misrepresented the nature of the conflict, with some asserting it unfairly labeled actions as genocide.
- The resolution was also criticized for not adequately addressing peace, safety, and the educational mission of the college.

These summaries encapsulate the diverse perspectives shared during the discussion, focusing on the key themes and arguments presented by those in favor and those opposing without attributing statements to specific individuals.

Motion to extend the meeting to 4 p.m. was passed by consensus

Report out from the divisions regarding constituent sentiment up to the date of the meeting

Apprenticeship – Representative absent

BSS - Brian mentioned 9 responses, 4 in favor and 4 against, and one ambiguous. In support, oppressions do not recognize all voices. Create a space to build a dialog. Another is to table the

resolution. Not in favor, title is misleading. Does this resolution have the support of the student body?

Counseling division - Faculty are all in support of it.

Disability Resource Center (DRC) - all faculty wish to abstain; we are in favor of an immediate cease-fire. Comments that the resolution may not share that we support all students. Remove statements about Zionism.

Fine Arts and Communication - Numerous constituents voiced serious concerns that this resolution is not in the 10+1 purview of the Academic Senate. FAC had a poll, and the majority of the respondents supported the resolution.

Health Science and Horticulture, 12 against. One doesn't believe that this represents all students and can't support this resolution. This resolution needs to be split. The majority of division is in opposition.

Kinesiology and Athletics – No feedback. Technical issues may have prevented feedback.

Language Arts - Heard from a handful of faculty, most with enthusiastic support. Concern that the resolution upholds the 13-55 charge. Technical issues may have prevented additional feedback.

LRC / Library – Library - one abstained, and two in support, representing the student voices. Five responses in LRC and STEM, 80% shared sympathy with the resolution, but 80% are opposed to the resolution; 80% rejected the word genocide.

STEM - Faculty sympathize and empathize with the resolution - see this as an opportunity to raise awareness.

At the end of the division reporting, one minute was left in the meeting. Voltaire announced that the meeting was adjourned, and we'll pick this up again in April.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m. The next meeting is April 8th.