**Foothill College Feedback on District Master Plan Draft**

January 3, 2017, Andrew LaManque

The District Master Plan Draft distributed at Chancellor’s Advisory Council was shared with PaRC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, President’s Cabinet, and Deans. The following is a summary of the comments, first General Comments, and then Suggestions on Specific Items.

General Comments

1. Educational Achievement – why not Student Success? How is Achievement defined? There do not appear to be any explicit **Equity** **Metrics**? To support student achievement/success, the District Master Plan might outline an activity focused on better aligning **Assessment** (placement testing – multiple measures) and financial aid processes to serve students at both colleges. In addition, the District Master Plan might outline an activity focused on **eliminating the curriculum disparities** re: transferability, prerequisites etc. of math (and a few other) classes between FH and DA – since this is an issue for students in terms of completion.
2. The plan does not contain a goal or strategy around **Enrollment Growth** to support stable resources. District Strategies might include how District Research might provide additional analyses to help guide college enrollment strategies. IT might provide **enhancements to the portal and registration systems** as well as support of data systems which use student educational plan data to project course demand, for example.
3. In its present form there is no data and discussion that leads to / supports the goals and objectives. Perhaps this will be added later. This information would help the reader understand the development of the goals and metrics listed.
4. The language for the strategies should make it clear that what is suggested are District activities not college plans / activities. Inserting the word “District” or “Central Services” should help to avoid confusion with new staff when read over a period of several years.
5. Key mission statement terms – the purpose of these tables is unclear. What methodology was used? Perhaps provide some context, or delete. In addition, the plan should be driven by data and not just the district mission statement.
6. For Priority #1 the Goals are broad but the strategies are very narrow - will the strategies help the district achieve the goals? Priority #3 and 4 might be grouped with Priority #1.
7. The metrics as stated are not metrics in the traditional sense - by what numeric values will we measure progress towards achieving the goals over time?

Suggestions on Specific Items

Metric 1.1a and 1.1b - These are not metrics in the sense of having targets for improvement – they seem to be actions to take to meet the strategy. This strategy (DS 1.1) is very narrowly focused and will not, by itself, lead to obtainment of the goals listed above (e.g. Decrease in achievement gap). The District Master Plan might consider using IEPI and Scorecard Metrics with set goals for the District.

Metric 1.1b: Conduct a minimum of two training workshops annually on the use of data resources—one during the district opening day and one (or more) in the academic year. Comment: Will this training include both how to use the tools as well as how to interpret the reports?

New:

Metric 1.1c: Generate statistics reporting capabilities for Canvas course management system to allow for identification of at-risk students for early alert outreach (e.g., see <https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-6061> and <https://github.com/jamesjonesmath/canvancement>)

Metric 1.2a: Raise three million to renovate and expand STEM Success Center. Add: “(as outlined in the Foothill College Facilities Master Plan Update).”

Comment: Renovation and expansion of physical facilities alone will not reduce achievement gaps unless there is additional staffing

CG 1.3: Increase participation in community and civic engagement within and outside the college.

This might be restated: “Central Services departments will participate in additional community activities with partners in Santa Clara County.” The college plans include community activities already.

Metric 2.1a: This metric (raise $) assumes that the only access barrier is financial. What about transportation, easier access to registration via the portal and access to classes via common placement policies across the district, etc?

Metric 2.2a: Why is conducting an evaluation considered a metric? How will we know the strategy has been achieved?

D.S. 3.1: Perhaps state the strategy in terms of District work. For example, “through participation in the OEI initiative, provide the colleges with additional mechanisms to support online education.”

DS 3.2: Support the Development of additional technology-based student service resources.

NEW:

DS 3.3: Adopt and enforce Universal Design standards for all digital and online instructional content

Metric 3.3a: Increase number of Canvas course sites that meet minimum accessibility requirements.

CG 4.1: Facilitate District-wide Partnerships with business and industry to prepare students for the workforce

CG 5.1: Expand ~~college~~ District practices and initiatives to support environmental stewardship.

CG 5.2~~: Management of space to encourage dialogue and engagement~~. Delete – ambiguous statement and primarily a college activity.

DS 5.2. Implement District facilities master plan strategies regarding classroom and campus spaces lists

Metric 5.2.b~~: Foothill--complete a comprehensive evaluation of the centralization of campus services at the campus center quad area~~. This is no longer a college goal and should be deleted.

NEW

Metric 5.2a: Increased number of smart classrooms. AND meeting rooms that have adequate microphones and cameras for live videoconferencing.

Comment: Just as important as increasing the number is upgrading what already exists and providing adequate training to faculty and staff who use the rooms; improve the setup of these rooms to be more user-friendly and functional (e.g., put an extra monitor in back of room so that instructor/presenter does not need to turn back to audience)

NEW

Metric 5.2b: Foothill – Improve bandwidth and stability of wi-fi

Metric 5.2d: Increase number of physical spaces on campus designated for online students to meet and network.

Metric 5.3e: Provide live streaming services for campus events including commencement so online students can attend (e.g., 3CMedia services or in-house)

DG.6.1. “Responsible stewardship of available resources to serve as the foundation for sound fiscal management.” Comment: This sentence has circular reasoning. Delete or reword

Strategic Priority #7: Governance

“When voices from all parts of the college and district are heard, including student voices, this greatly enables the district to be innovative and provide all students an education that is accessible, innovative, and relevant to their needs.” Comment: Too broad a statement - need to indicate how buy-in from stakeholders impacts accessibility, innovation, and relevance of programs

A. CG7.1 Goal – suggestion: Broaden -- DISTRICT employee participation in ....

District Strategies:

DS 7.1: Evaluate the district governance process to continually assess its effectiveness in terms of …..

Comment: Circular statement - need to define effectiveness or explain

Metric 7.1a: Conduct a district governance evaluation survey every two years.

Comment: Satisfaction survey alone cannot determine effectiveness - need to add another metric such as case studies that demonstrate specific examples of when an issue went through the entire shared governance process and was implemented

DS 7.2: Provide opportunities for constituency feedback at all district governance meetings.

Metric 7.2a: All district governance committees will allocate time in their meeting for constituency feedback. This will be demonstrated in meeting minutes.

Comment: Isn't this already being done?

DS 7.3: Increase number of partner based workgroups and initiatives at the district that involve participation from colleges and central services.

Comment: Need to qualify this strategy in that this number should be increased when appropriate and not just for the sake of having more partner-based workgroups

NEW

DS 7.4: Provide employees with training about shared governance in the onboarding process.

Other Ideas - CTE

1. District Marketing tools - CTE infographics that demonstrate the breadth of CTE across both campuses.  This could be used for internal and external communication.  
  
2. Chancellor meetings with industry at the CEO to CEO level.