FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)
Wednesday, December 4, 2013
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

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Welcome	Roberto Sias	
2	1:35-1:40	Approval of Minutes: November 20, 2013	Roberto Sias	Action
3	1:40-1:45	PRC Rubric – 2nd Read for Approval	PRC	Action
4	1:45-1:50	OPC Rubric – 2nd Read for Approval	OPC	Action
5	1:50-2:05	Perkins Rubric Presentation	Workforce Workgroup	
6	2:20-2:30	Questions/Concerns/Announcements	Roberto Sias	

Notes:
December 13 – Instructional and Student Services Program Reviews are due to their respective dean/director.

ATTACHMENTS:
Item 2: Draft Minutes of November 20, 2013 Meeting
Item 4: OPC Rubric

Present:
Alex Baker, April Henderson, Cara Miyasaki, Casie Wheat, Craig Gawlick, Denise Perez, Dolores Davison, Kimberlee Messina, Kurt Hueg, Lauren Wilson, Laureen Balducci, Mark Anderson, Maureen Chenoweth, Meredith Heiser, Nanette Solvason, Omar Zeitoun, Paul Starer, Peter Murray, Robert Cormia, Roberto Sias, Sarah Munoz

The meeting started at 1:32PM.

1. Welcome
Roberto Sias welcomed the group. Sias alone chaired the PaRC meeting because Judy Miner was in Santiago, Chile to present as panelist for the Fundación Ciencia para la Vida and Dolores Davison was attending a veteran's summit.

2. Approval of Minutes: November 20, 2013
November 20, 2013 minutes approved by consensus.

3. PRC Rubric – 2nd Read for Approval

Craig Gawlick introduced Pat Hyland and Cara Miyasaki as fellow PRC members present at the meeting. Gawlick reported on the PRC revisions made since the rubric was presented as a first read to PaRC on November 20, 2013. Gawlick commented that PRC followed PaRC's recommendation to shift the focus of the rubric from the program data to the analysis of the program. Gawlick stated that the presented rubric was the instructional rubric. Once this rubric was finalized, its prompts would be used to build the administrative and student services rubrics. PRC worked alongside Elaine Kuo to ensure that the PRC rubric aligned with the program review. Some of the program review template language can be found in the PRC rubric.

In regard to Section 5: SLO Assessment & Reflection, Galwick inquired about PRC's responsibility to review the quality of SLOs. Kimberlee Messina noted that this question was also asked by OPC. Currently, Messina stated, PRC is not responsible for reviewing the quality of SLOs; however, PaRC could review this issue with more internal conversation, if needed. Robert Cormia commented that it is the common practice of Foothill faculty to review the quality of SLOs for fellow faculty members. However, Cormia continued, the Academic Senate is willing to make changes to this practice to align with any ACCJC accreditation policies regarding SLOs. Kuo concluded that the SLO Assessment & Reflection section would then specifically review only the assessment leading to changes that shape SLOs.

Messina recalled the discussion point from the November 20, 2013 PaRC meeting concerning the dean's comment section. Messina stated that the dean or vice president does not need to agree with the discussion and/or analysis provided by the program in the program review's 'Does Not Meet Criteria' column of Section 9. Messina commented that PRC should review the program's analysis. Gawlick then asked how PRC should account for both the dean or vice president's review and the program's review. Kuo suggested that the author of the program review could strike the 'Dean and VP feedback does not agree with discussion and analysis provided by the program' box and make additional comments in the comment area.

Pat Hyland mentioned that the PRC rubric does not specifically designate an area to discuss the rating given to the program in the previous year. Kuo agreed with Hyland stating that although the previous year's rating is referenced, there is no program review summary section for the previous year. Messina concurred with these comments and stated that addressing a program's rating from the previous year needs to be more explicit. Hyland then noted that PRC would need to create a section for the program's rating from the previous year on the program review template as well.

PRC Rubric approved by consensus.

4. OPC Rubric – 2nd Read for Approval

Meredith Heiser presented the OPC rubric on behalf of OPC. Heiser noted that the one typo identified during the rubric's first read presentation on November 20, 2013 was corrected. Heiser commented that OPC had a discussion to incorporate equity in the committee's work, but thought it would be best to wait until the newly formed Student Equity workgroup was more established.

OPC Rubric approved by consensus.

5. Perkins Rubric Presentation
Mark Anderson provided hard copies of the Perkins rubric and requested that any feedback be written on the provided rubric and returned his office in the Fine Arts Division by Friday. Anderson presented the Perkins rubric, which provided the guidelines for determining the appropriateness of Perkins funding for programs. The rubric guidelines rated a program in the following categories: (1) Taxonomy of Programs (TOPs) code or located on a campus service that supports Workforce students; (2) the advisory board; (3) the program review; (4) the program's needs; (5) the special populations targeted; (6) the expenditures that receive extra scrutiny; (7) supplanting; (8) new programs; (9) past spending practices; (10) student outcomes; and (11) collaboration with other community colleges—not a requirement.

Anderson commented on the use of Perkins funding for student tutors. Anderson mentioned that previously Perkins funds were not used to pay tutors; Anderson noted, however, that the college does need to decide as an institution how to move forward with this request. Nanette Solvason asked if paying for tutors was not allowed per federal regulation. Messina stated that there were provisions to limit Perkins funding for salaries; thus, short-term use of funds for positions could be acceptable, but the district should provide for long-term funding. Anderson then cited the example of using Perkins funding for Temporary Employee Assignments (TEAs), saying that TEAs should not be used to replace full-time classified staff. Messina commented that the college would need to discuss this issue in great depth.

Messina asked how the rubric's 'Needs Additional Documentation' rating column would be used. Anderson stated that this column was previous titled 'Insufficient data,' and it was established to notify a program that the Workforce Workgroup needed more data before assigning a rating. Messina stated that a 'Needs Additional Documentation' rating in the 'Past Spending Practices' category might not be applicable. Anderson provided an example of the usage of the 'Needs Additional Documentation' rating column and explained that the Workforce Workgroup would like to see Perkins funded programs specify expenses and program costs, and also keep financial records. If any of the previously described criteria were missing, the program would receive a 'Needs Additional Documentation' rating in the 'Past Spending Practices' category.

Anderson reminded PaRC that the finalized rubric would be presented at the January 15, 2014 PaRC meeting.

Questions/Concerns/Announcements

Lauren Wilson announced that the ASFC would be collecting food donations in room 2011. The donations would be given to students who could not afford holiday dinners. The ASFC would also be collecting hygiene products to handout at well.

April Anderson announced that EOPS still had six ornaments for the CARE holiday gift donation. Each donated gift would be given to a child of a CARE program student. Gifts would be accepted until December 9, 2013.