



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Educational Master Plan (EMP)
Wednesday, February 11, 2015
DRAFT Minutes

PURPOSE: Participatory Governance Leaders Meeting for the Educational Master Plan (EMP) Revise
LOCATION: Administration Building / Room 1901 / President's Conference Room
TIME: 1:30 – 3:00 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Welcome	Messina	
2	1:35-1:45	Finalize Membership	Kuo	
3	1:45-2:00	EMP: Timeline & Tasks	Kuo	
4	2:00-2:15	Consultant: Role & Process	Kuo	
5	2:15-2:45	Review of Plan Template	Kuo	
6	2:45-3:00	Questions/Comments	Messina	

Notes:

The meeting schedule for the EMP is posted online at: <http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/esmp.php>

Attendance:

Lauren Balducci, Robert Cormia, Bernie Day, John DuBois, David Evans, Craig Gawlick, Meredith Heiser, Carolyn Holcroft, Kurt Hueg, Elaine Kuo, Andrew LaManque, Debbie Lee, Charlie McKellar, Kimberlee Messina, Teresa Ong, Josh Rosales, Karen Smith, Bernata Slater, Paul Starer, Denise Swett

Meeting started at 1:30PM.

1. Welcome

Vice President of Instruction & Institutional Research Kimberlee Messina convened the first meeting of steering committee.

2. Finalize Membership

Membership is comprised of the voting members of PaRC. Participation was strongly encouraged, and if a meeting could not be attended by a member, it was suggested that a representative should be sent in one's place, as all are welcome to attend EMP meetings.

3. EMP: Timeline & Tasks

College Researcher Elaine Kuo presented that this is a major revision to the plan, not an update. This revision will be using feedback from the college, and the process needs the blessing and support of entire campus. The final document will be one that will dictate the direction of the college over the next 10 years.

Kuo presented a rough draft of the timetable and task list as a starting place for the college to react to, and as part of the grassroots approach to this effort, both quantitative and qualitative data will be reviewed and discussed by the steering committee. An external and internal environmental scan will be conducted and, to capture campus voices, there will be focus groups and interviews conducted on campus. This meeting serves as the starting point of the process, and will be the only meeting to take place in Winter quarter. Process will conclude with submitting the EMP for Board approval, currently scheduled for December 2015.

4. Consultant: Role & Process

Kuo presented on the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT), a consulting firm recommended by the President's office, and the funding will go through the President's office (<http://cbtcollegeconsulting.com/>). This will ensure that an entity outside of Foothill's planning process is part of the plan. Kuo described the make up of the Collaborative Brain Trust to be those who have had a long career in higher education, many of whom have held administrative positions in the California Community College system. They will engaged as active participants in this process and will come to campus and join our community for spring quarter. The anticipated cost is around \$50,000; the college is currently in negotiations with the CBT.

April and May 2015 is when the bulk of the work is planned, when information will be collected, reviewed and discussed. One key question that will drive this process: "What are our institutional goals and what is helpful/needed by our students and the community we serve over the next ten years?"

5. Review of Plan Template

Kuo continued presenting the EMP timeline, noting that on May 13 there will be an all-day campus workshop, and a town hall session toward the end of the academic year. This will give an opportunity for feedback from PaRC (all-day workshop) and its constituents (entire campus community via Town Hall). The draft of the plan will be written in the summer, with it being dispersed campus-wide in Fall 2015. Second reads of the draft and a final approval for the plan to go to the Board of Trustees in December 2015 were outlined.

Kuo reiterated that the EMP references all the other planning documents and governance structures Foothill has, so it is a central document for the direction of Foothill.

6. Questions/Comments

The discussion was open for comments and suggestions:

Robert Cormia emphasized the importance of making sure "equity" was firmly embedded in the planning process for the EMP. Kurt Hueg noted the need to make this an actual living document, not just a shelved plan for Foothill. Another member noted that this should not be a prescriptive manual. Questions that should be answered are: "Are we serving our students? Are students experiencing equitable outcomes?" Meredith Heiser asked who the audience of the document would be, which Elaine Kuo answered it was Foothill as a whole, it will be used to inform the self-study of accreditation as well as support all other plans and documentation (e.g. Ed Center Master Plan, Technology Plan, 3SP Plan, Student Equity Plan, etc.).

Debbie Lee stressed the importance of program vitality and stability, instead of just sustaining. What is the process of improvement?

Further discussion took place around the need of an outline for the plan, to give direction and focus to the process of writing the EMP.