

Mission Informed Planning Council
March 17, 2023
President's Conference Room 1:30 – 3:30 PM

Attendees:

Stephanie Chan, Simon Pennington, Ram Subramaniam, Kennedy Bui, Jordan Fong, Chamu Palaniappan, Jerry Robredo, Voltaire Villanueva, Bret Watson, Bernadine Chuck Fong, Jordan Fong, Skye Bridges, Michelle Nguyen, Saintra Thai, Ellen Judd, Valerie Fong, Bebel (online: Kennedy Bui, Janie Garcia, Fatima Jinnah, Filippi Montes, John Fox, Phuong Tran, Adiel Velasquez, Kristina Whalen)

Minutes:

Minutes approved

Information/Discussion Items/Action:

Logo Discussion (Bernadine)

This is an information item to encourage the MIPC group. (Jerry) Provided an update on the log redesign process. The rollout was not handled as well as everyone would have liked. The rollout took place in 2016. (Bernadine) The District logo use the old Foothill logo and there is a disconnect with the current design. (Janie) As someone who has worked in Outreach, it is fiscally more responsible to stay with the current logo. I have learned so much working in close proximity with the marketing team and I have come to appreciate branding, etc. The issue here is that the District did not meet us half way and change the logo. The materials required to start over would be very expensive. (Jerry) President Miner was instrumental in overseeing the Foothill logo redesign. Jerry approached Judy as Chancellor and Judy did not sanction the update (Skye) Feels that the acorn logo looks more like a tech startup logo. Students identify more with the owl.(Jerry) We have a style guide with three official logos, the seal, the acorn, and the student clubs and athletics have the owl and a red F in a black circle. Student clubs do have the option of using the owl, acorn, etc. (Bernadine) There is not consistency in logos across the campus. The issue is what we need to do as a college. I am not persuaded that we need a consultant. (Fatima) Was wondering if there is a poll on how the campus feels about the current logo. Not sure there was a general vote. If you have a say in what is decided, then folks have more ownership. This is just the beginning of the dialogue.

B. Mission Statement Update: (Janie) Our remit was to review and decide if the mission statement should be revised. Nothing is set in stone. Janie shared the current mission statement and then shared two possible revisions. Students on the committee stated they wanted a more declarative statement. There is one edit suggested by the Academic Senate. (Bernadine) There is only a slight difference. (Janie) The last sentence is something we went back and forth on. We originally borrowed from the SVE "...where success is not predictable by race...), but wanted to acknowledge intersectionality.(Michelle) We wanted to present just one statement to share, but were torn. Students advocated to shorter sentences to make the statements more manageable. (Fatima) Thank you to everyone working on the Mission

Statement. I like the second iteration as it is more positive. I am not sure marginalized is an appropriate choice of words. What it would look like to remove that word. (Chamu) We have to be cognizant that we do serve lots of marginalized groups of students. The whole point of CCCs is accessibility. (Valerie) I hear Fatima's point about an alternative to 'marginalized,' but we might want to think about the term assured. (Janie) I understand the wordsmithing, but not predictable/assured was added as a more positive statement. AS felt the original statement was referencing whether or not we were stating that students could succeed or not. Also, we need to call out marginalized students in some way to reference the fraught history of these communities in education. (Ram) I agree with Fatima. Marginalized does seem problematic. (Stephanie) I would argue the tension that came with calling out racism in the first version should be retained in some way. (Michelle) We have had healthy and fruitful debate about the word marginalized. We are aware of the complexity. We are a little stuck and welcome suggestions. (Skye) Looking at the second statement, the grammar seems a little off. Replace 'to' with 'in achieving' in the statement. (Ellen) I like the statement in the equity statement about 'dismantling oppressive systems." (Voltaire) I would replace marginalized with oppressed. The reality is that these people are oppressed. (Jerry) It was not until I began working at Foothill that I began to understand marginalization. This reflects my college experience. (Voltaire) As a Filipino American male 'marginalized' captures my lived experience. (Phuong) I do not like the word 'marginalized.' We need to use inclusive words. (Fatima) making note of the chat..."historically marginalized" recognizes the history. The dominant culture recognizes us as being deficient. Using historically takes some of the blame and guilt from people. President Whalen suggested historically underserved which takes the label off. I do not want the marginalized label. (Phuong) We do not want to be decisive in our mission statement. It should promote positive energy. (Bernadine) Take this back to the committee. We start with Foothill College and with Skye's suggestion, we are getting closer. If we do not use marginalized, how do we make a statement that positions the institution as the actor, not the student. (Skye) Calling out marginalized groups is needed to acknowledge the history in education (Voltaire) We are also working on a district-wide mission statement. (Bernadine) Mission statements are very important. In my classes I encourage my graduate students to review an institution's mission statement to understand that institution.

C. Resource Allocation Guidelines (RAG): (Ram) This is our team (Amber, Laura, Ellen, Chamu, Phuong, Michelle, Saintra, Ram). The guidelines looks at all types of resources (fiscal, space, etc.). The guidelines are a draft. In parallel, the AS is working on Program Viability as well. Will walk through Financial Resources as an example of the proposed. Each year, a program will be able to submit a budget request. The form is for any new items that the program needed (lab equipment, software, etc.). We are recommending that the request must be referenced in the program review; the action plan should say that to achieve a particular outcome, we need item xxxx. The request should align with the strategic vision for equity as well. The request will go to a team of reviewers (Finance Allocation Team – FAT) who are directly working with financial matters (including AVP of Workforce). FAT will review and, if approved, they will identify a budget (lottery, etc.). Guiding principles – Student need, staff and faculty need, program review for improvement, alignment with the SVE, necessary items for program operations, sustainability (in this case, the cost of ownership and operation, ongoing costs). Procedures –

Overview of the process for submitting and input on requests from program submitter through to the allocation or denial process. Once this is completed, there is notification in the Smartsheet form to approve an expense or denying. In the following year, the program leader must close the loop on the cycle by providing information on how the purchase/equipment/position has supported operations. The RAG team is continuing to refine this proposal and they will be bringing a more complete version back to MIPC in spring for approval. (Skye) Why are purchases brought before the Board? (Bret) Larger expenses have be approved by the Board. (Ram) This follows the timeline for program review each Dec 1 and the approval process will take place in January. This is a process for each program (instruments/subscription...) items that are not in their regular budget. This is a one-time approval. (Janie) Are we sticking to the same metrics we use in program review? (Ram) in the request form there will be mechanism to justify the purchase of a new item related to the program review. (Janie) It will be helpful to have narrative provided as non-instructional programs do not have metrics like productivity. Many of our student-services programs are not allowed to collect data as this is a FERPA violation. It is hard to provide hard data on our student demographics. (Voltaire) This is a great start. It documents how we do things here. How is this document related to MIPC? (Ram) The charge for creating this document came from MIPC (Bernadine) MIPC would not be involved in day-to-day budget requests. We approved the committees' guiding principles, but the resource allocation process is not overseen my MIPC. (Bret) In the past we brought these requests to governance. (Bernadine) We are not going to do that. We do not get involved in the operational running of this process. (Ram) Once we bring back the final form...the principles are the most important to review...we will need approval for the guiding principles as they are important and guide the process. (Skye) Is the submitter given a rationale for not being funded? (Ram) Yes. Typically the submitter will be in the room when a project is discussed/rejected so they will know why. (Bret) We have a shared document that everyone can see during the process. (Ram) Mostly, the intent is to approve requests and try and find the money to fund projects. (Skye) If the process is so transparent, why not convey that in the document wording? (Ram) Sure, we can review and rewrite that. This does relate to our accreditation process on closing the loop. Thank you to the whole group for working on this. We'll come back with the final version of the document in spring.

C. 13-55: Sense of Belonging (Bernadine) (Voltaire) If you look at the attachment we have three themes.. belonging, growth mindset, and purpose. The group does readings on these themes and then meet to implement ideas into our courses, etc. Participants and planning implementation over the summer and hopefully used in classes in the fall. We are very lucky to have David to help us as he is a key figure in Mentor Mindset research. Next week, we'll go online in small groups to work with researchers to understand how to implement different tools in our classes. At Foothill, we are creating a model for future cohorts at the CC level. No one is uninvolved with our 13-55 goals and we all have our part to play in this initiative. (Bernadine) David Yaeger is the top cited researcher in this field. These techniques and strategies significantly increase student achievement, particularly students of color. (Voltaire) We are involving classified professionals in this work, which is a first across the nation. (Ellen) Is there going to be data collection on how this is working once we have full implementation by the first cohort? (Voltaire) Yes, that is the intent. David is working on that. (Ellen) When we

know what works well, will that be rolled out across the campus? (Bernadine) Yes, the goal is this will be an ongoing professional development program.

D. Budget (Bret) A simulation of what hold harmless means for our district. This is a projection. The SCFF is our formula. In 2017, there were districts that would have lost a lot of money. The hold harmless provision has benefitted us. We have received COLAs and will do so until July 2025. Starting in July 2025, where we are with enrollment will be our new base. The model has a 3% COLA built in moving forward. Our revenue will hold flat. Any COLA we get would not be passed to Hold Harmless districts. There will be an increasingly large gap between funding and revenue. This structural deficit will increase over time. The scenario projects an annual cut of about \$2.5 million. If we reduced expenses every five years, we'd be looking at \$10 million each year. (Bernadine) The purpose of discussing this projection is so we can be more intentional in our planning. (Bret) At the next DBAC meeting, the District will discuss this information. (Ellen) Can we grow back the lost FTES? (Bret) The district provides a flat enrollment model. We have used \$2.2 million extra from our carryover for flat enrollment this year. (Ram) Please restate the reason we will not get the COLA (Bret) We are stable in funding at the 2017/18 level unless we grow back enrollment. (Bernadine) We are gaining in enrollment. This is a District-wide issue. How many students would we need to make up this? (Bret) Our college is well positioned to handle challenges. We have resources that our sister college does not have. We have lots of smart folks who work well together. (Bernadine) Some of our new initiatives are designed to bring more students to the college. Looking at our MIPC graphic, our mission statement is very important as it should be a guide for allocation of resources.

Vaccine Mandate: (Bernadine) The constituency groups will be meeting to consider the end of the mandate. (John) FA is fine removing the mandate for the fall once faculty have time to prepare for it. (Voltaire) The reason for the April 3 deadline so students registering for summer will know what we have decided. (Janie) CS has weighed in as we are in spaces where we do not know if the folks we work with are vaccinated. I am interested in seeing how it progresses.

Welcome Weeks: (Bernadine) Main event will on April 11 in our 1900 courtyard. (Ram) Thank you for running these meetings. (Bernadine) Thank you to everyone who worked on MIPC.

Next Meeting: Friday, April 21, 2023 1:30 – 3:30 PM