

## Academic Senate

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
<b>Advisory Members</b>	
President's Cabinet	
Stacy Gleixner	4006
Dean of Equity	
Ajani Byrd	4006
<b>Guests</b>	
David Marasco (senator emeritus), Fatima Jinnah (online), Evan Gilstrap (articulations)	

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



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

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

