FOOTHILL COLLEGE   DRAFT
Roundtable Guidelines

Adopted April 17, 1996, revised June 4, 1997, February 4, 1998, October 7, 1998, September 22, 1999, March 9, 2000, November 1, 2000, May 2, 2001, April 6, 2005, June 7, 2006

PURPOSE: To advise and consult with the President on college-wide governance issues and institutional planning from a mission-based perspective.

OBJECTIVE: To ensure open communication, genuine involvement before and while decisions are made, and inclusive participation.

METHOD OF OPERATION: ~~Standard meeting agendas would allow a brief period for open hearings from any member of the college community on appropriate items.~~ Meeting agenda items would be annotated and posted for non-members to be informed and know when to come to participate if so desired.

MEMBERSHIP

1. Appointed members are representative of the respective missions. There will be three members per mission, with the third member being a student.

       Transfer (3)
       Career Education (3)
       Basic skills and ESL (3)
       Student Outreach and Recruitment (3)
       Student Development and Retention (3 from student equity, counseling, health, psychological, or tutorial services)

   Appointed membership is by the College President in consultation with the Presidents of the Academic and Classified senates and the ASFC. Appointees who are faculty will be submitted to the Academic Senate for ratification.

   Student members will be recruited college-wide by ASFC, or by any other means, each Spring Quarter as mission-based positions are available. All student candidates will be asked to fulfill the same application process as other mission-based members which should be reviewed by ASFC (which will compensate student participants) and recommended by ASFC for appointment to the Roundtable. Appointments will be made in the same manner as for other members.

   Footnote: Student members will attend any additional mission-based committees, such as the Vocational Education Committee, at their option.

   1a. Appointed members are expected to represent their respective mission to the Roundtable and to a larger constituency in the college. This larger constituency will be sought through Open Forums on each of the missions and from which a list of "burning issues" will be developed.
   1b. Student equity, equal opportunity, and equal access for all students are implicit in the activities and programs of all missions.

2. Ex officio members are members of the Roundtable by virtue of their respective positions:
       President of the ASFC Students
       Foothill Student Trustee
       President of the Classified Senate
       President of the Academic Senate
       Representative from the FA
       Representative from the MSA
       Representative from SEIU (Foothill steward)
       Representative from CSEA
       Co-chair from the College Curriculum Committee
       Director of Economic Development or Dean of Career Education
       Director of Multicultural Relations
       Vice President of Educational Resources and Instruction

3. All members are required to participate in an orientation and background readings before participating.
4. Membership term for the appointed members is three years, non-renewable. Mission based members' terms will be staggered between members.
5. Additional ad hoc resource members may be added as needed, for example, during an accreditation self study.

OPERATIONS

1. The Roundtable will operate through consensus rather than vote whenever possible and appropriate. Consensus is used because not all votes may be weighted equally if an issue affects one particular group or area than another.
2. To assure open and fluid communication, each Roundtable agenda will begin with Open Hearings which is an opportunity for anyone within the college to appear before the Roundtable to share an item of interest, an issue, or information.
3. Each action item on the agenda will be preceded by at least one hearing on the item at a previous meeting.
4. Anyone in the college community may submit an item for the agenda.
5. In this new mission-based governance structure, it is important that the Roundtable reinforce the distinction between policy and governance decisions and operational decisions. The President will decide whether the item will be information only, information and ultimate action, or other resolution. However, if there is any disagreement then the President will consult with the Roundtable, or Roundtable members may ask for a consultation to take place.
6. Action items approved by the Roundtable will be taken by the President to the responsible groups or party to implement the action. For example, some policy recommendations may go to Chancellor's Council, others may be referred to the appropriate administrator or college body for implementation.
7. These Roundtable Guidelines will be reviewed at least every three years or as warranted, by the Educational Resources Committee and/or the Roundtable itself.
8. The above operational guidelines are meant to be only guidelines and not immutable.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Educational Resources Committee is a subcommittee of the College Roundtable and is empowered to formulate recommendations to the Roundtable in the areas of personnel and funding allocations. Normally, Educational Resources Committee members are also Roundtable members ~~joined by a representative of the Institutional Planning Committee.~~ **The core members are the Academic Senate President, Classified Senate President, ASFC President, the Vice President of Instruction and Institutional Research and Dean of Faculty and Staff. For allocating new full-time faculty positions, the Academic Senate will augment Educational Resources with an additional faculty member on Roundtable.**

This working group is chaired by the Vice President of Educational Resources and Instruction and is charged with the development of initial resource allocations as per the Roundtable Guidelines.

Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Block Grants

("ONE TIME MONEY" such as Instructional Equipment)
Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable March 20, 1996, revised October 7, 1998

Background:

Each year the District allocates to the campus various Block Grants, such as the annual "Instructional Equipment" grant received from the state.

The following policy linking program review and resource allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

> Policy Linking Program Review and Resource Allocation: Requests for resource allocation or resource redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study. Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document. Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information.

> The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on the Educational Resource Committee.

Committee's Charge:

Establish guiding principles (or criteria) for determining how Foothill should spend any Block Grant from the District.

Ensure the principles are not so prescriptive that we become overly rule bound.

Principles that should be used(not in priority order):

Each year, specific goals should be established for use in allocating funds.

The items "modern instructional equipment and methodology" and basic instructional needs should be a high priority.

Projects that would attract and retain students over the long run should have priority over those which would not.

Both large and small projects should be considered, including requests related to division needs and requests for replacement of out-of-date equipment.

Projects undertaken should be done "right," so that they will have long term, continuing value to FH. If needed, money from various sources should be combined to successfully complete a project.

Projects should be chosen that benefit the maximum number of students in credit classes, programs, or services.

Money should only be spent on equipment and technology that we can properly install, maintain, staff, and provide proper training to use.

Projects should be defined and developed in consultation with the end users.

Principles (and criteria) that should NOT be used:

Some money should go to each of the funding areas identified in the Guidelines.

The money should be equitably distributed among the divisions and programs in the College.

Procedures for Determining Allocating Block Grants

("ONE TIME MONEY" such as Instructional Equipment Allocation)
Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable May 1, 1996,
revised October 7, 1998, September 22, 1999, May 2, 2001

These procedures provide a mechanism for implementing the "Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Block Grant Allocations." The procedures are designed for the allocation of large (typically > $10K) projects enabling the College to engage in long range planning well in advance of the actual receipt of funds. A portion of the Block Grants may be set aside each year for smaller (<$10K) projects.

Block Grant Allocations should be distributed according to the following procedures:

Faculty, staff, and students should present funding requests to Division Deans, Senators, or Roundtable members during early Spring Quarter. Funding requests should be written and justified in terms of campus needs, campus goals, and the "Guiding Principles." Every program should have a 1/2 to 1 page summary of their program review document to show how financial need connects to program plans and needs. Every "project" funded through the resource allocation process should have a summary of how program review (or related document) supports the budget allocation.

↓

The administration will develop a decision-making timeline and will receive the prioritized funding requests from Division Deans, Senators, and Roundtable members.

↓

The Educational Resources Committee will review and develop a proposed list of allocations.

↓

The administration (primarily the Vice Presidents) will review the proposed list of allocations.

↓

The administration will report back to the Roundtable (including a first and second reading) with a rationale of how the proposed allocations meet campus goals and "Guiding Principles", and hear final input and suggestions.

↓

The College President will make final budgetary decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Ongoing Budget Augmentations

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable October 2, 1996, revised October 7, 1998

Background:

The District sometimes allocates to the campuses ongoing budget augmentations, often in the form of a cost of living adjustment to "original" budgets.

An existing program's ongoing budget might be decreased, creating an ongoing revenue source to be used in another program

The Division Deans, in their Budget Task Force meetings in 1994-95, concluded that the existing ongoing funding level ("1994-95 original budgets") at that time was the "minimum needed to operate their divisions," and that division budgets should not be further cut except in extreme emergency.

The following policy linking program review and resource allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

> Policy Linking Program Review and Resource Allocation: Requests for resource allocation or resource redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study. Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document. Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information

> The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on both the Educational Resource Committee and the Budget Task Force.

Committee's Charge:

Establish guiding principles (or criteria) for determining how FH should spend any such permanent augmentation in funds from the District.

Ensure the principles are not so prescriptive that we become overly rule bound.

Principles that should be used(not in priority order):

Changes in enrollments across Divisions (WSCH), or overall headcount for college-wide services (counseling, library, admissions/records, etc.).

Severe losses in a major funding source by a division of the College.

A major new responsibility required of a division of the College, such as creation of a new department, maintenance of substantial new equipment, or need to adhere to new regulations.

A significant change in educational methodology by a discipline, such as the need to incorporate new technology.

Changes in casual staffing needs.

A program's "value and quality"(as determined by a program review process) in relation to its productivity. (Benefit vs. Cost)

Services and resources which enhance retention and student success.

Price changes due to inflation, affecting the purchasing power of divisions in the College. (The Committee felt this should be lower priority than the above principles.)

Principles (and criteria) that should NOT be used:

Some money should go to each of the funding areas identified in the Guidelines.

The money should be equally distributed among the divisions and programs in the College.

Procedures for Determining Allocating Ongoing Budget Augmentations

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable October 2, 1996,
revised October 7, 1998, September 22, 1999, May 2, 2001

These procedures provide a mechanism for implementing the "Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Ongoing Budget Augmentations."

Ongoing Budget Augmentations should be distributed according to the following procedures:

Faculty, staff, and students should present budget augmentation requests to Division Deans, Senators, or Roundtable members during early Spring Quarter (or as budget augmentations become available). Requests should be written and justified in terms of campus needs, campus goals, and the "Guiding Principles." Every program should have a 1/2 to 1 page summary of their program review document to show how financial need connects to program plans and needs. Every "project" funded through the resource allocation process should have a summary of how program review (or related document) supports the budget allocation.

↓

The administration will develop a decision making timeline and will receive the prioritized budget augmentation requests from Division Deans, Senators, and Roundtable members.

↓

The Educational Resources Committee will review and develop a proposed list of budget augmentations.

↓

The administration (primarily Vice Presidents) will review the proposed list of budget augmentations.

↓

The administration will report back to the Roundtable (including a first and second reading) with a rationale of how the proposed budget augmentations meet campus goals and "Guiding Principles," and hear final input and suggestions.

↓

The College President will make final budget augmentation decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

Guidelines and Procedures for Funding New Programs

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable March 9, 2000, May 2, 2001

The following policy linking program review and resource allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

> Policy Linking Program Review and Resource Allocation: Requests for resource allocation or resource redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study. Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document. Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information.
>
> The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on both the Educational Resource Committee and the Budget Task Force.

The Educational Resources Committee recommends the following guidelines and procedures for funding new or expanding programs or initiatives:

1. Divisions or program areas identify new programs, significant program expansions, or other initiatives, which would be viable, and meet emerging student needs. This identification could be based on program review, changing demographics or workforce needs, developing technologies, etc.

2. Institutional planning (program review) data or a planning document must accompany funding requests.

3. Funding sources could be one or a combination of the following:

   A. Divisions would absorb start-up costs.

   B. Project funding would be requested by placing the new program on the Budget Allocations Model for one-time funding.

   C. Deans or program leaders could write a rationale for permanent "B" budget funding, to be submitted to the Educational Resources Committee for approval.

4. Actual funding may proceed through A-B-C above, as the program is instituted and evaluated.

5. Funding would follow the normal procedure for ongoing College allocations:

   The administration will develop a decision making timeline and will receive the prioritized budget augmentation requests from Division Deans, Senators, and Roundtable members.

   ↓

   The Educational Resources Committee will review and develop a proposed list of budget augmentations.

   ↓

   The administration (primarily Vice Presidents) will review the proposed list of budget augmentations.

   ↓

   The administration will report back to the Roundtable (including a first and second reading) with a rationale of how the proposed budget augmentations meet campus goals and "Guiding Principles," and hear final input and suggestions.

   ↓

   The College President will make final budget augmentation decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

6. The new program will undergo program review at the earliest reasonable time.

Guidelines and Procedures for Reducing or Eliminating Funding

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable November 1, 2000

This procedure is parallel to the one for providing funding.

NOTE: This procedure assumes a timeline which would allow the process to unfold. In an emergency, the Cabinet and/or Roundtable could take immediate steps.

1. Faculty, staff, students (where appropriate), and Division Deans will be requested to submit possible cuts in programs and services for review by the Budget Task Force and Educational Resources Committee.

2. Program review data will be provided when available, and applied if useful and appropriate.

3. The Educational Resources Committee will review the proposed budget reductions and forward recommendations on each to the Cabinet.

4. Summary notes should be included showing the impact of the cut on campus/student needs, campus goals (including *Partnership for Excellence* goals), and consistency with the "Guiding Principles for Determining Allocation of Ongoing Budget Augmentations."

5. With this information, the President's Cabinet will develop a proposed list of budget cuts.

6. The Cabinet will report back to the College Roundtable, (including a first and second reading) with a rationale for the cuts and a probable impact on students, and proposed listing of fund restorations to be implemented when the funding exigency has passed. The Roundtable will offer final suggestions and recommendations to the President.

7. The College President will make final budget reduction decisions based on recommendations from the administration and the Roundtable.

Guiding Principles for Determining New Full-Time Teaching Faculty Positions

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable November 1995

The following policy linking program review and faculty position allocation was developed by the Institutional Planning Committee, approved by the Academic and Classified Senates in February 1998, and approved by the Roundtable on October 7, 1998:

> Policy Linking Program Review and Faculty Position Allocation: Requests for faculty position allocation or faculty position redirection will only be considered if current program review self-studies are on file. Upon request, programs will be provided with current information to update their program self-study. Requests which involve a new program, more than one program, or which don't fit within an existing program framework shall be accompanied by a division area review and/or planning document. Self-study narratives give programs the opportunity to clarify any issues regarding numerical information.
>
> The Institutional Planning Committee should have formal representation on the Educational Resource Committee.

Principles that should be used:

Areas of the College do not "own" faculty positions; vacant positions revert to the College for possible reassignment.

Departments with a high part-time/full-time faculty ratio should have priority over departments with a low ratio.

Departments with increasing enrollments should have priority over departments with decreasing enrollments.

Highly "viable" programs should have priority over less viable programs. "Viability" should be determined by program review and should include such issues as assurance of future enrollments, availability of facilities, and provision of proper staff support.

Departments needing full-time faculty to address health/safety/legal requirements should have priority over programs having lesser such need.

Established departments with no full-time faculty and viable newly proposed departments should have priority over departments with existing full-time faculty.

Departments which do not have available part-time faculty should have priority over departments which do have available part-time faculty.

Departments should exhaust the possibility of reassigning other (possibly under loaded) full-time faculty to department before being authorized to proceed with full-time hire. Such reassignments should be consistent with contract provisions.

Principles (and criteria) that should not be used:

Whether or not the productivity of a department (measured in WSCH/FTE) is high or low. Departmental productivity may properly be used in determining the number of sections of classes offered and whether or not to continue a program, but productivity should play a much lesser role in deciding what portion of classes in a department should be taught by full or part-time faculty.

The number of years a department has been making a request for a full-time hire.

Recent retirements/resignations/reassignments of full-time faculty in a department.

Additional principles that should be used if there are more candidate pools than positions available:

Positions with a truly exceptional candidate should have priority over positions with a less qualified applicant pool.

Positions with a candidate able to teach in multiple disciplines should have priority over positions containing applicants able to teach in only a single discipline.

Positions whose filling would advance the College's equal opportunity goals should have priority over those whose filling would not.

Procedures for Allocating New Full-Time Teaching Faculty Positions

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998, revised
September 22, 1999, June 7, 2000, May 2, 2001, May 17, 2006

1. The District office communicates to the campus the number of available positions early in the fall quarter.
2. The College President and Dean of Faculty and Staff estimate additional positions that might become available due to unannounced retirements/resignations.
3. The Vice President for Educational Resources and Instruction asks Division Deans for prioritized requests for positions (by department).
4. The President's Cabinet reviews ~~and approves~~ the proposed prioritized list of positions **and forwards its recommendations to the Educational Resources Committee**. The Educational Resources Committee ~~with the faculty Senate President~~, will develop a proposed list of approved positions using the Division requests, and the "Guiding Principles for Determining New Full-time Teaching Faculty Hires."
5. The Educational Resources Committee presents the proposed list to the Roundtable with a rationale of how the proposed hires meet the "Guiding Principles" and hears final input and suggestions.
   5a. If, later in the academic year, new faculty needs emerge due to an unanticipated vacancy, the Division Dean or Vice President may request a replacement. This request is to be forwarded to the Educational Resources Committee. It will include a rationale for immediate replacement. In making its determination, the Committee will consider the Guiding Principles, extenuating circumstances, and the realistic timeline leading to a successful search.
   5b. The Educational Resources Committee will meet to consider these emerging needs in the context of existing unfilled requests, if any, and the Guiding Principles.
   5c. The Educational Resources Committee will follow the same procedure in considering this new request as it does for all others, and forward a recommendation to the Roundtable and Cabinet.
6. The College President makes the final decision based on recommendations from the ~~Vice Presidents~~ **President's Cabinet** and the Roundtable.

Guiding Principles For Allocation of Contract Classified Staff Positions

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998

Principles that should be used (not in priority order):

1. Areas of the College do not "own" classified positions -- vacant positions revert to College for possible reassignment.
2. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of health/safety/security issues.
3. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of where money is currently spent on casual labor/comp time/overtime.
4. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of College mission and goals.
5. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of program review information.
6. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of program viability.
7. Available positions should be evaluated in terms of workload:
   - If a position is eliminated, reallocate or eliminate the workload;
   - If a position is available, consider allocating to areas where work load is high;
   - Weigh the creation of new positions with the redistribution of work.
8. Adhere to union contract rules.

Procedures for Allocating Contract Classified Staff Positions

Developed by Educational Resources Committee
Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998,
revised September 22, 1999

1. Classified staffing requests should be submitted to the Vice Presidents who will make classified staffing recommendations to the College President. The recommendations should be based on the Guiding Principles for Allocation of Classified Staff positions and the classified union contract. The Vice Presidents should also solicit input from affected faculty, classified staff, and students.
2. Management should meet and confer with the union(s) on changes in classified staff positions as required by the contract(s).
3. The College President will make the final classified staffing decisions based on input from the Vice Presidents.

Guiding Principles for Allocation of Office Space

Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998

These guidelines were developed to insure that office space be allocated equitably to meet the needs of the college and to maximize the utilization of space.

1. Full-time faculty, classified staff, and administrative offices shall be allocated according to the nature and content of the job. As has been the past practice, full-time faculty shall be assigned a private office whenever possible.
2. People working in similar programs, areas, or disciplines shall be located in physical proximity, if practicable.
3. An employee shall have no more than one office.
4. Article 19 and part-time faculty may share offices if available.

Procedures for Allocating Office Space

Approved by Roundtable March 4, 1998,
revised September 22, 1999

1. Division Deans, using the guiding principles, shall have authority to designate office spaces equivalent to the number of full-time faculty in the division.
2. Unmet need for full-time faculty space shall be resolved by negotiation among Division Deans.
3. When additional office space is needed, those offices unoccupied for a quarter or more by employees on Professional or Staff Development Leave or Article 18 may be temporarily allocated by that employee's supervisor to other employees.
4. The Dean of Faculty and Staff shall resolve space conflicts if Division Deans are unable to resolve them directly.
5. The President and Vice Presidents shall have authority to resolve conflicts for administrative offices.
6. The President and Vice Presidents shall allocate office space for other groups only after the allocation of office space for faculty, classified staff, and administrators.