



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

# Operations Planning Committee (OPC) Meeting

APPROVED MINUTES

JANUARY 10, 2011

2:00 – 4:00 P.M.

LOCATION: PRESIDENT'S  
CONFERENCE ROOM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Shirley Treanor
<b>TYPE OF MEETING</b>	Advisory Committee Meeting
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Phuong Tran
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Phuong Tran, Shirley Treanor, Ion Georgiou, Gigi Gallagher, Elaine Kuo, Laureen Balducci, and Pam Wilkes

## Agenda Topics

### INTRODUCTIONS

SHIRLEY TREANOR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes for the Dec. 9th meeting were approved</li> </ul>

### PROCESS FOR DETERMINING THE HIERARCHY OF PRIORITIZATION

SHIRLEY TREANOR

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 year comprehensive review to be presented at PaRC</li> <li>Both Division and VP follow priority band that has high, minimum, or low</li> <li>VPs' prioritizations will replace the dean's prioritization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elaine make follow with VP to see what rubric they are using to set prioritization.</li> <li>VP comes up with the list of prioritization, but OPC does not have to endorse it.</li> <li>Then go back to our guidance and rubric and submit to PaRC.</li> <li>However, OPC and VP come up the list and compare with each other.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Department's requests → Division Priority → VP &amp; Dean meet → VPs meet and make the list → Present PaRC and OPC. OPC gets list form core mission groups, VPs joint list, and each VPs area list.</li> <li>Two models for request funding proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linear Model: Dean &amp; VP, and VP come up with the list, and list send to PaRC→OPC→ PaRC→present. VP present to OPC →Joint presentation from OPC and VP</li> <li>Parallel Model: Dept reg. → Div priority → Div present to VP → VP came up with the list → present PaRC Or to OPC → OPC present to PaRC</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

### GUIDANCE PRINCIPLES FOR RUBRIC VERSION 3.00

ELAINE KUO

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment with institutional learning outcomes and core missions</li> <li>4 Cs = Communication, Critical thinking, Community consciousness, Computation.</li> <li>Measurable student learning outcome – achievement or progress towards program learning outcomes.</li> <li>have yet decided to keep - suppose to link program review with resource allocation</li> <li>Characteristics of students served</li> <li>Divisional priority</li> <li>Organizational efficiency</li> <li>Legal mandate</li> <li>Data enrollment trends.</li> <li>Cost per FTES is consistent and appropriate for the program</li> <li>Supports student learning outcomes</li> <li>Financial stability</li> <li>Combine allotment or organizational changes and operational and equipment needs and cost</li> <li>Future need</li> <li>One-time or ongoing requests</li> </ul>

### FUTURE DISCUSSION

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss these considerations with regards to prioritization by the rubric</li> <li>Will people get separate request that people can use that indicate what OPC is looking for?</li> <li>Send rubric out for feedback from PaRC/Deans/VP's?</li> <li>Do a pilot test of rubric with a specific test case funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rubric grading/design should dictate an expected result</li> </ul> </li> </ul>