FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Educational Master Plan (EMP)
Wednesday, June 10, 2015
MEETING 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 PM – 3:00 PM

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Welcome	John Spevack	
2	1:35-1:45	Review of Open Forum + Online Survey Feedback	Elaine Kuo	
3	1:45-2:30	Working with EMP Draft Goals (Revisions & Suggestions)	John Spevack	Action
4	2:30-3:00	Next Steps in the Planning Process for PaRC	Dan Rosenburg	Action
		EMP Leadership Committee Discussion	John Spevak	

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

ATTACHMENTS:
Item 1: Proposed Institutional Goals Feedback (PDF + PPT)
Item 2: CBT Presentation: Educational Master Planning (PDF)

ATTENDANCE:
Bernie Day, Carolyn Horcroft, Charlie McKellar, Clare Tang, Craig Gawlick, Josh Rosales, Judy Miner, Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Paul Starer, Robert Cormia, Roberto Sias, Teresa Ong, Victor Tam, Andrew LaManque, Denise Swett, Elaine Kuo, Kimberlee Messina, Laureen Balducci

GUESTS:
John Spevak *(Collective Brain Trust)*, Dan Rosenberg *(Collective Brain Trust)*, Justin Schultz, John Rubin, Breeze Lim, Bryan Kim

MEETING START: 1:31PM

1. WELCOME
John Spevak welcomed the committee members and thanked them for taking time out of their busy schedules to meet and continue to discussion regarding the Education Master Plan (EMP). He noted that there were two main things to discuss in the meeting: (A) Do we need to revise the goals from the May 13 day-long session, based on the feedback provided by Elaine Kuo? Is there is a need to add/ subtract / collapse / combine any of the goals. (B) Where does Foothill College go from there (in order to have a final document by December 2015)? John indicated that 60 minutes would be spent on the first topic and approximately 30 minutes spent on the second.

2. OVERVIEW OF GOALS AND CAMPUS FEEDBACK
John Spevak indicated that it is key that a formal document be created before putting any of the EMP goals into some type of planning process. Review of the feedback from the open forum and the online survey will help move this process along. Judy Miner noted that she was very pleased with the attendance at the EMP town hall, specifically the student participation. She appreciated all the feedback.

Elaine Kuo provided a brief overview of the feedback based on the proposed goals from May 13, taking into account written and verbal feedback from the open forum as well as data collected from the online survey. Please refer to EMP Proposed Institutional Goals Feedback (PDF or PPT).

3. CONTINUED GOALS DISCUSSION / REVISION
Following presentation of feedback, John Spevak suggested going down the list of the 15 goals (8 categories) and soliciting additional commentary. Before starting, Andrew LaManque asked John for insight as to the purpose of these goals and how

they relate to the EMP and to explain how many goals are a good measure and how colleges can realistically move forward with such goal framework. John Spevak explained that there are many approaches and the number of goals is actually arbitrary (as many as are needed is realistic). He noted that at this point, there are 15 goals that the group wants to pursue and make the emphasis, but this should not limit the college from pursuing any additional initiatives just because it is not specifically mentioned in the goals framework (many things are just "understood").

John noted that these are the things we want to focus on for the next five years. Of the 15 goals, it could be the mission to tackle 5 for one year, 3 for another, etc… Each year should have a set emphasis that can be addressed over time. Every year, PaRC could go back to the EMP and reflect on whether or not the short-term action plans have made any impact or addressed any of the specific goals.

Andrew LaManque asked for clarification if the 15 stated goals were the set goals everyone agreed on and if all members are comfortable moving forward with. John Spevak stated that deleting or moving things around must be discussed. As only 60 minutes was allotted to do this exercise, it may need to be worked on further (over the summer months)

Judy Miner suggested going through each of the goals and labeling them as an automatic keeper and to consider if each should be a stated goal or simply a culture that should be occurring. She stated that some may naturally fall off but also asked where *diversity* and *sustainability* fit into the picture. Kimberlee Messina added that there have been numerous discussions regarding the mission statement vs. vision statement vs. plans vs. goals vs. values. She noted that these goals are what the campus community values; it might be helpful to think about these as the most important values and derive more concrete goals from these values. Judy Miner agreed, adding that it would be a good approach to develop more concrete goals while still expressing all 15 values (as listed).

John Spevak added that the goal is somewhere between a value and an objective. The goals should lead to some type of objective in the next phase of the project. He asked the group to consider who might want to be on an EMP Leadership Steering Committee to work with Elaine. Roberto Sias added that the goals selected must resonate today as much as 5 years from now, as changing leadership may shift the focus of those goals.

4. GOAL STATEMENT PRIORITIZATION
John Spevak asked the group to go through each stated goal and label it A, B, or C. A = keeper; must-have / B = possibly subordinate to another goal / C = set aside.

EQUITY
(1) Create a culture of equity that promotes student success and strong support for underserved students. **(A)**
   Elaine Kuo added that survey feedback indicated a potential need to clarify the meaning of "underserved".

STUDENT SUCCESS
(1) Encourage student participation in leadership and activities outside the classroom that engages students with the college and the community. **(A)**
(2) Reduce barriers and facilitate students' ease of access across the District and region. **(B)**
(3) Enhance support for online quality and growth for instruction and student services. **(B+)**

EMPLOYEE SUPPORT
(1) Provide better onboarding, support and professional development for all college employees. **(A)**
(2) Encourage employee participation in leadership and activities that engage them with the college and the community. **(A)**

INNOVATION
(1) Recognize and support a campus culture that values innovation and creative problem solving. **(B)**
(2) Employ a data-driven decision-making process. **(B)**

COLLABORATION/PARTNERSHIPS
(1) Collaborate with K-12, adult education, and four-year colleges in ways that serve students and society. **(A)**
(2) Partner with business and industry to prepare students for the workforce. **(A)**
(3) Increase lifelong learning opportunities for our community. **(B)**

GOVERNANCE
(1) Strengthen everyone's sense of community and commitment to the College's mission; expand participation from all constituencies in shared governance. **(A)**
(2) Promote consistent and clear communication in order to create a more informed, cohesive and engaged community. **(A)**

LEADERSHIP
(1) Articulate a clear vision and priorities for the College. **(B)**

FUNDING
(1) Increase advocacy at the state level, increase grants and private donations to secure stable and sustainable funding, and manage college resources strategically. **(B+)**

5. PRIORITIZATION DISCUSSION

Dan Rosenberg asked the group if leadership/vision really needs to be a stated goal - isn't that what we are already doing? Carolyn Holcroft and Kurt Hueg both expressed their concern that due to the fact there was so much rich discussion that led to these goals … if we remove something, do we lose what the intent of the goal was initially?

The group suggested the possibility of moving STUDENT SUCCESS 2 & 3 to EQUITY. Kimberlee Messina noted that the statements regarding INNOVATION (1 & 2) are something we already do; they are not new concepts. Paul Starer suggested moving COLLABORATION 3 to FUNDING, as a big part of that goal would be community education.

The group suggested adding the term *entrepreneurial* somewhere within the framework of the FUNDING goal(s). It was noted that LEADERSHIP 1 should be moved under GOVERNANCE and combined with *promoting consistent and clear communication*.

Teresa Ong asked if this was the point in time where we would want to weave in *diversity* and *sustainability*. She noted that Debbie Lee (absent) asked that the diversity of faculty/staff/students be mentioned somewhere as a stated goal. Teresa asked if *diversity* would receive its own categorical heading. Roberto added that diversity was not mentioned in the last EMP and questioned how the college can expect to have a long-term or short-term action plan for it if it is not explicitly stated. Andrew LaManque asked for clarification regarding *sustainability* and whether or not it was environmental? Financial? – this would determine what category it would fall under.

Elaine Kuo brought up the suggestions of adding service-learning opportunities. Andrew LaManque noted that it could be captured under STUDENT SUCCESS by adding *including service learning and work-based learning*.

6. NEXT STEPS

Dan Rosenberg noted that it is possible in the document that every goal has a paragraph discussing what PaRC meant with each goal (to be able to address the richness of the discussion). A PaRC steering committee for the EMP (i.e. small leadership team) will be critical.

The EMP document should have a structure similar to the proposed Table of Contents below:
A. Executive Summary
B. Integrated Planning Process
C. Environmental Scan *(the data)*
D. Online Survey Results
E. Qualitative Input Summary
F. Labor Market Analysis *(if appropriate)*
G. Enrollment Management Analysis
H. Growth Forecast and Future Space Needs *(part of Facilities Master Plan)*
I. Institutional Goals

Denise Swett suggested putting the data as part of an appendix, to avoid burying the key information before the reader even gets to it. Carolyn Holcroft noted that she sees lots of words, but doesn't see a plan – she questions why a faculty member would even read this document? John Spevak added that a faculty would understand that this is what is important to the college and its constituents and read and take it into account when preparing.

Kurt Hueg suggested that the Executive Summary have a lead-in to the goals (some type of business plan). Judy Miner stated that the document must address the connection back to what faculty/staff do every day (it must be tied back to Program Review). Kimberlee Messina added that the institutional goals would be guiding principles for Program Review, which will serve as a motivator for faculty members. Each of the goals could be broken down into smaller chunks for year-by-year consideration.

Charlie McKellar asked for clarification on how to implement the goals – the implementation factor should be the main focus of the document (and it cannot be too vague). Dan Rosenberg added that short-term action plans should be created/revised each year (they should be measurable, have a specific timeline, a main point-of-contact, etc.).

Judy Miner suggested using the word *frame / framework* and have the language in the document support that. Each frame would then have multiple specific stated intentions that still honor the richness of the discussion but give greater guidance (particularly for student services) – the goal is to answer the "so now what?" question(s). Judy indicated that the discussion would continue over the summer along with consideration of the mission statement(s).

John Spevak and Dan Rosenberg thanked everyone for their participation.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 2:56PM