Approved Minutes, Academic Senate, November 17, 2025

1. **Call to Order, Villanueva**

2. **Roll Call, La Piana**

Present: Campbell, Chang, Fox, Gilstrap, Gray, Davison, Holcroft, Jama, Kaupp, Lenkeit Meezan, Mar, Marasco, Mudge, Nguyen, Peters, Santillan-Nieto, Thao, Tripp Caldwell, Vega, Villanueva

Zoom: MacNeil, Ripp, Gomes, Vennarucci

Absent: Schnell, Jinnah

Guests: Periera (Zoom), Cembellin (Zoom), Whalen (Zoom)

3. **Agenda Adoption**

Approved by consensus.

4. **Public Comment**

Happy Birthday to Voltaire!!

5. **Approval of Consent Calendar, Villanueva**

Added:

- Acting Dean, Language Arts & Ethnic Studies: Rachael Dworsky (Division), Kella Svetich (Division)

Request for volunteers to serve on District IR hiring committee; Marasco volunteered.

Fox moves to accept amended consent calendar with addition of Marasco; Gilstrap seconded; approved.

6. **Approval of Draft MInutes**

Villanueva proposed approving both sets of minutes together, from 10/27/25 and 11/3/25

Kaupp moved to approve, Marasco seconded**;** approved.

7. **ASFC President Updates to the Academic Senate, Nguyen**

- Student AI Fellow participants have been selected; ASFC requested and were approved for an additional two participants, up from the initial 2
    - Selected student representatives met w/ Dean Cembellin, including his choice from STEM
- Voted to approve student health fee increase
- Exploring new initiative to extend library hours on campus
    - Outreach to faculty
- Bookstore proposals coming up

8. **Classified Senate Updates, Santillan-Nieto**

- Finalizing selections for AI fellows (2 seats)
- Hosting upcoming classified townhall in Toyon, noon-1, hybrid, space for classified to discuss AI, professional development, climate, also inviting TEAs,
    - Please help keep TEA colleagues informed about classified senate
- Last classified senate meeting after Thanksgiving Break

9. **AI Fellows Program, Villanueva**

Foothill seems to be slightly ahead of other campuses in terms of these discussions and with the AI Fellows Program, which includes RAT or stipend; compensation for this work doesn't seem to be the norm at other institutions

Emphasizes importance of these discussions being shaped and informed by faculty

La Piana read Kimberly Escamilla's perspective on AI Fellows application, communicated via email (links included in original):

> "I reviewed these carefully as I was advised that the college could benefit from having faculty who believe in informed refusal at the table as an AI fellow.
>
> It looks as if someone worked to balance the approach in the application, where I see lines like
>
> *By identifying and addressing potential risks related to equity, privacy, and access, fellows will design approaches that align the use of emerging technologies and employee learning with Foothill College's mission*.
>
> However, the documents describe the commitment to **integration** and **implementation** (using AI and **adopting** it at all levels) but using it "ethically and with equity in mind."

> I'm trying to understand how Foothill College is rushing to adopt a technology that is enriching oligarchs, creating less connection between students and their teachers, stymieing foundational skills, and hurting the very communities that we say we are looking to serve and improve their gaps in outcomes. Is it a fear of other colleges having or offering more? Is it just that the technology is free? Is no one uncomfortable being so intertwined with private businesses, many of which have terrible human rights track records. Has anyone read Google's recent reversal?
>
> If Foothill really wants a wide range of faculty and students guiding AI use on campus, then all of these documents should include the term **informed refusal** for faculty and equally important, for students. We should be protecting faculty and students' rights to say no without dismissing them as Luddites. Currently, these documents for the AI Fellow program aren't inviting for faculty or students who understand AI but don't want to implement it."

Meezan: HSH agrees w/ sentiments expressed by Escamilla, particularly with respect to data privacy and informed refusal.

Villanueva notes that revisions to application and criteria have been made based on feedback, but perhaps more adjustments are needed.

Discussion of timing and scheduling issues that may occur because registration for winter quarter has already begun and so dean's approval required; options for RAT or stipend for spring.

Questions regarding the language of the original application presented at MIP-C, particularly with respect to assumption of or dictated integration of AI; should be reframed as "consideration of integration" rather than "integration."

Discussion and voiced agreement about the benefit of the program with caveat that Fellows should have diversity of opinions, experience, and knowledge. Program should offer opportunity for exploration but perhaps deliverables should not be as prescriptive as they are in current form. Mention of sharing out in some sort of public forum by Fellows to campus community.

Discussion of selection criteria and makeup of the Fellows, as well as the rapidity with which selection needs to occur because of President Whalen's desired timeline.

Emphasis on opportunity the program offers for our institution in terms of leading these discussions and being compensated for it.

Comment regarding the importance of deliverables to support faculty and students, recognizing that this work will be ongoing

Mention of State Chancellor's AI Fellow program and the fact that students and classified staff are farther along in selection process than faculty; emphasis on role that Academic Senate should play so that we have agency and faculty are at the table for these discussions.

Discussion of moving forward with logistics, given the lack of flexibility with the timeline.

Question about why only some values have been called out in the Program Overview and not others

Discussion of potential scenarios for selecting applicants.

Discussion of application due date, given the holiday, timing in the quarter, etc, as well as importance of thoughtful consideration of applications rather than speed. Discussion of processes used by Classified Senate and ASFC.

Question about whether PT faculty can have RAT if selected; may be possible, depending on circumstances.

La Piana and Marasco propose 12/8 as application due date.

Villanueva proposes officers screen applicants but can continue discussion of selection process in next AS meeting on 12/1.

Villanueva: All those in favor of approving AI Fellows Program pending revisions from officers please say AYE.

Question about whether approving is in consideration of changes to language and deliverables.

Clarified that offers will make revisions based on today's input and send a link to EC for preview and additional adjustments.

Maasco moves to vote on approval for officers to move forward with circulating application based on feedback received from faculty. Seconded by Kaupp.

Approved; no objections, no abstentions.

10. ACCJC Follow-Up Report, Davison

Documents have been compiled for submission; if approved, will be sent to MIP-C this Friday for a first read, followed by second read in December, then to BoT for first reading in January.

Villanueva solicits motion to approve ACCJC Follow-Up report; moved by Meezan, seconded by Fox.
Approved.

Gleixner: Acknowledges work that went into report and rejuvenation of SLO process, special thanks to Allison, Dolores, and Voltaire. Expresses confidence in report and SLO efforts.

Break

11. **2025-28 Student Equity Plan (Equity 3.0),** Byrd and Scolari

Byrd: Explanation of required elements to receive Student Equity and Achievement Program Funds and submission timeline; report needs to be submitted by week 10 to State Chancellor's Office and then will be submitted to BoT during week 12.

Byrd: Explanation of relationship between Equity 3.0 and Blueprint for Success, as well as responsibilities of assigned leads and shared work between faculty and staff.

Marasco: Who at the college is responsible for submitting updates?

Byrd: Office of Equity

Highlighting of Five Core Focus Areas, p. 3-8

- Enrollment (goal 1)
- Persistence, Primary to Secondary Term (goal 1)
- Transfer level Math & English (goal 1)
- Transfer to four year (goal, 1, 3, 4)
- Completion (goal 1, 2, 4)

Scolari: Description of Kickstart Days, all student services in one room, one stop shop for students

Scolari: Discussion of intensive focus

-biggest challenge/barrier, across most metrics, college is failing Black & Brown students; remains same since Equity 1.0 and 2.0 - requires action plan for Black & Brown students; create high-touch ecosystem of care, right now, low touch DMV system - focused on getting Ed plans to students earlier, especially DI students, do not currently have client relations tracking system (Spotlight: focus on Black/Latiné students ADTs have lived experience on campus that mirrors their expense, that system adapts to them, not the other way around)

-highlight on Ed plans - pilot for reimagining counseling - IR and counseling deans and counseling faculty looking at appointment patterns, especially for students of color - comprehensive plan earlier, transfer more quickly? Strengthen early connections to those students - pilots to make sure scalable -

Byrd: Mention of connection to Vision 2030 Alignment (State Chancellor)
-Spotlight on foster youth; Asian American students, DI, MANAPUA (could also be used for Latiné and African American students - mentors). Have smaller cohorts in Umoja and Puente; reminder that far more students who aren't a part of those programs than are; MANAPUA is not a learning community but for all AA students across campus, anchored in mentoring.

Byrd: Issues with registration and the fact that many students don't register during their assigned time blocks. Hope to get more students registering during their assigned time, increasing the likelihood they'll get the schedules they need, which would hopefully have a domino effect for persistence, etc.

Question about whether initiatives are framed/accessible for online students.

Byrd and Scolari: With respect to CAPs, focus has been on both online and on campus students; otherwise, there has not been as much focus for online students, efforts have skewed more toward being in person on campus. The Blueprint for Success does address online students, particularly in CAPS sections.

Question about whether Office of Equity takes into account disabled students enrolled in noncredit courses, and how outreach occurs.

Byrd: Yes, Office of Equity takes into account all DI students, which often intersects w/ race. Students of color with disabilities are likely more disproportionately impacted. Outreach occurs typically through online counseling.

Scolari: The plan is for more intrusive outreach to these students, which needs to be more intentional.

Question about the vision for instruction, since Office of Equity has moved to Student Services.

Scolari: Emphasis is determined by State Chancellor's Office.

Gleixner: Instruction is addressed in Blueprint.

Question if Blueprint is in lieu of Vision for Equity.

Scolari: Details will likely change as Blueprint action items are implemented.

Reminder by faculty member that the Vision for Equity was in addition to Equity 1.0 and 2.0 because campus agreed those documents were for compliance whereas the Vision for Equity was more intentional and comprehensive. Wondering about the three years spent on 13 issues, and where those issues are in Equity 3.0 and/or Blueprint.

Scolari: Should be collaboration because these issues belong to everyone; can provide vision for Student Services but not for Instruction.

Marasco: reiterates concern with emphasis on compliance document tailored for the state when college spent a lot of time thinking about our students, what they need, and how we've failed them. Concerned about one vision for student services and another for Instruction.

Comment that Blueprint is incredibly aspiration and aggressive, given the goal to eliminate all DI by 2028 when the college has been working on this for 70-something years; this is all going to be solved in the next three years? What is the assessment plan? What are the implementation milestones and plans for assessing goals, via Equity 3.0?

Scolari: To be decided in workgroups.

Question about what in equity 2.0 has or hasn't been carried over to 3.0.

Scolari: Notes that previously the BP for Success didn't exist; now, Equity 3.0 is contextualized by BP objectives. Notes that DI for Black and Brown students hasn't changed, hence the urgency. BP allows for organization of data and means for targeting students.

Reiteration of question about what from Equity 2.0 has not made it into Equity 3.0

Byrd: Nothing has been taken out, but 3.0 builds on 2.0. The five focus areas in 2.0 are still present in 3.0, which also includes additional sections. Part of focus in 2.0 was retention from primary to secondary term, and so the creation of the Office of Retention Services stemmed from that. 2.0 provides foundation for 3.0.

Villanueva: Mentions familiarity with 13-55 document and wondering if there is a second version of that, since 3.0 is for the state, but FH had ownership over 13-55; is there an iteration of something like that?

Gleixner: Equity 3.0 isn't a compliance check, it's a living document; the 13 issues are included in the goals of the Blueprint for Success; there may be something missing, which upcoming work will hopefully surface

Concern expressed about how previous equity plans and 13-55 weren't about compliance and that state mandates aren't enough. Desire for Blueprint to reflect 13-55.

Move to approve Equity 3.0 for submission to State Chancellor and BoT by Marasco; seconded by Kaupp.

Villanueva: Further discussion?

Discussion about past practice of including Classified Senate and clarification about template provided by the State.

Scolari confirmed visit to Classified Senate for approval.

Motion approved.

12. **Professional Development Strategy**, **Villanueva, Meezan**

Discussion of professional development, particularly with respect to AI.

Call for opportunities for sandboxes, disciplinary-focused conversations, and opportunities for everyone to get up to speed.

Question about whether current PD offerings are missing people.

Response that doesn't currently feel like a campuswide approach, need for more centralized coordination of efforts between PD coordinator, TwT, and Online Learning.

Villanueva: Question about what PD may look like going forward; is this kind of coordination in the form of something like a Center for Teaching and Learning? Is Objective 4.2 from the BP an opportunity to re-envision teaching & learning? Could this align with Chancellor's vision of FHDA being an employer of choice; could this be for all employees, like onboarding of deans and familiarity with contract. AI can be addressed, but perhaps the lens can be widened a bit more.

13. **Google Partnership**, **Villanueva**

Villanueva asks for our position on partnership and access to tools.

Comment about not necessarily interested in using Google tools or aligning with company and concern about how Google benefits.

Villanueva notes he did bring up these concerns in MIP-C and is waiting on information. Asks if Hadsell should come to AS to discuss risks and benefits.

Request from faculty representative to not just make tools accessible without guidelines and reiteration of concern about what users would be giving up.

Comment regarding question of implementation and concept of informed refusal; distinction between being made available and integration and marketing. Can accept access but refuse integration and marketing.

Marasco: Emphasis has been on employee refusal, but students should also have the option of informed refusal.

Meezan: Agree, but ship has already sailed. Given that Google is offering FERPA compliance, making available but not integrating seems like the right way to go.

Question about possibility for access via MyPortal as a tile and not integrating with other systems.

Kaupp: If employees already use Adobe and students are already using ChatGPT, why wouldn't we give students access to these Google Tools?

Comment about how training occurs even in closed model; question about what happens to input data.

Villanueva: Will hold off on recommendations and will report on discussion at MIP-C.

14. **Agentic AI: Academic Integrity and the Future of Learning, Meezan - Tabled**

15. **Welcome the Vice Chancellor and Build connection with the Academic Senate, Momijan**

Introduction to Vice Chancellor of Strategy, INstitutional Effectiveness and Engagement, Gohar Momijan, who has just finished first three months in her districtwide role of putting into action the Chancellor's vision. Working on alignment between District strategic plan, to be informed by Foothill's Blueprint for Success and De Anza's strategic plan.

- Unit also includes Executive Director of IR and work of district-level research that should inform initiatives at both colleges.
- Realignment of International Students Program with the goal to sustain and build in current political environment.
- Unit includes districtwide public information officer

As member of executive leadership team, Momijan invites feedback and ideas from faculty.

Meeting Adjourned.