



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)
Wednesday, February 17, 2016
MEETING 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

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:32	Welcome + Announcements	Holcroft / Smith	
2	1:32-1:35	Approval of Minutes: February 03, 2016	Holcroft / Smith	Action
3	1:35-1:55	Workforce Workgroup – Funding Updates	Girardelli / Cormia	
4	1:35-1:45	Educational Master Plan (EMP) – Draft (<i>2nd Read</i>)	Kuo	Action
5	1:45-2:05	History Department – Out-of-Cycle Request (<i>2nd Read</i>)	Holcroft / Smith	Action
6	2:05-2:40	Shared Governance – Committee Structure & Analysis (<i>Discussion</i>)	Holcroft / Smith	
7	2:40-3:00	ACCJC Substantive Change for Sunnyvale Center (<i>1st Read</i>)	LaManque	

Future PaRC Meetings: *Mar 2, Mar 16, Apr 6, Apr 20, May 4, May 18, June 1, June 15*

Upcoming Events: *Dr. Frances Kendall – Diversity Presentation (Feb 26), Courageous Conversations – Part 1 (May 26-27)*

PaRC Members Present:

Alexander Park, Bernata Slater, Carolyn Holcroft, Maureen McCarthy, Debbie Lee, Denise Perez, Hilda Fernandez, Karen Smith, Lan Truong, Paul Starer, Robert Cormia, Teresa Zwack, Dawn Girardelli, Courtney Cooper

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Elaine Kuo, Laureen Balducci, Meredith Heiser

Guests:

Pauline Brown, Steve Batham

(1) WELCOME & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Kimberlee Messina, Interim President and PaRC Tri-Chair, was unable to attend due to a conference; Carolyn Holcroft & Karen Smith led the meeting. Meredith Heiser reminded interested parties that there is still a chance to attend the FACCC 2016 Advocacy & Policy Conference on February 28-29.

Courtney Cooper announced that the closing ceremony for Black History Month will be held on February 24 from 12:00PM-1:00PM

(2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 03, 2016

The minutes from the February 03, 2016 meeting were approved by consensus.

The revision made to the January 20, 2016 minutes were noted in the February 03, 2016 meeting minutes.

(3) WORKFORCE WORKGROUP – FUNDING UPDATES

Dawn Girardelli and Robert Cormia presented on the funding for Perkins and the rubric used to determine the allocations. Allocation requests are discussed using the Perkins rubric and the established guidelines [http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/02.17.16/Perkins_Allocation_Rubric.docx]. Dawn noted that the Workforce Workgroup tri-chairs take all the requests and prioritize and make their recommendations. Those recommendations are then taken to the workgroup members for further discussion. Voting then takes place to approve the recommended changes or adjustments to the allocations. Dawn noted that the total for requests amounted to approximately \$300,000 (prior to making adjustments to the allocation requests). Following adjustments of the requests, the total sits at approximately \$265,000. History of funding and other factors are taken into account when making allocation adjustments.

The solicitation process for requests is as follows: (a) Communication goes out to the Deans (b) The Deans should push that out to their divisions Any changes made after the initial consideration of requests are taken back to the workgroup members for discussion. Donna Wolf tracks the expenditures and keeps the different groups on track with their planned/approved spending (different expenditure deadlines are used as markers).

A suggestion was made to add a consideration of the EMP Goals as one of the sections on the Perkins rubric (for next year).

It was noted that the Perkins rubric and OPC rubric were brought to PaRC for approval, but Equity, Basic Skills, and SSSP rubrics for funding requests were not – this was brought up as a possible issue with transparency and consistency. A response to this concern was that Equity, Basic Skills, and SSSP follow State methodology and guidelines for approval, as opposed to internally generated guidelines at the College-level. It was suggested that, moving forward, all the rubrics used be brought to PaRC (either for approval or for information) for the sake of transparency.

(4) EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN (EMP) – DRAFT *(2nd Read)*

The draft of the EMP went to the Board of Trustees in the beginning of February 2016 and was approved; Elaine Kuo noted that the Board did not ask for any revisions to the draft. Elaine has already begun going out to the various shared governance groups to present and answer any questions or concerns. As the EMP presentation was the last item on the agenda, there was not a great deal of time for feedback or discussion.

It was noted that the process moving forward would be to determine how to track the indicators lists out in the EMP (e.g. annual updates?). Hilda Fernandez added that she would like the EMP to be seen as a living document with multiple working all parts, all of which remind us that all members of the campus community must collaborative in order to continue to drive us forward – the EMP should not simply be a shelf document. Andrew LaManque added that we should have discussion about the key performance measures, what the targets should be, and how to achieve them. Connecting the EMP to other areas, such as ACCJC and IEPI standards should also be incorporated into that discussion. It was agreed that this should be an agenda item at a future PaRC meeting.

The draft of the Educational Master Plan (EMP) was approved by consensus.

(5) HISTORY DEPARTMENT REQUEST *(2nd Read)*

PaRC reviewed the out-of-cycle faculty request from the History Department using the established out-of-cycle rubric and guidelines for consideration: [http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/02.17.16/Faculty_OutofCycle_Doc.docx].

The statement of need was reviewed to determine how it addressed the following elements:

(a) Sole Full-Time Faculty Member:

Does Not Apply

(b) Enrollment Trends:

Consistent

(c) Student Impact & Effect on Ability to Graduate:

It was noted that the lack of an additional hire would push back the development of new courses. Courtney Cooper noted that granting this request would be in support of the urgently needed development of Latino and African-American history courses and support of the EMP. Lack of development of such courses may affect retention and enrollment in the department. Faculty noted that new faculty do not write curriculum for new course development and there is the possibility that equity could fund or support using current faculty resources for course development in these critical areas.

It was emphasized that this discussion is to determine if this request rises to the level of an out-of-cycle. It was also noted that departments should be anticipating future retirements and have the ability to reach out to other districts for interested adjunct faculty to fill the need; PaRC also expressed support for paying adjunct faculty to assist with course development or paying for professional development for full-time faculty to increase their experience in specific areas. It was voiced that equity should not be the sole consideration or argument for approval of an out-of-cycle faculty request.

It was summarized that the most compelling argument is the need for curriculum, but alternative proposals for achieving those goals and addressing that deficit have been provided – the full-time position may not solve the problems identified. PaRC is support of a new hire, but does it warrant an out-of-cycle request? This is not a lack of support for the history department, but a consideration of whether this request outweighs the other departments. It was noted that this argument works well for “within” the cycle and possibly warrants a high ranking within the in-cycle prioritization. The use of equity funds was noted as an efficient solution for curriculum development needs, particularly if using adjunct faculty.

PaRC’s RECOMMENDATION TO PRESIDENT:

PaRC is opposed to granting the History Department’s out-of-cycle faculty hiring request. They suggest this request be placed in-cycle as part of program review for the regular faculty prioritization process. PaRC would also like to recommend that the History Department go to the Student Equity Workgroup for funds to help develop curriculum for African-American and Latino history coursework.

(6) SHARED GOVERNANCE – COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Several broad issues were discussed regarding Foothill College’s current shared governance policies and committee structure:

- Who gets a vote on PaRC?
- Should PRC and OPC both be voting members on PaRC?
- Who do the workgroups represent and report to?
- The Tri-Chairs do not ask the workgroup members how they should vote – do the Tri-Chairs report what was discussed at PaRC to the workgroup?
- What is the role of governance on campus?
- Does the current governance structure facilitate two-way communication?
- Not all faculty feel they are given the opportunity to participate in the decision-making of the College.
- There is a lot of redundancy in certain areas and not a lot of efficiency; reduce the overlap.
- President’s Cabinet – How does that information trickle up or trickle down?
- The College should eliminate policies and procedures that are a hindrance to equity efforts.
- How do you get all the information from all the workgroups out to everyone so that it is meaningful information (possibly a listserv?)
- A small number of individuals serve on multiple committees – this becomes very taxing from a workload perspective.

- There needs to be a mindset among the workgroups (and other committees) that input from the constituents is critical.
- Take a look at all the governance groups that currently exist, review their structure and purpose and determine what the College really needs.

(7) ACCJC SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE FOR SUNNYVALE CENTER *(1st Read)*

Andrew LaManque introduced the substantive change proposal document; he noted that any time the College does a major change to one of its programs, it must go to the commission (ACCJC) and indicate, *“this is what we are doing”* and *“this is the plan”*. The College cannot offer financial aid for a program unless you have approval from ACCJC. As the Sunnyvale Center is a change of location, a new building and offering new programs, a substantive change document is required. Meredith Heiser asked that two clarifications be made on the proposal, (a) report out the number of students at Middlefield, and (b) a breakdown of full-time and part-time staffing (with a comparison to Middlefield). Andrew LaManque noted that more detail will be provided at the next scheduled PaRC meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED