

Mission Informed Planning Council
March, 15, 2025
Administrative Conference Room (1901) and Zoom

Attendance	<p>Voting Members Present: Kristina Whalen, Voltaire Villanueva, Adiel Vasquez, Patrick Morriss, Nicole Nguyen, Nina Mistry Haywood, Nate Springer, Doreen Finkelstein, Kelaiah Harris, Josh Pelletier, Phuong Tran, Valerie Fong, Jordan Fong, Clifton Der Bing, Simon Pennington</p> <p>Voting Members Absent: Joshua Agupugo, Nicole Nguyen, Kathy Perino, Bebel Yan, Lisa Hills, Fatima Jinnah, Phuong Tran, Roxanna Cnudde</p> <p>College members present: Bret Watson, Zach Cembellin, Lene Whitley Putz, Allison Meezan, Elaine Kuo, Janie Garcia, Harini Nagappan</p>		
Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Chair: Kristina Whalen			
Facilitator: Kristina Whalen			
Approval of agenda	Kristina Whalen		1:00-1:05
<p>Call for alterations to the agenda was solicited.</p> <p>None. Agenda was accepted.</p>			
Review of Minutes	Kristina Whalen	Minutes	1:05-1:10
<p>Kris: An AI tool will be taking our minutes.</p> <p>Patrick: if you don't mind me asking, which bot have we hired?</p> <p>Kris: It's called fireflies.</p> <p>Patrick: I've seen the AI note taking bot show up in meetings where the person is not.</p> <p>Kris: What I have done is only manually invite to meetings.</p> <p>No corrections to the draft minutes were made.</p>			
Public Comment	Kristina Whalen		

Nate Springer: I'm in a jazz band. We have a gig coming up very soon on the 27th. We're going to be at Old Skool Cafe in San Francisco. We're going to be playing from 4:00 - 7:30. Feel free to come.

Elaine Kuo: The standing reports portion of MIPC agendas includes, in addition to report out by task forces and work groups and groups to also include district governance.

Student Voice	ASFC Rep	ASFC Rep will share student perspective on MIPC items	1:10-1:15
----------------------	-----------------	--	------------------

Nate Springer: One of my favorite teachers here, Jeremy Peters of the library, he had interviewed for a position, a higher position. Currently, the concern that is happening is he's looking, and he's such an integral part of what my student life has become at Foothill college.

Doreen: Jeremy Peters is actually classified. One of our many members who makes a very big difference with students.

Kris: I will add that he is very special.

New ASFC rep Harini introduced herself. Introduction to Harini were made around the room and on zoom.

Nina I guess I will fill in then. AC finance board has been working in conjunction with the foothill VP of Finance on raising our student body fee to \$12. You'll see that more in depth in the official finance presentation, but I just wanted to give you a heads up. Enrollment is increasing, as you know, but it is still way below what it was pre COVID. And to be able to continue to fund things that ASFC has funded in the past and would like to keep funding in the future, we need to increase that fee because it's been \$10 since the 80s.

Lost Nina's signal. She will continue report when she arrives in person

Old Business			
Tech Committee Reporting Structure-Action Item	Alison Meezan	Review and approval of committee reporting structure for tech related committees	1:15-1:25

Presentation was started. This is where we have landed, talking to all of the different stakeholders. So what we are looking at is having a tech committee that is kind of the nexus of all technology decision making at the campus. And it would report out to MIPC and also up to the district level ETAC. I think Elaine's point earlier of needing to really pull in district level committee reports because one of the big challenges with technology decisions at this campus is they're not isolated at this campus. ETS is integral, which is district level. And ETS wants to streamline things by having the same technology in as many cases as possible at Foothill and DeAnza. So that comes into a lot of the decisions that we are looking at making. We also are looking at taking that tech prioritization committee. And one of the pieces of feedback that we have received is instead of having, I think they're biweekly meetings, currently asking ETFs to provide either quarter or annual summary of that tech prioritization so we can get a much bigger picture and see where we cannot have overlap or redundant work as much as possible.

Okay, so if we go to the next slide, so what we have come up with is this need to have broad representation. One of the pieces of feedback also that we have received is the need to have high level decision makers. So currently, the sort of ad hoc tech committee has some folks from student services who

kept saying things like, that's above my pay grade to have input on this. And so I think that what we really need are people who are empowered to be decision makers on these committee th. And then we also need to make sure that these committees have focused, streamlined meetings where we are inviting people who have a stake in the conversation at that time so that we are not having extraneous invitees who are sitting for a meeting that they don't have anything to do with.

What would be an ideal candidate to fill that slide?

That is a good question and an interesting challenge, because the time involved with, ideally we would be looking at a trichair or a co chair model. So either faculty admin or faculty admin classified. And the time involved with running a well run committee probably would be such that we would be needing that for release time for the faculty who was appointed to be running that. So that would be a little bit of conversation. Ideally, probably it would be someone from the academic Senate executive committee. So you have that channel of communication going on, and then another faculty member who is deeply involved in tech.

This would be an additional workload, if that's what you're going for.

One of the challenges is right now, there is no conduit to district. Right. So I go to the ETS, which is the district meetings, or the ETAC meetings, which is meeting. We would be formalizing that with this structure.

Higher level positions that you mentioned, Lori, as VP of student services,

So, budget would definitely be important because we're buying things with tech. So that's going to play in probably someone in Simon's position or. I don't know where you guys are with the marketing, but we would need someone at that marketing level who has a decision making capacity for the website and outreach and that sort of thing.

Voltaire: I do have some concerns in the sense that there is some fiscal resource or financial resources that will need to kind of support this, in the sense of reassigned time. So my question would be, if we do approve this representation, we do need to look at resources first. And, we need to look at classified reassign time

Kris: concern only in the sense that voting on this now without an assessment of the resources involved would probably not be prudent. So I think we would need to regroup with Bret, take a look at our ability to support

that, and then bring this back.

MIPCs Past, Present, Future	Janie Garcia & Joshua Pelletier	Story on how we might function as a council	1:25-1:45
------------------------------------	--	--	------------------

Janie Garcia: Big, audacious goal, is a better collective understanding of MIPC. I'd like us to consider if we want to decide if MIPC will continue with the original vision and pick up where it was left off.

Background: Students, classified professionals and faculty came together in summer fall of 2021 to work on a task force to envision a restructured participatory governance model that centers one mission aligned committee. What we came up with was MIPC, a mission-based committee that would act only in a visionary capacity to ensure the requests, tasks and initiatives brought to and pursued by Foothill College focused on student needs first and foremost aligned with our college's mission and values or mission and included wide college community representation. What do I mean by a visionary capacity? When a request, task or initiative

is brought to a body like our college, the strategies and tactics are what get the work done.

However, in the past, what foothill was missing was the visionary piece to ensure consensus. Making sure the work gets done by the appropriate people. Also, people aren't being left off out of the conversation. And efficiency. One committee, one focus.

So the people who envisioned and formed MIPC, we only got so far. We didn't really fully form it. We envisioned it. And that was only the first step in restructuring and reorganizing our participatory government governance. What we also needed, and still need, was to identify active and necessary committees. I say active and necessary because just because they're active doesn't mean they're necessary, and just because they're necessary doesn't mean they're active.

But don't worry, we're not doing all of that today, not by any means. Today we are going to build, hopefully, a collective understanding of MIPC so we can move forward together to continue where those who envision it left off and finish reorganizing Foothill's participatory governance. The scenarios that I handed out and dropped in the chat you will see today are not new, but rather they are reimagined to highlight MIPC's role as it was envisioned and areas that need improvement to achieve.

We will explore through scenarios. 3 scenarios were presented.

In the first scenario, the issue comes here from a general population student, not just an ASFC member. We envisioned was a model where anybody from the campus community could submit a topic to the MIPC chairs that would be reviewed in advance of the meeting to say, yep, we're going to give this time.

Valerie Fong: So I think the question that you're raising with scenario one gets us into questions around whether we who serve on this are meant to be just perspectives, I'm sort of the AMA sort of perspective, or is it a representative body where we're all tasked to go back to our constituencies and report out?

Janie Garcia: I think that's important because how do we get that information back out into the public? Broadly invite people on our website to submit a request to this body or an issue to this body, we also need to make sure we're mindful of how we follow up. Dissemination of information is important, and this kind of reframing of how we look at something as important as budget, I want to be completely honest in that the more I know, the more I can do my job better, the more I can collaborate with everyone better. And so it's not that these pieces of information aren't important, it's just how are we looking at the efficiency of our time? I feel like I've heard in classified spaces, which is the only space I can really speak to, is that I feel like this information is brought to me, but I'm just listening. I'm not really giving any feedback, or at least not any feedback that I think is going to go and do anything in real time. And so that's where purpose and intentionality becomes so important.

Bret Watson: When is the budget not connected to our mission and vision? What content are you seeing that it would be a budget presentation that we would not look at our mission and vision?

Janie Garcia: I think it's more of the action orientation. We want to do and make space for mission-based action. If you're giving the same presentation to three different spaces, that's another piece of how we consider what we're doing in terms of reorganization or improving our governance.

Kris Whalen: Can I just add that I keep on thinking that Valerie's question, and I'm looking back at all of the times that I sat down with the people who set the agenda with me and I had assumed the representation model and that from this the committee in the upholding the value of transparency, that they would go and spread the information. So that question seems central.

Voltaire Villanueva: Yes. So this third scenario really highlights and reinforces this idea of we are very siloed. And one of our big challenges at this college is disseminating information through all

constituencies. And if MIPC really can take that role as representatives of community, and then if we can really reimagine as a college, how we anoint people as the representatives to then actually disseminate the information, because that is where I know in Senate we're running into this. And I'm sure throughout the college there are those challenges.

Janie Garcia: But that's potentially where next steps could be, and that is making sure we know what other committees or work that is happening. That essentially is an extension of MIPC and is included in our participatory governance already

Discussion of Middle College Campus presence	Bret Watson & Simon Pennington	Questions have arisen about support for various student populations	1:45-2:00
---	---	--	------------------

Bret: So actually, back in 1993, when the middle college program started, it includes Mountain View Los Altos, Union High School and Palo Alto Unified school district. So we actually designed the campus center, the new campus center, which is our existing campus center, with space in mind for middle college.

Simon: So in 2021, the middle college expanded. Originally it was 60 students, 30 juniors and 30 seniors from both Mountain View Los Altos and Palo Alto. They had ten times as many applications as spaces available, and they expanded to double the size, Those students are taking, on average, between seven to eleven units. So the average is about nine units a quarter. Some students are taking up to 15 units. And due to the increase in the number of students served, middle college was moved to the 5700 building in the 2022-23 year.

Palo Alto Unified School District decided to split off with Mountain View Los Altos. Going forward there'll actually be two middle colleges. So we had to find space for that second middle college. We had one place of mind, 6300, as the option. What we're looking at 60 sophomores, 60 juniors, 120 students initially for next year, and then adding another years worth of students, 180. And again, we're anticipating them taking an average of about nine units, somewhere between seven and eleven units.

Bret: The fiscal information related to some of the decision making, it's not all financial decision. But the estimated revenue, if we look at the FTES generated from that program, just the existing one right now, about \$371,000.

And then the space per square foot is about 68,000. And then for 120 students, again averaging about nine units, that revenue. What we get through the student-centered funding formula is about 446,000. And with 180 students, it actually jumps up to about \$668,000. That's kind of the fiscal information.

?: Where are these funds being reallocated from?

That's revenue coming in, not going out.

Bret Watson: We have students that do stay and take additional courses, and they may go on to earn certificates and degrees. So that's where we get that other part of the student centered fund formula, the success portion, and maybe even supplemental financial aid. Thinking of different tiers, certificate level that we can award these individuals because they might need, like the province.

Simon: And about, based on the current middle college, MVLA, anywhere between 15% to 25% of the students do stay at least another year. So depending on the year, sometimes it's up to 25%, sometimes a little

more, sometimes it's down to 15. It really depends. But when those students stay an extra year, or sometimes two, then obviously certificates, degrees, that all counts towards the SCFF

Valerie Fong: Reflecting on the kind of communicative hiccups you alluded to earlier, my thought is that I'd love to ensure that these decisions are integrated into our existing processes for reallocation of space. All of this is sort of happening at the same time because, as you mentioned, the space is in my area, but I was also trying to reallocate a different space.

Elaine Kuo: I think the Valerie brings up sort of a big point in terms of the issue. And so I think one of the reasons why this is a good conversation specifically about middle college, and I'm sort of leaning into the Josh's earlier exercise about purpose and outcome desired, is that where does this sit right operationally? So I think that's what you're hitting on, Valerie. But I would also say where does this sit in terms of institutional priorities? Right. So I think in this case, because we're looking at dual enrollment. It is a district priority, but it's also a state priority as part of Vision 2030. So it would then also sort of, in terms of the alignment piece, prioritize that higher in terms of the college work to bring it in line operation.

And I think this is a place.

Where we talk across our units to say that where else would this conversation come in this case? This would not work as a town hall or just to go to Senate or just to go to classified, because it is a planning on that sort of strategic big P and then small p in terms of the operational planning. And I think maybe that would be helpful to then think about what is appropriate or helpful or how to package something.

New Business			
Student Voice, Cont'd			

Nina Haywood: We went with FACCC and FCC to Capitol a couple of weeks ago, and in line with full time enrollment, we would like MIPC to either issue a statement or some type of support in reducing the full time requirement from 15 units down to 12 units. As you know, majority of our students are part time, and the CSU and UC requirement is twelve units. To be a full-time student

Really important that we're lobbying for these initiatives, because this is when they're going to start turning over this stuff. Lobby with our local representatives and make sure that community colleges are not undervalued.

And then the other issue funding is tight you'll see it in the finance presentation. ASC is looking to increase our student body fee from ten dollars to twelve dollars because it hasn't changed since the 80s. Enrollment is increasing, but it has still not come back since COVID. And along those lines, there are some things that ASC, we've been picking up the bill on, and it's really just not sustainable for us, like NSO, we have been funding that pretty much in its entirety. And we are asking that the college please help to pick up some of the bill on that, because it is one of our most expensive events and it is our most attended event of the year. And that is when new students.

And clubs are having a very hard time getting advisors and having attendance at their meetings. We would like to ask you to encourage your students to attend clubs and if you can offer extra credit for attending those events, that seriously increases students attending those events.

And ASC, we added an equity and inclusion officer to our team, and he has been working on equity.

ASC is generally comprised of traditional students by nature, just because it's such a large time commitment. And we are looking to hear the voices of students that don't fit into that category because they are the ones that need the most help and are not being heard and being able to provide that at a hybrid

capacity with a low time commitment of three meetings a quarter, 2 hours a month, may allow us to hear their voices. We would like to increase engagement with the Sunnyvale center.

We would like to see more funding towards our heritage month and having at least one heritage month event at the Sunnyvale center on their campus. And then along the lines of just making sure everyone is aware when things are being planned. Like the Ethnic Studies summit, I couldn't attend because it was at the same time as our women's history month opening ceremony.

The first Wednesday and the last Wednesday of every month is the opening and closing ceremony for our heritage month. And when those things come up on the calendar, if people can be gently reminded that those events are pre-established and to please take another day so students can attend both.

And as far as the MIPC handbook committee. That was a project that was very important to ASFC and figuring out where all the committees are and what student representation they have. Please create a list of committees that exist just so ASC can go through for representation?

Proposal: Institutional Effectiveness Committee	Elaine Kuo	Proposal to formalize an Institutional Effectiveness Committee to support continuous improvement, strategic planning, and alignment.	2:05-2:20
---	------------	--	-----------

This item was moved to the next meeting due to time constraints.

Committee Reports			
Accreditation Report	Elaine Kuo & Kelaiah Harris	Open Form Debrief	2:20-2:25

Elaine Kuo: quick recap. Not necessarily everybody has been a part of the accreditation process. A recap was provided on the process, the timeline and production of the ISER..

Elaine Kuo: So peer review team has been working this quarter to evaluate our document, because it's about 250 pages, we had a virtual meet and greet with the actual peer team members back in March 6. This was a meet and greet. With the folks who had participated in the development of the ISER, including our team leads, team members, our faculty editors, and then folks. who sit on the accreditation steering committee. We just had a virtual open forum, which was open to everybody except for our senior administrators, which is defined as folks who sit on cabinets. And that was this past Wednesday

In the background the peer review has requested the college send additional evidence

The peer team is meeting on March 19th to draft the core inquiries report, which is a formative review. Once we get that back, we have until about early September to respond to the items in the core inquiry report, which typically means they want more evidence. We submit the evidence in early September to the peer review team. The people who focus on the areas of inquiry will come and conduct a site visit in that last week of September.

Request for additional evidence came in this week.

Standard one: No additional requests. We are awesome.

The rest of the standards were reported on and an assessment of where we might reasonably expect a core inquiry were provided.

Standing Reports		Old Business	
Taskforces and Workgroups Reports	Measure G Taskforce ILO WG Foothill 2030/IEPI		2:25-2:45

Buildings, Grounds and Sustainability (Taskforce on Measure G).

Bret Watson: We had prioritized three projects. They went to the board of trustees at the study session on March 4. The board listened. We had a lot of positive feedback for all the projects and also for the pool project, which wasn't part of those three prioritized projects. . So that's basically what the task force was charged with, we're kind of in a holding pattern on whether we need to continue that task force, but most likely we're going to dissolve the task force and we'll just continue having the buildings, grounds, and sustainability committee, as we have had, meet on a monthly basis. It's always the second Tuesday of the month.

Kris Whalen: This is a slide of what was in Joel Cadiz's presentation to the board of trustees that came from the chancellor about how that money might be allocated to the various bodies. The Chancellor did ask that I get feedback from the shared governance group about the proposal to be in the next April board meeting. And so as you can see, went from getting 15 million, 5 million, of which I know only through conversations, was meant to be pulled off for infrastructure up to 25 million, with a very explicit note that 5 million of it is to be used for infrastructure. So that kind of sort of gets us one of the projects on the priority list. It's 1 million shy of what it is estimated to cost. And then De Anza is getting 30 million for infrastructure because they didn't put as much infrastructure money aside, and their infrastructure is aging and close to failing, and then they would get 20 million to build an alternative to the event center space. So, I want to do my due diligence and make sure that this is proposal we can live with.

Any other thoughts that you'd like me to take forward?

Zach Cembellin: So from my understanding, it sounds like infrastructure is a responsibility of the individual colleges as opposed to central services or the district.

Kris Whalen: It is considered part of central services, but they just wanted to show that the money was going to be equally divided, so they folded it in on that slide to each of the colleges.

Bret Watson: We have new lights, and we would like to, at next month's buildings, grounds and sustainability meeting come to a decision on whether we're going with the new lights and at what brightness. So there are two that are brighter, and then there are two that are a softer light that we see around the campus at night. So we're trying to get feedback

It was offered that a brighter light is good, but make it a warmer tone. Bright white is kind off putting.

SLO workgroup:

Stacy Gleixner: Stephanie and Carrie did a presentation for the department chair meeting. They're working to communicate where we landed on ILOs and get feedback on it.

Foothill 2030.

Voltaire Villanueva: We're moving along. We've looked at the mission statement already. If were to look at the vision work, we've looked at that and kind of dissected it. Looked at the vision statement and dissected it and how it. Begin to communicate with the rest of the college about the work that has been done.

Affinity Group Reports	APAN OLA AAN LGBTQ		2:45-2:55
<p>APAN Jordan Fong: One is we have social justice tour coming up in May 11 in San Francisco. Chinatown. Time TBD. Maximum 25 people. It's a free event, but if you're interested, hit up Clifton. We have a filmmaker Q and A event happening May 8th (12-2) about the film of <i>Chinatown Rising</i>. Then, we're continuing to plan for our end-of-the-year APAN celebration, which includes scholarships as well.</p> <p>LGBTQ. Clifton Ver Bing. We're moving forward with the Pride Center, and we worked with ASFC and other entities to find a space. And so things are being finalized, and we want to thank you all for your input and for contributing to helping this to be a more inclusive college.</p> <p>Nina Haywood: I'm kind of bouncing off that. So yesterday, in our last campus council meeting of the corner, we approved having the council chambers converted as the space for the Pride Center under the condition that ASFC receives full use of the Los Altos room. So any staff or faculty or admin meetings that are happening in the altos room, they need to either happen here or another space.</p>			
Announcements			2:55-3:00

Simon Pennington: Please mark the calendars for Saturday, May 4. It's going to be a combination of Day on the Hill and Possible Self. It's going to be a nine to three event. Should be a blast. And may the fourth be with you.

Valerie Fong: A workgroup is reaching out to our Asian American Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander students regarding a student leadership conference that is being hosted at San Jose City College also on May 4. And so next week we're going to be reaching out to different folks on campus to help spread the word to our students.

Simon Pennington: You will all have seen an email probably a minute ago just to remind you there's a lot of construction coming up. Three major projects which start in April. The first, Smithwick will be offline. New roof, new glue land beams. Access from parking lot one will be cut off, so they'll be signs up by April 1. Also the library. The restrooms in the library will be converted to all gender restrooms. The library will still be usable, but there will be construction. So, we'll be pointing students who need distraction-free environments to other spaces.

And finally, the restrooms outside the vet tech classroom are going to be closed. They too will be converted to all gender restrooms. People can just walk upstairs and use the restrooms on the next floor, the vet tech classroom will still be accessible. There will be some staging areas in the parking lots. Starting on July 1, we have the ADA project in the lower campus as well.

A discussion about the feedback and decision timeline on the all gender restrooms occurred.

MIPC 13-55 project.

Kris Whalen: I had mentioned previously that we had received counsel from Santa Clara legal on how we would be compliant with regulations regarding the repatriation of Native American cultural artifacts and remains, of which we have a considerable collection. And the first step in that process is a complete inventory of what we have, and that is in the process. And the two members of our project that are working on that are Sam Connell, as you might expect, and Dean Korngelbel. And that is expected to be completed at the end of this month or early April.

Next is consultation with the Muwekma. And we're going to do that, hopefully bring some of leaders here and invite all that are working on this project to meet with them. It might be an opportunity then for Valerie and Ulysses, who are really heading up what they have requested, which is the ability to visit the inventory, visit their ancestors. So that wouldn't happen until after the inventory is complete.

Good of the Order	All		
--------------------------	------------	--	--

Nina Haywood: This is my final meeting of the voting member of MIPC. Very much enjoyed my time. We'll be working with ASFC remotely from Guatemala, so if you have any projects you'd like to coordinate, you can still contact me.

Nina was congratulated for her service.

Meeting adjourned.