

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Integrated Planning & Budget (IP&B) Task Force**  
**Thursday, August 20, 2015**  
**MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT**

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

ITEM	TOPICS
1.	Review of August 06 Meeting Minutes
2.	Revised Proposal – Out-of-Cycle Faculty Prioritization Process
3.	Revised Proposal – Emergency Requests for Faculty Hiring
4.	ACCJC Standards and Program Review
5.	ACCJC – Notice of Enhanced Monitoring of Institutional Standards
6.	Comprehensive Program Review – Feedback & Discussion
7.	Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Template (Revision)

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Revised Proposal – Out-of-Cycle Faculty Prioritization Process
2. Revised Proposal – Emergency Requests for Faculty Hiring
3. Memo – ACCJC Standards & Program Review
4. ADPIE Model – Data and Trend Analysis for Program Review
5. ACCJC – Notice of Enhanced Monitoring of Institutional Standards
6. Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Template

**PRESENT:**

Andrew LaManque, Cara Miyasaki, Christine Mangiameli, Simon Pennington, Craig Gawlick, Justin Schultz, Teresa Ong, Carolyn Holcroft, Elaine Kuo, Karen Smith, Victor Tam

**ABSENT:**

Paul Starer, Kurt Hues

**1. REVIEW OF AUGUST 06 MEETING MINUTES**

Feedback was requested regarding the minutes from the August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting – no changes were noted. All documents can be viewed at [www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php](http://www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/IPB2015.php).

**2. REVISED PROPOSAL – OUT-OF-CYCLE FACULTY PRIORITIZATION PROCESS**

Carolyn Holcroft presented several suggested revisions to the Out-of-Cycle Faculty Prioritization Process proposal. These changes provide greater clarity as to the normal process and requirements for faculty hiring (i.e. new requests being made during program review and the faculty hiring pool). Members of the group added that a more explicit link between how positions go into the pool and how program review gets the positions was needed. It was suggested that an additional sentence be added to the proposal to note, “*the district determines, based on budget and other factors, the number of faculty hiring positions available*”. It was also suggested that any mention of the faculty hiring pool be referred to as the pool, not a pool.

**Summary:** It was agreed that the revised proposal would be reviewed at the next meeting and be brought to PaRC in fall.

### **3. REVISED PROPOSAL – EMERGENCY REQUESTS FOR FACULTY HIRING**

Carolyn Holcroft presented several suggested revisions to the Emergency Requests for Faculty Hiring proposal. The group discussed the two justifications noted on the proposal: (a) accreditation/regulatory requirements and (b) availability of qualified adjuncts. It was agreed that an accreditation requirement would clearly constitute an emergency faculty hiring request while the availability of adjuncts (i.e. a lack thereof) was not a Y/N justification.

Consensus was reached that it would be up to PaRC to make the determination.

**Summary:** It was agreed that the revised proposal would be brought to PaRC in fall.

### **4. ACCJC STANDARDS AND PROGRAM REVIEW**

Carolyn Holcroft presented a summary of her findings regarding the ACCJC Standards in relation to program review. Based on her research, she noted the following:

- (a) A cyclical program review process needs to be used to evaluate how well we are accomplishing the mission.
- (b) Program review needs to include data on student learning and achievement, improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation.
- (c) Program review must be tied to budgeting and resource allocation. It also must provide the basis for decisions about human, physical, technology, and financial resources.
- (d) Criteria for review need to include relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future (e.g. program-level SLOs).
- (e) The program review process needs to be consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of type of program (collegiate, developmental, etc.).

The group thought the information as helpful and all thought it should be shared with the College.

Cara Miyasaki also provided a document highlighting suggested methods for analyzing data and incorporating the data-driven reflections into the program review (using the ADPIE model).

**Summary:** The ACCJC standards related to program review will be taken into account when revising the comprehensive program review template documents.

### **5. ACCJC - NOTICE OF ENHANCED MONITORING OF INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS**

On August 17, 2015, Foothill College received a notification from the ACCJC that it was being placed on *enhanced monitoring* status based on an evaluation of institution-set standards for job placement rates across several programs.

A standard (for job placement, course completion, etc.) must be considered reasonable – it was determined that some of the institution-set standards (below 40%) were not considered reasonable. Members of the group noted that limitations with the data entry procedure of the standards may have caused them to be flagged, as cases of programs with no grads (or less than 10) were reported with a 0%, as N/A was not an available option. The College will also need to re-examine its methodology of setting Institutional Standards.

**Summary:** Feedback from the ACCJC would be taken into consideration when moving forward with program review template revisions. This information will be available to the visiting team in Fall 2017.

## **6. COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW – FEEDBACK & DISCUSSION**

Simon Pennington provided a summary of the feedback he and the PRC received regarding the comprehensive program review process last year.

### Common Complaints / Questions

- (a) The form is too long.
- (b) It is hard to find all the requested data (transfer rates, etc.).
- (c) What is the purpose of the comprehensive program review - why do we have to do it?
- (d) When is the form due?
- (e) What is the timeline for the review process (to the Dean to the VPs, etc.)?
- (f) What kind of analysis is required for each prompt (just data or a more nuanced discussion)?
- (g) There does not seem to be enough institutional support to help everyone complete the forms to the expected standard.

### Suggestions to Improve the Program Review Process

- (a) Provide a separate program review form for Workforce programs.
- (b) More institutional support for writing program reviews (program review writing workshops, program review writing day, PGA credit could be used as an incentive).
- (c) Find a way to access hard-to-find data (transfer data by discipline, students by declared major, UC and CSU data on completion rates for Foothill students).
- (d) Each program review section should have a “why are you doing this?” rationale to direct the writers.
- (e) Is there any way to pre-attach the TracDat SLO four-column reports?
- (f) Equity – more instruction on how to analyze the data and identify solutions for improvement.

In response to the shared feedback, Andrew LaManque noted that he is exploring, through P.R.C., the possibility of providing each group doing comprehensive program review with their data analysis already completed so they can move directly to the substantive discussion.

Others in the group suggested having the Division Deans meet with their faculty in November (instead of December) to preliminarily discuss the data and any holes in the program review documents. Once the informal feedback is received, the departments/programs can then work on and submit the final draft to the Dean for formal review by December/January. Karen Smith noted that it is critical that classified staff be asked to attend these program review sessions. Several members of IP&B emphasized the importance of having members of PRC present at these meetings in order to assist.

It was also suggested that PRC meet every week in October to meet with all the departments/programs doing a comprehensive program review. This would allow the groups to get ahead of things and assist with data analysis. This would also provide time for follow-up with certain groups.

**Summary:** The feedback appears to suggest that the major issues with program review do not revolve around the template forms but the overall process. When revising the template documents, the group will keep in mind the goal of directing the focus of the document to indicate how to drive the program review process forward. The suggestions regarding division meetings, data analysis, and PRC scheduling will continue to be discussed.

## 7. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE - REVISION

Group members reviewed the first several pages of the instructional comprehensive program review template. Several revisions were suggested:

(a) Page 1 – Program Mission

It was suggested to remove Program Mission and insert the following prompt: *What are the goals unique to your program and how do they relate to the College Mission and EMP goals?* Links to the College Mission statement and EMP goals would then be provided as reference.

(b) Page 2 – (a) Program Data

It was suggested removing the following prompts:

i. *If you have a non-transcriptable certificate that serves a workforce need, and/or has external certification, please provide a brief narrative explaining the industry need for this certificate, and attach any supporting data.*

ii. *If it does not have external certification, and/or is not a workforce program, please provide a brief narrative justifying the need for a certificate that is not state-approved, and attach any supporting data.*

The following replacement prompt was suggested: *Please explain the rationale for offering non-transcriptable certificate(s) and share data to justify its existence (refer to primary data sources).*

**Summary:** IP&B members were asked to continue looking at the instructional comprehensive program review template and note their suggested revisions. They were also asked to start looking at the templates for the administrative and student services units. The goal for next meeting is to have a revised and proposed instructional comprehensive program review template document and spend time revising the administrative and student services unit templates.