FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Mission Informed Planning Council (MIP C) Agenda
General Meeting 1-3 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
April 19, 2024
Zoom: Meeting ID: 820 8209 6262 **Passcode:** 621067

Attendance:	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 Voting Members Absent: Joshua Agupugo, Nicole Nguyen, Kathy Perino, Bebel Yan, Lisa Hills, Fatima Jinnah, Phuong Tran, Roxanna Cnudde College members present: Bret Watson, Zach Cembellin, Lene Whitley-Putz, Allison Meezan, Elaine Kuo, Janie Garcia, Harini Nagappan		
Item	**Presenter**	**Description**	**Time**
Chair: Kristina Whalen **Facilitator:** Adiel Velasquez			
Approval of agenda	Kristina Whalen		1:00-1:05
Agenda was approved without amendment			
Review of Minutes	Kristina Whalen	Minutes	1:05-1:10
Corrections for name spelling were provided.			
Public Comment	Kristina Whalen		
No public Comment			
Student Voice	ASFC Rep	ASFC Rep will share student perspective on MIPC items	1:10-1:15
Harini shared that ASFC elections are happening over the next couple of weeks. Joshua shared that a lot happened last week following the controversial motion of the Academic Senate. Students reacted negatively to how I voted. I was called racist for how I			

voted. During last Thursday's ASFC meeting, a lot of people come to public comment, there was a cameraman taking pictures. it was a massive learning lesson on being a leader and how to deal with the consequences after a vote. I believed it wasn't the best interest of the students or to have dialogue. I thought the best time in place to discuss that would be in our Council chambers, which is why I voted that way. Looking back and seeing all the upset by I probably would have abstained and explained myself afterwards.

Moving forward we are creating an ad hoc committee to host programming on the campus
.
my other project with the gym is going smoothly. We're having 40 plus students attending per day. Also, staff are invited anytime. I'll be this opportunity for students to get their exercise on campus.

Kristina: I thank you for those updates, Joshua, and I think a sign of a good leader is someone who reflects on their actions and reports back those reflections to the people they serve and serve beside. So thank you so much.
And congratulations on the continued success of your project fitness and wellness.

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

The discussion on resources for the tech committee were brought back to the body.

Zach: I don't think it's actually ideal just for one administrator to just be running that committee. We should have a multitude of different people on there, the right staff and faculty and admin. And really we're still looking for a student. Rep on there. A tri-chair model. The proposal from faculty perspective is that they wanted some kind of reassign time associated with that. And so here we are. I don't have any input from the faculty perspective.

Stacy: I just clarify one thing on that. We give assigned time, reassign time to the Senate that's above and beyond the one that required by the contract. So it's a total 2.5 total to the Senate. And the Senate decides how they distribute That's an important clarification.

Kristina: The is agendized so we can close the loop and given the financial outlook on the horizon cannot commit more resources.

Allison: One of the considerations is that we need to have faculty representation not only on the Tech Committee, and ideally helping run the committee. So not just attending meetings, but doing the planning and the background work that is necessary to make a committee successful. But in addition to have a faculty representation on ETAC on the AI Committee, the Hardware Software Committee and the Tech Prioritization Committee. And ideally, there would be some closing of the loop on all of that. So it's just something to consider, because we are currently very challenged to get faculty representation on a lot of committees.

Patrick: And I could add from the Senate perspective is that when the allocation from administration is sent up for release, time was increased a few years back. That was kind of with the understanding, and take on the committee and online learning, and actually make that a Senate position because additional work came with that. Senate allocation was increased, we had room to to allocate resources to that chair position and honestly in in practice. What Alison described is really how it happens that you have somebody who shows up everywhere and then they tell everybody else. And then somebody who shows up everywhere. That's a lot of hours.

Kristina I would entertain from this body proposal for how to move this forward. I think everyone agrees that this structure is an improvement over the disconnected and disjointed tech related discussions that happen district-wide and I feel I feel comfortable suggesting that we endorse this decision-making model. Are people comfortable doing that even though we don't have a full picture of any kind of resources that we can commit at this time?

Kathy: So that's kind of the difficult discussion. First, I'm hearing about the reassign time request for some of this work, and I I'm I don't have a complete understanding of what that work looks like. Are you a member of the committee? Are you the chair of the committee? How often does the committee meet? I mean, we have some benchmarks that we use in for hour to release.
It makes me a little nervous that every time somebody serves on a committee they get released. That that makes me nervous, and I'm the Union person sitting here. So I think there's a little bit more that we need to flesh out from my perspective. We need to flesh out what the work looks like and whether it would fall under a category of reassign time versus college service, because we do actually have that as part of our job.

Kristina: Can I suggest that we at this point determine whether we have consensus on this model. I would like to talk a little bit about the shared governance handbook that that we have been talking about and have descriptions, charges of each of the committees, and especially those that are newly formed, that now exist in PowerPoint presentations, maybe and meeting notes, maybe still in people's heads, that we list the membership, and that we begin to start making a master calendar for the college so that we know when committees are meeting, and that people can make a decision about whether or not they join them based upon when they're meeting in their availability.
That resource will also give us clues as to whether or not the reassigned time resources that are available aligned with the work of this committee.

Zach: I think that it's really important for us to think. Thank you very much for those comments. And I, 100% agree that getting that charge written is gonna be critical to understanding how these different committees are working together, and I think that Alison has a good start on many of those. We are currently in kind of a burst of technology changes. And these bursts have been coming quite frequently. So AI now is going to be making a dramatic change on the technology that we use in our classrooms and the technology that we use to run our campuses.
And this will these rapid changes are not only gonna require groups of people willing to learn the new change, but also decision making. That it's in really important, where our classrooms are concerned, that we have faculty who are serving on those committees and fa and faculty

that are leading some of them. So it's an incredibly important time to be thinking about the ways that technology is drastically changing, the work that we do.

Bret: One thing that I don't see, and I think it would tie to the final tech committee would be the program review budget request process, because we do see a lot of requests for software and technology equipment in there. So somehow, that should be a box. Maybe I don't know to to the Foothill tech Committee. Well, so I don't know if it's on the same document, but you do have some document if you scroll down a bit there. But there are some duties associated with the Tech Committee, and we've had that discussion within that group
Kristina: May I consider that consensus?

Consensus was reached on the decision making and committee model.

Kristina: I really want to thank all of those who went into pulling all of the threads together and making coherence out of chaos. Thank you so much

Proposal: Institutional Effectiveness Committee	Elaine Kuo	Proposal to formalize an Institutional Effectiveness Committee to support continuous improvement, strategic planning, and alignment.	1:25-1:40

Elaine: This is business. From our March meeting, our last March meeting. We had agreed as a group to renew it into spring. So we're coming to MIPC to have a conversation about proposing, yes, another committee. One of the limitations of MIPC is that we don't have a lot of time that allows everyone to get the same base by the knowledge about all these initiatives. and then to be able to then necessarily come to a decision about next steps.

So the proposal for the charge is for a group that serves to promote ongoing continuous improvement with the evaluation and assessment of processes. The committee would meet roughly every 3 to 4 weeks, and would report to MIPC. The accreditation steering committee would morph into this committee and a subgroup would spin off when accreditation work increases, such as our midterm report.
.
The committee would focus on providing ongoing evaluation of processes not necessarily alignment. This would be a recommending body and track when plans due. When would they be revised and updated.
Who would do this work?

The membership was discussed.

Elaine: We are not wedded to anything, and this is what the committee has come up with as the first shot at you. As MIPC continues to evolve right it might feel a little squishy.

I would say that's how it should be. To a certain extent both should be living organizations for us to a certain extent. There's a lot coming down the pipe right? There's a lot of changes we're anticipating. There's some fluidity we should embrace.

So it's not taking on learning outcomes or guided pathways. It's evaluation and assessment.

It was asked if the group would make recommendations on the governance structure.

Elaine: Yes, so this group would be responsible for evaluating government as well.
This group would not implement any of the recommendation. It's still up to MIPC. This group will report to MIPC. They're not doing the actual planning work.

It was clarified that the committee is not responsible for the decision of what happens, but is responsible for looking at the evaluation results, connecting results from other areas of the college, and making recommendations to it. Then it's all a recommendation to the President. And this would be ongoing throughout the academic year.

Kristina: This committee feels needed to me. We've been trying to move some work into work groups. But those work groups don't have administrative support. Don't have a cadence of work and a regular structure that I think is moving the work along at a pace the institution needs and that's not to say that that people aren't doing good work, but it is better supported by committee.

It was asked if this would replace the accreditation steering committee then? Yes. So, except in the off years where it gets accreditation heavy, then it would be a subcommittee of the of the institutional effectiveness.

Kristina: I think people can marinate a little on it, and then we can bring it back to the next agenda. Okay, sounds good.

MIPC: Role of membership		Continued Discussion on envisioning to implementation	1:40-1:55
The question was raised: do we roll the work of the shared governance work group into perhaps a newly formed institutional effectiveness committee? No consensus was reached.			
BREAK			1:55-2:00
New Business			
ASFC – Foothill Olympics	Joshua Agupugo & Adiel Velasquez	Proposal for staff v students community building event.	2:00-2:10
Context was given. It was noted that students are coming back on campus attending more events. The staff and students would like to capitalize on that by having a massive event, not only include students, but also faculty as well.			

The Foothill Olympics was discussed to increase engagement and to establish new connections and familiarity among staff. faculty and students. It was brought to MIPC for feedback.

Having a range of activities so that those that are not athletic or may have mobility issues could participate. These included playing volleyball against each other but also a scavenger hunt, steps competition, trivia, meditation, mindfulness, and forms of light Yoga. The idea was floated that it might be a 3-way competition between Classified Senate, Academic Senate & ASFC.

The desired outcomes were discussed including the ability of the event to humanize staff and faculty for students.

The name of the event was discussed. Owl Olympics although we weren't sure we could use the term Olympics.

Broad support for the idea was noted.

Mission Align Stability Phase	MIPC members on DEMC	Develop principles for upcoming fiscal outlook	2:10-2:20

It was noted that a deeper dive on the fiscal outlook will be provided at the Chancellor's Budget Town Hall on April 30th.
Stact Gleixner recapped that this year we were support for enrollment growth with $800,000, and the District has agreed to continue that funding support next year, and so that $800,000 translates directly to sections that we open. Also, Foothill College has been supplementing our instructional budget for the last couple of years. Last year we supplemented to the tune of 1.8 million dollars of our one time escrow to cover additional sections.

It was noted that the money opened class sections that benefited our students and benefited the community. It also covered some supplemental instruction on our campus.

It was noted that next year is sort of a transition before we move on to the SCFF model of funding. We need to align our scheduling and align our other practices with the budget

It was clarified that Hold Harmless does not go away but the funding we receive now is the new floor and we will not receive COLA until we are again serving more students than we are receiving funding for. It was noted that we will be in plateaued funding.

The question mark of basic aid or community supported funding was discussed, including the likelihood of property taxes increasing and having no negative ERAF (educational revenue augmentation fund). The number of times positive ERAF existed was discussed as rare but has occurred.

It was noted that flat funding means that if we grow at the same rate we grew this year, assuming we even retain the growth or we shrank we would still get the same funding until a time where our FTES exceeded the amount of FTES we are currently funded at as a District.

It was noted that it does impact some categorical. We will lose some funding streams if our enrollment declines.

Kristina encouraged people to get a richer understanding of the budget landscape by attending the Chancellor's Town Hall and then what we're hoping to do is follow that up with maybe a very specific discussion here at Foothill.

Accreditation Report	Elaine Kuo & Kelaiah Harris	Core Inquiry Report	2:20-2:25

Elain: Kristina and I did meet with our peer review team chairs, and then we're heading into the next stage of the accreditation process. The next phase will be would be for a visit where people show up and they will ask for additional evidence and ask questions of people. That visit is scheduled for September 30th. Unlike in years past only be the areas that are highlighted by the core inquiries will be discussed.

It was noted that the core inquiries are an intermediate outcome. The Peer Review Team will have an opportunity for 2 way engagement with the college and have answers for some additional questions. There is also a chance to provide additional evidence.

We have 3 core findings.
First Student Learning Outcomes. The focus from the peer review team is that we they want to verify that we have a cycle of regular assessment. That actual assessment of these slos that are being entered and assessed regularly.

The Office of Instruction, through Stacy and Kurt, have faculty who are leading the charge and have been working on these conversations.

The second core inquiry is RSI--. Regular and Substantive Interaction.

RSI is a Federal compliance issue not mapped to a standard but a policy.
Elaine: we sent them a sample of our fall quarter classes. Less than a half were determined to meet the policy.

Stacy: We thought we were putting our best foot forward. Our best foot forward is sort of highlighting the tip of an iceberg problem

It was highlighted that the process is under review but hasn't been implemented yet. But the documentation templates and training on the new RSI 3 year assessment cycle will be avialble for the team. We will be able to show our progress.

It is a district finding is that no calendar exists for a regular cycle of updating for policies and administrative procedures.

Committee Reports			
Tech Committee	Zach Cembellin		2:25-2:30

Zach: we met last week, and our goal is to come with a draft document. That draft never actually officially got approved by the school at any point in time. So that draft tech plan document we are cleaning up. We are bring to MIPC in the future. And then it's actually we're gonna be heading into the last year of the 3 year cycle.
So next year we'll have to kind of come up with a new plan.

And there's a group of student workers that have brought attention the printing services on our campus. They want it to be more vocally known that they're very upset with the way this the printing services are taking place. They currently use this contract with Eprint.
They find it very problematic. Sometimes they have to log in into 3 different apps, just to give you access to the printing service. We usually use this service called paper cut and and all the feedback I got in that meeting was that it's a far superior service in terms of user interface and usability. So I wanted to bring to the space, and let that issue be known that they are a number of problems brewing with the eprint services. ETS does not seem to have an interest in helping with any troubleshooting of the services

The question was asked about who maintains the services. It was not known.

Bret Watson is going to facilitate a solution.

Standing Reports		Old Business	
Taskforces and Workgroups Reports	District Committees Measure G Taskforce ILO WG Foothill 2030/IEPI MIPC 13-55 Project		2:30-2:45

Buildings & Sustainability: 2 major things the signage project. Went to other colleges looked at their signage. We'll have focus groups when we get to our vendor that we will select eventually.

Students did a presentation that will be utilized in the work.

Bret: The other thing is our lighting. So we have the the sample lights out there. We've been receiving feedback. We are giving it a couple more weeks before we make our final decision. People have found the new lights positive. The light comes down. It doesn't create light pollution. We were encouraged to go with the Lower Kelvin, the 27 Kelvin. But from a safety standpoint the 4,000 Kelvin seems to be the best way to go. So that's where we're kind of leaning at this point.

SLO: No Report

Foothill 2030: The vision revise team is slated for one more meeting this quarter before we would probably come to MIPC. We are at the stage where we have a couple of drafts. We're

trying to synthesize it into one statement. EMP group is meeting once in May and June. Really to figure out planning for the fall as more of an official kickoff for the end master planning and then also to really think more deeply about the kind of data we want to collect in the fall, and or and or to start reviewing in the fall.

MIPC 13-55: I'm gonna give that update I mentioned at the last meeting that we were at the stage of the process that's outlined in the legal process. We were about to finish up the inventory of the native American cultural artifacts and remains we have completed that inventory the next step is to reach out and do consultation with the most likely descendants, which will happen in May. Sam Connell had a student who did a wonderful project on where we might repatriate or bury those remains here on campus. He has identified 3 places.

Affinity Group Reports	APAN OLA AAN LGBTQ		2:45-2:55

APAN:
(Valerie) Having an end of the year ceremony. We also have 2 events going on. One is a film maker question and answer panel: Chinatown Rising. The other one is the San Francisco Chinatown Social Justice tour happening in a few weeks. T
he Chinatown tour was on May 11th. Saturday,

OLA:
Fatima Jinnah: I have 2 announcements. The first is that we also have an end of the Year Celebration. It's on Friday, June fourteenth, at 6 o'clock, and it will be held in the dining hall,
The second and last announcement is about the OLA scholarship. So I started this scholarship 17 years ago when I started here at Foothill, and I'm very proud that it has continued due to our fundraising efforts, u, faculty and staff contributions
Fatima Jinnah: so the application season for the scholarship just closed and due to staff contributions. We are going to be able to offer 2 OLA scholarships.
Those scholarship recipients are also invited to the end of the year celebration to get honored.

AAN

Lisa Hills: No report.

LGBTQ+
Clifton: We are having the pride inclusive flag raising ceremony, which is annual. That's gonna be on Wednesday, June 5th, from at 2 o'clock. It's going to be at the FHDA District office flag. At the football college, lower school parking lot 7. All are welcome. And again, this is not just an Lgbtq+ thing. It is pride for all.
Before that we have the foothill beats and the pride March, who will also meet beforehand about 30 min before, at 1130 at the Caesar Chavez Plaza. We march together, drumming around the campus and eventually end up at the flag, raising ceremony.
As you may know the Student Council chambers will be the future Pride Center. You wanna make sure it's not called the Lgbtq plus center.
And last, but not least, we have the lavender graduation for everyone to enjoy.

That's going to be on Friday, June 20, first at 4 pm. We ajourn this meeting at 2 59 pm. Thank you. Everyone.			
Announcements			2:55-3:00
Good of the Order	All		