



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)**  
**Wednesday, May 21, 2014**  
**DRAFT 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	1:30-1:32	Welcome	Judy Miner	
2	1:32-1:35	Approval of Minutes: May 7, 2014	Judy Miner	Action
3	1:35-1:40	PRC Recommendations – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Read	PRC	Action
4	1:40-1:55	PRC Remediation Update	PRC	Information
5	1:55-2:05	Accreditation Midterm Report – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	Kimberlee Messina / Andrew LaManque	Information
6	2:05-2:25	OPC/Resource Allocation Recommendations – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	OPC	Information
7	2:25-2:35	Vision & Goals Update	Andrew LaManque	Information
8	2:35-2:50	Review Faculty & Staff Prioritization Survey Results	Andrew LaManque	Information
9	2:50-3:00	Questions/Concerns/Announcements	Judy Miner	

**Notes:**

Governance Survey Opens

**Events:**

June 11 – Unveiling of the Foothill College Memorial Tree  
June 18 – End of Year Celebration  
June 19 – Welcome New Administrators – Coffee & Pastries  
June 27 – 2014 Commencement!

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Item 2: Draft Minutes of May 7, 2014 Meeting  
Item 3: PRC Recommendations  
Item 5: Accreditation Midterm Report  
Item 6: OPC Recommendations

**Present:**

Adiel Velasquez, Alex Baker, Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, April Henderson, Bernie Day, Cara Miyasaki, Casie Wheat, Charlie McKellar, Chris White, Craig Gawlick, Dawn Girardelli, Denise Perez, Denise Swett, Dolores Davison, Elaine Kuo, Erica Onugha, John Mumert, Judy Miner, Ken Horowitz, Kimberlee Messina, Kurt Hueg, Lauren Wilson, Leslye Noone, Mark Anderson, Meredith Heiser, Omar Zeitoun, Paul Starer, Roberto Sias, Sarah Munoz

**Meeting began at 1:31PM.**

## **1. Welcome**

## **2. Approval of Minutes: May 7, 2014**

Minutes approved by consensus.

## **3. PRC Recommendations – 2<sup>nd</sup> Read**

John Mummert acknowledged the PRC members present at the meeting. Mummert reiterated that the seven programs that received a yellow rating were required to submit a remediation plan to PRC. Miner invited PaRC to share any comments and suggestions for the program review process. Meredith Heiser suggested that PRC's comments could be summarized on a cover page so that those interested could quickly review the program's rating.

PRC Recommendations approved by consensus.

## **4. PRC Remediation Update**

Mummert presented the PRC Remediation Update. Mummert again noted that the remediation plans were due to PRC by June 13, 2014 so that PRC could report out at the June 18 PaRC meeting. Mummert stated that PRC was unsure about its authority in regard to holding programs accountable for acting upon their remediation plans. Roberto Sias asked if the campus understood the importance of the program review process. Cara Miyaskai stated that each program had different levels of awareness, noting that PRC gives a great amount of feedback.

Chris White asked PaRC to clarify PRC's role to enforce a yellow-rated program to develop, submit, and act upon a remediation plan. Kimberlee Messina commented that remediation plans should go through the program's vice president and then to PRC. Messina added that PRC could then recommend to PaRC and the president that a program be discontinued, shifted, eliminated, etc. White stated that PRC's official charge was to give color ratings and recommendations to each program during the program review process; and that it was not PRC's responsibility to manage the remediation process. Messina concurred with White's statement, replying that it was the faculty and administration's duty to manage remediation plans. Miner commented that those programs that were required to develop a remediation plan would need to establish a timeframe. A program might also need to reengineer specific program elements, depending on PRC's recommendations. Miner noted that the college should recognize that programs received yellow ratings for different, individual reasons.

Dolores Davison stated that a consistent yellow rating on a program review could affect PaRC's decision to grant a program an emergency hire request. In addition, Davison said that the faculty did take the program review process seriously, noting that Anthropology was an example of a yellow-rated program that had already submitted its amendments to become a green-rated program. Heiser added that often it was the full-time faculty, and not the part-time faculty, that were involved in the program review process (part-time faculty were not required to contribute). Paul Starer said that the college should attempt to ensure that the process unfolded without culpability as many

programs were very willing to change, but if for example, a program's enrollment continued to drop despite enrollment management efforts, the end result would be the same. Miner emphasized that program reviews and accreditation were necessary as their outcomes ultimately impact Foothill students.

Erica Onugha requested information on how a program could receive a red rating. Mummert stated that through a subjective process, the committee measured each area of the program, according to the PRC rubric. Messina added that it was through a non-subjective process that programs were rated. Messina used the yellow-rated Spanish program as an example, stating that in theory this program could receive a red rating if enrollment continued to drop and the faculty did not have any teaching assignments. Mummert agreed that the usage of PRC's rubric was an objective process, but also subjective, in the sense that the committee assessed and discussed a program's efforts to meet each requirement. Starer stated that a yellow-rated program would not necessarily receive a red rating automatically, but that the rating was dependent upon several factors.

Onugha then asked, if a yellow rating was due to low enrollment, what could a program do to better enrollment trends? Miner replied that the program should look to the vice presidents on how to approach this issue. Messina stated that faculty were not charged with enrollment management issues, and instead the programs should work alongside the deans to review internal processes. For example, Messina said, if trends showed high enrollment during evening hours, then the dean should recommend that the program offer more class sections to meet the demands of the students. Messina then added, the faculty were also charged with writing new curriculum, which could also increase enrollment. Lastly Messina noted, when focusing on due process, if a program demonstrated initiative and actively took steps toward program improvement, the program would probably be successful. Miner added that the college supported professional development leaves (PDLs) so that faculty could continue to meet the needs of students.

Denise Swett updated PaRC on the yellow-rated Student Activities and Counseling, stating that these programs were reviewing data and outcomes, and also exploring new curriculum. White added that last year Student Activities received a yellow rating, but for completely different reasons.

### **5. Accreditation Midterm Report – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Messina corrected the agenda, stating that the midterm report would be issued as a first read to the June 4 PaRC meeting. Messina stated that the writing group was still working on the report. The draft that was shared at this meeting should be considered a rough draft. Messina welcomed constituencies to review the rough draft and send feedback to Andrew LaManque. Davison asked if the midterm report would go to the board in July, as the last Academic Senate meeting would be June 30, 2014. Messina responded that it would depend on De Anza's submission, as both campuses submit the reports to the board at the same time; thus, Foothill might wait until October to submit the midterm report alongside De Anza.

### **6. OPC/Resource Allocation Recommendations – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Heiser presented the Resource Allocation Recommendations on behalf of OPC. Heiser reported that of the two hundred and thirteen requests, sixty-nine were rated as high priority by the vice president's; OPC only rated these sixty-nine requests. Miner invited PaRC to ask questions about the recommendations. Mummert requested clarification on the athletic trainer intern position, which was a request for either a two-year or one-year contraction option. Messina responded that there were contractual issues to be discussed with Bernata Slater before moving forward.

### **7. Vision & Goals Update**

LaManque reported that the Workgroup Tri-Chairs met on May 12, 2014 to discuss the vision and goals of the college. Elaine Kuo recorded that the group spoke about many ideas leading to the college's vision statement and president's vision statement, which were previously discussed by PaRC in February 2014. The group's research showed that many of the president's vision statements from other colleges were used to drive annual priorities and decision making throughout the year. LaManque stated that the group came to no definitive recommendations. Hueg noted that the struggle with the president's vision was that it contained the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), which made it appear like a vision statement. Starer commented that there were many documents that contained competing verbiage and that the college should look to produce a unified message. Miner stated that the language used in the president's vision statement included specific suggestions that could be implemented in college planning. Hueg commented that the college was required to focus on the mission statement for accreditation purposes, and that everything else would be at the college's discretion. Messina noted that the idea of a taskforce to move forward with the vision and goals work would be helpful.

Miner volunteered to participate in the first meeting of the taskforce. Miner stated that she would like to lead the campus in student equity. In the past, Miner continued, she had to take a fiscal leadership stance; however moving forward, Miner commented, the way in which the college discussed approaches to lead the campus should flow through a student equity lens. Miner added that a piece on online learning as a function of the Online Education Initiative (OEI) grant alongside student equity would also be appropriate. Messina reaffirmed that the Workforce Tri-Chairs wanted to meet outside PaRC to discuss the vision and goals. Sias noted that the first meeting provided the group with the ability to review both internal and external foci and expectations.

### **8. Review Faculty & Staff Prioritization Survey Results**

LaManque presented the Faculty & Staff Prioritization Survey results, reporting that fourteen of the twenty PaRC members participated. Miner commented that she would report her recommendations at the June 18 PaRC meeting because she would not be able to attend the June 4 meeting due to conference travel. Regarding faculty position prioritizations, Heiser requested clarification on the librarian position, asking if the increase of the contract from ten months to eleven months was considered a new full-time position. Messina responded that this was not a new position. In the past, Messina reported, the position's one-month extension was funded with one-time dollars on an annual basis; thus, the department was now requesting to make the additional month a permanent contract increase.

Davison requested verification that the emergency hires would not be included in the requests for new positions to the district. Miner affirmed that emergency hires were not considered new positions, as they were vacant due to retirements. Miner stated that the college hoped to receive permission for four positions from the district, but that enrollment would be the deciding factor. Davison commented that new hires was a popular conversation at the state level, in that many colleges were in a hiring freeze during budget reductions; however, now that the economy had stabilized, colleges were hiring to fill several positions.

When reviewing the staff position prioritizations, Miner acknowledged the struggle for full-time staff positions and noted that administration was watching the budget for updates. Miner noted that Vice Chancellor of Technology Joe Moreau indicated that there would be instructional design support through the OEI grant. If Foothill was selected as a pilot college for the grant, the campus could participate in such projects. Sias commented that there was a hope to see more classified positions in the future. Miner responded that the budget for classified positions was bleak; thus PaRC was asked to rank only the three top ranked classified positions.

### **9. Questions/Concerns/Announcements**

Miner announced that the Kinesiology & Athletics (KA) Division was now under the leadership of Dean Mark Anderson of the Fine Arts & Communication Division. Miner noted that the FTEF from the KA division dean position would be used to hire a full-time athletic director.

Miner stated that the college would reevaluate this merger of divisions in two years to ensure that expectations were being met. Miner then stated that all instructional divisions would now be under the Office of Instruction.

LaManque notified PaRC that the Governance Survey opened and that the results would be reviewed at the June 18 PaRC meeting. LaManque also noted that the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) had a seventy-seven percent participation rate. The survey results would be presented to PaRC in the fall.

Ken Horowitz commented that the district should look to certificate programs to increase enrollment. In addition, Foothill should not offer the same programs as De Anza. Mummert replied that the campus was in contact with UCSC Extension to learn about the extension model.

Starer announced that the library was undertaking a massive remodel. The anticipated reopening in its new location in 3600 was the second week of summer school; and thus there would be no library access during the first week of the Summer Quarter. Heiser requested that this message also be posted on MyPortal.

Maureen Chenoweth announced that the Transfer Celebration would be held on June 10, 2014. Chenoweth encouraged faculty and students to attend.

Sias announced that it was Classified Staff Week. Miner adjourned the meeting in honor of the Foothill classified staff.