



MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 18, 2019

Time: 1-3 p. m.

Loc: President's Conference Room, ADMN 1901

Item 1: Approval of Agenda and December 14th Meeting Minutes

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

Minutes amended as written and approved by consensus.

Item 2: Presidents Report

President Nguyen provided an update on enrollment. There are still challenges around enrollment and part of that may do with the implementation of AB 705. The elimination of many basic skills courses has resulted in students having to take fewer courses to get to degree applicable/transfer level courses. The belief is that long term, funding loss due to enrollment will hopefully equal out a bit if the College can demonstrate success with AB 705 implementation. By doing this well, the College will earn points in the new formula for students completing in a year (English/math transfer level). Census check in is next week.

President Nguyen sent a governance memo regarding the hiring process for full-time faculty coming from new state funding allocated for hire of a full time faculty, plus one (1) from carryover of a position (accounting) due to an unsuccessful search. Another plus one (1) is coming from the Governors Innovation fund to pay for one counselor (full-time, tenure track) for the implementation of the Math Performance Success Program.

Speaking on the budget, President Nguyen posed the question, "What is the one major challenge for Foothill?" Budget seems to be the answer, however budgets are cyclical. So what is the big challenge for Foothill? In light of today, budget is the presenting challenge and the College is prepared to present the other part of the Phase II budget reduction proposal now that SRPs have been finalized.

Item 3: Part-Time Faculty Subcommittee

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)



S. Negus was not able to attend the meeting. S. Pennington updated the committee that Sean wanted to investigate a part-time faculty subcommittee, originally for Advisory Council, but it appeared to be better suited for Academic Senate. It currently is in the planning stages, short of implementation. More information on the subcommittee may be provided at a later date.

Item 4: Institutional Effectiveness and Partnership Initiative Funding

Presenter: Thuy Nguyen (President)

Decision points were made at the last Advisory Council meeting regarding the Partnership Resource Team (PRT) funding. L. Balducci stated that the final report was submitted with President Nguyen and I. Escoto (Academic Senate President) signing off. As a reminder, Foothill developed four (4) initiatives. The PRT suggested that it was a bit industrious but the College held steadfast that we would maintain the four. Implementation of the initiatives will begin once the funding comes through (fairly soon). The PRT team will come back in May to see how the College is doing and provide us with more feedback.

Item 5: Institutional Planning and Budget Update

Presenter: Kristy Lisle (Executive Vice-President, Instruction, Student Services and Institutional Research)

The Institutional Planning & Budget study group (IP&B) has completed the Instructional Program Review and the rubric evaluation component that goes with it, providing direction for evaluations. IP&B completed a Career Technical Education (CTE) addendum for the instructional template rubric. Both will go to Academic Senate and the Education and Equity committee for final approval. The finance template was started, but put on pause. The annual budget template has been finished and approved by Senate and all feedback from the Revenue and Resources committee was incorporated prior to Senate approval. K. Lisle worked with Eric from ETS and they are building the template into the dashboard in MyPortal so it will be online with an electronic submission.

On February 5th, Student Services Program Review will have an upcoming retreat. This program review will be different and will need to start from the ground up. IP&B will continue developing the finance template, and creating a structure around the program review process. This may entail a five (5) year timeline, rules and responsibilities for all submissions; annual surveys about what submitters liked/didn't like, and what was meaningful. Additional tasks include creating a manual, convening public forums on the overview of the program review template so that governance has an idea of what is in the program reviews to be considered (when voting for approval).

B. Nikolchev asked where a program like the Family Engagement Institute fits into this? Lisle responded that at the student services retreat, one of the first things that will need to be addressed is are student learning outcomes; that despite being student services, there



are still outcomes and knowledge students need to understand. Once that has been articulated in the learning outcomes, then we are better able to evaluate whether or not students are walking away with those skills and knowledge. Sometimes those outcomes are operational.

Item 6: Foothill College Phase II Budget Reduction: College Re-Organization

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

S. Pennington reviewed the Advisory Council's role in the budget phase reduction process (see first slide). Today is a first read. K. Maurer had questions about the timeline for Academic Senate and whether there would be enough time for Senate to review the plan and provide feedback. I. Escoto states that he would suggest an additional meeting for Academic Senate to provide enough time for two (2) reads.

Pennington reviewed the seven (7) guiding principles. B. Watson updated the committee on the current budget standing with regard to new changes due to the SRP that was approved in December 2018, the particulars approved in early January, and how that has made an impact on positions that were eliminated, moved and saved. On November 2nd Advisory Council approved a budget plan to be sent to the District, but the SRP required that there be some revisions to the original plan since they were both submitted on the same day before having the ability to reference one another. Watson reviewed the current timeline (see PowerPoint) with upcoming meetings and public forums. The plan will be implemented on July 1st 2019. Planning for the third year in budget reductions is occurring now, which is the most significant of the cuts. Years one and two have been implemented already. Watson then shared the results of the number of SRP participants throughout the district that were approved. Foothill had a small share of SRP participants in comparison to De Anza and the District. Either way, the SRPs were helpful in minimizing the number of people laid off. With regard to part-time faculty, the College will utilize the funding savings from the 13 faculty SRPs and back fill those positions with part-timers so that the positions were not subject to elimination, while also providing positions for part-time faculty. The college could've eliminated all 13 positions to meet the budget reductions but they decided not to. They wanted to continue to provide the courses needed to teach students. Watson went through a summarized version of the moves and eliminations of positions. Although there are moves and eliminations, some positions were redesigned and reclassified and brought back into the departments/areas which affects the bottom of line of proposed cuts (those costs have to be figured back into the equation). Utilizing B budget funds, the College was able to make a proposal for budget reductions, down to the very dollar.

P. Starer began the college re-organization presentation by starting with the Office of Instruction (see PowerPoint). By eliminating the Vice President of Student Services position and turning it into an Executive Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, they're hoping that will help reduce the "silo-ing" of the two sides of the College. The hub for Instruction aims to increase communication between deans and students. With regard to the Biology and Horticulture program changes, they wanted to ensure



that Horticulture maintained representation on academic committees. The change from a dean overseeing the program to a director position is due to the number of duties and employees to be managed being far fewer than what a dean position would manage, generally. All academic deans will report to Starer and will be located in the 1900 building. What is the value of this re-organization and move? Currently students with issues coming to meet with a dean in the division offices are subject to the dean being available and there or not. By providing a hub, it ensures that schedules are staggered and students can meet with multiple deans that will be able to address their questions (see PowerPoint). Ideas for use of the vacated division offices were proposed: a Career Centers, a Dream Center, part-time faculty space, or keep it for the division to use as a communal space. Starer reiterated that Administrators are really invested in feedback on this model.

L. Balducci discussed changes in the Student Services area (see PowerPoint). The priority for student services is to become better at work efficiency. Notable changes include Articulation being moved from Enrollment Services back under Counseling, and the Dean of Enrollment and International Students was split so that the Dean of Enrollment only focuses on enrollment.

T. Ong presented on changes to Strong Workforce and CTE. The new position of Dean of Apprenticeships was created with the vision of helping students get more jobs due to the State's focus on apprenticeship programs. Foothill currently has 4,000+ students in apprenticeship programs. Allied Health programs would come under Ong, making some processes (including budgetary requests) more efficient via a direct line to the dean. The position overseeing the allied health program would be a director position and each of the allied health programs have a faculty director.

E. Regalado presented on the Finance and Administrative Services reorganizations. Some of the reorganization have already occurred due to the immediacy of the need to address certain issues.

M. Cervantes presented on the structure of the new Office of Equity. The Program Supervisor is a way to help ease the operational needs from the dean's responsibility, so that the dean will be able to focus more on strategic planning. The First Year Experience program is on hiatus, to be evaluated for continuance. The STEM core grant has ended, and thus will the program. The Honors Institute has been moved to the Office of Equity with a focus on increasing the population of disproportionately impacted students, while increasing the overall population of Honors to 1000 students. The Family Engagement Institute also was moved under the Office of Equity due to its cradle to career model and how it utilizes a community engagement approach.

S. Pennington presented on the College and Community Relations, Marketing and Communication changes. In the past layoffs, the College decided to reduce outreach positions. With enrollment being a continued issue it was imperative to bring outreach back, but in more strategic ways.



Feedback and the budget timeline are available on the budget website at <http://www.foothill.edu/president/updates>. A request has been made by Pennington to take the information back to the Council's constituents to share and discuss. The second read for this budget plan/re-organization will be February 1st, with the third read on February 8th.

C. Nguyen had a question about the SRP participant vacancies, asking for more information on how it helps with the reductions. Starer answered, clarifying the college savings. K. Maurer had questions about the process; how it was developed and when and where feedback was received by faculty and staff. Or is it that faculty/staff feedback is limited to the three (3) weeks provided between the first and last read? K. Lisle mentioned that this process started approximately 9-10 months ago. President Nguyen mentioned that this was the time for feedback and that there's been a push from Administration to go to division meetings to get more feedback. She mentioned that there are other options, but those include program elimination. Lisle stated that there was outreach to faculty but that employees may not have known that. She gave an example about how managers and deans solicited information from their employees about every area in an informal manner, but the conversations kept circling back to the area/issue of consolidation.

President Nguyen addressed the "silo-ing" of the College and the opportunity now to bring both sides of the house together, including physically. There are changes that everyone will need to adjust to in this proposal.

A. Edwards is in the Bio-Health division and has already spoken with her fellow faculty about the proposal. From faculty she's spoken to, they feel like they are creating new silos, except now they are between Administration and Faculty. She emphasized that faculty like their deans, as well as the informal one-on-one, day-to-day being access to them. A potential solution might be to have dean's office hours back in the division areas so faculty know a time when they can access their dean.

Escoto requested a summary of how moving to the hub saves money, because the monetary savings of this re-organization were not very clear. C. White, ACE President, chimed in on the confusion because it sounds like some positions were just replaced with others. President Nguyen and Lisle clarified that some positions, like SRP positions, were used as landing spots for positions that would've been eliminated.

P. Ni acknowledges the reality of the re-organization and it's necessity, but wants to propose an idea that there be regular office hours in the areas where the division faculty reside because it doesn't seem rational to him to not have division deans in the vicinity of the area of the faculty. He believes this will help maintain faculty morale. He also thinks student safety is a concern. When numerous minor emergencies occur, having a division dean in the area to refer the student to has been important. If the deans can't be there full time, then they should at least have a part-time physical presence.



Lisle acknowledged Ni's point, but also wants to consider that we have to be responsive to online faculty as well, and so we have to stretch our thinking on this issue.

Pennington asked the group to think about where the college is going to be 10-20 years down the line. How are we setting up our college to meet the needs of the changing student population and their needs? Change is difficult but also an opportunity. This is a first read, so he made a request that we return with lots of questions.

Meeting adjourned at 3:07pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Voting

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

Administrator: Betsy Nikolchev

Classified Staff: Vacant

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

Students: Jashandeep Chahal, Sissi Hu, Chelsea Nguyen (ASFC President)

Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Vanessa Smith, Elias Regalado, Paul Starer, Bret Watson, Ram Subramaniam, Teresa Ong, Kristy Lisle, Laureen Balducci, Melissa Cervantes

Recorder: Adrienne Hypolite

Facilitator: Simon Pennington