FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B) Task Force
Wednesday, August 17th, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 1901 – President's Conference Room
TIME: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

ITEM	TOPICS	OUTCOME
1	Review minutes.	Discussion
2	Review work from previous meetings.	Discussion
3	Discuss the idea of a documented process for creation and implementation of learning community programs.	Action

ATTENDANCE:
Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Kelaiah Harris, Kimberlee Messina, Carolyn Holcroft, Adrienne Hypolite, Dawn Girardelli, Cara Miyasaki, Bernie Day, Kurt Hueg

1) Review of Minutes
Upon review of the meeting minutes from July 20th, the committee discussed changes to the minutes regarding the *Process for Classified Hire*. The revisions will state that departments are reminded to include the new classified staff positions in the program review process. The committee proposal recommends that PaRC no longer rank the prioritization list, but either approves, rejects, or sends back requesting additional explanation/clarification.

To view revised IP&B minutes from July 20th click **here**.

Summary: Andrew and Carolyn will continue working on the new faculty request form. New classified staff positions will be included in the program review process.

2) Review of Work From Previous Meetings.
Follow-up action and discussion items from previous meetings were discussed. Andrew reviewed the proposals to PaRC:
   a) **Annual PR Pilot using TracDat**
      IP&B recommends to PaRC that the Program Review Committee (PRC) be charged with conducting a pilot to assess the feasibility of using TracDat to collect Program Review information normally collected on the Program Review Templates. The 2016-17 pilot would include 3-5 units from across the college and involve the Annual Program Review template.

b) **Length of Comprehensive PR Cycle**
IP&B recommends that Foothill College continue with the 3-year comprehensive program review cycle. The committee reviewed the benefits of the 3-year cycle:

- Correlates with our accreditation midterm reports that are completed every 3 years
- Allows for timely response to changing institutional priorities / budgets
- Allows for more timely response to curricular needs / changes
- A 3-year review is likely less onerous than pulling together all the information every 6 years.

The committee agreed that the benefits of a 3-year cycle were important and despite the work involved could be beneficial to the departments and the college.

c) **PaRC Position Prioritization**
IP&B recommends that PaRC no longer rank the prioritization list for new faculty and classified positions (does not include replacement classified positions) in making its recommendation to the President. The college should continue to use their current ranking/prioritization processes but exclude the step of individual rankings by PaRC members. Program faculty and directors identify position requests during the program review process, the deans provide feedback, and VPs continue to collaborate to prioritize the list based on this information. This information will continue to be aggregated in a matrix of information that is presented to PaRC by the VPs and Deans. PaRC will review the prioritized list and votes as a recommendation to the President to either approve, reject, or send back the list (with suggestions/questions) for further review. Holcroft reiterated the importance of consistency and transparency in criteria used for ranking faculty position requests across divisions. Faculty want to see how the rankings connect to our college's stated goals and values. Holcroft also requested the criteria used for ranking are shared with faculty to use during their division-level ranking process.

Summary: The committee approved by consensus to move forward with the proposals as written. Andrew will submit to PaRC for a 1st and 2nd read on October 5th and October 19th.

3) **Discussion on the PaRC charge to IPB for "A documented process for creation and implementation of learning community programs (e.g. Umoja, FYE, etc.)."**

The group first reviewed the guidelines for new program creation in the Governance Handbook, specifically (p10):

"Program Creation is handled similarly to resource allocation of existing programs to ensure the proposed program meets a substantiated student need, is aligned with the college mission and that the college is able to commit to the resource needs of a program **before** the program is in development stages. "

"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."

The group talked about 4 important concepts as they related to the Governance Handbook reference to approval for "significant program expansions" or "other initiatives":

1) What types of initiatives should be included - what guidelines or parameters could we suggest to define which initiatives should go through the process?

   The group agreed that initiatives that have the potential to have a college-wide impact on resources regardless of funding source, and involves direct service to students should be included. This would include initiatives that recruit students to be part of a distinct activity or service group/cohort.

   The group thought these were some examples of ongoing and developing initiatives:

   Umoja, First Year Experience, Mentoring, Early Alert and Intervention, STEM Core, Campus Ambassador Program (CAP), Adult Learner Program

2) What is the purpose of a new process - notification, transparency, collaboration, approval, and/or sharing of information?

   The group agreed that the primary purpose was as stated in the Governance Handbook – "to ensure the proposed program meets a substantiated student need, is aligned with the college mission and that the college is able to commit to the resource needs of a program before the program is in development stages."

   It was agreed that the purpose is to both inform the college community to allow a discussion of the potential impact on work being done in other divisions, as well as to give a formal commitment by the college to proceed with the development of the initiative.

   The campus should be aware of new initiatives as they have the potential to impact personnel, financial and physical resources of the college.

3) Who should initiate the proposal and what group should review the proposals?

   It was agreed that the division in which the primary activity is projected to take place should initiate the proposal. Initiatives that cross divisions can be jointly sponsored. Division sponsorship will ensure that there is buy-in across the division. In the long term the college might decide that a planning-related

committee, whether it was IPB or PRC and/or OPC, should review the proposals before going to PaRC but this will require a larger governance discussion. The immediate recommendation is that the proposals would come to PaRC and PaRC would make a recommendation to the President.

The group agreed that for this year it would propose a "Notification of the Intent to Develop" form and request new initiatives to submit them for review and approval by PaRC. Ideally this would be done before the initiative was started but it should also be used to provide recognition of programs currently under development. The new program proposals should include evidence of the need for the program and should be linked to college mission and master plan goals.

Factors considered in the IPB discussion:

Unlike instructional programs, the Transfer or Workforce workgroup may not be the appropriate committees to approve the proposal before sending to PaRC.

There was a suggestion to have the divisions or the Student Equity Workgroup approve the proposals. However, some program initiatives may cross divisions, and the Student Equity Workgroup is only tasked with equity-related initiatives. All proposals should be reviewed in depth by an appropriate committee to ensure adequate discussion of resources, funding, college-wide impact, staffing, etc. Other possibilities mentioned were PRC, OPC, IP&B, PaRC, or creating a separate planning committee. The point was made that PRC could review the program proposals, but will not be able to review resource requests in-depth. In that case, the proposal will need to be submitted to OPC for further review of resource allocations.

A planning committee could be created with the charge of reviewing proposed initiatives and making recommendations, but to refrain from creating a new committee IP&B was suggested to review program proposals. IP&B currently only meets during the summer and in order to review proposals, the IP&B committee would need to review its charge and meet year-round. There was a suggestion for IP&B to continue meeting only during the summer and proposals could be submitted annually for recommendations.

4) What are the linkages between new initiative proposals and program review in terms of future resource requests, assessment, program evaluation and responsibility for defining and assessing initiative / program outcomes?

This question was also left to a future discussion of governance and the clarification of what constitutes a program for program review purpose. For instructional programs a program leading to a degree or certificate or constitutes a pathway are defined as a program for program review. For student services and administrative areas what defines a program is based on the organization structure.

It was agreed that the new initiative should be included in the next possible program review, whether under an existing unit, or a new unit, so that program evaluation and resource requests can be included as part of the planning and resource allocation process.

The committee agreed a one-page notification worksheet will be developed and presented to PaRC. The worksheet will be a "*Notification of Intent to Develop*" to introduce the new non-instructional program. Some of the information it should include is the title of the program, primary program contact, planned staffing, funding, collaborations, and population served-to be submitted to the division dean and PaRC. The dean and PaRC will then make necessary recommendations as needed. The notifications should receive approval from PaRC before the program moves forward into the development phase. This ensures programs will receive guidance and feedback.

Summary: The *Notification of Intent to Develop* for new initiatives/non-instructional programs form will be used to document the process for program development and implementation.