

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**

**PaRC – Educational Master Plan (EMP)**

**Wednesday, October 14, 2015**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:**  Room 1901 – President’s Conference Room

**TIME:**  1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **TOPICS** |
| 1 | Review Proposed EMP Goals + Objectives |
| 2 | Revisit College Mission & Vision Statements |
| 3 | Revisit “Targeted Groups” Definition & Terminology |

**PRESENT:**

Paul Starer, Donna Wolf, Elaine Kuo, Jon Rubin, Justin Schultz, Teresa Ong, John DuBois, Bernie Day, Kimberlee Messina, Carolyn Holcroft, Dawn Girardelli, Denise Swett, Andrew LaManque, Kurt Hueg

1. **REVIEW PROPOSED EMP GOALS + OBJECTIVES**

It was noted that PaRC is supportive of the proposed EMP goals + objectives. Carolyn added that all the planning and efforts related to degree completion, transfer, etc. (in the Student Equity Plan) are disconnected to the objectives under the 1st goal. She suggested going back and looking at the original comments (regarding equity) from the Spring 2015 planning sessions – perhaps there is more to add to more thoroughly reflect the original conversation. It was also noted that student learning and achievement of student outcomes are not specifically stated in the goals or objectives. Incorporation of an equity focus into the preamble statement was also suggested.

It was suggested that it be made clear that the objectives are a “such as” or “for example” and not exclusive- these objectives should not be seen as the only paths that College can take to achieve the major EMP goals. The placement of a disclaimer was also suggested, to specify the purpose of the EMP document and note that the objectives are not the only things departments/divisions can consider.

It was clarified that the pieces the College really wants to be held accountable for are the larger items (the three overarching EMP goals). The objectives are ways to reach the goals as outlined in the Educational Master Plan (EMP).

1. **REVISIT COLLEGE MISSION & VISION STATEMENTS**

Elaine Kuo proposed that this EMP meeting group discuss the suggested process for moving forward (to bring to PaRC). She noted that, normally, you start with the Mission and then move to the Educational Master Plan (EMP) – as we are considering the Mission out-of-cycle, getting things back into alignment is critical. As PaRC is supportive of revising the College Mission statement out-of-cycle, it was noted that the College Mission and EMP must be done at the same time – they will need to go for Board of Trustees approval together in one document [as such, all planning must be done Fall 2015].

It was noted that the College Mission does not explicitly discuss equity, the baccalaureate degree, or a definition of the student population served. The student population served was noted as a critical piece from an accreditation standpoint.

An editorial team was formed to gather feedback and begin drafting a revised Mission. Members of the team included John DuBois, Andrea Hanstein, Carolyn Holcroft, and Andrew LaManque. The team will present a (proposed) revised Mission at the upcoming regular meeting of PaRC.

1. **REVISIT “TARGETED GROUPS” DEFINITION & TERMINOLOGY**

PaRC is supportive of reviewing the use of the terminology ‘targeted groups’ and identifying and usable definition for the campus constituents. Instead of ‘targeted groups’, the use of ‘underserved’ or ‘disproportionately impacted’ was suggested. While the State has mandated focus on certain student groups (ethnic groups), the use of ‘disproportionately impacted’ allows for the focus to change based on the program, department, or measure of success. Lack of 2-3 set ‘targeted groups’ prevents one data sheet from fitting all the departments (for program review), but it does allow all the programs/departments to determine their most ‘at-risk’ student groups experiencing the greatest achievement gap.