



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)**  
**Wednesday, November 20, 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	1:30-1:32	Welcome	Judy Miner	
2	1:32-1:35	Approval of Minutes: November 6, 2013	Judy Miner	Action
3	1:35-1:40	Procedures Around Multiple Tri-Chair Voting	Judy Miner	Action
4	1:40-1:50	PRC Update (Membership & Timeline)	PRC	
5	1:50-2:00	PRC Rubric Presentation – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	PRC	
6	2:00-2:10	OPC Rubric Presentation – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	OPC	
7	2:10-2:20	Perkins Rubric Presentation	John Mummert	
8	2:20-2:30	Student Equity Mission Workgroup Objectives 2013-14	Equity Workgroup	
9	2:30-2:40	Vision Statement	Judy Miner	Discussion
10	2:40-2:45	Accreditation Midterm Report Update (Standing item)	Dolores Davison/ Kurt Hueg/ Kimberlee Messina/ Roberto Sias	
11	2:45-2:55	Review ILOs and Values (Standing item)	Judy Miner	
12	2:55-3:00	Questions/Concerns/Announcements • December 4 <sup>th</sup> PaRC Meeting – Scheduled as Tentative	Judy Miner	

**Notes:**

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

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Item 2: Draft Minutes of November 6, 2013 Meeting  
Item 5: Institutional Program Review Rubric  
Item 9: Vision Statement

**The meeting began at 1:30PM.**

**Present:**

Bernata Slater, Casie Wheat, Charlie McKellar, Craig Gawlick, Denise Perez, Erica Onugha, Jud Miner, Kimberlee Messina, Kurt Kueg, Mark Anderson, Meredith Heiser, Mia Casey, Pat Hyland

**1. Welcome**

Judy Miner welcomed the group.

**2. Approval of Minutes: November 6, 2013**

Minutes approved by consensus.

**3. Procedures Around Multiple Tri-Chair Voting**

Miner introduced the topic of multiple tri-chair voting and proposed that a new “one person, one vote” policy be placed in the governance handbook. Meredith Heiser stated that this policy would be disenfranchising, in that, if a constituent group fails to come up with a representative, then the group would lose a vote. Conversely, Dolores Davison gave the example that if one member has two votes, this member could give two votes for a single event, rather than having two distinguished votes from two members.

Peter Murray spoke about the selection process of voting members. Murray stated that process transparency is essential if the “one person, one vote” policy becomes practice. Davison and Kimberlee Messina echoed Murray’s sentiments saying that if a person is being blocked from participating, the process should be reevaluated.

Miner commented that PaRC should look to the Academic Senate and Classified Senate to determine the selection and vetting process, and also review the issue of multiple tri-chair voting. Miner noted that if the only dual chair is Roberto Sias, then PaRC can revisit this issue later date. Sias stated that the Classified Senate approved his dual roles as PaRC classified tri-chair and Student Equity Workgroup classified tri-chair. Miner then noted that administrators would only have one administrator per committee. Davison stated that the faculty already have a selection process, which is to select one faculty member per committee. Davison then commented that it is impractical for a faculty member to sit on two committees due to the heavy workload.

Erica Onugha suggested that the “one person, one vote” policy include a by-law that would first announce a vacancy, and then also specify a waiting period before a group loses its vote. Onugha explained that this would help to notify the senate of a vacancy and to inform constituents that a vote would be lost unless a person was found to serve. Messina commented that at the November 6, 2013 meeting, PaRC held a valuable discussion about how classified staff might not be able to serve due to the perception that their supervisors would not allow them release time. Messina encouraged the classified staff to participate.

Miner suggested that the constituencies should take time to codify how each group selects their committee chairs. PaRC would then revisit this item at a later date.

**4. PRC Update (Membership & Timeline)**

Davison stated that PRC is in need of an additional faculty member.

**5. PRC Rubric Presentation – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Pat Hyland spoke on behalf of PRC to present the PRC rubric. Hyland noted that PRC has been assessing the annual and comprehensive program reviews for the purposes of giving consistency to color rating system. Hyland stated that the rubric should be a guidance tool when completing a program review. With the rubric, programs should be able to give PaRC a complete and focused report. Hyland then asked PaRC for feedback on

the rubric. Craig Gawlick commented that the presented rubric was a working draft and the group would continue to make edits.

Davidson noted that the Chancellor's Office should be specified as the State Chancellor's Office throughout the document. Davison requested more clarification on the 'too much information' and 'incomplete' rating. Messina commented that an 'incomplete' rating should be defined as 'not meeting specific required criteria' and then the missing elements should be listed so that programs understand what is incorrect or incomplete. Messina then recommended removing the word 'data' and replacing it with 'data analysis' because the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research provides both the data and the analysis.

Hyland posed a question to PaRC, asking if the rubric should include a grade from the deans. Gawlick stated that there was a section for dean's recommendations in last year's program review. Messina responded that if there was a section, there should be a rubric. Hyland then asked, if a dean comments and/or recommendations are not inline with a resource request, should this section be included? Messina continued on to recommend that resource request comments from a dean should be placed on the OPC resource allocation sheet. Messina noted that deans should comment on the analysis on program only, and not on the programs competition rate.

Sias asked about the criteria for the discontinuance of a program. Messina responded that PRC presents program ratings to PaRC using a colored coded system. If the program receives a green it will continue. If the program receives a red or yellow rating, PRC reports this to PaRC and then the program has one year to make changes and to be reevaluated. PaRC and President Miner ultimately have the ability to discontinue a program.

#### **6. OPC Rubric Presentation – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Bernata Slater presented the OPC rubric to PaRC. Slater reported that many changes were made to the existing rubric. Last year, six categories existed for rating. These previous categories were repetitive in nature. Slater mentioned that this year, the rubric has fewer categories but more room for comments. Miner reminded PaRC that program reviews are due in December and all rubrics will be approved at the December 4, 2013 PaRC meeting.

#### **7. Perkins Rubric Presentation**

This item will be presented at the December 4, 2013 PaRC meeting.

#### **8. Student Equity Mission Workgroup Objectives 2013-14**

Onugha reported that the Student Equity Workgroup had one objective: to enhance the ethos of equity on campus and educate the campus about equity and its relevance to student success. Onugha also stated that the workgroup has begun work on the student equity plan, which is due October 2014. Onugha mentioned that the group wants people to not only read the student equity plan, but to also integrate it in their daily work on campus. The group plans to work alongside the Professional Development Committee to hold equity themed workshops. The next Professional Development Day is January 24, 2013.

Onugha then ask PaRC for feedback on the presented workgroup objectives. Messina commented that the 'equity plan' should be listed as the 'student equity plan'; and this should be consistent throughout the document. Miner announced that the Foothill-De Anza Community College District was just awarded a sixteen million dollar grant for online education. The Chancellor will host a town hall in January to educate the campus about the new grant. Miner encouraged the participation of Student Equity Workgroup, as well as PaRC, to weigh in on the equity commitment and asked how the college might operationalize the student equity plan within the online educational sphere.

Heiser commented that faculty who teach online courses could participate in the Student Equity Workgroup to help prioritize equity in online education. Heiser noted that online communication differs greatly from in-person communication. Miner commented that underrepresented students often have lower completion rates. Miner continued on to note that Stanford would be providing research on the online space to PaRC in

the near future.

### **9. Vision Statement**

Miner presented the vision statement to PaRC. Miner stated that the vision statement would shape Foothill's master plan and ILOs. Miner commented that the statement should clearly articulate the college's commitment to serve a diverse population. The vision statement incorporates the four core competencies, which the college would like to have Foothill students leave the campus with. Miner commented that she is continuously impressed with Foothill's student leadership and activism on behalf of many populations and communities.

Miner continued on to state that all four core competencies need to work together for the campus to be successful; some key elements include: curriculum, effective instruction, comprehensive students support systems, and strategic partnerships with both internal and external organizations. Messina reviewed some next steps and stated that Elaine Kuo would create a visual map of the vision statement in junction with the ESMP and institutional values to review what needs to be updated, integrated, or changed.

Kurt Hueg asked if the goals should be under the mission statement and not the vision statement. Messina explained that the mission statement is broader, while vision statement is more specific. Miner stated that the core competencies were included in the vision statement to compliment the mission statement and provide highlights to the college's focus. Lauren Wilson commented that she viewed the vision statement as student goals, which she would take with her when she graduates from Foothill College.

### **10. Accreditation Midterm Report Update (Standing item)**

Davison announced that the next ACCJC meeting would be December 12, 2013. The ACCJC would also hold an open meeting on January 10, 2014.

### **11. Review ILOs and Values (Standing item)**

Messina reported out on behalf of Kuo stating that Kuo was working with Academic Senate and Student Services to come up with questions for the CESSE, which will be used to assess the college's ILOs.

### **12. Questions/Concerns/Announcements**

Miner announced that the December 4<sup>th</sup> PaRC meeting is no longer tentative and will be held at the regularly schedule date and time. PaRC was reminded that both Miner and Davison would not be able to attend the December 4 meeting, and that Sias would chair PaRC in their place.

In addition, Miner announced that Denise Swett would be the ex-officio administrator for the Student Equity Group, in place of Laureen Balducci.

Davison commented that the ACCJC's review of the accreditation standards includes significant changes. Some of the changes to the accreditation processes are in conflict with Academic Senate rights.

Craig Galwick announced that there would be two professional development workshops on program review.