# MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 24, 2020

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: President’s Conference Room 1901

## NOTES BY TOPIC

| **ITEM** | **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **OUTCOME** | **NEXT STEPS** | **\*RESP** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Introduction/Agenda Approval of Minutes |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Student’s Report | * FHDA AS approved $19K for the HSA campaign; Leo has been working on raising minimum wage
* Focusing on the campaign; recruiting volunteers
* Working to get better benefits for our students
* Subsidizing printing for students through ASFC funds
* ASFC collaborating with clubs to set up activities for Black History month
 |  |  |  |
| 3 | President’s Report | * Appreciative of student leaders (ASFC)
* Celebrating 100 years of women’s right to vote
* Parcel and Bond (proposed project list) on the District website; going with Simon and others to community organizations to give information around the cost-benefit analysis; people love Foothill; love dual emrollment, middle college, opening our college for various facility rentals
* Why should they fund a college with low enrollment? Even with low enrollment we are the highest in the area.
 |  |  |  |
| 4 | New Program/Certificate Feedback Process for Advisory Council (MDIA application is attached for prior review by Council members) | * Our role is an advisory role, not to stop the movement of a certificate or program but to provide feedback (point out things that should be considered); group pointed out that we should have a rubric; Isaac will present a proposed rubric
* The process has been long, we don’t want to cause any longer delay
* Isaac: Not necessarily a rubric, more of a Questions/Comments/Feedback document
* Guide to help frame how we look at new programs that come through
* Help as a reference when we look at a new program
* Other committees looking at these programs; we are not the only council looking at these programs
* Three main goals: create a culture of equity, strengthen a sense of community, recognize and support a campus culture that values ongoing improvement (see Advisory Council New Program Feedback Guide)
* Second part of the document asks several questions to put us in the mindset
* We want to ensure that you are able to apply the lens to the new programs we are looking at, you don’t necessarily need to have questions or answers at the moment
* Anthony Question: The CCC created an updated form to ensure that the information/program is being reviewed by all councils/aligns with our feedback guide
* Our view is just looking at this through the lens around our strategic objectives
* There will still be an opportunity for feedback because this document still needs to be approved by the CCC
* Thuy Question: We need to be clear on our process and who is involved in this process 1. What is that idea and where does it live (what division?); it would need to happen through the CCC of that division, open meetings where anyone is able to attend; relationship between our college and community
* Curriculum development is housed with the faculty
* Mike Question: Identifying a business plan/marketing strategy needs to be discussed campus-wide in the creation of new programs
* Preston: Section that asked for comparative programs in the Bay Area, how was enrollment, that section can include a proposal in regards to marketing
* Proposal: We are providing an opportunity for questions and feedback, this is how we cross paths with this process; How do we move forward? Everytime there is a new program do we make it an agenda item or provide feedback via email?
* Time is important, therefore we want to ensure our part of the process is efficient
* Paul: Time-sensitive nature; because of groups meeting once a month, this process can be elongated to several months
* Kathryn Maurer: Importance of how our counselors are finding out about these programs; internalizing what new programs are being offered
 | * As soon as the program comes in it will be distributed via email for feedback; Thuy will include/provide a facilitated question
* Motion to approve: Mike Mohebbi, Itzel Sanchez seconds; unanimous approval
 |  | Isaac/Simon |
| 5 | New Faculty Prioritization Process: Normally, we would have two reads. The Academic Senate approves the AC having one read this year and voting to approve now that all programs have had a chance to submit their requests and advocate for their programs. | * Isaac: Academic Senate agreed to have one read to move the process along; struggling with this process
* Hiring faculty takes time; the longer we wait, the smaller the pool
* Thuy: Faculty prioritization did not come to governance; no matter what the source of funding is I still felt it was important for this to come to governance
* Paul: We are really behind, this presentation should have been given last Spring for us to hire in the Fall
* Top three in categorical funded positions and top ten general funded
* Over 20 positions were reviewed
* Reflection of the limitations of our resources
* Recommendations to Council and President:
* Two DRC Counselors/One Transition to Work faculty
* Lene: This is a legal compliance issue
* General Fund: Horticulture/Art History; Rad Tech (can’t be sustained the way it is going now); General Counselor focused online support for students (online is growing, out of the regular business hours support for students); ESL with noncredit emphasis/Anthropology (ESL used to have 8, now they have 2.5; Anthropology’s demand is growing); Communications; Accounting; Library (they used to have 8, now they have 4)
* Kathryn Question: They could not maintain these programs with adjuncts alone
* Preston Question: Bret will speak more to funding we have available to fund these positions; only positions we will be allowed to fill are non SERP
* Bret: 3-4 faculty positions; 4 more likely for the general fund; also some vacancies in the special ed fund; tty position could be funded with the special ed funds; unfortunately we are limited in the resources to hire all the faculty that have been prioritized; maintain 13 vacancies connected to SERP
* Isaac: Waiting to hear from the District; we know the retirements that happened and can’t be filled
* Bret: R&R recommended 6 and Thuy decided 5; state lowballs the cost, but costs are much higher; 4 of the positions were hired, one of the positions was internal (two of the positions were well above the average)
* Lene Question: Three faculty positions available
* Kathryn: How would we ever do this earlier for future reference? We would encourage divisions to channel up their priorities this Winter, come up with agreement in Spring, look at top, and we then know how far into the list we can look
* Online Counselor position: After hours; better service for our students
* Thuy: need help breaking the ties
* Preston: Technology is really going to change and affect these disciplines in the next 5-10 years
* Anthony: Strong workforce funds can be used however it is only a two-year guarantee and we are looking for positions to be tenure track
 | * Are we replacing the positions (categorically funded)?
* Anthony motions, Isaac seconds, unanimous vote
* General Fund Requests:
* Leo Motions: Group approves the lists as developed in terms as priorities and recommends this list to the President of the college however if we can explore extra funding sources that might allow us to expand the number of hires that we can make this year that we do so
* Preston seconds
* Isaac is a yellow (specific to the vote regarding looking to see if CTE funds could be used for Hort/Rad Tech). Yellow vote because Hort and Rad Tech submitted for a general fund position (permanent). Categorical funds are not permanent, and subject to change. If these positions were to be funded from categorical funds, there could be problematic program implications in the future.
 |  |  |
| 6 | Members of Cabinet and President Nguyen will present mid-year updates on the 2019/20 Strategic Objectives (E2SP2030).  | * Equity Plan 2.0 be due June 30th
* What does the future look like for Foothill?
* Less than 1% decline projected as a District for Resident FTES
* Apprenticeship Programs are thriving in hours
 | * Unanimous vote for Equity plan to be due June 30th
* Unanimous vote to begin working on EMP 2030 in next school year
 |  |  |
|  | Review meeting normsPublic comments | * Everything was good
* Thank you Cheyanne Cortez PT faculty rep for joining us
 |  |  |  |

\*Include the person(s) and or group responsible for next steps.

## MEMBERS PRESENT

### Voting

Tri-Chairs:

Administrator: Anthony Cervantes

Classified Staff: Mike Mohebbi, Itzel Sanchez Zarraga, Danmin Deng

Faculty: Name (FT), Name (PT): Isaac Escoto, Cheyanne Cortez, Preston Ni

Students: Tiffany Nguyen, Leonardo Blas

### Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Chris Allen, Bret Watson, Paul Starer, Doreen Finkelstein, Leticia Maldonado, Melissa Cervantes, Vanessa Smith, Kathryn Maurer, Lene Whitley Putz, Elias Regalado, Thuy Nguyen

Recorder:

Facilitator: Simon Pennington