



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Integrated Planning & Budget Task Force**

PRC Suggestions for IP&B Work Summer 2015 (06.12.15)

The following suggestions are based on discussions at PRC during review of program reviews this year.

- Review PRC Charge to consider whether PRC should be able to report themes / observations occurring across PRs, the ability to make college-wide recommendations to improve college effectiveness, and to point out duplication of resources / services between programs.
- Review Comprehensive PR prompts with the goal of making the sought after answers easier to arrive at.
  - There was confusion regarding the Core Mission section and perhaps a need to have a separate question for Student Equity.
  - Consider asking departments to include goals related to improving equity.
  - Revamp / streamline the section on CL-SLO and PL-SLO assessment; make it similar to annual template.
- Review the AUO process in terms of what areas should be included or covered.
- Consider whether to shorten the annual program review – perhaps asking only 2-3 questions.
- Review the linkages and continuity between annual and comprehensive program reviews.
- Review the length / extend the Comprehensive Program Review Cycle.

## Governance Survey Summary (Selected Items) - Elaine Kuo

### Program Review Feedback:

- SLO reflections are hardly used in the document
- Program data should be auto-populated
- Template and data sheet should use consistent terminology

### Top suggestions:

- Helpful to have a grid to explain all planning functions/elements (e.g. program review, standards/goals, ed master plan, etc.)
- Provide stipends/reassign time for committee work
- Core mission workgroups need more representation and diversity in membership
- Governance/planning meetings should be calendared so they are not scheduled at the same time
- Professional development about how to participate and why it is important to do so

## Planning and Resource Council (PaRC) - Selected Minutes

- Escoto reiterated that for the administrative program review process, Academic Senate would like constituencies involved moving forward. Vice President of Workforce & Institutional Advancement John Mummert commented that the program review timeline and the administrative program review timeline conflicted. LaManque noted that the Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Committee could review the administrative program review process over the summer. Smith noted that the program review process should be an all-inclusive effort across campus. *(May 6, 2015)*
- Judy Miner suggested the possibility of a nomenclature change (e.g. out of cycle request) and stated she appreciated the suggestion of moving the issue to the IP&B meeting over the summer. *(June 3, 2015)*
- Bernata Slater, Vice President of Financial & Administrative Services, presented the Resource Allocations Recommendations. Slater reminded the group of the process for resource allocation – if there are no concerns from PaRC, the recommendations then go to the President and OPC for additional input – a YES/NO is then given to each of the funding requests. Slater also noted that if clarification were needed regarding any request, OPC would reach out. Debbie Lee noted that the PSME Center expansion (under FACILITIES) states no program review posted under OPC notes. Kimberlee Messina stated that is OPC doesn't see a program review document; they will follow up with the Office of Instruction to double check if there an error occurred. Slater and Miner assured group that OPC will continue to review over the summer and will request for clarification as needed. *(June 3, 2015)*