

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Task Force
Thursday, July 23, 2015
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

LOCATION: Room 1901 – President’s Conference Room
TIME: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

ITEM	TOPICS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1.	Review of Agenda & 07.16 Minutes	
2.	Out of Cycle Process (Categorical/Grant/Foundation)	
3.	Faculty Prioritization - Timing	
4.	Out-of-Cycle vs. Emergency	
5.	Program Review Committee (PRC) - Charge	ACTION
6.	Administrative Unit (AUO) – Program Review	ACTION
7.	Program Review Templates	ACTION
8.	Operations Planning Committee (OPC) – Status Change	ACTION

ATTACHMENTS:

None

PRESENT:

Andrew LaManque, Kimberlee Messina, Justin Schultz, Victor Tam, Elaine Kuo, Karen Smith, Cara Miyasaki, Craig Gawlick, Carolyn Holcroft, Kurt Hueg, Paul Starer, Christine Mangiameli

ABSENT:

Simon Pennington, Teresa Ong

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA & 07.16 MINUTES

Andrew LaManque requested feedback regarding the meeting agenda and the minutes from the July 16th meeting. No additions or revisions were verbally noted. Elaine Kuo submitted two revisions via email; those changes are reflected in the minutes posted on the IP&B website.

< www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php >

2. OUT OF CYCLE PROCESS (CATEGORICAL/GRANT/FOUNDATION)

Andrew LaManque began the discussion by asking the group to continue the discussion of the processes for out-of-cycle requests, specifically for categorical and grant/foundation funded positions. Members of the group were unsure if these positions were part of the regular process – it was clarified that these positions do not go through the regular process. Several group members expressed the concern of what occurs once funding for a position goes away (will the position cease to exist or will funding come from B Budget?).

Kimberlee Messina clarified that grant-funded positions are different than categorical-funded positions. With categorical funding (e.g. DSPS, 3SP), those funds are restricted to certain positions within that specific department/division – the funding cannot be moved around to other areas of the College for

allocation. Grant funding; however, does not carry that same restriction. It was added that categorical funding is typically used to hire classified staff, not faculty.

Kimberlee noted that any time a department is looking at hiring a full-time faculty member, PaRC needs to be informed (in order to discuss questions of funding source, prioritization, etc.). She added that categorical-funded positions go away once funding goes away, unless alternative sources of funding are found.

It was discussed that in-cycle and out-of-cycle requests do not technically exist for (1) grant, (2) foundation, and (3) categorical positions. Ideally, these requests would be included in the regular program review process, but that is not always the case.

Karen Smith requested that it be clarified that this process is for faculty hiring only, not classified staff. Kimberlee added that a different process exists for classified staff hiring – the positions still get ranked by PaRC, but that can happen throughout the year, in comparison to the 1x per year that the District allocates FTE for faculty. Kurt Hueg added that if a classified staff member leaves, it generally does not go into a pool – it is typically replaced (unless it is a new position requiring submission of program review for PaRC's consideration).

Summary: It was agreed that grant and categorically funded positions would continue to be handled separately from the prioritization process. Requests do come to PaRC so that they can be assessed from a campus planning perspective. No consensus was reached on a formal proposal for changes and/or clarification on the process.

3. FACULTY PRIORITIZATION – TIMING

Andrew brought up the suggestion of presenting the faculty prioritization to PaRC early in the Fall, right after most of the retirements are announced. The concern of a negative impact was expressed, as was the timing, as new members serving on PaRC would be asked to prioritize new faculty hires without having previously been involved in such a process. Kimberlee added that if the faculty prioritization were done in the Fall, the requests done in program review along with the requests that come up after program review is completed could be included. There would still be one request sent to PaRC, just with two sets of documentation (in-cycle program review requests + out-of-cycle request justifications [from summer]).

Kimberlee clarified that this would not eliminate the out-of-cycle hiring requests, but lessen the quantity, as many of the requests would need to wait until Fall for consideration.

Summary: It was agreed that a proposal to move the faculty prioritization process to the fall would be brought to PaRC in the fall.

4. OUT-OF-CYCLE VS. EMERGENCY

Members of the group emphasized the importance of defining an out-of-cycle request in comparison to an emergency request (which cannot wait). Emergency requests would occur in the rare circumstance that a true negative effect would occur if not addressed immediately. Emergency requests must fit all of the out-of-cycle request criteria and must do harm if the position were not filled as soon as possible. If the request cannot be justified as an emergency hire, it would wait until Fall for the regular PaRC prioritization process.

Cara Miyasaki asked if it is really clear to all departments that they do not automatically retain vacant / open department faculty positions. Kimberlee suggested that this be placed more prominently on the program review templates.

Summary: The criteria and data for an out-of-cycle hire agreed to at the last meeting will be put on one page as a proposal to PaRC this fall. Andrew agreed to look into the feasibility of adding a note to the template(s) about reallocation of faculty positions.

5. PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) – CHARGE

Andrew noted that the current PRC charge only talks about reviewing and analyzing the program reviews. He added that since PRC is one of the few committees that see all the program review documents, the members felt that being able to make analyses across all the program reviews and make reports to PaRC would be helpful.

These reports would include:

- (A) themes/observations
- (B) college-wide recommendations
- (C) point out duplication of resources [for institutional discussion]

For (B) college-wide recommendations, it was agreed that PRC could express to PaRC if many departments are having difficulties with certain areas of the program review.

Summary: Andrew agreed to work on a proposal for changing the PRC charge (to present at PaRC).

6. ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT (AUO) – PROGRAM REVIEW

The AUO program review process has come up in discussions in PaRC and Academic Senate. The most critical concerns include:

- (A) What defines the unit? What does it mean for the Dean/VP?
- (B) What elements should be included in the administrative unit program review?
- (C) Who is reviewing this? Who should be involved in the discussion?
- (D) When there are resource requests, what is the process for governance/dialogue?
- (E) What is the feedback loop – does a sharing mechanism exist?

Discussion – Item A

There is little confusion about the administrative units on the instructional side. There is less clarity regarding Student Services – it was suggested that Student Services be consulted in the next meeting about administrative unit distinctions (i.e. clearly differentiate the administrative units vs. student services units). An administrative unit (per the governance handbook) is defined as any support service area that does not qualify as an instructional unit or a student services unit.

Discussion – Item B

Paul Starer stated that Deans should have the opportunity to say, “based on what I see in my division, I suggest the following [resource request]”, even if that specific resource request is not included in the department-level program review documents.

The data is at the departmental level – the Deans/VP should be adding anything that is missed in the data and discussion presented across all the department program reviews. The AUOs should take an overarching approach and provide a “state of the unit” summary.

Discussion – Item C

Two questions were proposed:

- (1) If a VP were to put a request in program review, which is then taken to the College President and President's Cabinet, is there a place in the process for others to be informed if that request would affect others in different departments?
- (2) What processes exist (if any) to ensure appropriate dialogue/discussion has taken place prior to submission of program review and resource requests?

Discussion – Item D

It was noted that a VP resource request would go directly to the President. If approved, it would eventually be looked at by a group/committee, but the issue is that no existing documentation specifies that the request must be shared prior to request for approval. Kimberlee added that OPC has a very narrow charge and they aren't looking to verify if appropriate discussion has occurred.

Kurt added that the program review process was intended to hold departments/divisions accountable so resources were not allocated without documentation, but it is not intended to replace the shared governance process.

Some members of the group suggested introducing additional questions or narrative boxes into the program review template, including:

- (A) Have you discussed resource allocation requests with appropriate constituency groups?
- (B) An area for the reviewer to check off Y/N that "the reviewer has verified and documented that dialogue has taken place"

Others stated that adding more information to the program review templates may increase the transparency regarding shared governance but expressed concern that this does not solve one of the main issues of program review ... the length of the templates.

Another option proposed was that the College President present to PaRC a list of recommendations that arose from the AUO process that she/he is considering. If the list were to be made public, it forces those who made the requests to discuss them with their constituency groups.

Discussion – Item E

Several members of the group noted that the most important piece of the discussion is emphasizing that people should have an opportunity to participate in either writing or reviewing the program review documents. If a VP writes the program review, it should be shown and feedback should be requested.

It was proposed that IP&B suggest to PaRC that all the divisions have meetings in which the resource requests are shared/discussed. Carolyn Holcroft offered the suggestion that the list of program reviews (annual v. comprehensive) be published on Opening Day to encourage all to become better informed. Posting the information on the Foothill College website was also noted as a key step.

Summary: Student Services will be consulted in the next meeting about administrative unit distinctions (i.e. clearly differentiate the administrative units vs. student services units). Multiple suggestions for change to the AUO review process (+ template) were made, but a consensus was not reached.

7. PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATES

Elaine Kuo suggested waiting until Student Services representatives are able to attend (absent due to timing conflict with division meeting) before planning any template changes, to avoid duplication of discussion.

Summary: Andrew and Kimberlee proposed looking at the comprehensive template first and then the annual templates, starting next meeting.

8. OPERATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE (OPC) – STATUS CHANGE

In the 07.16 meeting, Elaine Kuo proposed changing the status of OPC from a Core Mission Workgroup to that of an organizational committee (similar to PRC). She noted that the function of both groups seems to be very similar (OPC for resource allocation, PRC for program viability).

It was noted that Basic Skills, Workforce, Transfer, and Student Equity are action groups, not evaluative groups. OPC's charge is to prioritize and make recommendations on anything coming to them requesting college-level funding. The other Core Mission Workgroups only make requests focused on their specific areas. Several members of the group added that OPC should not remain a Core Mission Workgroup as it is a conflict of interest to prioritize the resources and then vote on them.

If moved to the status of an organizational committee, the tri-chairs of OPC would attend PaRC but would not be voting members – this matches the current structure for the tri-chairs of PRC. This proposal would not change what OPC does (their charge and processes would remain the same) – they just would not submit objectives and evaluations like the other Core Mission Workgroups.

Summary: Cara Miyasaki motioned for approval of proposal to change OPC from a Mission Workgroup to a Committee and removing the OPC Tri-Chairs as voting members of PaRC. Kurt Hueg seconded the motion. Karen Smith opposed; remainder of members in favor of proposal. This proposal will be presented at PaRC for a 1st and 2nd read in the Fall.