

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Task Force**  
**Wednesday, September 09, 2015**  
**MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

**LOCATION:** Room 1901 – President’s Conference Room  
**TIME:** 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

ITEM	TOPICS
1.	Review of September 02 Meeting Minutes
2.	Revised Annual Program Review Template - Discussion
3.	Revised Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Template – Discussion
4.	Revised Student Services Comprehensive Program Review Template – Discussion

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Revised Template – Annual Program Review
2. Revised Template – Instructional Comprehensive Program Review
3. Revised Template – Student Services Comprehensive Program Review
4. Debbie Lee – Program Review Template (Feedback & OPC Perspective)

**PRESENT:**

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

**ABSENT:**

Christine Mangiamelli, Victor Tam, Craig Gawlick, Kurt Hueg, Karen Smith

**1. REVIEW OF SEPTEMBER 02 MEETING MINUTES**

Feedback was requested regarding the minutes from the September 02 meeting – no changes were noted. All documents can be viewed at [www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php](http://www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php).

**2. REVISED ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE**

The discussion around the Annual Program Review Template focused on the possible integration with TracDat. As TracDat is not built to allow users to list out resource requests, it was suggested that a separate form be used for the resource requests, with the possibility of a link to that form embedded in TracDat. Several members of the group were hesitant to separate the two key aspects of program review (narrative responses + goals/resource requests) – one solution was to still ask the user to write out the resource requests in TracDat (in a narrative format), but provide additional/specific detail using a separate form.

For Section 2, it was suggested that wording be adjusted from Objectives to Program Objectives to better capture what is really being asked for. Such changes will also carry over to the comprehensive program review templates. Instead of *Measure of Progress*, Progress Measures will be used as a column header for the table in Section 2A. Members of the group agreed that providing an example for Section 2A would be a helpful reference. An example of a sample response would be the following:

<b>New Program Objective</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Progress Measure(s)</b>
<i>Example: Develop two new courses to meet student demand</i>	<i>By Winter 2016</i>	<i>Course Enrollment at Census</i>

It was agreed that the Unbudgeted Reassign Time (Section 2C) should be kept in both the annual and the comprehensive program review templates. This provides programs more opportunity to document what they want – even if it does not end up being granted, at least a section exists for the request(s).

For Section 2B: Resource Requests, it was suggested that the Program Objective column header specifically state *from Section 2A* – something should be in place to remind the user to relate each resource request back to a stated program objective.

**Summary:** Consensus was reached that if TracDat is a feasible option for completing the annual program reviews, it should be explored. If not, a user-friendly word/PDF template should be used. The annual program review will be revised and the draft will be emailed out to IP&B for review (in preparation for presentation to PaRC in the fall), as TracDat continues to be explored.

### **3. REVISED INSTRUCTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE**

All members of the group agreed that adding a preamble to the comprehensive program review templates would be a helpful revision – a modified version of the annual program review preamble was suggested, with the addition of verbiage emphasizing the importance of the comprehensive review as part of the program review cycle.

For Section 1: Program Data, the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research is looking into the possibility to pre-loading the comprehensive templates (for those completing comprehensive review) with the program-level data that is available online (possibility utilizing a TEA currently working with Elaine Kuo).

To avoid unnecessary calculations on the part of the user, the group asked to break apart targeted and non-targeted students for Section 1E: Enrollment Demographics into all the ethnicity groups. It was also noted that the college-level data should be put back into the document, possibly as a separate table or an add-on to the current table in Section 1E. An equity-related prompt was also suggested: *If your enrollment of targeted students [define] is lower or different than that of the College, how does your program proposed to address the issue?*

Narrative prompts explaining the institutional standards and the IEPI goals should be included for Sections 2A and 2B. Prompts that ask the program to list of out relevant goals should be placed after each data-focused section, specifically Sections 1F (course enrollment trends), 1G (productivity), 2B (course completion rates), 2D (course-level SLOs), and 2E (program-level SLOs). The goals section at the end of the document would then be used to summarize all the goals discussed earlier in the document.

Section 3 would be renamed Section 3: Summary of Program Objectives & Resource Requests. The challenges prompt will be separated from the rational prompt located under the table in Section 3A. Separate responses will be expected.

Consensus was reached to remove Section 3D: Support, as the EMP goals are still being discussed.

**Summary:** Debbie Lee, tri-chair of OPC, provided email feedback and suggested revisions for the annual and comprehensive templates – those comments will be taken into account when preparing

revised template drafts, particularly concerning the use of data to drive goal creation and resource requests [for exact comments, please refer to Attachment # 4]. Consensus was reached that the instructional comprehensive program review template will be revised and a draft will be emailed out to IP&B for review (in preparation for presentation to PaRC in the fall).

#### **4. REVISED STUDENT SERVICES COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE**

A preliminary revision of the student services comprehensive program review template was discussed. Most formatting changes will be made in an effort to mirror the changes made to the instructional comprehensive and annual program review templates.

Several members suggested moving Section 1.2: Service Area Data before Section 1.1 Instructional Program Data & Enrollment, as all student services units will be filling out Section 1.2, but only counseling will have Section 1.1. This change is to avoid confusion and make Section 1.1 easier to skip (if applicable).

One critical area for the student services template is the consideration of Service Area Student Learning Outcomes (SA-SLOs). A new prompt (that requests consideration of the TracDat data) should be developed for Section 2.

**Summary:** Consensus was reached that the student services comprehensive program review template will be revised and a draft will be emailed out to IP&B for review (in preparation for presentation to PaRC in the fall) – these changes will be used to guide revisions made to the administrative unit comprehensive program review template.