Draft Minutes, Academic Senate, November 3, 2025

1. Call to Order, Villanueva

Villanueva called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call, La Piana

Present: Barrientos Calero, Chang, Davison, Jama, Gilstrap, Gleixner, Gomes, Holcroft, Kaupp, La Piana, Lenkeit Meezan, Mar, Marasco, Mudge, Nguyen, Peters, Tripp Caldwell, Santillan-Nieto, Villanueva, Gray, Campbell

Zoom: Fox, Ripp, Vennarucci, , MacNeil, Vega, Byrd

Absent: Jinnah, Schnell

Proxy: Jama for Fox

Guests: Cormia, Cembellin, Whitley-Putz (Zoom), Pereira (Zoom), Agyare (Zoom), Rivera (Zoom)

3. Adoption of Agenda, Villanueva

Approved by consensus.

4. Public Comment

Cormia: Citations are being issued in the parking lot for staff, for anyone who does not have a staff permit. Request for police to collect data on who uses the parking lot to determine if citations are a necessary means of ensuring staff have enough parking.

5. Approval of Consent Calendar, Villanueva

Added:

- J1B/C Guidance Working Group: Dolores Davison, Sally Baldwin, Nicole Gray, Steve Batham
- Search Committee, Acting Dean of Language Arts + Ethnic Studies: Rosa Nguyen (FA), David Marasco (EO)
- Search Committee, Dean of Counseling: Cleve Freeman (Transfer), Jue Thao (Counseling)
- District Budget Advisory Committee: Dolores Davison
- Teaching with Technology: Myra Aguilera, Oldooz Mohammadi

Moved to approve by Marasco; seconded by Kaupp; approved.

6. ASFC President Updates to the Academic Senate, Nguyen

- Working on recruiting ASFC – AI Fellow Student Representative
- Vote on student health fee increase moved to future meeting
- Approved budget request for Diwali event on 11/8
- 11/4 is the last day of political outreach event
- Activities Board currently working on scheduling events for Native American Heritage Month

7. Classified Senate Updates, Santillan-Nieto

- Recruiting for 2 Classified Staff AI Fellows; several folks are interested; in process of determining selection process
- Retreat debrief held on 10/30; considering holding multiple retreats next academic year
- Convening with De Anza classified staff to start planning district-wide PD event in spring, to be held at FH;
- Plans to hold FH debrief on climate survey as well as joint debrief with De Anza

8. State of AI in Higher Education, Villanueva

Villanueva began discussion with encouragement to enter conversation with curiosity and to be mindful of community agreements. The goal is not to adopt or reject AI but to prioritize learning about AI and the impact it's having on campus, within the district, state, higher ed, and society at large.

Explicitly stated that we would not be making decisions today but giving space for people to think and consider, particularly with respect to how we may be influenced by market interests and need to keep in mind research and scholarship, particularly regarding the effects of AI on student learning. Concern for return on financial investments inform partnerships with higher ed sector, can lead to inflated claims and unmet expectations.

Discussion of broad application of the term AI and its use as a buzzword, often used to describe tools and features that are not actually AI. Noted importance of being exact with our terminology and defining terms.

Mention of data centers as infrastructure, material conditions of "hype."

Point made about how we are only now seeing analysis of longterm studies on social media and its effects, particularly on young people, highlighting the need for critical thinking and discussion before adopting new technologies.

Comment on the influence of corporate-sponsored research.

While social media platforms have had lasting influence, AI seems to be evolving at a far more rapid pace. Concern that students are using technologies we don't yet understand ourselves and that we as educators are at risk of falling behind. Educators overwhelmed because of pace of advancements.

Remark about not being an academic but a practitioner in a field that was discovered by accident: X-rays. Advocating for exploration of AI as a tool, necessary to consider downsides but not necessarily grounded in fear.

Discussion of generational differences and desire to frame as opportunities for students.

Return to need for critical perspectives and thinking through the societal implications, particularly since not many institutions will be critical, already fully adopting without fully understanding.

Positing of LLMs as a tool that is useful for those who already have advanced knowledge and skills but students are leveraging it without having acquired background and experience; how to invite students to use it as a tool rather than a crutch, particularly when our goals as educators is at odds with the companies who create these products. The business model is based on dependency, which is fostered through partnerships with institutions such as ours; results in giving student data to these companies. Students should benefit, not companies promoting their products.

Others seek to consider how to incorporate AI in their classrooms, necessity of changing pedagogy and assignments, require clarity on desired SLOs.

Pointed out that because these products are already ubiquitous and integrated into most of the platforms and apps and search engines our students use, they aren't necessarily opting in or even conscious that these products are undermining their learning. For example, many students aren't aware that using predictive text isn't doing the work themselves. It's our responsibility to prepare students for four-year and university-level expectations. Not interested in being a cop or surveilling students but concern about how to prepare students for AI landscape while also doing the actual job of teaching the subject, particularly when research shows that students who use AI retain almost no knowledge of the topic.

Concern expressed for decreasing literacy and relationship between literacy and functioning democracy, as well as decline in journalism as a profession and correlation with media companies' reliance on AI-generated content.

9. Foothill College Landscape Analysis, Villanueva and Gleixner

Gleixner initiated documentation of Foothill Instructional Initiatives in AI, which has been shared with deans.

Categories:

- Curriculum
    - Courses related to industry
    - How AI is shaping curriculum
- Co-Curricular Activities
    - Student-focused

    - Learning communities
    - Clubs
    - Instructional support
    - Partnerships
    - Etc.
- Policies
    - Least-developed area
- Faculty and Staff Professional Learning
- TBD; role of AI for FH employees

Mention of the AI Transfer+Articulation Network, which in current stage does not seem worth pursuing. Concern about lack of critical perspective/discussions from the Foothill Instructional Initiatives in AI document, as well as conversations about how this is impacting students.

Concern about energy implications and growth of data centers outstripping power capabilities.

Question about whether "critical" conversations should be categorized as distinct from what is included on document; those perspectives should be shared within context of current initiatives.
Response: The follow-up question, then, is, are they in fact happening in those spaces? They don't appear to be, or at least the concerns aren't being documented.

AI often compared to invention and use of calculator, but not at all similar; more significant in terms of how it changes our relationship to knowledge. Should not have a separate group that is critical of AI but there should be a forum that considers that aspect.

Observation that the document foregrounds techno-optimist embrace and doesn't capture faculty concerns and disciplinary distinctions; request for guidance to shift from product to process.

Observation that those disciplines that rely on writing for assessment don't seem to be represented.

Acknowledgement that the Foothill Instructional Initiatives in AI document is a first draft but concerned that there is no mention of consequences or negative side effects, no mention or discussion of informed consent or informed refusal, or declarations of use.

Comment regarding lack of noninstructional opportunities for engagement and learning; lack of conversations around possibilities and/or dangers of automation; worry about lack of representation because of department size; including classified staff would help foster more collective culture on campus.

10. Mission-Driven Alignment, Villanueva

Foregrounding ILOs in AI conversations would help align with institutional values and perhaps mitigate need for separate group. If values are embedded in these conversations, would hopefully result in balanced approach. We need to consider the mission, vision, college values and how that informs work related to AI.

Remark on absence of "student success" from AI conversation.

Break

11. AI Fellows Program Development

President Whalen is initiating a program called AI Fellows; draft of the program has been provided and includes major fellowship activities. See slides for AI Fellows Program Development and Deliverables.

Fellows would include:
6 faculty (2 from instruction, 2 from student services, 2 at large)
2 classified professionals
2 students

Some on campus have extensive repertoire who should be supported and nominated for training the rest of campus.

Concern that application in current form does not invite diverse perspectives or experiences; feels leading; should be revised to foreground critical analysis of the tool itself, with consideration of benefits and detriments, who it is helping and who it is hurting.

Possible to come up with a rubric, with goal of having fellows who together represent balanced approach?

Fear of impact that labels might have, particularly on students.

Whitley-Putz: AI literacy needs to be defined; literacy requires understanding benefits and consequences; need diverse perspectives to ensure critical thinking going forward.

Question about how those with little experience or knowledge who want to be involved and learned more will be considered alongside those with more knowledge/expertise. If goal is more involvement, needs to be inclusive of those who aren't as informed but want to be.

Rubric could be created from current criteria, with the hope that it would draw people who have diverse perspectives.

Discussion of who should select the fellows, as well as question about whether there will be a reasonable number of applicants to choose from.

Proposal of interview process, especially since it comes with RAT.

Fellow positions are for Winter and Spring 26. RAT or stipend.

Question about expectation for number of hours faculty will spend each week.

Gleixner: Work can be scoped depending on RAT, dependent on RAT; there is flexibility based on division and schedules. No one will do more work for less money. Fellows may have different responsibilities or projects.

Villanueva: Who are the administrative leads?

Gleixner is the executive liason and Cembellin is the administrative lead.

No documentation of estimations of time spent per week on role; how to give RAT if unclear on expectations? Given the deliverables, sounds like an immense amount of work.

Gleixner: Winter and Spring are about getting people engaged and starting to move the needle, not necessarily completion. Consider as ongoing work.

Concerns that given the turnaround, not enough time to encourage healthy number of applications. Perhaps AS officers can select from applicants to help get the ball rolling.

Concern that not enough information regarding workload, reimbursement, selection process has been provided to solicit interest from divisions. Question about whether the urgency is necessary. Villanueva suggests more discussion with President Whalen re: accountability, setting expectations.

Gleixner: Some of these concerns are addressed in the MIP-C document, including activities and deliverables. Goal is to make progress, not necessarily complete final product.

Comparison to SLO process, which is an iterative, ongoing process. AI Fellows could help shape program, whether it continues, needs to evolve, etc.

12. Professional Development Strategy, Villanueva and Meezan

AI conversations during Teaching with Technology meetings are happening without complete information, making it difficult to determine needs and address challenges.

Determined four potential areas for AI-focused professional development

Concern that there is a lack of coordination or stewardship of these diverse AI conversations or for AI Fellows; request for a position to unite conversations and efforts across campus.

Major concern regarding Agentic-AI that exploit Canvas's lack of guardrails. Students provide their FH credentials and the Agentic-AI completes the coursework for them. Request for institutional support for Canvas/Instructure accountability.
Discussion of letters to leadership (President Whalen and District CTO Hadsell) re: coordination and oversight.

Villanueva offers to share and elevate at MIP-C and engage classified professionals

Suggestion to agendize at Chancellor's Advisory to address at district level.

13. CCCCO-Google AI Partnership, Villanueva

Gemini + Notebook AI offered to Foothill for free through a district-sponsored partnership; Foothill has its own instance and autonomy in deployment (faculty/staff, students, or both).

Some think there is an opportunity for faculty to lead by example, integrating AI into research and student projects.

Version is FERPA-compliant and closed model (not trained on user data).

Questions:

- Should we deploy broadly, to everyone (employees and students), or selectively (just to employees)? Or not at all?
- What are the implications of providing access to everyone?

"Nothing is free." Need to review contract and end-user agreement, particularly given Google's long-term strategy is building downstream users (similar to CSU agreements with OpenAI).

Need to review terms and conditions and consider implications for students.

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

Sending letter to Vice Chancellor Hadsell asking district to take a stance and communicate to Instructure/Canvas that we are taking this seriously. Instructure is statewide and the license is purchased through a state collective, so asking the Vice Chancellor to take action on behalf of the district.

Agreement with intent of letter; shouldn't be responsibility of individual faculty to come up with measures to deal with Agentic-AI.

Meeting adjourned.