



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)
Wednesday, February 18, 2015
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	1:30-1:35	Welcome	Messina	
2	1:35-1:40	Approval of Minutes: February 4, 2015	Messina	Action
3	1:40-1:55	Budget Update	Slater	
4	1:55-2:15	Basic Skills & Student Equity Funding Priorities	Basic Skills Workgroup & Student Equity Workgroup	
5	2:15-2:25	Midterm Report Status Update	LaManque	
6	2:25-2:40	Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Report Out	Kuo	
7	2:40-2:50	Educational & Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) – <i>Standing Item</i>	Kuo	
8	2:50-3:00	Questions/Comments	Messina	

Notes:

Week of February 23 – VPs meet with their Deans to review resource requests
ESMP (ongoing through 2014-15)
Assess ILO “Communication” (ongoing through 2014-15)

ATTACHMENTS:

Item 2: Draft Minutes of February 4, 2015 Meeting

Upcoming Events:

Authors Series: *New York Times* Bestselling Author Lalita Tademy – February 25 / 10:15-11:15AM / Hearthside Lounge

PaRC Members Present:

Anthony Cervantes, Behrouz Amirbadvy, Bernata Slater, Carolyn Holcroft, Charlie McKellar, Clare Tang, Craig Gawlick, David Evans, Debbie Lee, Hilda Fernandez, John DuBois, Josh Rosales, Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Paul Starer, Robert Cormia, Roberto Sias, Sarah Munoz, Teresa Ong, Victor Tam

PaRC Ex-Officio Members Present:

Andrea Hanstein, Casie Wheat, Elaine Kuo, Kimberlee Messina, Meredith Heiser, Nanette Solvason

Guests Present:

Al Guzman, John Rubin

Meeting began at 1:30PM.

1. Welcome

Acting President and Vice President of Instruction & Institutional Research Kimberlee Messina presided over the meeting as President Judy Miner was on medical leave until April 2015.

2. Approval of Minutes: February 4, 2015

February 4, 2015 Minutes approved by consensus.

3. Budget Update

Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Administrative Chair Bernata Slater presented the budget update. Slater provided a handout from the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) website which detailed the 2015-16 State Budget Proposal. Slater noted that the presented budget was only a proposal, and that changes should be expected before the budget was actually approved. Slater stated that the current proposal was good compared to previous years, given the dynamics of the current budget, high levels of revenue; and thus the State reflected these positive elements in the proposal with \$8.5 million in one-time funds. The proposal also included an increase to Student Success and Support Program (3SP) Plan funding. In addition, funding for Student Equity Plan (SEP) was proposed; currently, this funding did not require the college to match state dollars, like 3SP funds.

Slater reviewed the base allocation funding and noted that California State Teachers Retirement System (CalSTRS) and California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) rates were increasing. An increase in base allocation funding would help districts off set increasing costs for the retirement systems. Slater stated that the budget proposal included funding for growth; however, the Foothill-De Anza (FHDA) Community College District would not receive any growth funding unless enrollment increased. Slater commented on the elimination of deferrals, and explained that those districts that borrowed funds during the years of large budget cuts might have their deferrals eliminated.

The governor also proposed a 1.58% cost of living adjustment (COLA). Regarding the enhanced non-credit rate change, Slater explained that non-credit full-time equivalent students (FTES) would be reimbursed at the same rate as credit FTES. Apprenticeship funds were also included in the proposal as an effort to restore funding that was cut in the past. Also, career technical education (CTE) funds would be grant based.

Slater noted that the presented material was a proposal that hoped to maximize funding of the community college system. Slater said that sales tax dollars would sunset in 2016 and income tax in 2018; in addition, the governor stated that Proposition 30 would not be renewed. The governor proposed a positive outlook for the coming year, but encouraged community colleges to prepare for leaner budget years moving forward. Meredith Heiser requested to know the CalPERS contribution increase in dollar amounts. Slater responded that this information could be provided at the next PaRC meeting, and stated that the increase would be ongoing.

Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) Classified Chair Roberto Sias commented that FHDA had been operating on a lean budget for the past several years. Sias requested a budget forecast for the coming year. Slater replied that FHDA had an operating deficit of \$2 million; given the deficit and other elements impacting revenue, alongside negotiations, Slater continued, the deficit might still remain. FHDA had a history of balancing expenses with revenue. One-time dollars would also be available to assist with next year's expenses and beyond. However, Slater said, until FHDA enrollment increased, the budget would always be tight.

Transfer Workgroup Administrative Chair Kurt Hueg commented that CalPERS and CalSTRS increases were a major source of concern. Slater commented that an automatic backfill was recently proposed by the legislature with hopes to protect the colleges. Classified Senate President Karen Smith asked to know the target number of FTES needed to create a comfortable budget outlook. Slater responded that FHDA had been below its FTES base since 2009. Each year, FHDA had three years to restore the lost FTES from the previous year. Slater estimated that a few thousand FTES had been lost district-wide since 2009.

4. Basic Skills & Student Equity Funding Priorities

SEW Faculty Chair Hilda Fernandez and Basic Skills Workgroup Classified Chair Craig Gawlick presented the Basic Skills & Student Equity Funding Priorities. Fernandez stated that the collaborative effort of Basic Skills Workgroup and SEW was successful and thirty-five proposals were received in December 2014. The two workgroups ultimately approved twenty-four proposals. Fernandez noted that some proposals were consolidated based on the populations served and goal objectives. A showcase of proposal objectives would be developed to highlight project outcomes. A showcase format was chosen to encourage the context of a positive and growth mindset to celebrate project outcomes.

Gawlick stated that approximately \$350,000 of SEP dollars and \$170,000 Basic Skills dollars were used to fund the twenty-four approved proposals. Fernandez stated that both the Basic Skills Workgroup and SEW would like to hear from Foothill students and encouraged student proposal submissions. Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC) President Josh Rosales stated that there currently was not an ASFC representative attending these funding meetings. Fernandez confirmed that students could write and submit proposals; in addition, the campus could write proposals that student service based.

The deadline for SEP fund spending had been extended. Messina commented that the State might also provide more Basic Skill funding before the June 2015 spending deadline. Thus, the campus was encouraged to continue to submit proposals. Slater reiterated that the campus should not fixate on the deadlines, and instead submit proposals, as funds were available. OPC Faculty Chair Debbie Lee asked if project funding requests included in department program review documents should also be submitted as proposals to the workgroups for consideration. Messina replied that during the analysis of department program review documents, when a proposal was appropriate for SEP funding or Basic Skills funding, the dean was notified.

Gawlick provided an overview of the funding allocations. Gawlick noted that the college had two years to spend down Basic Skills funds, and that the college would have a new funding base moving forward. In general, Gawlick stated, proposals were not funded for two main reasons: 1) the proposal was paired with another proposal; or 2) the proposal was omissible due to state regulations. This year, the workgroups would discuss the funding process further, and also work with Office of Institutional Research (IR) to evaluate the effectiveness of funded projects. The majority of projects were curriculum or process development focused.

Lee asked why a project that proposed the translation of materials from English to Spanish was denied. Messina responded that that particular proposal was going to be funded by 3SP dollars, as 3SP had funding to cover the project. Smith asked if any proposals were

received from the Library. Messina replied that no proposals had been received from that department yet. Smith then asked if there were any other departments on campus that should be identified as in need of funding. Academic Senate President Carolyn Holcroft commented that the best place to begin with funding requests would be to document proposals in the department's program review, specifically in the equity section. Starer noted that SEP and Basic Skills funds should not be viewed as "spending to be spent"; but instead, these funds existed to fuel the equity and basic skills agendas. Messina stated that the funding guidelines were very strict and all proposals must fall under the SEP or Basic Skills plans before the college could allocate funds.

Fernandez and Messina agreed a funding guidelines reminder could send out via email. Heiser stated that the funding proposal expenditures did not total correctly. Messina explained that there were several factors that were influx that caused the unbalanced total, including the funding of the IR Equity Research Assistant position, and also the expenditures of the Summer Bridge Program.

5. Midterm Report Status Update

Messina presented the Midterm Report Status Update on behalf of Vice President of Instruction Andrew LaManque. After Foothill's report was received, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requested a follow up report due to an inactive evidence link in the J1 report. The link had been corrected and the follow up report will be sent in.

6. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Report Out

Institutional Researcher Elaine Kuo presented the 2014 CCSSE results. Kuo stated that 350 other community colleges participated in this survey alongside FHDA. The college decided to participate in the survey for a number of reasons, including: 1) research showed that students who were engaged were more likely to have positive outcomes; 2) institutions used CCSSE data for benchmarking with other community colleges (first participated in 2012); 3) the survey was the primary way that Foothill tracked institution learning outcomes (ILOs)--outcomes which were key cornerstones of the college mission and drove college practices; and 4) the survey data provided longitudinal data collection, as the college would participate again in 2016. Kuo noted that the accreditation visit would occur in the fall of 2017.

Kuo reported that the survey was administrated by pencil and paper to sixty course sections and 1,890 students participated. Kuo noted that the survey had positive participation with a 55% response rate and 77% of selected sections administered the survey. Kuo applauded the deans for their participation. Overall, the survey favored full-time students, general education (GE) courses, and face-to-face instruction. When evaluating the benchmarks and comparisons, Kuo noted, the data was weighted on full-time responses. Regarding respondent characteristics, Asian students, many from the International Student Program, were overrepresented in terms of the sample. 56% of survey participants stated that their main goal for enrollment was to transfer to a four-year institution. Starer noted that the enrollment for the purposes of self-improvement option could be seen as all encompassing. Kuo agreed that the response options were a mix of concepts. Messina commented that in general all categories saw an increase.

Lee asked how online students could participate in the survey, noting that about 30% of Foothill students took online courses. Kuo responded that about half of the online student population also took courses here on campus. Heiser asked how the college could identify which online students participate in the survey. Kuo replied that if a student included their campus wide identification number (CWID) on the survey, the student's schedule from Spring Quarter 2014 could be reviewed.

Kuo reviewed the custom questions that were written specifically for Foothill College to measure the college's four ILOs: communication, computation, critical thinking, and community. Heiser stated that comparing data from De Anza and Foothill on the ILO community

responses would be interesting in light of De Anza's Civic Engagement Program. Starer commented that the survey's affective line of questioning might not provide accurate representations of students' feelings. For example, how students felt about their math skills might differ from their actual skill level. Kuo replied that Starer's concerns were well founded; however, research showed that feelings of confidence correlated with student performance. Holcroft noted that in general student responses were positive; in the event that negative responses were reported, the college could then review the specifics of the areas of concern.

ASFC Representative David Evans stated that the survey was asking students to assess their confidence, based on their experience with the college. Evans then asked how the college could confirm that responses were based specifically on Foothill experiences, and not based on other external experiences. Kuo agreed that the survey could not establish a baseline on student confidence in this area. Kuo noted that CCSSE data was not the only evaluation tool, and that the data could be triangulated with other data sources to evaluate areas of concern.

Student Services also had custom questions written for the CCSSE survey, with hopes to obtain a snapshot of support services usage, satisfaction of services, and service importance as ranked by students. 55% of respondents stated that they met with a counselor and 29% of respondents stated that they could not meet with a counselor because services were unavailable. Kuo noted that the survey was issued prior to 3SP and SEP funds. Overall, 80% of respondents said that their experience with Foothill College was good or great.

7. Educational & Strategic Master Plan (ESMP) – *Standing Item*

Kuo provided a brief ESMP update. The first ESMP meeting was held on February 11 and discussion topics included: ESMP timeline, and subsequent meeting dates. In addition, Kuo reported that the college was in negotiations with the Collaborative Brain Trust for a consultant contract. Once the contract was proposed, Collaborative Brain Trust would be brought to PaRC for introductions.

8. Questions/Comments

No questions or comments recorded.