

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Task Force
Thursday, August 06, 2015
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

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

ITEM	TOPICS
1.	Review of Agenda & 07.23 Minutes
2.	Review Proposal – Change to PRC Charge
3.	Review Proposal – OPC Change to Committee
4.	Review Proposal – Faculty Prioritization to Fall
5.	Review Proposal – Out-Of-Cycle Requests
6.	Administrative Unit – Program Review
7.	Comprehensive Program Review Templates

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposal – Change to PRC Charge
2. Proposal – OPC Change to Committee
3. Proposal – Faculty Prioritization to Fall
4. Proposal – Out-of-Cycle Requests
5. Instructional Comprehensive Program Review - Template

PRESENT:

Andrew LaManque, Cara Miyasaki, Christine Mangiameli, Simon Pennington, Craig Gawlick, Justin Schultz, Paul Starer, Teresa Ong, Carolyn Holcroft, Elaine Kuo

ABSENT:

Karen Smith, Kurt Hueg, Victor Tam

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA & 07.16 MINUTES

Andrew LaManque requested feedback regarding the meeting agenda and the minutes from the July 23rd meeting. All documents can be viewed at www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php.

2. PROPOSAL REVIEW – CHANGE TO PRC CHARGE

Andrew asked all members to review the proposed addition to the PRC charge.

This summary may include observations of common patterns or themes, suggestions for reducing duplication of resources, and/or broader recommendations to the College that would increase institutional effectiveness.

The group also noted that the notation of *all four Core Missions* in the membership section of the charge may or may not change, depending on PaRC’s decision regarding OPC and its Core Mission Workgroup status. Consensus achieved regarding revisions to the PRC charge.

Summary: It was agreed that the proposal to revise the PRC charge would be brought to PaRC in fall.

3. PROPOSAL REVIEW – OPC CHANGE TO COMMITTEE

Andrew noted that the proposal and rationale, as written, is open to suggestions/revisions. Several members suggested specifying that OPC's proposed status, as a committee, would be similarly aligned to that of PRC. Elaine Kuo suggested greater detail be added to the proposal since it will be going to PaRC for discussion. It was agreed that the section (*similar to the Program Review Committee*) be changed to (*consistent with the function of the Program Review Committee*). A small typo was also noted in the final sentence: *Tri-Charis* will be revised to *Tri-Chairs*. With noted changes, consensus achieved regarding the proposal.

Summary: Andrew agreed to revise the current proposal to reflect the changes discussed. It was agreed that a proposal to change OPC from a workgroup to a committee would be brought to PaRC in fall.

4. PROPOSAL REVIEW – FACULTY PRIORITIZATION TO FALL

Teresa Ong requested clarification if this proposal is for Fall 2015 or 2016. Following clarification that Fall 2016 is the target timing, members of the group agreed that adding *Beginning Fall 2016*, to the first sentence of the proposal would be needed.

Elaine asked if the voting members would have access to a document summarizing the rationale for each requested position (citing program review data) to review prior to voting, as the current voting process requires each person to take it upon himself or herself to review each program review document. It was agreed that the first item to tackle is timing – the second item to address could be a document/proposal for a template for review.

It was summarized that this proposal is aimed at capturing late retirements announced after program review is complete but before the start of the next cycle. The Vice Presidents would need to meet and prioritize over the summer and come to PaRC in the fall. Ideally, a summary of program review requests plus the added summer requests for each division would be ready in the fall. All the data collection and list preparation would happen in the Spring (program review timeline is not affected), but the PaRC ranking would occur in Fall, not in April (as it currently exists).

Several members noted that any templates/rubrics used for requests and prioritization by departments should be made public in a repository of some type. It was suggested that the discussion of formatting for such template/rubrics be postponed until a proposal can be written up. Consensus was reached.

Summary: Andrew agreed to revise the current proposal to reflect the changes discussed. It was agreed that a proposal to shift faculty prioritization to fall (beginning in 2016) would be brought to PaRC in fall.

5. PROPOSAL REVIEW – OUT-OF-CYCLE FACULTY REQUESTS

Many members of the group requested further discussion/clarification on the difference(s) between an out-of-cycle hire request and a true emergency hire request. Several members noted that the key criteria for an emergency hire request (as opposed to an out-of-cycle that would wait until the fall prioritization) would be (a) accreditation or regulatory requirements [pending any approved extensions] and (e) availability of qualified adjuncts (and recency of adjunct interviews).

In order to set emergency requests apart from out-of-cycle requests, Carolyn Holcroft proposed the following revision: *Emergency requests occur in rare circumstances in which an unexpected vacancy leads to failure to meet accreditation requirements or an inability to fill the position (even temporarily) due to lack of qualified adjunct faculty.* It was suggested that the 2nd sentence under Emergency Requests vs. Out-of-Cycle Requests be removed: ~~Such negative impact might be in terms of availability of classes, quality of instruction,~~

~~accreditation, or health and safety concerns.~~ If the request does not qualify as an emergency request, it would automatically be considered out-of-cycle and wait until the regular prioritization process in fall. Creation of two separate documents was also proposed ... (a) out-of-cycle request (b) emergency request.

The timeline of the out-of-cycle requests was discussed. It was agreed that out-of-cycle requests would be generated between January and August of each year (outside of the program review cycle), in preparation for the 2nd PaRC meeting in fall of that year.

As PaRC is responsible for making the final recommendation to the College President, establishing a rubric for PaRC to consider was also suggested. One suggestion was creation of a spreadsheet with the key criteria as column headers and all the faculty requests as individual rows – this could then be handed out to the members of PaRC for review. Members also suggested taking the list of criteria and sitting down with the program review templates to see how they fit with the data being requested for out-of-cycle and emergency requests. As this was not part of the charge for IP&B this summer, these suggestions will need to be taken up by PaRC in the fall.

Further discussion of the Out-of-Cycle Criteria Proposal yielded the following revisions:

- (a) Revise (1A) to reflect *Accreditation, Regulatory, and/or Safety Requirements*
- (b) Remove (1J) *Consideration of the 50% Law* – this is not covered in program review
- (c) Remove (1H) *Number of Students Served?* – this is already addressed in (1F)

Consensus was achieved regarding Steps 1-6 of the out-of-cycle process.

Summary: Andrew agreed to revise the out-of-cycle criteria/process proposal to reflect the revisions discussed. Consensus was not reached as to whether or not the document is ready to bring to PaRC in the fall.

6. ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT – PROGRAM REVIEW

Per the governance handbook, an administrative unit “is defined as any support service area that does not qualify as an instructional unit or a student services unit”. The criteria used to determine an appropriate student services administrative unit (for program review) was unclear. Andrew clarified that the administrative unit program review is meant to capture issues or resources/personnel that are missed or not included in the department-level reviews. This is key if the administrative units have their own resources that must be addressed, but comes into question if the department-level program reviews account for all the resource requests. It was also noted that, from a resource allocation perspective, if a budgeter is not included elsewhere (in a student services or instructional program review), then they must do an administrative program review.

Teresa Ong provided an example with the DRC and the Veterans Center – both do student services program reviews. All the departments collectively fill out these reviews and account for all their resource requests – she does not complete a DRC/Vet Center administrative program review.

Summary: No consensus was reached regarding a proposed change to the current labeling and/or breakdown of administrative units for program review. Consensus was reached regarding the suggestion that an administrative unit program review is required if there are resources/budget that are not covered or considered elsewhere in an instructional and/or student services review. It was proposed that any discussion regarding the AUO form/process be saved for the template discussion.

7. COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATES

Group members reviewed the observations/suggestions from PRC. Three key issues included:

- (a) Confusion between attaching the SLO documents and the actual analysis of the data
- (b) Understanding the importance of analysis/reflection (lack of clarity of what to reflect on)
- (c) Resource requests not linking to department goals

The group was asked to keep these issues in mind when reviewing/reflecting on the comprehensive program review templates.

The instructional comprehensive program review template was chosen as the first document to consider. The group browsed through each section and initial thoughts/comments were expressed.

One member of the group asked if the program review should continue to ask the mission of the program. Other members noted that it should be included, as this gives members of PRC the chance to review if the program mission aligns with the College Mission (as the revised EMP is coming). The program mission gives PRC better insight into the target group the program is trying to serve.

It was noted that the comprehensive program review asks the reviewer to *address all the Core Missions that apply*, while the annual program review asks the reviewer to *address all the Core Missions*. Consistency across all the templates should be considered.

Several sections ask for reflections across multiple text boxes (i.e. A through G). It was suggested that these areas be shortened to only a few spots for a more holistic reflection/analysis.

Members of the group asked if the data requested on the program review templates is driven by accreditation. It was clarified that the accreditation standards do not specify questions – it asks that program review be conducted and linked to resource allocation as well as inclusion of student learning outcomes.

It was noted that the current prompts ask for reporting of data, but do not do a good job of soliciting substantive discussion regarding the students served and/or how to serve them better. With faculty, some disciplines are not used to the data-driven approach and the current document does not specifically call for data-driven discussion or consideration, aside from reporting requested metrics.

The expectation for departmental discussion should be set up and the document(s) should call out specifically for this to occur (program review + SLOs). Having a section asking for attachment of minutes from a department meeting could be one solution.

Several members of the group agreed that many elements on the form are needed, but the detail can be curtailed, as filling out the form is different than the discussion that should occur. It was also noted that PRC would like to invite departments to present on their program review and receive feedback.

Summary: Simon Pennington suggested each member of IP&B review the instructional comprehensive program review template individually prior to the next meeting, August 20, 2015. Members are asked to bring their feedback and suggestions for revisions to the meeting.