



MEETING MINUTES

Date: February 1, 2019

Time: 1-3 p. m.

Loc: President's Conference Room, ADMN 1901

Item 1: Approval of Agenda and January 18th Meeting Minutes

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

Minutes approved by consensus.

Item 2: Presidents Report

Public forums are put on for the benefit of campus feedback. The feedback from those forums is to be brought back to the governance committees, specifically the Advisory Council to review and vote on. President Nguyen has visited all division meetings with the exception of Language Arts and Library who are meeting at the same time as the Advisory Council. She intends to step away from the Advisory Council meeting briefly to address that division but will return before meeting's end.

Item 3: Foothill College Budget Reduction: Phase II and College Re-Organization

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

S. Pennington shared the general themes emerging from the feedback that has come through via the Town Halls and the website. One of the common themes was concern around taking the division deans out of the area, along with questions around what access to the hub would look like. Other feedback themes include concerns around a "top-heavy" administration, and concerns about administrative "silos" forming. After sharing themes from the town halls and the online feedback Pennington opened the conversation to the group to share what they've been hearing from their constituents

A. Edwards noted that no matter where she goes her constituents still object to not having been involved from the ground up on the idea of an Instructional Hub; noting a feeling of a "false choice". Consolidating services between Foothill and De Anza was suggested.



K. Maurer offered two comments/questions: a positive aspect to these conversations is that it is evident people really care about what's going on. We have an engaged community. She also noted that people are taking a closer look at how we're organized institutionally. More thoughtfully: taking a look at what our organization is, and if this is the best way to organize it (even if it is not new). She shared some thoughts about the separation of the Office of Equity from the Instruction and Student Services areas in the organization and what that implies about the mission of things like equity and service leadership. Pennington offered that in the proposed changes Instruction and Equity would share the same space. However, Maurer clarified that she wasn't referring to just location but structural organization.

P. Ni offered that there are points in the proposal faculty agree with administrators on. He reiterated points Edwards stated, expressing some confusion about shared governance and how it's taking place. Ni offered the importance of getting everyone on board together, as opposed to the perception that administrators are working in contradiction to faculty interests. Yet, faculty feedback was that they felt rebuffed more than listened to.

I. Escoto offered that a lot of faculty are looking to understand what has been learned from this experience and how it will inform processes moving forward when big picture decisions need to be made.

A public comment was made following up on Maurer's comment regarding the dislocation of equity from Instruction in the organization chart. President Nguyen asked if the dean of Equity should report to the Executive Vice President. The commenter noted that the College feels too top-heavy and has concerns about: 1) the concentration of power in one role, and 2) the idea of group think with all the administrators concentrated in one space and not enough diversity of thought (based on roles). President Nguyen wanted to know, if not the Executive Vice President (encompassing both areas) then who? The response was that it is good that it reports to the President, but perhaps have Instruction and Student Services report to the Equity position. She would like to see more informing of equity in these areas, guiding the decision making.

Maurer wanted to clarify what was summarized from Escoto's point regarding looking at how shared governance is working. She referenced concerns around issues like class cancellations that came through, and wants to look more thoughtfully about how decisions are made via shared governance.

S. Negus added that we might use this opportunity to include an agenda item for next Advisory Council to streamline campus feedback and make that publicly available to people. He suggested a role whose purpose would be to receive feedback and answer questions in a manner that is more ongoing and systematized. If the consensus across faculty is that there needs to be a more sustained feedback process, then we need to figure out a way to make that work. He believes it deserves time on the agenda.



B. Nikolchev offered that she felt it was a bold move for the Office of Equity to be created in the way that it has. She feels that it is validating to have a space, mechanism, voice, and a deliberate structure wherein one hasn't existed before. Nikolchev sent the Phase II re-organization chart to all her non-credit faculty and they really appreciated the move of FEI to Equity. Looking at process, she recognizes that there's so much that had to be done due to the immediacy of the budget. Nikolchev held on to President Nguyen's comment about this time is not just an opportunity for budget savings, but a re-organization of the College.

A. Cervantes said that some of the discussions he's heard from classified staff is that they also feel that management is heavy on top and have stated concerns with micro-management. Administrative assistants moving from different areas not being addressed. There hasn't been much discussion about how the potential move affects relationships between administrative assistants and faculty. There has also been confusion around why some positions were reclassified into higher positions. If it was functioning this way for years, why the change now.

S. Xu offered that she never talks to her deans, she talks to her professors and counselors to resolve questions. She mentioned that this process reminds her of last year's re-organization with shared governance and going through that experience. An Instructional Hub might be a cool idea for talking to many deans at the same time, but she recognizes that it will be a challenging idea, and we need more suggestions/solutions to help faculty to keep that connection. Long term, if this is good for the budget reduction then we need to consider it. President Nguyen asked Xu about the notion that students may feel intimidated by going into a room with lots of deans. Xu replied that it depends on the student. She also noted that sometimes you can't find the dean because they are in meetings and are really busy.

A. Bharal offered that students are more connected to their professors. She mentioned that she's never been to a dean's office. But she thinks the Hub is a good idea.

Cervantes personally thinks the Hub is a good idea, reflecting on how difficult it has been in the past to get in contact with the division offices. Five years down the road, Cervantes noted the importance of really syncing up with De Anza and to make it easier for students to be served by both campuses. He noted that one of the places where a lot of that gets held up is in Instruction and requested that faculty really make the push to get the collaboration going with De Anza. Edwards wanted to clarify if Cervantes was talking about aligning classes and offered that in some instances there might be some administration hold ups with those collaborations.

Escoto had a procedural question around if administration noticed new questions that they haven't yet addressed so that representatives could bring that information back to their committee's constituents. President Nguyen noted that the point around the



organization of equity in the org chart, was a new question. Additionally, there were continued concerns around the splitting of the Bio-Health division.

President Nguyen responded that equity wasn't meant to be a different house. The president is doing equity, but needs help doing that work. Which is why the dean of equity is part of cabinet. She worries whether or not moving it to student services, instruction, etc. diminishes the impact of equity. The intention is for equity to circle the whole institution. In terms of administrators, before this all happened the administrators voted to share the pain and that resulted in the elimination of some positions. With regard to the re-class for the EVP there were some personnel issues and guidelines that made it impossible to go out for the position because it would require eliminating the position in real time.

Where are the plusses? President Nguyen mentioned the EVP. Why a director of EOPS? We used to have one and it was eliminated. By law, we're supposed to have a director of EOPS and that was work that was sent to the AVP, but really the supervisor was managing the office. They're "making it right". With the dean of apprenticeships, the money is not coming out of general fund. With 8 facilities, we need leadership in those areas. We don't want to lose those sites, we want to add to them and this is a strategic investment that makes no impact on the budget reduction. The final one was the director position. Due to the responsibilities and the number of people served it was classified as a director position.

President Nguyen reminded Advisory council that budget reductions have a lot to do with personnel issues and position terminations and so that it can't always happen in the round with everyone's input. She then reviewed the memo she devised regarding the three distinct options for the budget reduction, with one of the notable changes including department chairs in some of the dean's meetings.

A.Hypolite asked to clarify whether the Dean's meetings and other administrator meetings are public. If they aren't, is there an unrealistic expectation to have that information conveyed to the public? Additionally, if the chairs are invited into that meeting doesn't that just bring them into the fold of that privacy/confidentiality negating the impact of having people's perspective represented at the ground floor?

Edwards feels like the proposal she's seeing now is a move in the right direction, but admittedly has not had a chance to absorb. But it's imperative that the process be a part of the proposal. And that there needs to be something stating that moving forward this is how we need to proceed. Pennington did a final check in on the three proposals. When the temperature of the council was taken the consensus of the council is that it's interesting but requires more investigation.

Edwards reiterated that for her there needs to be something more concrete about the process, but that the solution noted in the proposal seems very specific to addressing the Instructional Hub. President Nguyen countered that she thought the solution noted in



the proposal did address that. Edwards noted that the way it was written was confusing because the new idea was listed under Option One. President Nguyen acknowledged that and noted she would change the memo to reflect the faculty chair proposal as overarching change, regardless of which budget proposal the Council votes on.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25pm.

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), Sean Negus (PT)

Students: Sissy Hu,

Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Vanessa Smith, Elias Regalado, Paul Starer, Bret Watson, Ram Subramaniam, Teresa Ong, Kristy Lisle, Aparwal Bharal

Recorder: Adrienne Hypolite

Facilitator: Simon Pennington