FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Mission Informed Planning Council (MIP C) Agenda
General Meeting 1:30 – 3:30 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
June 7, 2024
Zoom: **Meeting ID:** 820 8209 6262 **Passcode:** 621067

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Members : (In person) Kristina Whalen, Aaron Korngiebel, Phuong Tran, Zach Cembellin, Simon Pennington, Asha Jossis, Elaine Kuo, Jordan Fong, Patrick Morriss, Bret Watson, Harini Nagappan, Ben Kaupp, Doreen Finkelstein (online: Adiel Velasquez, Clifton Der Bing, Kathy Perino, Kelaiah Harris, Lisa Hills, Mark Barnes, Peter Chow, Lené Whitley Putz) Guests: Stephanie Crosby, Stacy Gleixner,			
Approval of agenda	Kristina Whalen		1:30-1:32
The meeting meetings were apporved			
Student Voice			1:32- 1:40
Harini: Amazing activities like wrap up the year. A project next year surveys students on what classes students want to be taking every quarter will be compared to the classes that are actually offered.			
Old Business			
Visit: IEPI-Partner Resource Team	Stacey Gleixner	IEPI Plan Presented	1:40 – 1:55 1:55 – 2:10
Stacy Gleixner: IEPI stands for institutional effectiveness, partnership initiative. This is a program that we joined. We. But we joined. It's a system wide program where there's a team, also an acronym called the PRT. The partnership partner resource team. They have come and visited our campus twice, and this team is made up of people in all different roles at all different California community colleges across the State. We have been signed an outstanding team. They were thoughtful. They provided really detailed feedback. And we had submitted a proposal around the educational master plan. It comes with $200,000 and so the resource team and their advice is really great, and we lucked out and got a really great team. We are going to get a lot of advice from them. But we're also getting $200,000.			

And our initial thought going into this was that we were going to use that $200,000 to hire a consultant to help with the strategic planning process. Also, What bubbled up a lot in the visits is campus engagement both from the faculty and the staff perspective. So it's a mix of moral--finding your place like, and being valued for your place

Another important aspect of what we're going to be doing is integrating plans together in a way that makes logical sense. There's, as we all know, there's a lot of things out there that are either called a plan or are app operating as a plan, like an initiative, and we want everything to sort of tie together in a clearer manner.

We also heard a lot on communication. The Prt team heard a lot on communication. And so, that's going to be an important part of keeping engagement and keeping these plans sustainable is that people understand what's going on, that we celebrate the accomplishments of what is going on in clear communication plans.

It was discussed that the Menu of Options has lots of resources. The Berkeley Culture of Engagement was mentioned.

The whole 200,000, might not go just to the consultant, because we are going out for a bid request for proposal, and so we don't exactly know how much it's going to cost but we do believe that, you know it would be hard to allocate the other funds until we do have that, because it will be the most costly thing.

Update on Relationship with Muwekma Ohlone Tribe	Aaron Korngiebel, Valerie Fong, Ulyssess Acevedo, Sam Connell	2nd visit with Chairwoman took place Friday May 17th	

Ulysses: We were lucky that chairwoman Nijmeh, was able to visit us for the second time and I also want to acknowledge that that Sam O'Connell has actually been leading a lot of the efforts through his long relationship with the tribe we had Michael Wilcox Who's actually an anthropology professor at Stanford University, and who has also a long relationship with the Moat Maloney tribe, and who actually drafted up our land acknowledgement. So he was there.
Also Joey Torres was there as well, who is involved with a lot of the spiritual work and cultural preservation of the tribe. On the day of the meeting. We met. We talked about this ongoing relationship.
There's been some a drafting of some agreements of how this relationship is going to work in the future. We affirmed that we're goning move forward with our partnership with the Muwekma tribe. One of the big things that we did was we walked around campus and we shared with them one of the the main locations for the reburial site. This is ongoing conversation, and you know this is not a 1 or 2 meeting type of thing. This is an ongoing relationship that that we hope to establish this is just the initial initial part of this relationship, which is one of the bigger goals is to get the
Patrick Morris: I know that in our mou that we've seen here at at MIPC before. One of the one of the points was also was actually repatriating the land back. Is the burial site that we're talking about on campus is that is that is it in the plan, then, to to transfer that land ownership to tribe.

Kristina: We will give them a a burial site here on campus that then becomes registered as a cultural heritage site. And once it's a cultural heritage site, then it in effect, becomes land that is sacred. It can no longer be developed on by Foothill, and we are looking at sites that are here on campus.

Aaron: I just want to acknowledge that there are a lot of people in this room that have been involved in this work, and I haven't been to many of the meetings. Just to kind of level set for everybody. These remains that we're talking about were actually found on our campus back in the 1970s. A development on the other side of 280. You can see here in the box. They were doing construction on that neighborhood. The Ohlone remains were found as well as artifacts, and we had a bunch of foil faculty students go down and do some salvage operations to preserve those artifacts before they were destroyed? So that's why we have gained custody of these items. And so they kind of did a half pattern survey. They drew a kind of cartoon drawing this map from the 19 seventies where they showed all the little sites where all the artifacts discovered. And so these artifacts basically went into boxes. In the geology department for many years.

and done some cataloging of the items to hopefully someday repatriate them in some way. there's a lot of laws around all this, and some of those laws have changed recently in December. I think there's the moral obligation to do the right thing and engage the tribe around how to handle their remains and and really begin an engagement with them. In a partnership. And so that that really began with the fall, 2023 meetings that you all were briefed on right. since that fall meeting. So we've had meetings with legal counsel. To to talk about what our obligations are under the the national standards that that Ulysses mentioned. There are also some California ones as well around how you handle remains, how you repatriate remains. And the legal obligations around that
since then that so over the years, the anthropology department has been cataloging. It's it's gone and fits and starts but they basically spent the the past few months gathering together all their materials into a single document that we have now. So we have an inventory of all all the items that we have and a list of the artifacts and remains that we have over the anthropology department.

Ulysses: I think the Mewukma weren't just interested in repatriation. They want a relationship with us. They want to have a space here on campus. We want them to have a space on campus. And so a lot of discussion that May 17th meeting was around that

Aaron: There was also discussion around partnering with the Wilton tribe. So that was that that idea that that Ulysses brought forward that you know the Wilton tribe is is a federally recognized tribe, and we there are different stipulations within laws where we could just give it the remains to the Federally recognized tribe, and they can turn around and give it to the unrecognized tribe. If you know the history of the Muwekma. They were recognized at 1 point and then an anthropologist said that they were extinct, which they weren't, and they were derecognized. And so some of the some of the conversations that we've had with with them is is is, they're looking for also an advocate and us, and helping them advocate for re recognition of of their tribal status. And they're looking for a a strong partner with that.

So they in in the conversation, expressed an interest in repatriation and ceremony of some sort. Where, you know we have a ceremony where we hand over the remains that we have to them to take care of their ancestors. We talked about Reburial on campus, and and Ulysses mentioned going out to different sites. And once. And as Kristna you mentioned once we put those remains in the ground no development no future development can occur there. So, in a sense, that's getting the land back to the ancestors, that that we're take that taken from them. So in a way, it is giving back the land to the community by do reburial it here on campus, because it's their land essentially

They also had a discussion around a a public archive of some of the artifacts. So the anthropology department would take pictures of. You know the the mortars, the pestles, the different implements that we have. And having just a library resource on the Foothill Web Page saying, this is this is what these are, the cultural resources that we have on our campus. They express a strong opinion that they really did not want to see their ancestors in these archives, and so it would only be tools and implements and that sort of thing. No, remains.

They also expressed interest in a gathering space where we could get together in community. The Chairwoman also expressed an interest in some sort of mural or monument commemorating that the Muwekma were here. And this was their land.
There's also the idea of flying with their tribal flag here on campus, up on one of our flagpoles.

Ulysses Acevedo: allowing all Muwekma tribal members to attend Foothill College for free. So, regardless of their income attending foothill for free. And that's just something that stood out to me.

Patrick Morris: Yeah if you don't mind saying a little more about that gathering space what I recall from the MOU there was that we were talking about office space as well phone computer setup that they don't have any other place, we would have that space on campus. We. Is that what you're talking about altogether.

Kristina: we would need to take it through our processes which are in our resource. Allocation guide process. We haven't firmly identified that because we don't know what questions are important to the tribe. Is it important for the tribe that that gathering space be near where the burial site is? Or is that immaterial to the discussion? I think we want to find you know, the best location. So that it's a meaningful space for them.

New Business			
Program Review Report	Stacey Gleixner		2:10 – 2:25

The new program review processes culminates with an exciting VP presentation to MIPC. And just a reminder that this program review process is new.

It's a revitalized rebooted process that went through a real robust consultation on how to create it. I think there's some strengths to this new process and some things that we want

to tweak as we move forward. I wanted to remind the group that when the campus as a whole thought about rebooting and revitalizing the program review process, they had some goals in mind. I wasn't here at the time, but these were the goals that were meaningful engagement with data, that that meaningful engagement with data was goning spark thoughtful program-level reflection. People were gonna come up with something that they could do reflecting on their own data. And there's was gonna have a tangible connection to our resources. Most tangibly--the budget allocation, as Brett will talk to, and the faculty prioritization guidelines.

And so the launch of the new program Review was successful in a number of ways.

I will emphasize that I read every program review in my area. Laurie read every program review in her area. Kris read most, if not every single program review. All of the Deans read the program reviews in their area and without doubt, the vast majority of the program reviews showed that there was authentic reflection and planning. I really think that's a strong win. That that was the central goal of this and that. We brought a lot of people along with us in that process.

We somewhat successfully elevated the challenges and the plans of the programs. I think, really importantly, that the Deans and I all know what the different academic programs are trying to do.

And the same is true for Laurie and her teams. They knew what they know, what the student services programs are trying to do. I say somewhat, because when you read some of the guidelines, one of the goals was that there was cross pollination. And I still think we have a ways to go in that area.

Just speaking from my own example. Every time I was going into one of the Budget Request meetings, I pulled up my notes from all those program reviews, so that I was sure of the alignment between what was being asked for and their action plans.

The faculty prioritization process was a little out of sync this this year and this year only, and the reason for that is that the program review plan and templates were rolled out in the spring and the faculty prioritization process and guidelines was finalized in the beginning to mid-June, and so they were out of sync this time. The templates had already rolled out before the faculty prioritization. They are now synced. The newly developed faculty prioritization questions in it.

And this the the IRP team ran a survey to all the readers and the writers. They gotta respond this out 19 on their survey, which is pretty good So this is just from a lens of mostly the writer perspective. The thing you take away from this is is that the red and orange are good colors.

The gray is the needs improvement, color and the blue needs work, and the the darkest blue is they didn't use them. And so when you see the dark blue. You also need to remember that most people were writers.

for the most part everyone thought everything was extremely to useful.

And then we asked if the process prompted meaningful conversations, and I think that the for the most part it did prompt the meaningful conversations that we are hoping for them to have. If you notice that one in the middle with the big dark blue. I learned about other areas of the college

We tried a meeting. We we invited all the readers and all the writers, and what we had hoped from that meeting. What we tried to prompt was that they were gonna share out their projects, their action plans, and their challenges. It wasn't actually that successful. And so that's on us. We think our prompt wasn't that good? Because what people did share out is feedback on the overall process. We got a lot of information about how they felt about going through the process the 1st time, and we had to kind of really pull out the action plans and and the challenges. And they they weren't prepared to share them out. So

we're gonna try that again next year. But we're also open to other ideas that you think we could strengthen this cross pollination of who's working on what and giving visibility to both the actions that are taking place and the challenges that are highlighted in those reports.

I see that a lot of the programs are working on things that I think are doable. So I'm excited by that I think they align with the existing campus momentum. So there's things already going on that can help with those things, and that there are multiple programs that are trying to do roughly the same things. And so for my position, I don't want this work to be happening in isolation. I want them to know about the other groups who are also working on non credit pathways or or dual enrollment pipelines, or addressing ZTC type of things.

I have a list for my reading the instructional report notes. Some of them are clear overlaps with strengthening connections with student services, but I know that there was also a lot of rich ideas out of the student services programs that I'm not rising up and elevating here.

I also read all the annual reports. And so I'm really excited by the annual report process and by the Dean's awareness of what each programs trying to work on, based on the program reviews. Because I think that's going to be a good way to keep programs work. And I momentum and energy alive as they go through trying to implement these plans because none of these plans are the type of thing that you can do in a year.

In terms of the challenges, There's also written surveys that came with that survey. We haven't digested all of those, so that once I show the quantified surveys. We still have a lot of qualitative data to go through to get the richness out of that survey. But we know that we

need something like a parking lot, because programs are still struggling with their action plan. Their own ideas versus the people over here should be doing this, and some of the ideas that I read about what the people over here should be doing are good ideas. So we should have a place where programs can record those. But then refocus back on what they can do and what their action plan is. The vast majority of programs were authentic and had reflection. There were a handful of program reviews, both on the instruction and the student services side, where the bitterness the burnout the disengagement of the program came out loud and clear, and it's helpful. It's information I now know better who is bitter and disengaged. You know all knowledge is good knowledge, but but it is something for us, as a campus, to still continue to work on, to make sure that every program feels valued and every program is energized to continue to grow and change and serve our students and our community better.

There was a range of reader reports. So I think we still need to grow in that area, too. I think we've done a good job with getting readers to the place of a culture of needs improvement, but some of them I couldn't tell from the reader, report what kind of improvements they wanted. So there needs to be a little more detail in that

continued engagement with the the data. I think people were looking at the data. We're reflecting on the data, and they come up with an action plan. But they didn't make a connection between the action plan and making a measurable impact on their data.

There needs to continued alignment with the budget request.

Voltaire: So here in MIPC couple of meetings ago, we approved the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. So how do you see program we've been fitting into or does it?

And I think that we we talked about this a little bit, Elaine. There's the charter for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and I know we talked about where program you overlap with that. But I can't remember. No. So I think one of the one of the issues that we have to be discussing in business in the I guess the working meeting we had. Was it

Elaine: That's what we had in terms of giving sort of processes like like program review the time in the space for more discussion. Then we typically are able to afford during because of the pack agendas that MIPC tends to have, and so that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee would be that opportunity. where there could be more

sustained engagement and discussion emphasis on the discussion piece

Bret: So I'm gonna talk about the budget request. It is part of the program review process. So when program review is you know, being developed areas are looking at what resources will improve their programs. And there has to be a link to the 13-55 the equity vision for equity plan. So we do have a team we call it the financial allocation team (FAT). On the left side is the divisions, and how much they requested overall. So there were a total of about 5.3 million dollars, and you can see the breakdown of how each division, how much they requested. On the right is the expense category. So obviously facilities and furniture was the

largest and then equipment was pretty large, and then we also had staffing requests. That were pretty significant as well.

There were delays getting their budget request in. So we allowed an extension of that through through the month month of January, and actually in February, we started meeting with the various programs to talk about their requests. There were 114 total requests, it pretty much compared to the prior year, where there was 109. The highest item was, 2 million dollars came from the stem area. This had to do with the stem center which is actually one of our projects on Measure G. For now we're kind of holding on that. And you know we've been talking about wanting to do some improvements to that building. We're hoping we could do a lot with the 2.7 million. But I know it's gonna be limited and what we could do. I'm also trying to find additional resources. Maybe that we can add to that 2.7 million. The committee all of us agree to 40 of those 100

114 items. It's about $650,000. There were 29 items that were denied, and there are 37 items still on. Our facilities, probably the main ones, are facilities. There are some of those holds that will go into yeses, and maybe some that will go into no's for the facilities furniture as well, and then the personnel we have. We have either the faculty prioritization process that we follow for faculty positions. But we also have the RAG guidelines for other personnel for classified personnel. So those were asked for some areas.

The idea would be to include all the requests for personnel, and and bring those to Cabinet for review. When we're asking for new position to fund those positions, and the only way we usually get that funding is by giving up something, giving up another position or giving up a a significant amount of the budget. So that's kind of a hard thing to do, but that's kind of what that entails. But anyway, the process is that Cabinet would review the review those positions, and either approve or just keep that list prioritize. So when we do have some some money available, then that would be maybe our 1st choice would be the top priority position.

.

BREAK			2:25-2:30
Regular Business			
Committee Reports			
Professional Learning Update	Lene Whitley-Putz		2:30 – 2:40

Lene: I also want to defer to Doreen, who is also on our committee, and since she's there in person. We are moving forward with planning. We have you know, several hiccups. One is that we are waiting to hear from the district. Because of the core inquiries. How much of our planning needs to be focused on addressing the 2 instructional core inquires that we have.

And we are coming up against summer. And so there's a lot of concern about faculty input and how we'll continue to get faculty input over the summer.

But what we have really dedicated ourselves to is making sure that anything that is offered on our college opening day is very much geared toward combining our faculty and classified staff and meaningful dialogue.

And we have the list of workshop topics that our faculty and classified would like to address as well with AI topping out the list.

Dorreen: So so there was a survey that went out. Actually, IP did not do the survey but I did get to see it. I thought it was well done. And We got back a lot of suggestions from faculty and classified and administrators about what what workshop they want? And it was interesting to see some of the overlap and definitely say, artificial intelligence was the number one overlap

We also talked about other areas of overlap with equity. And also recognizing that from the faculty side there does seem to be a need to continue the conversation about Rsi and about Slos, because that is part of accreditation. And recognizing that those really are specifically faculty topics, and trying to make sure that there is time for that andWe support that and so you could say, here's gonna be a session on Rsi, and that is for faculty. But then have something that is also for classified at that period time, or else just to say, Hey, this is for faculty. And I think that what has happened in the past has been business for everyone and then classified go, and it's not for everyone.

And so that's something that we want to try to not have happen this year. C

Elaine: while the core inquiry was specifically related to instruction, the SAOs are part of the larger umbrella of student learning at and I would encourage the professional learning commitee and the the team here to consider that because that is sort of shared language that we should adopt above the college and not be exclusive to faculty.

Doreen: Last year is there was an attempt to make it inclusive of everyone that didn't work. listening to conversations around the campus about people's feelings of exhaustion and frustration. And so how do we do that? In in a way that is like a a fresh start. Energizing, celebratory

Lene: This committee was supposed to come forward with suggestions to MIPC for what to do. For flex and opening day. But we're not exactly sure what the operation operationalization of that actually is. So who is the committee that that does the work, and what is entailed in making sure that that work gets done and the planning gets done. That was the the biggest question that we had out of our last meeting.

Voltaire: Faculty being part of this conversation in the in the professional development is important. But I I'm seeing that this might occur during summer. I'm sure we could probably tell some of our colleagues to come during the summer, if there's compensation that's provided.

Kristina: We'll look at resources and and loop back.

| Tech Commitee | Zach Cembillan | | 2:40 – 2: 50 |

Zach: This plan is actually expiring next spring. So we're gonna have to remake a whole another one anyways. This was originally done a couple of years back. And then we realized just recently this was never like formally adopted by any group on the campus. So

What we have done is clean it up a little bit from its original form. We've done some edits to some of the goals, but our philosophy in that group was like, Well, why, redo the whole thing right now, when we're gonna have to redo it all over again next year. We I do have a couple of questions for this group. And

We hope to get this approved by the end of June, hopefully in the next MIPC. And then we can actually start the process in fall to start creating another 3 year cycle of a of a updated technology plan for the college.

We will let you all take some time to look at it on your own and see if you have feedback. But this has been vetted through several different meetings in our technology group. So we are good where that group is at. That's why we're bringing it h

Standing Reports		Old Business	
Taskforces and Workgroups Reports	District Committees Measure G Taskforce ILO WG Foothill 2030/IEPI MIPC 13-55 Project		2:50-3:15

Reports from District Committees were given

Foothill 2030: Our vision statement work ideally is concluding

We did a survey hopefully. Everyone was able to participate in that survey. That talk about our vision statement but this was a statement that went out so kind of draft one that the team created sort of vision is a future where students from our community form a sense of belonging and agency to thrive in Silicon Valley and beyond.

So part of the second phase was to then solicit some feedback.

We also sent an online survey to everyone, students and employees. Only have 90 responses.

At least two-thirds or more felt this one statement was defaulting aspirational, but fewer felt it was inspirational and memorable

You'll see that for the most part, folks were supportive of the agency to drive in the simple line, but less enthused in regards to the phrasing of in Silicon Valley and over here.

There was a lot of open ended a opportunities there. For folks to respond to. We also took the feedback that folks got from the constituency spaces, and there's a lot of conversations. I just wanted to spend a little bit of time on the in Silicon Valley phrasing. What seemed to rise up was the fact that it seemed very exclusionary with a tilt on stem.
So a lot of folks within Arts and Humanities background felt that somehow left them out of the conversation. Students come from outside Silicon Valley. We also have online students. But we also had comments related to the fact that we perhaps leave Silicon Valley after their time here. And so those were some of comments we got related to that.

We deliberated and proposed additional edits. So this is what we're coming to MIPC with. This is the 1st read, we would do a second read in 2 weeks.

Then MIPC would make a recommendation. To the President.

Kathy Perino: So I just have a question for the group who came up with the 2nd statement, if the 1st statement a lot of the feedback had issues with the reference to Silicon Valley. I'm just curious about how that ended up still in there.

Elaine: The one is where your education is going to happen, and the other is where you're gonna live post, and the objection was on the when it when it was the assumption that you were going to thrive here. But we do have the assumption that you're going to choose Foothill College which is in Silicon Valley.

Shared Gove WG:
Kristina: For the shared governance handbook work group. Tell you we did spend the entirety of what would have been the MIPC meeting on May 17.th I'm hoping at the next agenda to bring you a draft document of what that work group is producing. We did get through answering a lot of questions about that had been raised from the past chair.

Affinity Group Reports	APAN OLA AAN LGBTQ		3:15-3:25
Affinity group shared their activities and upcoming end of the year celebrations.			
Announcements			3:25-3:30
Good of the Order	All		