



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE

Room 3523
May 17, 2006

Present: Debbie Budd, Sid Davidson, Bernie Day, Adrian Diaz, , Don Dorsey, Bernadine Fong, Brent von Forstmeyer, Karen Gillette, Art Hand, Mary Hawkins, Marcus Lam, Phuong Lam, Christine Mangiameli, Judi McAlpin, Macy Ng, Jay Patyk, Penny Patz, Lety Serna, Roberto Sias, Paul Starer, ,

The President called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm.

Adrian Diaz inquired about motion sensors for lights and recommended that with the high energy costs, this might be a great avenue for savings. Timers have been installed in the refurbished buildings like the 3000 but not the 5000. Christine Mangimeli also mentioned that the bathroom lights are on. We need to discover why the sensors do not work. Faculty and staff need to be reminded to turn off computers, lock classrooms and turn off lights.

Von Forstmeyer and Davidson said that tagging in the BSS men's restroom is a problem.

Fong and Day's roundtable term will end -Transfer and Basic Skills. Call for nominees for the two slots. Students fill the slots at the beginning of the year. Macy is also done so we also need an addition to the Voc Ed area. The previously sent first call should have noted that there are three positions available on the Roundtable. The current openings are in Transfer, Basic Skills and Career Education.

Fong mentioned that the Interim VP position is internal only. Applicants will be from Foothill or DeAnza only. The position closes May 26th. Plans for a Decision in time for June board Meeting

Action:

1. **Accreditation recommendation follow up.** Accrediting body said, "While the college is clearly a mission – driven institution, the written mission statement does not reflect its actual practices and priorities, especially in the area of its intended population. The college could improve the mission statement by looking at its actual practices and making sure that the statement addresses the college's purposes, student learning, and intended student population. In addition, the college may wish to formalize a periodic mission review process." (p 14 or accreditation report).

It was discussed that we want to make sure that we don't just change for change sake. This accreditation request appears to be driven by an external rather than internal factors. Our Guiding philosophy of the Institution is internal.

While Accreditation asked us to review and consider, it is still our call. The decision was, "Let's review before we change."

When it is time for our mid term report in 2-3 years, we will have a new president and it will be a good time to revisit our mission and see if it is still appropriate. Decision for now: No real substantial need to change. Review in two years.

2. Change to roundtable guidelines to clarify what currently happens in the procedures for allocating new full-time teaching faculty positions:

Updated guidelines now read:

Procedures for Allocating New Full-Time Teaching Faculty Positions

Developed by Educational Resources Committee

Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998, revised September 22, 1999, June 7, 2000, May 2, 2001, now amended May 17, 2006

1. The District office communicates to the campus the number of available positions early in the fall quarter.
 2. The College President and Dean of Faculty and Staff estimate additional positions that might become available due to unannounced retirements/resignations.
 3. The Vice President for Educational Resources and Instruction asks division deans for prioritized requests for positions (by department).
 4. The President's Cabinet reviews and approves the proposed prioritized list of approved positions.
- ~~The Vice Presidents, augmented by the faculty Senate President, The Educational Resources Committee~~ with the Faculty Senate President or designee, will develop a proposed prioritized list of approved positions using the Division requests and the "Guiding Principles for Determining New Full-time Teaching Faculty Hires."
5. The administration presents the proposed list to the Roundtable with a rationale of how the proposed hires meet the "Guiding Principles" and hears final input and suggestions.
 - 5a. If, later in the academic year, new faculty needs emerge due to an unanticipated vacancy, the Division Dean or Vice President may request a replacement. This request is to be forwarded to the Educational Resources Committee. It will include a rationale for immediate replacement. In making its determination, the Committee will consider the Guiding Principles, extenuating circumstances, and the realistic timeline leading to a successful search.
 - 5b. The Educational Resources Committee will meet to consider these emerging needs in the context of existing unfilled requests, if any, and the Guiding Principles.
 - 5c. The Educational Resources Committee will follow the same procedure in considering this new request as it does for all others, and forward a recommendation to the Roundtable and Cabinet.
 6. The College President makes the final decision based on recommendations from the Vice Presidents and the Roundtable.

3. **-Classified Staff Position Prioritized list** will be brought to the June 7th meeting after recommendations from Ed Resources.

All College Issue

Discussion on the Resolution to name a building –

Adrian Diaz reviewed a resolution to name the Student Serviced building after Dr. Jean Thomas. Questions were raised about where do such requests go? Impression was that it had to come up through the ranks. Adrian and Karen Gillette read and reviewed the reasons why they felt Jean Thomas is deserving of having a building named after her. Von Forstemyer mentioned that he was the Legislative Director for the Class of '06 and spoke on behalf of the resolution. The Board procedures-3216, indicate naming requests go through the “College Review” process. However, it is unclear what a naming process should be.

Don Dorsey reviewed how they developed a resolution involving many, and how it went out for 6 different iterations. The process was a community effort, and it came out of Black History Month. The discussion was “Let’s not think globally but locally”. Letty worked with Don .

Fong voiced her concerns.

May want to disaggregate -what is being named vs. naming
Board Policy is not clear on the criteria for naming for service.

We need to think through the process, as a Building name will outlive all of us.

Questions:

What level of service warrants a building vs. an area?
What should the naming process be?

The Foundation is developing specific criteria for naming a building for monetary donations.

Our goal is to get board to say yes to any proposal submitted.

Paul Starer recommended a small group convene to develop next steps for this naming and future namings.

One of the outcomes after the RT meeting about the naming is to have a small group of RT members meet and do two things. First, develop the next steps of the "college review" process, i.e. does it come back to RT, does it need to be vetted elsewhere, etc; second articulate the elements of service that warrant the type of facility that should be named. The resolution is a good start--

There will be a report back at next meeting.

The final discussion of the Roundtable was about the NO smoking policy. Law enforcement on campus has let us know they will not issue citations.

Meeting Adjourned 3:30 pm