



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Educational Master Plan (EMP)**  
**Wednesday, May 13, 2015**  
**Minutes**

**PURPOSE:** Participatory Governance Leaders Meeting for the Educational Master Plan (EMP) Revise  
**LOCATION:** Administration Building / Room 1901 / President's Conference Room  
**TIME:** 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	8:00-8:30	Welcome & Introductions	Spevak	
2	8:30-10:00	Review of current, updated data	Kuo	
3	10:15-11:00	Small group activity: college needs	Spevak/Rosenberg	
4	11:15-12:30	Ranking of college needs	Spevak/Rosenberg	
5	1:00-4:30	Identify possible goals & report out	Spevak/Rosenberg	

**Notes:**

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

**Attendance:**

Anthony Cervantes, Bernata Slater, Bernie Day, Debbie Lee, Sarah Munoz, Teresa Ong, Andrew LaManque, Nanette Solvason, Hilda Fernandez, John DuBois, Josh Rosales, Kurt Hueg, John Mummert, Victor Tam, Roberto Sias, Andrea Hanstein, Kimberlee Messina, Bill Ziegenhorn, Elaine Kuo, Judy Miner, Denise Swett, Karen Smith, Dawn Girardelli, David Marasco, Laureen Balducci, Liz Leiserson, Craig Gawlick, Carolyn Holcroft, Liliana Guillen, Dexter Lim, Breeze Liu, Courtney Cooper, Adiel Velasquez, Albertina Oliva, David Evans, Carlos Acuña, Choi Leong  
John Spevak & Dan Rosenberg (Collaborative Brain Trust)

**Meeting started at 8:00AM.**

**1. Welcome**

John Spevak, Consultant from Collaborative Brain Trust, began the meeting. Introductions began around the room and proceeded to an ice-breaker activity for the entire group.

Spevak asked Judy Miner to say a few words of inspiration to the group, and thanked the group for efforts thus far and the efforts put in today. Miner reiterates to the group that what was perceived as a revise to the District mission, which was discussed at the previous PaRC

meeting, was actually a technical edit for compliance to the state. The “real” revision to the District mission will be happening in January 2016, thus the mission presented was just a slight technical revise. The official revision will take into account the work done by the EMP this Spring and Summer from both Foothill and De Anza.

Spevak noted that by the end of today, we will create a number of goals that set the tone and direction for Foothill for the next 10 years. After looking at the quantitative and qualitative data, now is the time to do something with it and answer the questions:

- What are the needs of the college and community in the next 5-8 years?
- Thinking broadly, who do we want to be, where do we want to go, who do we want to serve?
- How do we prioritize the goals ahead?

## **2. Review of current, updated data (environmental scan, 2<sup>nd</sup> pass)**

College Researcher Elaine Kuo reminded the committee of the data presented on April 29, and also added a few new pieces of data. The overview included previous institutional goals and data (from current ESMP versions [dated 2009-10 and 2010-11]). Kuo encouraged everyone to share and talk about what is discussed from today. The previous meeting on April 29, 2015 was an internal scan that included: enrollment including city of residence, student demographics, course success, graduation and transfer rates, as well as an environmental scan that included census data, income gap, housing costs, and poverty.

She explained that the previous ESMP (Educational Strategic Master Plan) plan was for the years 2010-2020, and version 1.0 was written in 2009. In the first version, the plan was a 10-year plan. But this version is a 5-8 year timeline, to align with accreditation cycle. Foothill identified the strategic initiatives during the first go around, and there were three: building a community of scholars, promoting a collaborative decision-making environment and putting access into action. The next year in 2010, version 2.0 changed the wording to “goals” and was altered to: Student success and achievement, Student access and Stewardship of resources. Those three items are reflective of what’s in the District plan and identified metrics and targets that could measure progress toward these stated goals.

President Judy Miner recapped the events of 2009, which saw Foothill hit with cuts from the state and deep cuts in classified staff along with cuts in programs like DSPS and travel careers. She stated that the goals were reformatted to meet the needs of a college under threat of cuts. Miner recapped that there was a realignment of how resources would be spent with diminished staff. A revision of the document is needed to more accurately the results of these cuts and accounts for the students Foothill currently is serving.

Enrollment data presented shows a declining trend in headcount and FTES, which brings asks the question if we are serving students better in light of declining enrollment. Kuo shared that we are increasing in full time enrollment, along with an ethnicity breakdown that shows an increase in African American and Latino students and a decline with White students.

David Marasco asked about the raw numbers in comparison to the number as a whole. It is noted that there generally appears to be an increase in raw numbers of African American, Latino/as, and Filipinos over the past five fall terms, while a slight decline was seen among Asians (about 3,500 to about 3,300) and a much steeper decline among Whites (from over 6,000 to over 4,000).

Socioeconomics data was presented through students who applied through CCCApply and those who provided the information beginning in Fall 2013. Marasco asked about the comparison to other colleges in our area to see what kind of trend is shown, including De Anza. Andrew LaManque noted that other colleges in our area don't report this data, and this data should be used as a big picture takeaway about who our students are. Thus, this data point provides just a quick snapshot of students' socioeconomic status as not every student is captured by this data point (optional and not completed by continuing students). However, a general picture is generated that Foothill does enroll students who are less financially resourced.

Course success, which was presented last time, show that there is some narrowing between online and not online course success. Graduation rates were presented that Asian students earned more certificates compared to others, and whites earned more degrees compared to others. Transfer rates to four-year institutions suggest that transfer rates to CSU and UC transfers show an increasing trend but are leveling off.

Top transfer destinations are UC Davis, UCLA and UCSD.

For the CSU system they are San Jose, San Francisco and East Bay.

In state privates are USF, Santa Clara and USC.

Out of state are Carnegie Mellon, NYU, U of Hawaii and ASU.

Employee data was presented, which was not presented last time. As of Fall 2014, 55% are part time faculty. External scan data from previous meeting also touched on county population, in comparison to Foothill's population.

### **Recap of Foothill and Community meetings**

Seven community sessions took place on April 13, 2015, which highlighted the need to:

- Train a supportive workforce
- Professional development for students
- Increase collaboration/partnerships
- Role of lifelong education

John Spevak expanded on the opinions of the community and business members, that the support industries will need an expanded workforce with skills for support. Despite the slow development of curriculum development, there is a need for other avenues to be looked at with collaboration.

Twenty-five sessions of campus interviews took place on April 28 and 29, 2015, with 129 participants and one webinar. The top themes of the sessions were:

#### **a. College collaboration**

-Increase participation in shared governance, increase transparency regarding college decision-making

- Collaboration between instruction and student services
- Increase student voices in shared governance

#### **b. Students services**

- Support students with specific needs (homelessness, mental health, first generation students)
- Expose students to multiple and alternative career paths
- Increase access to counselors (consider tech, intrusive counseling, etc.)
- Increase staffing
- Streamline application/registration process as much as possible

#### **c. Planning**

- Reflect on previous EMP
- Increase discussion regarding the EMP, mission statement, the process, etc.
- Align resource prioritization and program review with the EMP
- Cultivate culture of program improvement, rather than reactive planning processes
- Increase dialogue – campus debates, campus newspaper, other forums/platforms

#### **d. Equity and Diversity**

- Increase/promote diversity among students and employees (enrollment and hiring)
- Make equity a priority
- Aim for high course success rates (more than 80%)
- Respond to Puente program needs
- Reinstate Mfumo

Spevak reemphasized that these overarching goals will need to be implemented and from these goals.

Other campus themes:

#### **e. Instruction**

- pursue additional baccalaureate degrees

#### **f. Online**

- Ensure integrity of online education
- Continue research regarding instructional methods for course success
- Ensure courses are not offered in online format only
- Find ways to increase sense of community online

Paul Starer raised the question as to how can we engage students online, how can we do this equitably both in person and online. Kimberlee

Messina clarified that students would like to have a balanced choice between online and in person courses, so that courses are not just offered in the online format. Debbie Lee noted that because online courses are relatively new, this is why it might be a focus on the

sessions. It doesn't mean there isn't a concern about face-to-face courses. John Spevak reiterated that there is a general push to increase success rates, but the balance must also be integrity.

The themes continued with:

**g. Workforce**

- Create more internships
- Increase options for dual track enrollment
- Develop more business partnerships
- Integrate labor market data in planning and decision-making

**h. Community education**

- Find ways to offer "aging in place" courses
- Respond more effectively to repeatability, lifelong learners needed

John Mummert asked if this is a college goal, and if the goal of lifelong learning that should be embedded in one of the college goals so our community members feel included. Teresa Ong noted that DSPS still offers non-credit classes in 10 community and senior centers in the area, which is also having issues with repeatability. Ong processes 300-400 paper applications for this older population and emphasized the need for a streamlined process.

**i. Athletics**

- Recognize this student group (support scholar athletes)
- May need accommodations due to travel
- Need for dedicated tutoring, early alert

**j. International Students**

- Offer non-credit multicultural class (intercultural communication)
- Help all students find affordable housing

Kimberlee Messina asked for clarification about the need to tutoring in athletics, and if the need is for a dedicated tutoring service for special populations. Elaine Kuo clarified that this need was more for tutors who understand their needs, not a dedicated service/program for them. Hilda Fernandez asked about the need for increased dialogue and making sure whatever we set out to do today actually happens. Kuo noted that if we say "communication" in one of the goals, it can be interpreted and engaged with in different ways across campus.

**k. FHDA Education Center**

- Attract re-entry and workforce students

- Provide extensive offerings
- View facility as a training center
- Facility should be current with technology

-Concern the Center may draw students from main campus

### **3. Small Group Activity: College Needs**

After the break, Spevak split the room into groups of 5-6 participants (representing diverse roles and functions on campus), and the groups were tasked to bring up as many ideas as they could focusing on the needs for Foothill (along with a name for their group).

### **4. Ranking of College Needs**

After all groups had written their ideas up on large sheets of paper around the room, spokespersons were designated in each group to explain the group's college needs. After all groups had presented, each participant was given 9 dot stickers (3 magenta=third priority; 3 yellow=second priority; 3 green=first priority) to mark which ideas were their top three personal priorities.

John then listed out the ideas that had the largest number of dots and were the highest priority. The main clusters with the most high priority dots were, in no particular order of importance:

- Equity Culture/Pedagogy
- Improve participation in Governance
- Support Underserved Students
- Communication, especially to students
- Clear direction on vision/priorities
- Stable funding
- Equity/standards
- Support adjunct faculty
- Increase support online (growth)
- More cohesive community
- Remove silos
- Maintain high quality faculty and staff

The dot clusters that received support, of strong and medium priorities were:

- Increase student leadership
- District collaboration
- Better transportation
- More support for Instructional Research
- Promote a culture of transfer
- Succession planning

- Mission statement
- Improved onboarding experience for new hires

After lunch, John Spevak explained the group would collapse some of the needs and transition into around 10 or fewer goals that can be moved along into the next brainstorming process.

### **5. Identify possible goals & report out**

More students arrive and are dispersed to groups. John explains we are trying to come up with overarching goals for the next 5 years. Before lunch, talked about needs, now looking at goals. We need to remember that once the plan is done, it is just the beginning. Once it is written, we have to write year-by-year action plans and measure.

Small group work continued. Each group to develop goals based on broad need areas developed before lunch, with the prompt, “Where do you want Foothill to be in 5 years?”

Each group reported on their top three goals. Participants then marked their nine top goals using sticker dots (and same priority ranking as when identifying college needs).

The goals that received some level of support were (via dot clusters):

- Exceed our equity and diversity objectives
- Maintain a sustainable budget
- Reduce barriers to students attending Foothill
- Strengthen sense of community and commitment to college
- Promote communication – consistent and clear messaging
- Access to enhance to student services to increase success
- Promote student and employee excellence (onboarding, sustaining, succession)
- Improve communication internally and externally
- Create a culture of equity that promotes student success and strong support for under-served students
- Provide better onboarding and support for college employees especially for adjunct faculty
- Increase advocacy at the state level; and increase grants and private donations to secure stable funding
- Collaborate with K-12 and four year colleges to align our missions in a way that serves students and society; along with partnering with business and industry that prepares students for the workforce (including in-kind opportunities)
- Always have representatives from constituencies – always administration, faculty, students, and staff including adjunct in shared governance
- Make innovation part of the campus culture including creative pursuits and problem solving; include ALL students when they leave knowing how we work
- Involve every student outside the classroom – access, support, leadership and mentorship valuable participant in civic engagement

- Live equity in every action in not only campus life, but everything; make it foundational; embed it in all processes this means: every member of campus will support student success for underserved and at risk students so that every campus community member will reflect the mission of the college. Self -responsibility
  - Create a more informed and engaged college community
- 
- Incorporate an equity perspective into the college culture (services, curriculum, etc.)
  - Facilitate students' ease of access across the district and region and streamline processes
  - Provide a student experience that meets and exceeds students' expectations
  - Articulate a clear vision and priorities
  - Utilize data/information to inform and assist students in career pathways
  - Utilize data to drive institutional planning
  - Establish an institutional infrastructure to support student success and communication
  - Reestablish life-long learning as a mission

Items that were made into goals:

### **Equity**

1. Create a culture of equity that promotes student success and strong support for underserved students.

### **Student Success**

2. Encourage student participation in leadership and activities outside the classroom that engages students with the college and the community.
3. Reduce barriers and facilitate students' ease of access across the district and region.
4. Enhance support for online quality and growth for instruction and students services.

### **Employee Support**

5. Provide better onboarding, support, and professional development for all college employees.
6. Encourage employee participation in leadership in activities that engages them with the college and the community.

### **Innovation**

7. Recognize and support a campus culture that values innovation and creative problem solving.
8. Employ a data-driven decision-making process.

### **Collaboration/Partnerships**

9. Collaborate with K-12 and four-year institutions in ways that serve students and society.
10. Partner with business and industry to prepare students for the workforce.
11. Increase lifelong learning opportunity opportunities for our community.

### **Governance**

12. Strengthen everyone's sense of community and commitment to the college's mission; expand participation from all constituencies in shared governance.
13. Promote consistent and clear communication in order to create a more informed, engaged, and cohesive community.

### **Leadership**

14. Articulate a clear vision and priorities for the college.

### **Funding**

15. Increase advocacy at the state level and increase grants and private donations to secure stable and sustainable funding, and manage college resources strategically.

Draft goals will be posted to the EMP website after PaRC blesses document one last time. The Office of the President will send out an email inviting feedback at an open forum, via online feedback form, through emails to the CBT. Participants want it in a format where people can comment and see others comments (i.e. a Facebook thread). Comments open through June 10, 2015. Consultants will come back on that day for another discussion.

Some discussion about adding in goals related to sustainability, diversity, etc. Group decided that those did not rise to the top during the process so we shouldn't add them in and leave it up to campus feedback. These goals can be added in as we continue the process (based on feedback and continued discussion).

EMP goals participants asked to fill out evaluation form and return to consultants.