FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)
Wednesday, December 3, 2014
Minutes

PURPOSE: Participatory Governance Leaders Meeting
LOCATION: Administration Building / Room 1901 / President's Conference Room
TIME: 1:30 – 3:00 PM / First and Third Wednesdays

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:33	Welcome	Holcroft	
2	1:33-1:35	Approval of Minutes: November 19, 2014	Holcroft	Action
3	1:35-1:40	Student, Success & Support Program (3SP) Plan Executive Summary – 2nd Read for Approval	Holcroft/ Swett	Action
4	1:40-1:45	Perkins Rubric Presentation – 2nd Read for Approval	Workforce Workgroup	Action
5	1:45-1:55	Student Equity Plan Addendum for Approval	Student Equity Workgroup	Action
6	1:55-2:05	Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Rubric Presentation Summary – 1st Read	OPC	
7	2:05-2:15	Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal	Holcroft/ LaManque	
8	2:15-2:25	Educational & Strategic Master Plan (ESMP)	Kuo	
9	2:25-2:35	Marketing Update	Hanstein	
10	2:35-2:45	Technology Plan Update	Baker	
11	2:45-3:00	Questions/Comments	Holcroft	

Notes:
ESMP (ongoing through 2014-15)
Assess ILO "Communication" (ongoing through 2014-15)
Administrative Unit Program Reviews due in January to their respective VP/President (See Craig Gawlick for more information)

ATTACHMENTS:
Item 2: Draft Minutes of November 19, 2014 Meeting
Item 3: 3SP Plan Executive Summary
Item 4: Perkins Rubric
Item 5: Student Equity Plan Addendum

Item 6: OPC Rubric
Item 7: Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal
Item 9: Marketing Update

PaRC Members Present:
April Henderson, Ava Gerami, Behrouz Amirbadvy, Bernata Slater, Bernie Day, Carolyn Holcroft, Charlie McKellar, Craig Gawlick, Debbie Lee, Evelynn Chun, Hilda Fernandez, Josh Rosales, Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Sara Munoz, Victor Tam

Ex-Officio Members Present:
Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, Casie Wheat, Elaine Kuo, Kimberlee Messina, Nanette Solvason

Guests:
Al Guzman, Meredith Heiser, Judy Baker

Meeting started at 1:32 PM.

1. Welcome
Academic Senate President Carolyn Holcroft chaired the meeting because President Judy Miner was in Washington, DC attending the White House College Opportunity Day of Action.

2. Approval of Minutes: November 19, 2014
November 19, 2014 minutes approved by consensus.

3. Student, Success & Support Program (3SP) Plan Executive Summary – 2nd Read for Approval
Holcroft presented the Student, Success & Support Program (3SP) Plan Executive Summary as a second read for approval. Holcroft noted that the document included the following additions, which were suggested at the November 19 PaRC meeting: the inclusion of the counselor to student ratio; and an emphasis on professional development. Student, Success & Support Program (3SP) Plan Executive Summary approved by consensus.

4. Perkins Rubric Presentation – 2nd Read for Approval
Workforce Workgroup Classified Chair Charlie McKellar presented the Perkins Rubric as a second read for approval. McKellar stated that no additional feedback had been received since the document was first presented. Perkins Rubric approved by consensus.

5. Student Equity Plan Addendum for Approval
Institutional Researcher Elaine Kuo presented the Student Equity Plan Addendum for approval. Kuo reminded PaRC that the Student Equity Plan was approved in October. Since then, minor formatting and grammar edits had been made. The final version was posted on the PaRC webpage. Kuo reported that the Student Equity Plan Addendum was written to address the additional requirements that were published by the State after the plan was approved. Addendum content included timeline and budgeting details.

In regard to student ethnicity identification data collection, Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Faculty Chair Debbie Lee asked if students could choose more than one ethnicity. Kuo cited the example of a student that chose African American and Latino on their application; the student would be identified as belonging to both the African American and Latino targeted groups. Kuo stated that the Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) would have additional discussions on this topic. Student Equity Plan Addendum approved by consensus.

6. Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Rubric Presentation Summary – 1st Read

OPC Administrative Chair Bernata Slater presented the OPC Rubric. Slater reported that the rubric presented remained unchanged from last year, with the exception of one line item. The new line item addressed programs' commitment to student equity. Slater noted that this was the first time that OPC would review programs for student equity initiatives. Classified Senate President Karen Smith asked if the new student equity criteria would impact the source of funding for requests. Slater responded that funding sources would not be changed; the purpose of the new criteria was to allow for the allocation of additional funds if a program demonstrated support for student equity initiatives. Slater welcomed additional feedback.

7. Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal

Holcroft and Associate Vice President of Instruction Andrew LaManque introduced the Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal. LaManque stated that the proposal sough to establish an ad hoc committee for the purposes of reviewing the college's assessment policy and planning processes. LaManque noted that the Common Assessment was due to the State next year. By establishing an ad hoc committee, the college could begin to discuss Common Assessment requirements and the current state of college's assessment processes. LaManque noted that areas of review could include: the multiple measures of assessment; existing policies, such as the retesting policy; and how students were placed after taking assessment tests.

LaManque commented that there had not been much conversation around the issues of assessment between the Office of Instruction and Student Services. Holcroft stated that assessment was emphasized as a major part of student success at a student success conference that she attended. Holcroft agreed that dialogue on this issue was long overdue. LaManque added that many Student Success Support Program (3SP) issues aligned with issues of assessment.

Lee said that faculty subscribed to several different philosophical arguments regarding teaching for assessment tests. Holcroft commented that professional development was needed on the subject. LaManque commented that the State would have a reassessment requirement, which the college could resolve by working with the Online Education Imitative (OEI). LaManque then stated that the retesting policy would require more discussion as some studies demonstrated the improvement of student test scores when students were allowed to retest within two weeks. Regarding the retest policy, Vice President of Instruction Kimberlee Messina stated that the Math Bridge Program had a very successful assessment preparatory component; students participating in this program were prepared for placement tests. Transfer Workgroup Administrative Chair Kurt Hueg commented that there was much research on the issue. Guzman commented that Middlefield students, many of whom were returning adult students, often did not realized the impact of the placement tests on their academic career. Guzman then stated that it would be good for students and the college to allow for retesting.

Holcroft said that there was a hesitance to create a new committee, in light of the many committees already established on campus; thus the idea was to create an ad hoc committee. Al Guzman asked who might serve on the committee. Holcroft noted that the proposal contained a section on the suggested committee members. Smith asked why the committee wanted Math, English and ESL faculty representatives.

Holcroft replied that these were areas with placement tests, per Title V mandated. The Chemistry Department also had a placement test. Bernie Day asked for confirmation of collaboration with the Testing Center. Holcroft verified that Testing Center Supervisor Thom Shepard also worked on the proposal. SEW Faculty Chair Hilda Fernandez asked when the meetings would be scheduled. Holcroft responded that the committee was open to any meeting dates. Holcroft stated that the Academic Senate approved the ad hoc committee proposal and noted that anyone was welcome to serve on the committee. Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal approved by consensus.

8. Educational & Strategic Master Plan (ESMP)

Kuo introduced the ESMP and announced that President Miner and PaRC had agreed to serve as the ESMP writing group. PaRC would meet on the following dates in 2015 from 1:30-3:00PM in the President's Conference Room, 1901 Administration Building: February 11, April 22, April 29 and May 13. Kuo stated that additional meetings would be announced at a later date (possibly one meeting in June 2015 and one or two meetings in the fall of 2015).

Kuo presented the ESMP timeline. The draft ESMP would be produced in Fall Quarter 2015. The final plan would be presented to the Board of Trustees in December 2015. Kuo stated that a general overview of ESMP planning would be presented to PaRC in January 2015. As for the first February meeting agenda, State of the College data along with results from local, internal surveys such as the Climate Survey and the CCSSEE, might be presented. The meeting might also discuss data collection processes, and data on Foothill's online only students; a population that was not previously included in the current ESMP. Meredith Heiser asked when the last ESMP was published. Kuo answered that the last ESMP was published in 2010.

9. Marketing Update

Director of Marketing & Public Relations Andrea Hanstein gave PaRC an update on the Marketing Department. Hanstein provided an overview of the department's goals, which included: increase enrollment by working on student engagement, which helped retention; review, assess, and redesign the Foothill College website; and streamline the procedures and processes within the department.

Hanstein reported that she was an advisor for the Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC) Marketing Board. Also, Hanstein announced the issuance of the second edition of Foothill Fusion earlier in the week. Marketing welcomed the campus to send in announcements for inclusion in the next issue. Hanstein reported that the work order system would soon be replaced with a new system. Additional Marketing projects included: a virtual campus tour for outreach purposes; a marketing campaign for the new FHDA Ed Center; the implementation of Omni Update for college webpage production; the review of the Heights Newspaper production; and the inventory and usage of the campus plasma screens.

Hanstein gave a personnel update and announced that there were two open positions in Marketing. Bradley Cramer, formally of De Anza, was hired as the new Webmaster with a January 2015 start date. Cramer would help Foothill transition to Omni Update by April 2015 (tentative date). Smith asked how the campus could request webpage updates. Hanstein replied that the campus should continue to email the Webmaster. SEW Classified Chair April Henderson wanted to know the general completion time for work orders. Depending upon the request, Hanstein stated, the campus could expect work orders to be started within one to two weeks; if not, Hanstein recommended that the department be notified directly. Smith requested an example of a work order. Hanstein stated that a work order could consist of a request for a flyer design, a listing on a Foothill webpage, or an announcement posting on a plasma screen.

10. Technology Plan Update

Dean of Foothill Online Learning Judy Baker presented the Technology Plan update. Baker commented that the Tech Taskforce was preparing to update the 2010-2015 Technology Plan. The next 2015-2018 Technology Plan would be written for a three-year span (instead of five year duration) to ensure the inclusion of the most up to date technological developments. Baker stated that the Tech Taskforce wanted feedback from the campus to understand the needs of each department. The Tech Taskforce hoped to leverage technology to help with the daily tasks for faculty and staff, which would then benefit the campus. Baker commented that functionality was key to determining next steps. Baker stated that Foothill was collaborating with De Anza and Central Services for plan development. Baker noted that the current 2010-2015 plan was posted online for review. In addition, the Technology Plan webpage would detail any updates to keep the campus informed.

Lee asked if the Technology Plan would include computer refreshes. Baker responded that the plan would make the refresh process more efficient as staff and faculty should have functioning computers and software. Smith wondered if the plan update could assess the future needs of the college, if staff did not currently have any recommendations. Baker replied that staff should just think about what was frustrating about their job and share these issues with the Tech Taskforce; the taskforce could then offer possible solutions. Messina added that program needs should be included in program review documents. Kuo commented that because needs would be documented in the program review process, patterns for technology usage and needs would become apparent.

Baker also stated that the Tech Taskforce was reviewing processes, and not just technology tools, so to hold entities accountable. Messina commented that processes should be observed and revised accordingly. Baker then extended Tech Taskforce meeting invitations to the entire campus. Hanstein commented that the taskforce needed faculty participation.

11. Questions/Comments

Henderson announced that the EOPS tree ornaments were all taken care of; however, EOPS was still asking for Target gift card donations ($20-25). If interested, donations should be dropped off to EOPS by December 11.

In regard to the Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee, Lee asked if the committee had authority to make policy. Holcroft stated that as an ad hoc committee, it would only make policy recommendations to shared governance groups.

Basic Skills Workgroup Classified Chair Craig Gawlick announced that Instructional and Student Services Program Review documents were due December 12. Kuo noted that all required data was up to date and posted online.

Kuo issued a clarification announcement, stating that PaRC would write the ESMP during the previously announced meeting dates. Kuo then noted that PaRC members were required to participate. If PaRC members could not attend due to previous engagements, alternate members should be chosen to participate. Kuo reminded the group that ESMP meetings, like PaRC, were open to the campus.

Fernandez announced that Basic Skills and Student Equity funding proposals were due Friday.