Item 6: OPC Rubric
Item 7: Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal
Item 9: Marketing Update

PaRC Members Present:
April Henderson, Ava Gerami, Behrouz Amirbadvy, Bernata Slater, Bernie Day, Carolyn Holcroft, Charlie McKellar, Craig Gawlick, Debbie Lee, Evelynn Chun, Hilda Fernandez, Josh Rosales, Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Sara Munoz, Victor Tam

Ex-Officio Members Present:
Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, Casie Wheat, Elaine Kuo, Kimberlee Messina, Nanette Solvason

Guests:
Al Guzman, Meredith Heiser, Judy Baker

In regard to student ethnicity identification data collection, Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Faculty Chair Debbie Lee asked if students could choose more than one ethnicity. Kuo cited the example of a student that chose African American and Latino on their application; the student would be identified as belonging to both the African American and Latino targeted groups. Kuo stated that the Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) would have additional discussions on this topic. Student Equity Plan Addendum approved by consensus.

6. Operations & Planning Committee (OPC) Rubric Presentation Summary – 1st Read

OPC Administrative Chair Bernata Slater presented the OPC Rubric. Slater reported that the rubric presented remained unchanged from last year, with the exception of one line item. The new line item addressed programs' commitment to student equity. Slater noted that this was the first time that OPC would review programs for student equity initiatives. Classified Senate President Karen Smith asked if the new student equity criteria would impact the source of funding for requests. Slater responded that funding sources would not be changed; the purpose of the new criteria was to allow for the allocation of additional funds if a program demonstrated support for student equity initiatives. Slater welcomed additional feedback.

7. Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal

Holcroft and Associate Vice President of Instruction Andrew LaManque introduced the Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal. LaManque stated that the proposal sough to establish an ad hoc committee for the purposes of reviewing the college's assessment policy and planning processes. LaManque noted that the Common Assessment was due to the State next year. By establishing an ad hoc committee, the college could begin to discuss Common Assessment requirements and the current state of college's assessment processes. LaManque noted that areas of review could include: the multiple measures of assessment; existing policies, such as the retesting policy; and how students were placed after taking assessment tests.

LaManque commented that there had not been much conversation around the issues of assessment between the Office of Instruction and Student Services. Holcroft stated that assessment was emphasized as a major part of student success at a student success conference that she attended. Holcroft agreed that dialogue on this issue was long overdue. LaManque added that many Student Success Support Program (3SP) issues aligned with issues of assessment.

Lee said that faculty subscribed to several different philosophical arguments regarding teaching for assessment tests. Holcroft commented that professional development was needed on the subject. LaManque commented that the State would have a reassessment requirement, which the college could resolve by working with the Online Education Imitative (OEI). LaManque then stated that the retesting policy would require more discussion as some studies demonstrated the improvement of student test scores when students were allowed to retest within two weeks. Regarding the retest policy, Vice President of Instruction Kimberlee Messina stated that the Math Bridge Program had a very successful assessment preparatory component; students participating in this program were prepared for placement tests. Transfer Workgroup Administrative Chair Kurt Hueg commented that there was much research on the issue. Guzman commented that Middlefield students, many of whom were returning adult students, often did not realized the impact of the placement tests on their academic career. Guzman then stated that it would be good for students and the college to allow for retesting.

Holcroft said that there was a hesitance to create a new committee, in light of the many committees already established on campus; thus the idea was to create an ad hoc committee. Al Guzman asked who might serve on the committee. Holcroft noted that the proposal contained a section on the suggested committee members. Smith asked why the committee wanted Math, English and ESL faculty representatives.

Holcroft replied that these were areas with placement tests, per Title V mandated. The Chemistry Department also had a placement test. Bernie Day asked for confirmation of collaboration with the Testing Center. Holcroft verified that Testing Center Supervisor Thom Shepard also worked on the proposal. SEW Faculty Chair Hilda Fernandez asked when the meetings would be scheduled. Holcroft responded that the committee was open to any meeting dates. Holcroft stated that the Academic Senate approved the ad hoc committee proposal and noted that anyone was welcome to serve on the committee. Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee Proposal approved by consensus.

10. Technology Plan Update

Dean of Foothill Online Learning Judy Baker presented the Technology Plan update. Baker commented that the Tech Taskforce was preparing to update the 2010-2015 Technology Plan. The next 2015-2018 Technology Plan would be written for a three-year span (instead of five year duration) to ensure the inclusion of the most up to date technological developments. Baker stated that the Tech Taskforce wanted feedback from the campus to understand the needs of each department. The Tech Taskforce hoped to leverage technology to help with the daily tasks for faculty and staff, which would then benefit the campus. Baker commented that functionality was key to determining next steps. Baker stated that Foothill was collaborating with De Anza and Central Services for plan development. Baker noted that the current 2010-2015 plan was posted online for review. In addition, the Technology Plan webpage would detail any updates to keep the campus informed.

Lee asked if the Technology Plan would include computer refreshes. Baker responded that the plan would make the refresh process more efficient as staff and faculty should have functioning computers and software. Smith wondered if the plan update could assess the future needs of the college, if staff did not currently have any recommendations. Baker replied that staff should just think about what was frustrating about their job and share these issues with the Tech Taskforce; the taskforce could then offer possible solutions. Messina added that program needs should be included in program review documents. Kuo commented that because needs would be documented in the program review process, patterns for technology usage and needs would become apparent.

Baker also stated that the Tech Taskforce was reviewing processes, and not just technology tools, so to hold entities accountable. Messina commented that processes should be observed and revised accordingly. Baker then extended Tech Taskforce meeting invitations to the entire campus. Hanstein commented that the taskforce needed faculty participation.

11. Questions/ Comments

Henderson announced that the EOPS tree ornaments were all taken care of; however, EOPS was still asking for Target gift card donations ($20-25). If interested, donations should be dropped off to EOPS by December 11.

In regard to the Assessment & Placement Ad Hoc Committee, Lee asked if the committee had authority to make policy. Holcroft stated that as an ad hoc committee, it would only make policy recommendations to shared governance groups.

Basic Skills Workgroup Classified Chair Craig Gawlick announced that Instructional and Student Services Program Review documents were due December 12. Kuo noted that all required data was up to date and posted online.

Kuo issued a clarification announcement, stating that PaRC would write the ESMP during the previously announced meeting dates. Kuo then noted that PaRC members were required to participate. If PaRC members could not attend due to previous engagements, alternate members should be chosen to participate. Kuo reminded the group that