



MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 30, 2018

Time: 1-3 p. m.

Loc: 1901 (President's Conference Room)

Item 1: Approval of Agenda and November 2nd Meeting Minutes

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

Request from I. Escoto to amend the November 2nd meeting minutes to reflect the outcome of the Council's vote to approve Foothill's Phase II Budget Reduction plan to be submitted to the District (not the Board of Trustees).

Minutes with amendment approved by consensus.

Item 2: Presidents Report

District has received the list of employees who are volunteering for the Supplementary Retirement Plan (SRP). While the Board of Trustees will vote on Dec 10 to approve the list, the board will meet in a closed session in the first week of December to review the list in more detail. President Nguyen also anticipates presenting the management reorganization on December 14th as a precursor to the college reorganization to be presented next year.

The First-Gen Summit is next week on Tuesday, December 4th. 1 in 4 students are first-gen at Foothill. The definition of first-gen is both parents haven't attended college. One of the challenges of first-gen students is picking a major and being aware of the broad spectrum of majors to choose from. With regard to career selection, first-gen students tend to prioritize their ability to support their family and will often pick majors with that in mind. A faculty panel will address this directly, speaking on how majors in their respective areas address social issues like housing affordability and homelessness—the topic of this year's Summit. The Summit will take place in the Toyon room between 12pm-3pm.

President Nguyen also thanked those that met with the service leadership consultants, who also presented at the Community and Communications committee.



Professional development for governance helps members of the committees to become more prepared for their roles. President Nguyen continues to look to provide committee members with opportunities for professional development. For example, the Resource and Revenue committee members have been invited to join President Nguyen at the Community College League of California's (CCLC) Annual Legislative Conference in January 2019 to form a better understanding of how the State appoints funding. Additionally, President Nguyen is asking this committee to consider a professional development opportunity with Stanford's D school in Design Thinking. Professional development opportunities for governance to be funded through the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI).

Item 2: Textbook Cost Reduction

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

In October, a discussion began around the idea of developing a campus-wide initiative or policy around textbook cost reduction for students. S. Pennington presented a revised memo to the Academic Senate and Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC), previously drafted in committee by the Advisory Council on October 19th. More suggestions on topics to probe around textbook cost reduction arose, including: limitations in our current processes and strategies that disadvantage faculty and online students (respectively), purchasing and selling options for students, assumptions around "affordability", faculty choice in low/no-cost materials, and the impact of technology on low-income, or underserved populations as it relates to online, open access resources.

Specifically regarding the memo, suggestions were made to specify that ASFC seek out diverse perspectives when surveying students, such as input from older students or online students, etc. K. Maurer requested that there exist language in the ASFC memo indicating Institutional Research's (IR) ability to assist with drafting a survey. Additionally, she would like to see in the Academic Senate memo a link to a website or other supporting material that speaks to the State's incentives around this issue.

A suggestion was made to present the newly revised version of the memo at the next Advisory Council meeting, but the group determined it was not necessary.

OUTCOME: Should Advisory Council accept the drafted memos to both the Academic Senate and the Associated Students of Foothill College with the caveat that recommendations for adjustments to language be included, and that the memo be distributed to Council as well as the intended constituency groups?

Motion approved.

Item 3: Program Approval Process



Presenter: Isaac Escoto (Faculty Tri-Chair)

I. Escoto opened the conversation by drawing the committee's attention to the program creation process and how it exists within a context that includes review and approval via committees that were disbanded in the governance redesign. If a new program is to be created, how will it be created in the absence of those prior committees? What process should be followed?

Escoto reviewed the program creation flow chart, emphasizing that the current approach ensured participation from certain constituencies that would be impacted in the program's creation. The aim of this agenda item was not to develop the creation process, but rather to determine the most appropriate avenue for which a new process could be created. For example, authorization from the Council to form a study group on this issue. President Nguyen liked the idea of a study group, but also suggested that the Community and Communication committee might be a good group to authorize it as that committee oversees governance, updates and revisions to the handbook, and is empowered to sanction a new program creation process. A. Edwards also agreed with the study group idea however, she mentioned some concerns about the potential size of this committee. She would prefer that the number of members in this group be small, with specific expertise on issues surrounding program creation.

Escoto requested that the committee authorize a memo to be sent to the other governance committees requesting appointments. K. Lisle requested that Advisory Council also reach out to the campus community to garner interest. V. Smith, suggested that the Parliament (the Foothill Faculty and Staff newsletter) could be a way to recruit committee members.

While a formal vote was not required to authorize the Council to act on this issue, a vote was taken and passed (by consensus) to move forward with developing a study group to explore and create a new program approval process. S. Pennington volunteered to draft the memo to be sent to the other governance groups.

Item 4: Innovation and Effectiveness Plan

Presenter: Thuy Nguyen (President)

President Nguyen informed the Council that the Partnership Resource Team (PRT) is an opportunity to leverage the use of state assistance to provide feedback on areas of improvement that the College has identified.

The PRT team visited the campus on 11/26/18 and based on four areas of improvement the College identified, provided Foothill with a menu of options (MOO). President Nguyen noted that our options on how the College would like to approach the feedback could include everything from following the PRT team's suggestions, incorporating the feedback with some modification, or not taking the team's suggestions at all. Ultimately, Foothill is tasked with creating a plan, as well as whatever funds have been appropriated by the



PRT team to put the plan into action. The four areas identified were governance, institutional effectiveness, service leadership, and student equity.

Governance: One of the comments from the PRT had to do with classified professionals being more engaged in shared governance. Comments around orientation, and assessing our efficacy as a governance organization also were revealed.

Institutional effectiveness: Much of the work around our institutional effectiveness is housed in two places: 1) program review, and 2) governance as a whole (what did we plan to do and did we do it). An interesting comment provided by the PRT was whether there were other places where institutional effectiveness could be evaluated.

Service leadership: Feedback was provided around the need to develop a plan of action, facilitating understanding around what service leadership is and is not, whether or not faculty share a common understanding about their role in service leadership, and whether service leadership is embraced by the college campus? To that note, I. Escoto asked how to approach measuring the college's embrace of service leadership? President Nguyen referred mentioned that some of the comments in the MOO that speak to that particular point.

Student equity is the last area identified for improvement by the College.

Council members expressed their appreciation for the MOO because it was a reflection of what the PRT team thought about what Foothill presented to them. A. Cervantes mentioned that Classified Senate weren't expecting some of the questions the PRT team asked, such as their take on service leadership, and mentioned that the senate didn't see their role in this initiative. On this note, President Nguyen would like Council to explore ways to better engage classified professionals in governance. What are the issues? S. Negus agreed with the sentiment around classified staff engagement, stating a connection to the idea of contributing to the college in labor and time, but not feeling like (as a part-timer) he always has access to the same conversations other employees may have.

Escoto reflected on the PRT's note about how much the College has taken on at once and the bandwidth required to effectively enact initiatives. In response, President Nguyen stated the College is undertaking a lot and posed the question to the Council about what can "we push out", respective to the concerns employees are experiencing with the budget reductions. Many of the PRT's comments were tweaks of things the College already does. The bottom line is the College doesn't have to enact their specific suggestions; there is a lot of leverage here.

A. Edwards says she's been receiving a lot of questions about how decisions made in Advisory Council are getting distributed to the larger community. V. Smith addressed this by reminding the Council that the Parliament, a faculty/staff newsletter is currently



coming out monthly. Cervantes discussed that there is a disconnect with representatives reporting back on what's occurring in the committees. Escoto mentioned that there's been some discussion in Academic Senate around bringing back Committee Reports as a formal agenda item. P. Ni added that he thinks it's great the parliament is available every month.

Meeting adjourned.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Voting

Tri-Chairs: Thuy Nguyen, Anthony Cervantes, Isaac Escoto

Administrator:

Classified Staff:

Faculty: Preston Ni (FT), Amy Edwards (FT), Kathryn Maurer, Sean Negus (PT)

Students: Jashandeep Chahal, Chelsey Nguyen (ASFC President)

Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Vanessa Smith, Kristy Lisle

Recorder: Adrienne Hypolite

Facilitator: Simon Pennington