



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning and Budget Task Force

Minutes Draft
August 27, 2014

Members:

Present:

Craig Gawlick; Carolyn Holcroft; Andrew LaManque; Bruce McLeod;
Kimberlee Messina; Paul Starer

Absent:

Laureen Balducci; Meredith Heiser; Pat Hyland;; Cara Miyasaki

I. Review progress from previous meetings

The group reviewed the charge from PaRC, which directs the work of IP&B. These tasks include shortening the annual program review, reviewing the comprehensive program review and reviewing the process and timeline for Program Review Committee (PRC).

II. Review of draft annual program review

Group had previously suggested condensing the instructional, student services and administrative annual program reviews into one template, instead of three. Andrew LaManque drafted a version of this combined template for review. Discussion points on the template:

- Page one remains the same, with basic program information
- Trend analysis on page two will need additional prompt for administrative, and an additional question on enrollment
- Suggestion was made to create a detailed instruction sheet/cover page, to help each of the three groups (instructional, student services and administrative) complete the form correctly
- Section two about Institutional set standards was removed and will only be on the comprehensive program review
- The wording of the student equity part on page three was discussed in depth, with ideas including:
 - Altering the word “impact” and adding a part to the question about how the impact of the initiatives is measured
 - Adding “obstacles” to the prompt about successes
 - Discussion about the accountability piece inherent in program review, and how much it hinders honest discussion on the document.
 - Paul Starer agreed to wordsmith this section for clarity

- Core mission questions were removed and will remain only in comprehensive program review.
- Section five: SLO assessment and reflection needs revision and clarity in asking the three specific groups (instruction, student services and administration) about their SLO progress Ex: Item “e” in section five needs to be changed from “faculty members” to “members of your program”
- Section four: Program Goals (which needs to be renumbered) has the definition for “mission statement” and “college vision,” which need to be moved to the previous section.
- The “previous goals” box should be moved ahead of “new goals”, and “new goals” will have an added phrase of “if your program has new goals”
- The wording in the “previous goals” box will be re-worded to change “completed, in progress and comment on status” to new phrasing
- Program Resources and support will have an added phrase of “only fill out if making new resource requests”

III. Plan next meeting’s agenda

The annual program review will be revised by Andrew LaManque with the above changes and discussion in mind, and will be electronically distributed.

The next meeting will address

- a) Complete the review of the annual form
- b) Reviewing the three (instructional, student services and administrative) comprehensive program reviews
- c) Clarify PRC charge/process/timeline
- d) Begin discussion on rubric for PRC, based on draft by Pat Hyland and Andrew LaManque

Paul Starer agreed to send Andrew language for the equity prompts.