7. Quick review of |æ cˆ^æ̶ɷ [meeting norms](), and there were no additional comments. John { ^}c̶̟}^å c@ɛ̶ɛ̶ÓŒÔ̶Ô̶Œ&æ̶|^å c@ɜ̶ %&[{ { ˇ } ɑ̃ˆ æ̶ˈ¦^^{ ^} ơ̶+rather than norms. Consensus was that w

Tracee Cunningham commented that she had been asked by a constituent to see President Þ*ˇˆ^}ᶐ *[æ•Ê[àᏏ&ᾱᶎᶜˆ•Êæ}å å^•ã^å [ˇᶜ&[{ ^•ÈSææ@ˆ} &[{{ ^nted that perhaps we (or Tracy?) should ask Thuy to see that documentÈÔæ[|ˆ} &[{{ ^ᶜˆå ᶜ@æᶜ¸ @ᶞ^•@¸æ•}ᶐ]æᶜ of the mediation group formed, she had heard it @æᶐ}ᶐ*[}^¸^||, but now what is the path forward?

Sara Cooper (æ•[) æ•\^åÊ¸@æᶐᶐ}^¢ᶜ? She had heard frustration and uncertainty from some constituents and colleagues as what were the next steps?

If we are open to discussing anything, at what point should we be polling our division faculty about (where they stand) of a vote of no confidence? Some divisions have started that effort. Ö[}}æ&[{{^}ᶜˆå ᶜ@æᶜ•[{^ -æ&ˇ|ĉ æˆ}[ᶜ%ᶛᶜᶜ@•\}[¸ +Êæ}å æˆ^ æ•\ᶏ*¸@ æˆ^}ᶐ¸^ •ˇ]][¦ᶏ* ᶜ@ᶜÚ¦^•ãᶐ^}ᶛÑSææ@ˆ} &[{{^}ᶜˆå ᶜ@æᶜY æᶏ|ˆ¸æᶐ}ᶐ¦^ææˆ (&[{ ᶊ¦ᶜæᶐ|^) ᶊᶜ•@æᶏ^ ᶜ@ᶜ(¦^•ˇ|ᶜᶞ)[ᶊᶜ@ᶜÚ¦^•ãᶐ^}ᶐᶐ |etter (objectives). Paul asked how we can re-engage in {^åᶐæᶐ|}¸@ᶐ}ᶜᶜ@¦^ᶃᶛ&[}ᶏᶛ^å åã-æᶛˇ|ĉ¸ãᶜ@%ᶛˇ@ᶜᶛ||ᶏᶛ*+&[{ᶏᶛ*ᶊ¦ᶜᶜ@ᶜÚ¦^•ãᶐ^}ᶊÈ

Milis•æ•@æᶄ^å æᶏ^^{^}c¸ãᶜ@Öæᶜᶃᶎ æ}å Úæˇ|Ê%ᶛ@ᶛ¸&æ}¸^ å[ᶜ@ᶏ¸ãᶜ@ᶛˇcåãᶐ&ˇ••ᶏᶛ* æç[ᶜ^[~ no confidenc^Ñᶑᶓ

Ôæ|ᶏ} &[{{^}ᶜˆå ᶜ@æᶜ¸@ᶏ^ãᶜã |ã^|ˆ ᶜ@æᶜ¸^ᶊᶛ @æᶜ^ æç[ᶜ^[~}[&[}-ãᶐ^}&^Êᶜᶜ@ᶏ¦^{ æ̂ not be one big truth, but many small truths, and it could be difficult to arrive at the truth.

Kathryn commented this is really challenging as Academic Senate president, we need to have agreements about what is the evidence, and what are the circumstances that are affecting these agreements. She further commented how challenging it is to come up with evidence to validate the assertions (accusations) made by the President. When accused of bullying, FHDA-CCD Human Resources (HR) and the Chancellor both commented that there was no evidence for bullying, and that accusation must stop immediately. And yet we are in that position again, she added it twice in the most recent objectives document. Even if she considers that her truth, this should not be an allowable narrative. Everything in our letters with legitimate faculty concerns has been countered with ‰^ @æᶜ^ •^¦ᶏᶛˇ• ãᶐˇ^• [~][¸^¦ åˆ}æᶊᶐᶞæ}å ãᶐˇ^• [~¦æ&^Ê[¸^¦ æ}å]¦ãᶃᶏ^*^ᶊ ˇ}]æ&ᶑSææ@ˆ}@]^• ᶜ@æᶜ]^[]|^ ˇ}å^¦•ᶜæ}å[ˇ¦•^}æᶜ^ æᶐ•[|ˇᶜ^|ˆ @æᶜæ concern for inequitable structures, inherently racist systems, and equity issues, but we are concerned with all of our concerns being countered with this narrative, and we have not yet heard an acknowledgement of our legitimate concerns. By allowing all narratives, how do we make progress?

Katy Ripp asked, what is the process of a vote of no confidence, what is the next step, what is the outcome of that? Does the Board of Trustees have a say in it? There was a comment that a vote of no confidence would put pressure on the Board of Trustees. There was a comment that it would be embarrassing to be operating the College with a President that has had a vote of no confidence, and the Board of Trustees are elected officials.

Stephanie Chan commented about the weight that we bear, and our duty to explain this to our constituents, and now is the time to get people up to speed.

Short break

9. Academic Senate priorities - Kathryn asked if there was anything missing from this list. Alexis Aguilar asked about professional development. Kerri commented about distance education plan,

technology plan, and title V updates. COOL would like professional development, specifically work on the summer PD, added to the priority list. Kathryn said she would check with Alexis about what he was thinking should be added in terms of professional development in other areas.

David Marasco commented that there has been messaging to the effect that returning to &æ{]˘• å[^•} ȼ@æ¸^ æ|[c[~•˘]] [¦cæȼ@˄ { [{ ^} Êà˘c¸ ^ }^^å ȼ •˘]] [¦c-æ&˘ |ĉ æ} å students who are returning to campus. Donna Frankel mentioned Reemployment Preference