

**Academic Senate Foundation for California Community Colleges Meeting Minutes**

**May 18, 2017 | Senate Office**

Members in attendance: Virginia May, President; Adrienne Foster, Secretary; Craig Rutan, Treasurer; Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Director; Michelle Sampat, Director; Lara Baxley, Director; Julie Adams, Executive Director; Erika Prasad, Communications and Development Director

1. **Approval of agenda, meeting minutes from March and action tracking sheet**
2. The agenda and minutes were approved by consensus.
3. The action tracking sheet was reviewed and approved. May will hold off on contacting Golden 1 for the Legislative Event. The action item: “research paper requirements for endorsement” were reassigned to Adams. Additional context will be added to the Webinar Leadership Academy action item.
4. **Strategic Plan**
5. The Strategic Plan was reviewed. The PDC will be removed from the plan because the Foundation does not control the content of the program as the Foundation only provides the brand identity for the PDC.
6. An election may be held in November for the two-year director position.
7. Under goal two of the plan, the marketing and branding activities were changed from complete to ongoing as the Foundation will be improving and evaluating all fundraising activities. The Directors will revisit the plan in fall.   
     
   **Action:**

* Hold election for vacant director positions.
* Directors will revisit strategic plan in fall.

1. **Budget**
2. The budget as of March was reviewed in detail. The fundraising goal of $40,000 was accomplished, however, expenses were greater than the revenue received. The Foundation is slowly diminishing its reserves and needs to consider sustainable funding outside of the Senate and sponsorships. Revenue from sponsorships may be transferred to the ASCCC because of diminished costs of ASCCC events and the need to cover actual costs.
3. A formal request to receive additional funding from ASCCC Executive Committee was discussed along with what the ASCCC can afford to provide the Foundation. The Foundation Directors agreed to ask the Executive Committee for $10,00o to continue operations for fiscal year 2017-18 and to reassess funding structures at the end of the year. See section five for further context on the future of the Foundation.   
     
   **Action:**

* Request of the Executive Committee a budget augmentation of $10,000 for Foundation meeting expenses.

**IV.**  **Spring Fling Results**

1. The financials from Spring Fling were reviewed.
   1. Spring Fling Tickets: 6 tables were sold at $1500 each. 41 individual tickets were sold at $150 each. The total revenue for Spring Fling was $15,150.
   2. Raffle tickets: 322 tickets were sold to 48 members for $1,893 in total profits.
   3. The spring session had two vendor partners: IEPI and EPI. Each paid the $500 table fee totaling $1,000.
2. What went well/what needs improvement? This was not discussed because it will not apply for next year.
   1. The Spring Fling generates minimal profits as cost for hotel, food, and beverage have increased. The Spring Fling was described as an “elitist” event by some members. To break this perception, the Foundation Directors decided to remove the dinner from future receptions. Attendees will have dinner on their own, but will be able to attend the dance where faculty can network and unwind for no charge. This would allow the Spring Fling to be open to everyone and would encourage individual giving, but would not be a prerequisite to enter the dance reception.
3. **Future of the Foundation**

The Directors raised concerns that have been circulating the field based on perception and/or criticisms. Concerns ranged from the lack of funding support from the Executive Committee to the Foundation being perceived as only a “party planning” committee. The focal point of discussion was based on the question: should the Foundation exist? Adams commented that even if the Foundation dissolved, the funds would not go to ASCCC. The Directors decided to commit for another year and to reassess funding at that time. It was agreed that fundraising through individual giving is not a sustainable source of revenue. Adams suggested that the Foundation rebrand itself to illustrate that it serves as the arm of research for the ASCCC.

It was stated that the Foundation needs to improve its messaging to the field regarding the progress it has made in areas of research, but in order to do this, the process would have to be streamlined. For example, the SLO project was significant, but was not shared widely because of the length of time it took to be reviewed by the Executive Committee. To improve the execution and timeline of projects, the Directors recommended that the Executive Committee not lead the efforts in research, but rather, act as facilitators with the Foundation Directors as the final decision makers. The criteria for such research projects would include broad perspectives and include research topics determined by asking ASCCC committees for suggestions and reviewing adopted resolutions. Marketing materials such as a brochure outlining the Foundation’s commitment and progress on research projects might assist in messaging efforts and will be explored by staff. The research projects have the potential to reach national audiences and can be turned into curriculum for the Professional Development College.

Additional items to note: the ASCCC will fund the Fall Plenary reception and will be named the “President’s Reception”. The Area Competition will remain as the fundraiser for Fall Session.

1. **Research Projects and Priorities**
   1. Projects
      1. Equity and Diversity Committee: effective practices for hiring diverse faculty research. The letter of inquiry was reviewed by the Foundation directors and was revised with their suggested edits. The final letter will be reviewed by the ASCCC president prior to sending to potential funders.
      2. Efficacy of SLO outcomes research. Limited colleges reviewed the project. Possible outcomes of the research were debated including a white paper. Since the Foundation funded the preliminary research, it was recommended that the research should be examined by the Accreditation Committee to use in further development of materials or information. The information would include a more informed abstract to be posted to the Foundation site along with the full paper that will be shared with the field.

**Action item:** May to take SLO paper to Accreditation Committee.

* 1. Other opportunities discussed included effective practices in research was deliberated on in length. Directors asserted the need for more learning and support in math and science. They asked to look at short- and long-term projects and to examine the outcomes for California community colleges and teaching support to discover programs and innovations in the field. It was agreed that first, there would need to be incremental projects to lead to a larger picture of interventions and to also connect with K-12 teachers. Further context for the “ask” from funders would need to be developed for STEM research projects.

1. **Grant Opportunities and Applications**

The letter of inquiry for the EDAC research project will be crafted to align with each potential funder. Prasad and Adams will begin outreach efforts in the next few weeks.

1. **Future Meeting Dates**

The next in person meeting will be held on August 25, 2017 from 10:30 am - 3:00 pm at the Senate office. It was announced that John Freitas will be the incoming Secretary and Cheryl Aschenbach will be Treasurer for the Foundation Board.

1. **Future Agenda Items**
   1. Strategic Plan
   2. Budget
   3. Research topics
   4. Elections
   5. Area Competition
   6. Three-year fundraising plan
2. **Adjournment**

The Foundation meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Erika Prasad, Communications and Development Director   
Julie Adams, Executive Director