

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**

**Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)**

**Wednesday, October 21, 2015**

**DRAFT 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 | Messina |  |
| 2. | 1:32-1:35 | Approval of Minutes: June 17, 2015 & October 07, 2015 | Messina | Action |
| 3. | 1:35-1:45 | PaRC Scheduling Update | Messina |  |
| 4. | 1:45-2:00 | New Program Creation Proposals *(2nd Read for Approval)** Fire Science
* Dental Hygiene
 | LaManque | Action |
| 5. | 2:00-2:15 | Educational Master Plan Updates *(2nd Read for Approval)** EMP Goals + Objectives
* EMP Summer Committee Proposals
 | Kuo / Messina | Action |
| 6. | 2:15-2:35 | IP&B Recommendations *(2nd Read for Approval)** Change of Faculty Prioritization to Fall
* ~~Suggested Status Change for OPC~~ *(Withdrawn)*
* Change to PRC Charge
* Out-of-Cycle Hiring / Prioritization Procedure
* Emergency Hiring Procedure
* Program Review Templates (Annual + Comprehensive)
 | HuegLaManquePennington | Action |
| 7. | 2:35-3:00 | Resource Requests (Approved by President) | SlaterMessina |  |

**PaRC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Anthony Cervantes, Bernata Slater, Carolyn Holcroft, Maureen McCarthy, Debbie Lee, Denise Perez, John DuBois, Karen Smith, Kimberlee Messina, Lan Truong, Paul Starer, Roberto Sias, Teresa Zwack, Victor Tam, Choi Leong, Courtney Cooper

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Donna Wolf

1. **WELCOME**
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 17, 2015 & OCTOBER 07, 2015**

Draft meeting minutes from previous PaRC meetings (June 17, 2015, October 07, 2015) were approved by consensus.

Classified staff hiring discussion was noted in revised version of October 07, 2015 (per Karen Smith’s request)

1. **PaRC SCHEDULING UPDATE**

An online survey was used to solicit PaRC members’ feedback regarding the possible adjustments to the PaRC schedule. The options included:

* Extend each PaRC meeting by 30 minutes.
* Add 2-3 pre-planned additional meetings per term.
* Schedule PaRC meetings every week (instead of 2 times per month).
* Do not add additional time/meetings (keep the same).
* Other (please specify)

The majority response was to add 2-3 pre-planned additional meetings (1 per term) to allow for substantive discussion of relevant issues. The PaRC tri-chairs will meet with look at the PaRC calendar for the 2015-2016 academic year and determine the best timing for the additional meetings. Once the meetings are tentatively scheduled, PaRC will be informed and an agenda will be provided.

1. **NEW PROGRAM CREATION PROPOSALS** *(2nd Read for Approval)*

Andrew LaManque presented the Fire Science Certificate and Dental Hygiene Bachelors Degree program creation proposals for 2nd read for approval. Both program creation proposals were approved by consensus.

1. **EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN (EMP) UPDATES** *(2nd Read for Approval)*

Elaine Kuo presented the proposed EMP Goals + Objectives. Previous discussions had indicated that equity should be pulled more to the forefront of the document and more of the objectives should focus on what we currently do (not just our aspirational goals). Elaine Kuo requested PaRC conditional approval for the working list can be taken to PaRC’s EMP Steering Committee for further discussion – the final version would then be presented to PaRC at the November 04, 2015 meeting as an information item.

Suggestion for Revision #1

(Preamble) *These goals are approached in a way that exemplifies Foothill College’s commitment to a culture of innovation and problem solving with emphasis on eliminating disproportionate impact among any student groups.*

Suggestion for Revision #2

(Goal 1, New Objective) *Implement activities to improve achievement of student outcomes amongst those population groups experiencing disproportionate impact.*

Elaine Kuo emphasized that everything on the list will need to be assessed and we must determine where in the College we are working to achieve the various goals/objectives. Karen Smith requested clarification on the term “better” with regards to onboarding. It was determined that the metrics used to assess the various goals/objectives would need to be defined at a later – as the College moves forward with the Educational Master Plan. Conditional support was given by consensus – with expectation of a final document to be presented to PaRC at the November 04, 2015 meeting.

The first proposal from the EMP summer committee was the consideration of the term “targeted student groups” and whether the College would like to adopt or move forward with new terminology. Currently, the “targeted student groups” refer to African American, Latino, and Filipino students. One recommendation is to use the terminology “disproportionately impacted students”. This terminology is broad and can vary based on the outcome being discussed (or the department/unit being assessed). Debbie Lee requested clarification of how the College (or units within the College) would define/determine “disproportionate impact”. Kimberlee Messina noted that it would be up the individual departments or divisions to make that determination. Carolyn Holcroft added that a good example was the Student Equity Plan, which asks the College to look at five key areas and determine the groups that are disproportionately impacted within each area. It was added that State-wide initiatives such as Student Equity and SSSP can help provide direction (or suggested methodologies) for determination. Use of the terminology “disproportionate impact” was approved by consensus.

The second proposal from the EMP summer committee was the consideration of an out-of-cycle review of the College Mission Statement. PaRC approved revising the Mission Statement at the October 07, 2015 meeting – a smaller group was formed to tackle the initial work (Andrew LaManque, Carolyn Holcroft, John DuBois, Andrea Hanstein). The goal is to present the EMP and the revised Mission Statement to the Board of Trustees at the same time. An open forum will be help for the EMP and the Mission Statement will be held from 11AM-12PM in the President’s Conference Room on Wednesday, November 11, 2015. Revised versions of the Mission Statement will be discussed further in PaRC’s EMP Steering Committee to be presented at the next regular PaRC meeting (November 04, 2015).

1. **IP&B RECOMMENDATIONS** (2nd Read for Approval)

The first proposal from IP&B was the Out-of-Cycle Hiring / Prioritization Procedure. Based on earlier feedback, a step was added to specify that feedback/support from the rest of the Division should be included in the process. It was noted that the Dean would still forward the request (whether it receives a Y or N) to the area Vice President. Debbie Lee requested clarification regarding the FT/PT faculty ratio and how it takes into account professional development leave, overload, or reassign time. It was noted that we have not gotten to the point of defining the variables (yet), but it is likely that a narrative would be needed to account for all the extenuating circumstances influencing the request. It was also emphasized that if a position (based on a retirement) can wait, the request should be put in the relevant program review.

The second proposal from IP&B was the Suggested Status Change for OPC. This proposal was withdrawn from consideration, as it was not part of the official charge of IP&B. The third proposal from IP&B was the Change to PRC’s Charge – no additional revisions to the proposal were noted. The fourth proposal from IP&B was the Change of Faculty Prioritization to Fall – no additional revisions to the proposal were noted. The fifth proposal from IP&B was the Emergency Hiring Procedure – no additional revisions to the proposal were noted. All IP&B summer proposals were approved by consensus. It was noted that, moving forward, an out-of-cycle guidance form or standard process/procedure should be developed for all departments to follow.

The annual and comprehensive program review templates were presented for approval. It was noted that for the purposes of program review, course completion rates mean course success rates – this clarification will be noted on the final templates. The final templates will be in WORD format, but have individual fields, allowing users to enter their data/narrative (the fields with automatically expand / page break, if needed). The templates were approved by consensus.

Elaine Kuo and Justin Schultz noted that the templates and the program review data sheets will be posted to the Program Review website by the week of October 26, 2015. Programs completing a comprehensive program review will have their overall data along with a breakdown of face-to-face/hybrid and online. Elaine noted that she is currently working on the labor market data sheets and should have them completed no later than the first week of November. If any additional data is needed for program review, departments/divisions are asked to contact Elaine Kuo directly.

1. **RESOURCE REQUESTS SPREADSHEET**

Bernata Slater presented an overview of the resource requests (approved by the College President). The request process starts with program review – departments make requests for B-Budget, staffing, re-assign time, and facilities. These requests get prioritized at the Division level, then by the area Vice President (some areas go directly to the President [e.g., senate, marketing]) – it then goes to OPC. Using a rubric, OPC makes comments/recommendations to the College President. The President then makes the approval decisions over the summer. Kimberlee Messina noted that, due to the overlap, she and Judy Miner had input in the approval of the resource requests for 2015-2016.

Bernata noted that OPC received approximately 100 requests – of those, 50 were ranked high (by the area Vice President). These requests also exclude any faculty/staff hiring requests. Roberto Sias requested clarification of the process for college-wide carryover. Bernata noted that college-wide carryover from the previous year is sometimes used for one-time expenditures here and there. She also noted that each departmental budget is rolled over (they are not swept together).

Upon discussion of re-assign time, it was noted that re-assign time is different for faculty than it is for classified staff. Not every classified staff member can participate in whatever position they want – some have job duties that prevent their involvement (as such, it is a challenge). Karen Smith asked that it be noted that Classified Senate made the same request as Academic Senate, but their request for reassign time was denied. Kimberlee Messina noted that Academic Senate has a legally defined role that no one else is allowed to do (e.g. curriculum). She noted that the function of Academic Senate cannot be negotiated – the College wants Classified Senate to participate in shared governance but it does not have the same legal obligations as the Academic Senate. It was also noted that there is no funding for new classified staff / administrators right now, so those requests have been deferred.