



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)**  
**Wednesday, March 5, 2014**  
**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

<b>ITEMS</b>	<b>TIME</b>	<b>TOPICS</b>	<b>LEADERS</b>	<b>EXPECTED OUTCOME</b>
1	1:30-1:35	Welcome	Judy Miner	
2	1:35-1:40	Approval of Minutes: February 19, 2014	Judy Miner	Action
3	1:40-1:50	Perkins Career Technical Education (CTE) Allocation Request for 2014-2015 – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	Workforce Workgroup	Discussion
4	1:50-2:00	ACCJC Institutional Set Standards – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	Craig Gawlick	Discussion
5	2:00-2:15	DSPS Update	Teresa Ong	Information
6	2:15-2:30	Questions/Concerns/Announcements	Judy Miner	

**Notes:**

Week of March 3 – VPs meet with each other to create one prioritized resource request list  
April 18 – Student Equity Professional Development Day

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Item 2: Draft Minutes of February 19, 2014 Meeting  
Item 3: Perkins Career Technical Education (CTE) Allocation Request for 2014-2015

**Present:**

Alex Baker, Andrew LaManque, Behrouz Amirbadvy, Bernata Slater, Casie Wheat, Charlie McKellar, Craig Gawlick, Erica Onugha, Judy Miner, John Mummert, Kimberlee Messina, Mark Anderson, Maureen Chenoweth, Meredith Heiser, Nanette Solvason, Nikki Ashayer, Omar Zeitoun, Paul Starer, Peter Murray, Robert Cormia, Roberto Sias, Sarah Munoz, Teresa Ong

**The meeting started at 1:35PM.**

**1. Welcome**

## **2. Approval of Minutes: February 19, 2014**

Judy Miner stated that Behrouz Amirbadvy was misspelt. Also, regarding Item 6: Accreditation Midterm Report Update, Kate Jordhal attended the Accreditation Institute, not Kate Jordin.

Minutes with amendments approved by consensus.

## **3. Perkins Career Technical Education (CTE) Allocation Request for 2014-2015 – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

John Mummert presented the Perkins Career Technical Education (CTE) Allocation Request for 2014-2015 to PaRC as a first read. Mummert stated that academic programs with the appropriate TOPs codes, in addition to workforce programs, were eligible for Perkins funding. Mummert stated that the allocation process was truly a shared governance model because the Workforce Workgroup reviewed and discussed each request. There were more requests than there was funding, so the committee also gave recommendations for other funding sources when appropriate. The deans have been made aware of the survey process and have given their recommendations.

This year \$12,000 of Perkins funding will be used to finance the CTE outcomes survey. The function of the CTE survey would be to poll program completers and program leavers for the purposes of capturing student outcomes. The last CTE survey had a 25% response rate. Kimberlee Messina commented that a survey of outcomes was required for some CTE programs; thus surveying all CTE programs collectively would be beneficial. Miner stated that the college could use this data for ACCJC reporting.

Mummert told PaRC that the total amount of Perkins funding given from the government was an estimate. The final allocation amount would not be finalized until the summer. The Workforce Workgroup had already created a waiting list for funding, in the event that the government provided more Perkins dollars. Meredith Heiser commented that Perkins funds had to be spent by the end of the fiscal year. Mummert stated that if a program had not spent its funding by May, a request would be issued to return the funds so that the dollars could be allocated to another Perkins program. Mummert commented that because all allocation requests had been accounted for (via the Perkins CTE Allocations Request document), allocating more funding to programs would be a clean process in terms of an audit.

## **4. ACCJC Institutional Set Standards – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Craig Gawlick presented the ACCJC Institutional Set Standards on behalf of Elaine Kuo, who was absent due to conference travel. The ACCJC implemented some changes to the institutional set standards, including: additional questions, SLO narratives, and CTE standards. Of the seven set standards, Gawlick emphasized that the two new set standards were: 1) the posting of licensure exam pass rates for CTE programs and 2) CTE job placement rates for program completers. Mummert commented that the second CTE set standard would require programs to post job placement information on their website. Miner mentioned that streamlining this requirement for consistency would be a priority for the new marketing director.

Gawlick defined a standard as an average that the college could easily meet and should exceed. Heiser questioned how this definition was different from a benchmark. Andrew LaManque responded that the ACCJC requires institutions to have aspirational goals as well as floors. Gawlick reported that the college should set standards as an institution, not on a program level; but internally, the college should demonstrate how programs contributed to achieving the standards. Gawlick then presented the following seven set standards and recommendations: 1) student course completion rate (55%); 2) student degree and certificate completion number (unduplicated) (450); 3) student degree completion number (unduplicated) (415); 4) student certificate completion number (unduplicated) (355); 5) student transfer to four-year colleges/universities (700); 6) student licensure examination pass rates for CTE programs (new standard for CTE programs); and 7) job placement rates for CTE program completers (new standard for CTE programs).

Regarding the two new CTE program set standards, Messina commented that the college conservatively chose a 75% average based on the overall three-year average. Mummert stated that because the college's licensure exam pass rates were so much higher than the standard, the standard would not be advertised. Messina added that the standard passage rates were for accreditation purposes only. Erica Onugha asked if there was a future possibility of the college being unable to set their own standards. LaManque replied that the accreditation guidelines require set standards to be written with a degree of reasonableness; thus standards must be supported by data and rationale to justify the provided standards. In addition, these standards must be reasonable when compared to peer institutions. Miner commented that these requirements were tied to federal financial aid. This new set of standards was an example of the push toward quantifying results and the move away from qualitative data. Miner stated that it was important for the college to remain with the peer review process and work toward strengthening the ACCJC, as there were those in congress who do not think that educational institutions should have the ability to self-regulated.

In response to the the new student job placement rate for CTE program completers standard, Heiser asked what the time frame was for job placement and how the data would be presented to students. Heiser then made a request to see the CTE report results. Miner replied that Casie Wheat would send out the link to the CTE survey. Nanette Solvason responded that within six months, program completers should be polled. Paul Starer commented that the data from the CTE survey could be skewed. Starer gave the example that in programs, such as culinary arts (not at Foothill, but in general) where many there were many program completers, students often found that positions in the their chosen profession were often low paying; resulting in minimal employment rates in the program completers' field. Miner stated that it could be helpful to report out on actual numbers, not just percentages to more accurately display placement rates to potential student. Onugha asked if enrollment affects the standards. Messina responded that standards were reviewed every year and were adjusted accordingly.

## **5. DSPS Update**

Teresa Ong gave an update on the Disability Resource Center (DRC). Miner congratulated Ong on moving from a director to a dean's position. Ong reported that the DRC had two major programs both on and off campus. On-campus programs and services included: accommodations and academic counseling, a computer access center, transition to work, and learning disability services and classes; and off-campus non-credit courses, such as art, music therapy and current events, were taught at local senior centers. Ong then updated PaRC on the online process to make accommodation requests. The online system helped the DRC track requests; half of all requests were received within the first week of classes.

Ong stated that the DRC student demographics had witnessed two significant increases. Students with acquired brain injury and mobility impairments increased from 3% to almost 10%. Ong attributed this increase to veterans entering the program. In addition, Ong reported that more than 700 DRC students were fifty-years or older, which accounted for about half of the population served. Also, senior student fees accounted for 30% of the DRC's budget. Miner stated that in November 2010, the state cut the DSPS program by 50%; however, the number of students served has increased. Miner congratulated Ong on the DRC's tremendous leadership and the hard work, as the staff has served so many students with such limited resources.

Ong reported that the DRC's vision/mission was to move toward disability access as visibility and accessibility for all. The DRC will meet this vision/mission through the principles of universal design, a focus on student independence and self-reliance, and leveraging technology. Ong's exemplified the vision/mission through the DRC's recommendation of a smartphone application with accessibility features that allowed a student with a detached retina to complete a group project. In addition, the DRC has collaborated with community education and Foothill courses. Sarah Parikh and Margo Dobbin's engineering students have been assigned a final project to design products for vision and hearing impairment. Industry leaders have been invited to attend the final project presentations. Ong also mentioned that the campus would now have access to accommodation programs such as Read:OutLoud, SensusAccess, and Clockwork.

## **6. Questions/Concerns/Announcements**

Omar Zeitoun announced that the ASFC would like to survey the college about the no wheels on campus policy. Zeitoun hoped that the questionnaire would measure the campus's thoughts on the bike and skateboard regulations. Messina commented that Zeitoun's study should also include data pulled from other California community colleges.

Maureen Chenoweth announced that a representative from Northwestern University would be on campus to discuss community colleges and online support services. Chenoweth invited PaRC to join the meeting.

Roberto Sias stated that there was a concern about the Student Success and Support Program (3SP) crosswalk and the Scorecard Report. Sias mentioned that it could be helpful to have the two responsible parties coordinate and present to PaRC. Miner agreed that the college does need to implement the 3SP, but that the guidelines were just recently published. Miner commented that the Foothill system would be tested at the Day on the Hill events, as the open house formats will provide incoming students with the opportunity to apply, complete partial education plans, and learn about college resources.

Heiser reported that the March on March was a huge success with more than fifty students representing the Foothill-De Anza Community College District. Behrouz Amirbadvy had the opportunity to meet with Assemblymember Richard Gordon and a representative from Senator Marty Block's office to discuss community college fees, as well as UC fees, and student debt.