



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)**  
**Wednesday, November 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

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:33	Welcome	Miner	
2	1:33-1:35	Approval of Minutes: October 15, 2014	Miner	Action
3	1:35-1:40	Program Review Committee (PRC) Rubric Presentation – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Read for Approval	Gawlick/ LaManque	Action
4	1:40-1:50	Vision Statement – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read	LaManque	
5	1:50-2:10	Curriculum Updates: Program Creation Proposals – 1 <sup>st</sup> Read a. Biomedical Technology Technician Program Certificate b. Commercial and Industrial Technician Program Certificate c. Certificate of Achievement Geriatric Health Care Technician Program	LaManque	
6	2:10-2:20	Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Basic Skills Workgroup	Basic Skills Workgroup	
7	2:20-2:30	Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Operations & Planning Committee (OPC)	OPC	
8	2:30-2:40	Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)	SEW	
9	2:40-2:45	District Office Update	Slater	
10	2:45-2:50	Foothill-De Anza Ed Center Update	Girardelli	
11	2:50-3:00	Questions/Concerns/Announcements	Miner	

**Notes:**

ESMP (ongoing through 2014-15)  
Assess ILO “Communication” (ongoing through 2014-15)

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Item 2: Draft Minutes of October 15, 2014 Meeting  
Item 3: Comprehensive Program Review Rubric  
Item 4: Vision Statement  
Item 5a: Biomedical Technology Technician Program Certificate  
Item 5b: Commercial and Industrial Technician Program Certificate

**Members Present:**

Anthony Cervantes, April Henderson, Ava Gerami, Behrouz Amirbadvy, Bernata Slater, Carolyn Holcroft, Charlie McKellar, Craig Gawlick, Debbie Lee, Evelyn Chun, Hilda Fernandez, John DuBois, Josh Rosales, Judy Miner, Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Paul Starer, Robert Cormia, Sarah Munoz, Teresa Ong, Victor Tam

**Ex-Officio Members Present:**

Andrew LaManque, Casie Wheat, Denise Swett, John Mummert, Kimberlee Messina, Laureen Balducci, Nanette Solvason

**Guests:**

Al Guzman, Meredith Heiser, Dawn Giradelli

**Meeting started at 1:33PM.**

**1. Welcome**

Academic Senate President Carolyn Holcroft opened the meeting on behalf of President Judy Miner, who was attending a fundraising luncheon for the first half of the meeting. Holcroft proposed the presentation of Item 9: District Office Update as the first item of business. PaRC approved the agenda amendment.

**2. Approval of Minutes: October 15, 2014**

October 15, 2014 Minutes approved by consensus.

**3. Program Review Committee (PRC) Rubric Presentation – 2<sup>nd</sup> Read for Approval**

Associate Vice President of Instruction Andrew LaManque presented the PRC rubric as a second read for approval. LaManque noted that PRC had not received any comments or suggestions since the first read of the rubric. Dean of Biological and Health Sciences (BHS) Nanette Solvason commented that the rubric was sent to the BHS division and only positive feedback was expressed.

Program Review Committee (PRC) Rubric approved by consensus.

**4. Vision Statement – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

LaManque reviewed the vision statement as a first read. LaManque stated that the review process of the vision statement began in the spring of last year. Over the summer a vision statement taskforce met to review and discuss the vision statement and their work was now presented. Al Guzman commented that traditionally mission statements and vision statements were shorter. Vice President of Instruction & Institutional Research Kimberlee Messina requested more information on the requirements for the mission and vision statement. LaManque stated that for accreditation purposes, the college must have a mission statement and that a vision statement was not required. However, the college felt that there should be a vision statement. Therefore, the college could create the vision statement with few constraints. Feedback on the vision statement should be directed to Andrew LaManque.

**5. Curriculum Updates: Program Creation Proposals – 1<sup>st</sup> Read**

Messina introduced the Curriculum Updates: Program Creation Proposals and commented that the three proposals were held over from last

year. Messina presented the *Biomedical Technology Technician Program Certificate*, as a non-transcriptable, 25-unit certificate program that was composed of courses that were already being offered by Foothill College. Program resources and equipment were funded by donations and preexisting funds. Basic Skills Workgroup Administrative Chair and Interim Dean of Physical Science, Mathematics, and Engineering (PSME) Victor Tam stated that this program could be completed in a year and that the program's enrollment was high. Tam noted that the program's Biomedical Devices component collaborated with the Dental Hygiene Program to develop toothbrushes for the developmentally disabled using 3D printers. Tam stated that the Science Learning Institute (SLI) Advisory Committee's connections ensured private industry internships for students.

Messina commented that this program was currently non-transcriptable because the advisory committee wanted the program to start immediately; proposing the program to the State would significantly delay the program's start. Tam stated that Executive Dean of the Science Learning Institute Peter Murray successfully connected with the Engineering Department at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo for discussion on the unofficial acceptance of the program's courses; thus, the program could be transcriptable in the near future.

Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Faculty Chair Debbie Lee asked about the sustainability of the program. Messina stated that adjunct professors taught the courses, but that any faculty could teach them. Guzman questioned how the program fit with the mission statement of the college. Vice President of Workforce and Institutional Advancement John Mummert replied that the program aligned with the workforce and transfer goals of the college.

Messina and Tam confirmed that the courses were already in session and that the pilot program would remain under observation for two years; depending on the success of the pilot, the department might apply to the State for transfer. Solvason commented on the importance of student employment data with the completion of the certificate. LaManque requested more information on the linkages between this program and already existing programs in PSME. Tam cited the Biomedical Devices component, which used 3D printers to produce toothbrushes. Holcroft noted that the 83A course had no prerequisites, so the course was open to any interested student. Holcroft then commented that the course could be reviewed as a potential entryway for Foothill's underserved students in the STEM field.

Tam introduced the *Commercial and Industrial Technician Program Certificate* as the rapid prototype and 3D printing program. The program was developed upon already existing courses. Students would be trained to produce prototypes of medical devices and consumer products. Classified Senate President Karen Smith asked about the scale of machines used to produce such prototypes. Tam commented that the program already had 3D printers to produce small items. For the larger items, the program would partner with De Anza College's Computer Numerical Control (CNC) program, which had large 3D printers. Lee asked if De Anza would share the enrollment in these Foothill courses. Tam confirmed that Foothill instructors taught the courses, and that Foothill was only utilizing De Anza's facilities. Regarding the *Biomedical Technology Technician Program Certificate* and *Commercial and Industrial Technician Program Certificate*, Holcroft stated that since the certificates were initially planned to be implemented as non-transcriptable, they would not automatically be included in the program review process; however, Holcroft noted, moving forward these two certificates should be included in the appropriate PSME program review document.

Solvason introduced the *Certificate of Achievement Geriatric Health Care Technician Program*, which was written by Dental Hygiene Instructor Ken Horowitz. Solvason stated that the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) labor market data confirmed the need for skilled caregivers. However, the Deputy Sector Navigator also confirmed that this 22-unit certificate was too ambitious for such a low paying job. In addition, a certificate was not required for employment in this field. Solvason then stated that the proposed courses did offer very valuable skills for the healthcare industry that might be better suited for a community education offering.

Messina stated that last spring, the BHS Division, Business & Social Sciences (BSS) Division, and healthcare professionals met to discuss the feasibility of offering gerontology program certificate. The healthcare professionals supported the idea of a non-credit certificate offered through BSS, which could have a psychological and sociological based platform. In addition, the group discussed the need for the State to offer a licensure for healthcare professionals.

Holcroft stated that a student looking for employment might enroll in this 22-unit program, which was not technically required for employment; continuing on, Holcroft then noted, if the student wanted to reenroll to earn an additional certificate or degree from Foothill, the already accrued units might actually work against the student. Transfer Workgroup Administrative Chair Kurt Hueg commented that the targeted population for a BSS gerontology certificate would be those who already worked in the healthcare field. Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) Administrative Chair Paul Starer stated that there was a definite need for this type of program. Mummert stated that the Workforce Workgroup discussed this program at length and agreed that there was a need for this type of skill set; however, community education or contract education might be a more suitable alternative for the course offerings. Dean of the FHDA Education Center Dawn Girardelli said that Middlefield already offered a non-credit Home Aid/Geriatrics Program. In the event that there was an opportunity and/or need for a credit program, Girardelli stated, the college could use the preexisting program to move forward with a credit program.

#### **6. Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Basic Skills Workgroup**

Basic Skills Workgroup Faculty Chair Sarah Munoz, Basic Skills Workgroup Classified Chair Craig Gawlick, and Tam presented the group's two objectives: 1) expand Basic Skills Math Bridge Programs to serve 140 students, with a focus on increasing the math placement level for targeted students (Latino, African American, Filipino/PI) and expanding the existing/potential collaborative efforts between Math, ESLL/English, and Counseling; and 2) support pathways to move students successfully through Basic Skills course sequences.

Munoz provided an overview of the Math Bridge Program. With regard to Objective 2, Munoz stated that funding proposals would help achieve the goal. Smith requested a definition for the term target group. LaManque explained that a target group was a district term, defined as an ethnic group identified by the District as being in need of an intervention. Lee asked for a definition of a course sequence. Munoz replied that a course sequence was a pathway designed for students to visualize the courses required for a particular plan or program. Holcroft inquired about the role Basic Skills would have in supporting pathways. Messina stated that the workgroup would provide funding and guidance.

#### **7. Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Operations & Planning Committee (OPC)**

OPC Administrative Chair Bernata Slater introduced Debbie Lee and Anthony Cevantes as the new OPC tri-chairs. Slater reviewed OPC's objectives: 1) revise the OPC rubric; 2) review and make recommendations on the highest ranked resource requests; 3) recommend a policy to PaRC on the 2014-15 B Budget carryover; and 4) review the status of OPC as a workgroup (workgroup vs. committee).

Smith commented that last year, managers did not know how to make requests for specific types of funding. Slater stated that managers should not focus on the funding type, as this was the administrations responsibility. Regarding the process, Messina commented that departments should submit their requests; the Deans and Vice President's would rank the requests; and then Slater would provide the source of funding for the top rated requests.

Referencing Objective 4, Lee commented that the Program Review Committee (PRC) was not a workgroup, but had the same advisory status to PaRC as OPC. In addition, OPC had voting members on PaRC, while PRC did not. Slater commented that OPC was a steward of

resources. Lee added that OPC was tied to program review. Lee stated that more discussion would be required to determine if OPC should remain a PaRC workgroup.

### **8. Core Mission Workgroup Objectives 2014-15: Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)**

Starer presented the SEW objective: to enhance the ethos of equity on campus and educate the campus about equity and its relevance to student success. Starer reported that the Student Equity Report was now operational. SEW had funding and was currently accepting requests. SEW was in the process of creating a funding request rubric. The funds must be spent by the fall of 2015. Starer encouraged the campus to submit funding requests for student equity efforts. Holcroft stated that the Associated Student of Foothill College (ASFC) was also invited to participate.

Starer then commented that SEW and the Professional Development Committee (PDC) had planned to give a quarterly student equity presentation to staff. Starer stated that the workgroup could assist divisions with any equity questions for the program review process. The workgroup also offered their assistance to support and facilitate equity conversations.

### **9. District Office Update**

This item was presented as Agenda Item 2. Slater noted that the District Office project was not necessarily a Foothill project, but that the District Office would be built in the location that is currently Foothill's Lot 7. Director of the Bond Program Art Heinrich gave a presentation on the District Office, which was given to the Board of Trustees in August. Heinrich stated that the building concept was to create a space that was simple and inexpensive.

ASFC Representative Ava Gerami asked if the plans were proposed or confirmed. Heinrich stated that the Board of Trustees approved the plans, but that the plans were in flux. Lee requested more information about the anticipated parking shortage due to construction. Slater stated that a shuttle and valet parking were options that worked in the past. Starer asked if Foothill's budget would pay for the District Office building. Slater stated that the funds for this project would be pulled from the District budget. Starer stated that the walkways to Lot 7 were dangerous due to speeding cars. Starer then noted that the area's design should be more pedestrian friendly. Slater responded that additional walkways could be included. Slater invited additional feedback.

### **10. Foothill-De Anza Ed Center Update**

Girardelli gave an update on the FHDA Ed Center, noting that full implementation would happen in Fall 2016.

### **11. Questions/Concerns/Announcements**

Miner announced that Foothill was given \$5,000 at the fundraising luncheon.