



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)
Wednesday, June 15, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

PURPOSE: Participatory Governance Leaders Meeting
LOCATION: Administration Building / Room 1901 / President's Conference Room
TIME: 1:30 – 3:00 PM / First and Third Wednesdays

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:33	Welcome & Announcements	PaRC Tri-Chairs	
2	1:33-1:35	Approval of Minutes: June 01, 2016	PaRC Tri-Chairs	Approval
4	1:35-1:45	Governance Survey Results	Kuo	
5	1:45-1:50	Participatory Governance Meeting Updates	PaRC Tri-Chairs	
6	1:50-2:00	Basic Skills Workgroup Reflections for 2015-16	Tam, Zwack, McCarthy	
7	2:00-2:15	Opening Day Discussion – Professional Development Committee	Stefonik, Baker, Smith	
8	2:15-2:20	Technology Plan – Draft (<i>Information Item</i>)	Baker	
9	2:20-2:30	Student Equity Workgroup Reflections for 2015-16	Starer, Fernandez, Sias	
10	2:30-2:40	Transfer Workgroup Reflections for 2015-16	Truong, DuBois, Day	
11	2:40-2:50	Workforce Workgroup Reflections for 2015-16	Girardelli, Cormia, Wolf	
12	2:50-3:00	Set Agenda for Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Committee	PaRC Tri-Chairs	

MEMBERS PRESENT: Donna Wolf, Bernata Slater, Carolyn Holcroft, Debbie Lee, Denise Perez, John DuBois, Karen Smith, Lan Truong, Robert Cormia, Teresa Zwack, Victor Tam

EX-OFFICIO PRESENT: Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Kurt Hueg, Denise Swett, Elaine Kuo, Karen Erickson

(1) WELCOME & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Karen Smith was acknowledged and thank for her service as Classified Senate President. Starting Summer 2016, this role will transition to Erin Ortiz.

(2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 01, 2016

The minutes from the PaRC meeting on June 01, 2016 were approved by consensus; no changes noted/requested.

(3) GOVERNANCE SURVEY RESULTS

The Governance Survey evaluates planning and the resource prioritization process. It is also used to identify the agenda for the Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) committee over the summer. This year, the survey was sent out to all employees as well as the students who participated in PaRC – there were 82 respondents.

The top four topics/issues that arose out of the Governance Survey included:

- (a) Faculty/Staff Prioritization Process
- (b) Resource Prioritization Process
- (c) Program Review Process [not the templates]
- (d) Other [governance structure, stipends, release time, reassign time, etc.]

Based on participant responses and comments, other suggestions topics for consideration include:

- (a) Link between Annual and Comprehensive Program Review
- (b) Link between Program Review and Resource Prioritization Process
- (c) Comprehensive Program Review Length
- (d) Review the Administrative Unit Outcome Process
- (e) Training for Program Review and Resource Requests

Email continues to be the preferred method of communication ... but emphasis was placed on there not being too many emails! Department/division meetings as a method of communication continue to rank highly (as compared to last year).

In terms of Information Management, clearer documentation of processes is requested (via diagrams, charts, use of Opening Day). Employees want to see a “one stop shop” page on Foothill’s website with links and a snapshot of all major decisions, major committee discussions, newsletters. Some employees have also asked that certain important emails be repeated (or sent out multiple times).

The sample Governance Survey can be found here:

http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/Gov_Survey_2016.docx

The Governance Survey presentation can be found here:

http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/Gov_Survey_Presentation.pptx

The results (+ comments) of the Governance Survey can be found here:

http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/Gov_Survey_ResultsSummary.pdf

In terms of Annual Program Review, more discussion/feedback at the department and/or division levels is requested. There is also interest in a clearer link between the annual program review and student success. More targeted subjective reflections as well as a more accessible program review webpage were also requested, perhaps with examples of “good” or “needing improvement” program review documents.

In terms of Comprehensive Program Review, respondents requested more data and more time to complete the documents. Expanding beyond the 3-year comprehensive cycle was also noted – perhaps moving to a 4-year or 5-year cycle. More defined discussion parameters when meeting with the Program Review Committee (PRC) was also requested, as is a request to expand participation in Program Review to include classified staff and adjunct faculty.

In terms of Resource Prioritization, clearer understanding of Perkins criteria and PaRC’s role in the prioritization process was requested. Follow-up regarding submitted requests (i.e. “closing the loop”) was also noted as a key issue.

In terms of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), more discussion around this topic is requested at all levels (department, division, campus). Overall, there is some confusion/disagreement as to the definition of Student Learning Outcomes, particularly at the program-level. There is agreement; however, that the new SLO Committee has been a positive addition.

(4) PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE MEETING UPDATES

The off-PaRC meetings scheduled during the Spring 2016 have concluded. The group began taking inventory of where the College is now, with regards to committees, specifically membership, charge, decision-making responsibility, deliverables. It was noted that this work is not finished and needs to be looked at further – as a revised Governance Handbook will need to be drafted.

(5) OPENING DAY DISCUSSION – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Professional Development Committee (PDC) presented a summary of the options under consideration for Foothill Opening Day 2016. It was emphasized that the keynote speakers are aware that the audience consists of faculty, staff and administrators. Format #1 would be to have a keynote speaker and then various break-out sessions on a variety of topics (similar to Opening Day 2015). Format #2 would be to have a keynote speaker and then break-out sessions that further expanded on the message by the keynote speaker.

More information can be found on the proposals submitted by the Professional Development Committee (PDC).

Opening Day Proposal: <http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/OpeningDayOptions.docx>

Suggestion from SLO Committee: <http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/SLOCommitteeProposal.pdf>

PaRC elected to have the PDC present both options (along with the suggestion from the SLO Committee) to incoming President Nguyen.

(6) TECHNOLOGY PLAN – DRAFT

A copy of the draft can be found here: http://www.foothill.edu/president/parc/minutes/parc2015-16/06.15.16/2016June6_FH_Tech_Plan_draft8.docx

It was noted that Foothill is almost done with its Technology Plan. De Anza is still working on theirs. The FHDA District Technology Plan is going to work in conjunction with the college plans (once completed).

(7) SET AGENDA FOR IP&B – SUMMER 2016

The tentative charge for IP&B is as follows:

- Review the Administrative Unit Outcome (AUO) process in terms of what areas should be included or covered in program review (either individually or combined with other units).
- Review the linkages and continuity between the annual and comprehensive program reviews.
- Review the length (and/or extend) the Comprehensive Program Review cycle for the College.
- Determine methods to increase the clarity of the connection between the Program Review and prioritization of resource requests by the Operations Planning Committee (OPC). This may include changes to the template to make it clear where the request is coming from (department vs. division program review document). Greater guidance for the individuals submitting the program review would also be helpful – why is there a need for a specific resource – is it tied to a specific learning outcome?
- Discuss/explore the use of TracDat V5.1 as a single program for student learning outcomes assessment/reflection and program review.
- Participation in Program Review – should this be mandatory? Discussion of avenues for increasing involvement (specifically for classified staff).
- Process for hiring new classified staff positions.
- The need for a process for creation of learning community programs (e.g. Umoja, First Year Experience [FYE], etc.)
- Develop guidelines/criteria for ranking full-time faculty hires in-cycle.

- (8) ~~BASIC SKILLS WORKGROUP REFLECTIONS (2015-2016)~~ *Postponed Until Fall 2016*
- (9) ~~STUDENT EQUITY WORKGROUP REFLECTIONS (2015-2016)~~ *Postponed Until Fall 2016*
- (10) ~~TRANSFER WORKGROUP REFLECTIONS (2015-2016)~~ *Postponed Until Fall 2016*
- (11) ~~WORKFORCE WORKGROUP REFLECTIONS (2015-2016)~~ *Postponed Until Fall 2016*