



## MEETING MINUTES

**Date: February 8, 2019**

**Time: 1-3 p. m.**

**Loc: President's Conference Room, ADMN 1901**

*Item 1: Approval of Agenda and February 1st Meeting Minutes*

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator)

Minutes approved by consensus.

*Item 2: Presidents Report*

Critical decision point for the college today; thank you for attendance. Announcements:

- ASFC fundraised about 700 pounds of goods along with \$1400 for Butte College for the college and student leaders due to the fires. President of Butte College felt so blessed by their actions.
- Perspectives: At a District level, about 80% of the budget is salary benefits; employees. Reductions involve people. The Foothill College budget is even higher at 93% personnel. When looking at a college budget it is around personnel. Even looking at program elimination you are looking at full time faculty laid off. Very tough for that reason. Tough on a governance staff point. There is a human element to all of this.
- A&B budget combined is the 93%? Yes.
- Senate: Discussion around program elimination.
- 7 programs with the Strong Workforce Gold Star were recognized and honored by the state for job placements, completions and degrees.

*Item 3: Foothill College Budget Reduction: Phase II and College Re-Organization (Final Vote)*

Presenter: Simon Pennington (Facilitator); Thuy Nguyen (President)

Budget timeline reviewed. Proposal must be submitted to the Board for the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting; the reason for the vote today. Discussion and public comment commenced.



President Nguyen clarified that layoff notifications for ACE is not in March but FA is; program elimination would mean full time faculty layoffs and there is a March 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for notification.

Memo revisions based on feedback given to President Nguyen by faculty, staff, and administrators. Three options were included in the memo (See memo). M. Mohebbi said that at the classified senate meeting there wasn't consensus on which option was the best; no clear obvious choice. You are not going to make everyone happy. Got final recommendations Feb 1<sup>st</sup>. Have only two weeks about which option to choose. Option one seems as the most front running option but even administration does not have a clear vision. K. Maurer asked if Option 3 would just be discussed among administration, or would it be open for discussion? President Nguyen said discussion would occur in the Gov. Council meetings.

B. Di Gregorio asked classified personnel: Favor Option 2: keeping division admin assistant is necessary in the division offices to reduce chaos. Provided example of commotion in one of the classrooms; student loud and swearing; she goes down the hall to see what is happening; makes eye contact with faculty member; classroom settled down. Faculty came down to the division office and stated there was about to be a fight in her classroom. Thanked her for being there. Faculty had the opportunity to check in with the Dean. Safety is key. C. Chavez: Public safety issue with not having people around. Active shooter situation what would happen if there is no one around? Where does the \$524,000 savings come from? B. Watson explained that it comes from the elimination of positions. P. Starer: Better service to students (with the Hub proposal) because we can ensure that there would be someone available for the students. There have been the situations when there is someone available but there are also situations when there is no one available.

S. Negus: PT Faculty fear being bumped by FT faculty if there is program elimination. Public comments made by constituents; concerned about employment; the hub will not be used by faculty since it will be far from classrooms; services/resources will be limited; hub will not be a comfortable place to focus, it will be chaotic; short term budget proposal, but what proposal exists for the future? Have the hub open for evening classes (void the hub could fill); recommended to keep the division offices.

K.Lisle: program elimination is concerning: enrollment was suffering greatly when she got here. Program review process did not give programs the points for improvement; she has taken that on to improve this process; IP&B has decided to make a continuous improvement plan to help programs on campus such as Theater. Advocate to not go in the direction of program elimination.

I Escoto: Memo came out a week ago: have had three weeks to sit on this; discussion at Academic Senate about how some faculty looked at the program elimination option because they felt it was the only option that allowed for further discussion about how to address budget cuts.



Senate officers sent email with three options and then memo came with three more options. What they really want to see moving forward is that the college is involved early on in this process in the future. Tier I cut also had that same feedback that faculty did not feel involved earlier in the process.

J. Singh: sacrifices have to be made; either option will leave some people unhappy.

Mohebbi: \$524,000 is only 10% of the overall budget reduction, the hub seems to create a lot of shifting and movement. Is there another way to save this 10%? C. Nguyen: Value convenience over everything else. Option 3 is not appealing because community college programs should have a lot of program options.

K. Lisle: What is required is trust and faith in the administration that they spent hours looking at the best options. Focus was always keeping all programs. They had to be confidential because they were discussing people's jobs. Keep everyone's job and all programs. Watson: We spent lots of hours on this. This was an evolution. The plan we had a couple months ago is not the plan we have now.

Escoto: Would like to clarify that senate as a whole did not favor program elimination. Negus: Lack of transparency needs to be fixed.

B. Nikolchev: Everyone wants to have a voice and a moment in this process; there is potential and opportunity in the first option for all stakeholders to get around the table to think outside the box, utilize the design thinking process, and design something that builds upon our core values.

President Nguyen: If you are feeling how tough this is, it is tough because it is the reality of the budget reduction. Know that at least with the large majority (division assistants all have employment on campus); Thought process: when admin was looking at phase II we really don't want to cut programs because we are not in a growth mode if we are cutting programs. Deans said no program elimination and eliminate division assistants. How can the hub be better designed to serve students? Design-thinking approach to design the hub (innovative way on how to approach problems).

Option 1 came as a commitment to not eliminate programs; help programs grow and improve.

Option 2 is on there because the Board voted for the SRP; 13 FT faculty volunteered. That's how this started becoming a possibility. How does it affect students? Option 3 decreases possibilities for students, Options 2 has potentially 60 sections cut, Option 1 would not have access to the division offices; Does the hub help remedy that effect for students?

Mohebbi: When a program is eliminated it is extremely difficult to get a program back.



**Option 1 votes: 8 (Negus, Edwards, Ni, C. Nguyen, Singh, Cervantes, Nikolchev, Xu)**

**Option 2 votes: 1 (based on her constituents) Di Gregorio**

**Option 3: 1 (Escoto, in order to represent opinion of many faculty in LA/BSS/PSME, though wants to be clear majority of senate voted for option 1)**

**Abstentions: 3; Mohebbi (classified senate noted that none of these are good options); President Nguyen, Maurer (Did not vote as faculty had four votes already)**

Discussion:

President Nguyen comments: thank you for going back to your respective constituency groups. K. Hueg: Revenue & Resources and Community & Communication committees are concerned about the timeline for getting this done. How do we structure ourselves to make recommendations?

Maurer: Could Option 1 further weaken our college? Business and Social Sciences faculty don't want program elimination, but they are very concerned with college vitality in the direction we are going. They are concerned with the whole 100% budget reduction strategy, and the impact that it is having on instruction, especially the loss of so many faculty positions, even though unfilled. It's not clear the impact the loss of these positions is having on part-time faculty, but it seems huge.

President Nguyen: Gets a sense from students that they love this idea of interdisciplinary interactions; do we have the right program offerings?

Negus: Thanks K. Maurer for raising the question about the 91%. Could it be possible to make those figures available? Design-thinking is a great idea but how much time do we have because we need time to reach out to our constituents.

Chavez: please be cognizant that there is some bargaining to be done.

President Nguyen: Why are departments so divided? We don't have a sense of community like we used to. A. Edwards wants to be involved in the conversations of how to best serve the students; being from the bio-health division she had been getting a lot of feedback; they made a promise to those allied health programs to keep them around.

K. Lisle: Consolidation timeline leading towards July 1<sup>st</sup>?



**As a committee do you agree to keep the vote from the initial decision? Yes.**

S. Pennington will work on memo that notes the decision that was made.

Escoto: majority of faculty feedback was regarding wanting to be involved in the creation of options to address budget cuts; figure out a way to involve folks earlier. Chavez: Sometimes there is no good way to be transparent because it involved people. There is no good option to go about this

President Nguyen: We received a lot of feedback; hope for governance is engagement and empowerment (well-informed, serve as a real thought partner).

Item 4: Educational Master Plan 2020/2030

Presenter: Thuy Nguyen (President)

Postponed.

Item 5: Public Comments

No public comments.

Meeting adjourned: 2:58pm.

**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)



 Foothill College  
**GOVERNANCE | COUNCIL**

**Non-Voting**

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

Recorder: Veronica Casas-Hernandez

Facilitator: Simon Pennington