



MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 1, 2019

Time: 1-3 p. m.

Loc: President's Conference Room, ADMN 1901

Item 1: Approval of Agenda and February 8th Meeting Minutes

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

S. Negus noted a typo on his comment on page 4. Suggested changing “to” to “do”.

Minutes amended and approved by consensus.

Item 2: Presidents Report

President Nguyen spoke about how the incorporation of technology is allowing us to increase access to spaces that allow for deeper engagement from different areas of campus. Zoom is the right way to engage people but it is clunky. The College is not advanced enough yet where our tech solutions are not seamless. She mentioned a camera that allows for 360 viewing in zooming meetings (i.e. Owl 360 all in one video conferencing camera), and is looking forward to unpacking technology needs as part of the revision for our Educational Master Plan.

President Nguyen also gave a reminder about the upcoming governance summit. In light of this year with the governance redesign, we need to do a mid-year check in. The mid-year governance summit is scheduled for March 15th, 2019. At the summit, she expects all 4 committees to engage in the Vision for Success conversation, as well as hold a mid-year check in on how we're doing with our strategic objectives and have a conversation about what is/isn't working with the new governance design. The mid-year summit will take place in the Toyon room.

Item 3: New Faculty Prioritization (Action Item)

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

Five new faculty positions have been approved to go out for hire: Articulation Officer, Radiologic Technology, ESLL/English, Biology, and Chemistry. S. Pennington reported that all positions were opened for all departments to submit requests. Requests were



forwarded to Institutional Research (IR). IR put together a spreadsheet of data based on key indicators: enrollment, equity (success rates for different populations of students), and productivity numbers for the department. Other factors taken into account included how many full-time faculty were in the department. This spreadsheet was shared with Deans and faculty representatives from across campus. Open and honest discussion occurred about positions. The Articulation Officer is a position the College has to have and the current person holding the position is retiring. These were the 5 positions that came out of that discussion. Discussions happened with Deans, Associate Vice Presidents (AVP), the Executive Vice President (EVP), Academic Senate reps, the Dean of the Office of Equity and the Equity and Education committee in a special convening.

B. Nikolchev asked if the ESLL faculty was non-credit or credit. Pennington could not answer with any certainty. C. Nguyen asked If AB 705 was abolishing most basic skills courses, including a number of ESLL classes the College would need to get rid of, why are we hiring an additional ESLL instructor? President Nguyen answered that with the retirement of two ESLL instructors, it resulted in only 1 full time faculty in the department. A. Edwards added that even with the policy change due to AB 705, the department still needs support to do the work required to revise the ESLL courses/sequence to be compliant with the new law.

S. Negus asked if the positions were full or part time positions and if the ESLL/English position was a hybrid of the two, or two separate positions. Pennington answered that they are full-time, tenure track positions and that the ESLL/English was one position that would teach for both areas.

President Nguyen mentioned that a few things were happening: We're really delayed in the game in hiring. We're behind not because we're short funding but because we didn't know the situation with the budget and what to do with the new state funding for the faculty hires. In being behind, we started an effort to bring faculty prioritization to governance. Foothill needed a better rubric. On top of that, the Equity and Education committee (E&E) said the rubric should have some real markers around equity. This was occurring in December/January.

In the interim, faculty leadership were invited into the Dean's Meeting for this conversation (for this year), collapsing the two processes to be more efficient. President Nguyen also mentioned that she's already posted these positions. That said, Administration is in an experimental mode right now so bear with them as they work this out. Pennington said the process this time around was really refreshing. Equity was forefront in the conversation and the discussion was collaborative. I. Escoto agreed, saying he felt really good about it as well. However, he did want to add that the ESLL/English hire wasn't just because of the retirement. That was just a piece of what was considered in the final decision of the five new faculty positions.

Edwards said she was amazed at the volume of data that was offered at the meeting, it showed her that the Deans were looking at the rubrics all the time and how well versed the Deans were in these factors that contributed to this discussion. One of her favorite things



that occurred in the meeting was an exercise that had everyone make a pitch for faculty hires outside of their department. That thinking carried over throughout the entire process which allowed everyone to think from that perspective. The overall feeling was that the Deans were advocating for other Deans and she felt that was eye opening in its collegiality.

K. Maurer offered a point for consideration that she asks not take away from the value of the effort. However, she doesn't want to lose the opportunity to learn from this new process. One of the things she was concerned about regarding the rubric was that it wasn't used in its entirety; the qualitative piece was missing from the form. Information in response to questions about service leadership specialization issues weren't collected or shared because there wasn't enough time to assemble it all. This was a missed opportunity for faculty to explain their need. President Nguyen wanted to know if the qualitative part was done, would it have changed anything for her? Maurer responded that she doesn't know because it wasn't discussed. For her department (Anthropology), some of the qualitative factors were a significant component for their request (noting that the Anthropology request ranked #6 in top five hires approved).

President Nguyen also noted she was surprised Chemistry was on the list due to a previous recent hire in that department, but the EVP gave her a lot of data to corroborate the request. President Nguyen believes that we're getting very sophisticated in this process and wants to make clear that prior to the EVP's input, that data-driven decision making wasn't occurring. She also wanted to remind the committee that the College will actually be going out for 5+1+1 positions (one of the positions is categorical funding hiring for a math Counselor for the Math Performance Success program).

OUTCOME: Should Advisory Council support the hiring of five new faculty positions in the following areas: Articulation Officer, Radiologic Technology, ESLL/English, Biology and Chemistry?

Votes: 11 Yes; 2 Abstentions; 0 No

Motion approved.

Item 4: Educational Master Plan 2020/2030

Presenter: Thuy Nguyen (President)

President Nguyen reminded the group that in October the Council did a preliminary envisioning exercise of looking backward to look forward. This was an exercise where Council members looked 12 years back (2006) to think about how different we were as a society with our social, educational and technology needs. Next academic year the Council will be guiding the conversation on the



educational master plan (EMP), but in light of the budget reductions, President Nguyen felt it would be important to have that conversation now. The question is how should we engage the campus in discussion about the EMP. Currently our EMP and facility master plan do not have a Bridge document nor did it guide the construction of the facility plan. Additionally, the EMP does not guide our resource allocation (but it should).

In order to get there, we have to do some groundwork. For this calendar year President Nguyen is just hearing thoughts, but maybe next year we have a lecture series featuring guest speakers with expertise in particular areas. She also wants it to mirror town hall for the budget. Additionally, if people are interested in doing some things to test out the water in some of these areas we have seed money (\$50k from the Office of the President) to try out some of these innovative ideas. She also wants to encourage students to be engaged in this process. This seed funding is to not just buy toys (tech) but to really ground new methodology in the work we're doing.

A. Cervantes mentioned blockchain as an example of a rapidly approaching technology that may change the way we as a college interact with data, but that it remains important to continue following policy while adjusting to these quick changes. He liked the idea of lecture series and piloting ideas but has concerns about over-trying and getting burned out on strategies and solutions. S. Negus offered that it's an exciting proposition to carve out space to think about technological innovation, but we would do well to be as systematic and holistic as we can. Considering our budget crisis, tech systems in general have the ability to displace labor. The other thing about the lecture series is to maybe think about how to make that pointed and focused not just for the college as whole but for the decision-making committees.

K. Maurer wants to know how a lecture format engages the community. She agrees with including students in the process but cautions against thinking about technology as part of the strategic process before we discuss where we want to be with our values. Maurer offered consensus building workshops as an idea to facilitate feedback instead of lectures. I. Escoto asks for an operations perspective to be in place that looks at the big picture and maps out a timeline that stipulates when discussions will occur and when feedback should happen. This is an effort to avoid the rush behind the last-minute feedback situation and that this should happen soon as we move forward. S. Pennington would like folks to ask their constituent groups about the best way to engage the campus community in EMP planning. We will bring this back to Council for more discussion, addressing community concerns around timing of the planning and resources needed to engage in the planning process. As a final thought on the topic, M. Mohebbi wanted to remind the Council that the EMP needs to be consumer driven (student centered). He suggests that we can learn from the budget process and adopt a similar model for engaging feedback on the EMP as a point of reference.



Item 5: Foothill College Core Values

S. Pennington noted that because we're behind schedule this will be just an introduction to the topic. People have pointed out where is equity in the conversation around the College's core values? While diversity and equity are mentioned in the College's mission statement, it may not be in the sense that we understand equity. K. Mauer really thinks it's an important discussion and supports working on values and potentially revising them. She thinks it will drive the other prioritization and resource planning.

B. Nikolchev offered that she thinks it's a great time to look at the core values. Nikolchev believes the ask really is around how do we think about how we're going to respond to the future of education? She thinks the previous conversation on the Educational Master Plan is really linked to the core values.

Pennington offered up the question, how do we become the future of education? How do we get ahead of things in education instead of reacting?

Item 6: New Program Approval Process

I Escoto reminded the committee about the need for a new program approval process because the old process includes committees that don't exist anymore in light of the governance redesign. Escoto walked the committee through the old process. A study group of this council was commissioned.

The new process includes fewer steps (in general) and they tried to have different pieces happen in parallel to expedite the process. The new process also attempts to bring in all the people that need to be involved in the discussion earlier on. The committee discussed having a small piece of information about the program that could be shared with the different committees, and then the full program narrative could be written out later. This allows for people to give feedback before engaging the entire process of writing the curriculum.

In the meantime, an expedited process was created. The first steps happen and then after the whole program narrative needs to be filled out. That full narrative is shared with all the committees at the same time as an information item (as well as academic and professional matters) allowing a few weeks for discussion in those groups. Then it would go to the college curriculum committee for action. Again, the expedited process is to address the programs that need attention right now. There are ADTs that need action right now.

The new process is very specific about when discussion info and action should occur. A. Cervantes asked about the hiccups from the last process and wanted to know when/where they get addressed. Escoto answered in step 3 mostly, when it hits the broader group.



Escoto also mentioned the college curriculum committee is a good place to address hiccups because it has representations from all programs. The concerns are discussed at the committee and however they like them to be shared. P. Ni asked the question because some past concerns had the tendency to bog down the process, and he was wondering if any of the constituents have the power to hold up the process. Escoto answered that one person shouldn't be allowed to muscle or strong arm the process so facilitation is important. Also need to take a look at where approval and action is happening.

President Nguyen wants to know if the committee will continue to define new programs as those that relate to curriculum. K. Maurer wonders if we can stop using the term program or at least refine it. She isn't sure if using the term program that is related to curriculum is enough of a definition. Escoto agrees, but also reminds that we don't want to veer too far off from language being used from the Chancellor's office.

Escoto will take the Council's feedback back to the study group. They will continue to work on refining the new program approval process.

Item 7: Deactivation of Nanoscience Certificate

The Nanoscience certificate has been deactivated. Questions can be directed to S. Pennington.

Item 8: Public Comments

No public comments.

Meeting adjourned: 3:00pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Voting

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

Administrator: Betsy Nikolchev

Classified Staff: Mike Mohebbi, Becki Di Gregorio



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, Bret Watson
Recorder: Adrienne Hypolite
Facilitator: Simon Pennington

DRAFT