

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Operations Planning
Committee



**FOOTHILL
COLLEGE**

Agenda

**Date: Monday, October 16, 2017 Time: 1:00-2:00 p.m.
President's Conference Room (FH 1901)**

Time	Topic	Discussion Leader	Expected Outcome
1:00-1:10p	A. Review and approve previous meeting's minutes. https://foothill.edu/president/opc-pdf/minutes/OPC_Minutes_10-02-17.pdf	Watson	Approval
1:10-1:20p	B. ACCJC Accreditation follow-up.	Watson	Information
1:20-1:40p	C. Review OPC Resource request Rubric for Prioritization, 2017-18. https://foothill.edu/president/opc-pdf/OPC_Resource_Rubric_2017-18.pdf	Watson	Information
1:40-2:00p	D. Review Adopted Budget 2017-18. http://business.fhda.edu/downloads/17-18%20Adopted%20Budget.pdf	Watson	Information

A. Review Minutes.

Noted two changes to minutes: (1) include in item C. Faculty and Deans are to report back to their VPs once funds are spent, this closes the information loop; and (2) change in item E. accreditation team, not audit team. Revised and approved.

B. ACCJC Accreditation follow-up.

Bret Watson describes accreditation meetings with evaluators and discusses how there was honest and open dialogue regarding the accreditation topics. Simon Pennington echoes the honest and open dialogue between FH and evaluators, pointing out that the three areas highlighted for recommendations were also the same areas that FH identified internally. General agreement among committee members.

FH shared governance will undergo evaluation and changes, OPC's role in shared governance will be part of those changes. Members of OPC are part of the committee that will investigate and make recommendations to change shared governance at FH.

C. Review OPC Resource Request Rubric.

Bret Watson opens floor to suggestions and comments about rubric, any suggested changes? Add/remove criteria? Does it fit within mission/vision of college?

Debbie Lee brings up "cost of doing business" items such as computers, lightbulbs, refrigerators or other items that departments need to operate and serve students. Bret Watson suggests that these items can be funded through B-budget but this situation is not equitable because there are imbalances in the amount of B-budgets available to different departments. Because B-budgets can be exhausted on other expenditures, sometimes even basic office supplies can be unavailable due to lack of funds.

Discussion around the need for criteria item: "minimum requirements align with at least one goal of EMP" because some requests can meet this requirement simply because of the stewardship of resources EMP goal. Discussion that this minimum requirement is too broad and easily achievable, thus making the requirement less useful.

Nanette Solvason asks about how the rubric fits with revised FH mission statement. Elaine Kuo explains that the OPC rubric was originally created before the last revision of the mission statement and proposes that OPC should revisit this requirement; OPC agrees. Elaine Kuo gives background on how Program Review also had different requirements for resource requests in previous years but that the PR forms have changed while the rubric has not.

Denise Perez asks do we need to start from scratch, given that FH shared governance structure is going to undergo potentially large scale changes? General agreement within committee that there is possibility that role of OPC and criteria for grading requests could change and that OPC needs to be flexible for future changes. Potential to start from scratch for rubrics, criteria, and objectives after the governance changes are put into effect.

Bret Watson points out that there should be a requirement in the resource prioritization process that ties the requests back to the mission statement, regardless of what the mission statement actually is. Elaine agrees and says that accreditation requires some documentation that the operations of the college are in support of the mission statement. Committee in agreeance.

Question becomes, what changes are needed for this year? Group looks at up-to-date PR template for this year and discusses the data given and how that fits into current rubric criteria. Questions regarding how some requests (ex: department chairs) cannot be graded or are consistently graded as low priority because of how the criteria are applied.

Point brought up by Elaine Kuo and others that many resource requests from last year were often eligible for other funding sources (Perkins, Lottery, etc), agreement from committee that these requests should not be graded by OPC because the rubric doesn't account for the same criteria as those programs. PR training in the past has emphasized that absolutely all requests must be put on PR and therefore all requests must go through OPC. However, because there are other pots of money that can address these expenses, there needs to be changes in PR training and reporting that gives faculty and staff the ability to recognize when their requests can be funded through alternative avenues.

Discussion shelved due to time constraints and also so committee members can reflect on the rubric and recommend potential changes.

D. Review adopted budget 17/18.

Bret Watson reviews adopted budget report, starting with ending fund balance summaries. Also discusses "variables impacting revenue and expense projections." Goes through slides in report: changes to tentative budget, projected ongoing revenues and expenses (expenses are exceeding revenue, \$10.4M deficit), productivity trends, FTES trends and projections, etc.

Committee has some questions about current state of FTES and some general projection assumptions. General agreement that flexibility and creativity is needed to improve enrollments and also hold DA accountable for increasing their enrollments as well.

Bret Watson encourages committee members to review the report and reminds them that the Q1 report will come out in the next few weeks and OPC will review that as well.