

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Task Force
Thursday, July 16, 2015
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

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

ITEM	TOPICS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1.	Task Force Membership	
2.	Agenda Item Review & Attachments	
3.	Role of Operation & Planning Committee (OPC)	
4.	Out-of-Cycle (Emergency) Hiring Requests A. Definition B. Criteria for Consideration C. Process	ACTION
5.	Summary & Moving Forward	ACTION

ATTACHMENTS:

Item 1: Meeting Agenda

Item 2: Agenda Attachments (PRC Suggestions, Governance Survey Summary, PaRC Minutes)

ATTENDANCE:

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

ABSENT:

Craig Gawlick, Simon Pennington, Teresa Ong

1. TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Kimberlee Messina informed the group that the process that currently exists is for the Vice President of Instruction to bring the suggestions from IP&B to PaRC and then to the (interim) President. She noted that once an acting Vice President of Instruction is selected, she would step away from the task force in order to maintain the appropriate shared governance structure.

2. AGENDA ITEM REVIEW & ATTACHMENTS

Kimberlee Messina asked the group if they needed any clarification on agenda items or have suggestions for movement of discussion topics. Carolyn Holcroft noted working on program review templates. Kimberlee stated that the revisions/considerations must be made, but to wait until later (work on other agenda items first) and perhaps work on it in a sub-group since it takes up so much time.

Andrew LaManque noted that information from three items were included with the agenda, for consideration with the current discussions:

- (1) PRC Suggestions for IP&B
- (2) Shared Governance Survey (selected summary from Elaine Kuo's powerpoint)
- (3) Excerpts from PaRC Meeting Minutes

3. ROLE OF OPERATION & PLANNING COMMITTEE (OPC)

Andrew LaManque asked Elaine Kuo if there was anything else important to consider from the shared governance survey. Elaine noted that there appears to be a desire for clarification / revisiting faculty and staff prioritization being done in PaRC, specifically since the bulk of prioritization is being done in the Operation and Planning Committee (OPC) – there is confusion as to which realm certain prioritization duties exist.

Kimberlee Messina noted that a discussion of faculty prioritization ownership (OPC vs. PaRC) should be left to the end of the conversation because that is a big issue. She stated that OPC is supposed to be involved with budget allocation and not involved in faculty prioritization.

Elaine Kuo proposed that OPC be placed down to the level of a committee (e.g. PRC), not as a Core Mission workgroup. Kurt stated that he had advocated for OPC to be at a higher level in the governance structure, as OPC is currently not comprehensive enough to provide faculty/staff and administrative input. Elaine and Kurt both noted that these issues should be brought up to PaRC. They noted that in the past, Educational Resources (a subgroup of Roundtable) met and prioritized all positions before going to Roundtable and ultimately to President's Cabinet (to be revised/adjusted).

Kimberlee stated that this discussion came up when there was confusion with re-assign time. OPC said it didn't want to prioritize positions. Kimberlee suggested putting this in the parking lot and bringing it up to PaRC for governance discussions/decisions. The issues placed in the parking lot included:

- (1) OPC continuing as a workgroup, mirroring PRC [OPC for budget, PRC for program viability].
- (2) Narrowing of the faculty/staff prioritization process.
- (3) Communication process – Determine an approach to let people know of timelines.

Elaine Kuo noted that the 3rd issue is critical as it relates to another topic from the survey – that of communication and dissemination of information to faculty and staff.

4. EMERGENCY (OUT-OF-CYCLE) HIRES

Kurt Hueg began the discussion by asking the group if there is an established definition for what makes an emergency hire. Kimberlee Messina responded that the College does not have a formal definition – the group needs to determine how to change/revise the labeling/procedure of an emergency hire (e.g. out-of-cycle hire). Carolyn noted that the College has a great process for prioritizing positions during the regular Program Review cycle, but the issues come up with last-minute retirements, etc. that occur outside of the regular cycle (as it doesn't help the College to wait to address these concerns). Carolyn added that has lead and does lead to confusion, as many faculty have discussed the idea of placing the positions back into the pool.

DEFINITION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REQUEST

Kimberlee Messina reiterated that the language is very generic. It must be determined what constitutes an out-of-cycle hire. Karen Smith asked for clarification that this would be for a vacancy occurring outside of Program Review. Andrew LaManque added that this is different than someone simply

forgetting to put the request in the Program Review. The group agreed that an out-of-cycle hiring request would be in response to a vacancy occurring after (outside) the Program Review cycle. This vacancy could be due to an unexpected retirement, resignation, death, or long-term disability.

Kimberlee Messina added that from the administrative side, when the vacancies occur, the Deans are asked to look at and provide evidence of the urgency to fill the position instead of waiting to include it as part of the regular Program Review cycle. The Vice President will then review the request and take it to PaRC for approval. Kimberlee gave the example of a full-time instructor teaching health who retired – the position did not go into an emergency pool as there were adjunct instructors available to teach. Kimberlee also noted that another faculty member said he was retiring but did not submit the letter until the last day (resulting in the vacancy being out-of-cycle instead of part of Program Review).

In response to the concern for last-minute retirements and increased out-of-cycle requests, Carolyn Holcoft stated that departments would still need to provide data to support the need for an out-of-cycle request due to an unexpected vacancy.

The standard process for expected retirements was noted: Retirement vacancies go into the general faculty hiring pool for FTE consideration by PaRC. Members of the group noted that with so many retirements, there is a perception that the increased vacancies are labeled as out-of-cycle requests as opposed to falling into the standard procedure. Cara Miyasaki added that the process regarding retirements should be clarified in the Program Review process – **specifically that a vacancy does not guarantee a replacement – the FTE goes back into the pool (unless out-of-cycle)**. Kimberlee Messina stated that it might be beneficial to clarify in the template that all FTE are placed in a college-wide pool for PaRC consideration. Karen Smith supported Carolyn's previous data-centered statement that instructors are teaching because there is data to support their positions – departments should take the opportunity to determine if adjunct back-fill is possible until the next Program Review cycle for FTE consideration.

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION

Members of the group agreed that General Fund positions should have consistent criteria established and agreed upon for in-cycle and out-of-cycle request prioritization. The criteria noted (as of 07.16) include:

1. Accreditation or Regulatory / Safety Requirements
2. FT / PT Faculty Ratio
3. Sole Full-Time Faculty Member
4. Enrollment Trends
5. Availability of Qualified Adjuncts (+ Recency of Adjunct Interviews)
6. Student Impact & Effect on Ability to Graduate (equity data required...)
7. Programmatic Considerations (for AD-Ts, etc.)
8. Number of Students Served?
9. Reflection on Institutional Priorities (FTES, Online, Equity, EMP)
10. Consideration of the 50% Law

Andrew LaManque asked if when individuals vote for prioritization, they all are aware of the criteria. He added that everyone must be following the same rubric. Kimberlee Messina noted that not all aspects of the criteria list would apply to each and every program, but at least a comprehensive list would be established.

Carolyn Holcroft asked for explanation of the FT / PT Faculty Ratio. Kimberlee Messina stated that 75%/25% is a goal, but in certain areas, the bulk of the students are being taught largely by adjunct, as the FT faculty are teaching the higher level coursework (as is the case for Basic Skills – Math).

Paul Starer noted that some of the criteria will need to be well-defined as to how they relate to a distinct out-of-cycle request versus normal request, as it may be difficult for some to understand the criteria/process outside of clear issues like accreditation requirements.

OUT-OF-CYCLE REQUEST – PROCESS

Members of the group chose to move on from criteria for consideration and discuss the process associated with out-of-cycle requests and any needed revisions. The process noted during the discussion is as follows:

- (1) Department must make a specific (and timely) request for an out-of-cycle hire and presents data to the Dean. [otherwise goes into the pool as part of the normal hiring cycle]
- (2) Dean forwards the request along with their recommendation (Y/N) to the area Vice President.
- (3) Vice President forwards completed request with all recommendations to PaRC.
- (4) Department faculty (requestors) are invited to attend and advocate for their request at PaRC.
- (5) PaRC makes final recommendations to the College President. [follows in-cycle process]
- (6) College President can accept/reject recommendation (if rejected, must provide rationale for rejection of the recommendation).

For (2), Karen Smith added that if the Dean is against the request, it cannot be personal – the rejection must be supported by data. For (1), Paul Starer noted that there is an old template that could be used for data + narrative support for an out-of-cycle request (i.e. an extra 1-page form to be used). For (4), Carolyn Holcroft stated that if faculty ask for one thing and the Dean/VP disagrees, it cannot just be on paper – there must be a venue for discussion and consideration. She said that this transparency is not always seen in PaRC – they do not always hear the faculty voice. Kimberlee Messina then suggested inviting departments (requestors) to attend PaRC on specific days to advocate for their request. Cara Miyasaki asked for clarification regarding departments with only part-time faculty – Kimberlee noted that the Dean would be the requestor and bring it to PaRC. For (2), Victor Tam requested that all Deans be informed (alongside the area Vice President) of an out-of-cycle request (to assist with transparency).

Kimberlee Messina reminded the group that PaRC reviews out-of-cycle requests as a 1st Read and 2nd Read. As such, the key issue with the process (and criteria) is “do the data suggest that the department keep its FTE or does it go back into general pool? – is there justification to violate the norm and keep the FTE?” The entire process/criteria should attempt to address these key questions.

Kimberlee added that an out-of-cycle request due to retirement/resignation after the Program Review cycle will be reviewed by PaRC in the Spring. If the out-of-cycle request is due to death/long-term disability, it will be reviewed by PaRC immediately.

It was suggested that perhaps PaRC should consider moving the faculty prioritization to the fall rather than doing it in the spring. This would include most (but not all) of what have been the out-of-cycle requests.

Karen Smith and Kurt Hueg both noted that a desperate need for new faculty should be written into Program Review. Carolyn suggested that departments put realistic what/if requests into Program

Review to address an unexpected vacancy situation. The group noted that if everyone puts such requests on their Program Review, the issue of transparency is addressed, but these what/if discussions would not be part of the hiring prioritization (an out-of-cycle request would still eventually be required).

5. SUMMARY & MOVING FORWARD

Kimberlee Messina reminded the group that positions involving Categorical Funding and/or Grant/Foundation funding must also be discussed. In these request situations, the Vice President of Finance provides evaluations and recommendations (along with data/reports).

A key issue for consideration is the process for moving forward when the categorical funding for a specific position ends.

In preparation for the next meeting, Kimberlee asked all members to considering the following:

- (1) Be ready to continue to current discussion (out-of-cycle requests).
- (2) Review the notes (specifically criteria, processes, and procedures).
- (3) Be ready to move forward with the discussion of the Program Review Committee (PRC) charge.