



FOOTHILL COLLEGE Integrated Planning and Budget Task Force

Minutes Draft
July 9, 2014

Members:

Craig Gawlick; Meredith Heiser; Carolyn Holcroft, absent; Pat Hyland; Andrew LaManque; Bruce McLeod; Kimberlee Messina, absent; Cara Miyasaki; Paul Starer

I. Review recommendations for IP&B from PaRC/PRC

The group reviewed the Charge from PaRC. The discussion centered on items 1-5 with Andrew noting that items 6 and 7 might best be considered later in the summer.

IP&B 2014 Charge:

1. Review PRC charge, rubric, timelines and processes.
2. Review, reduce and revise annual template for program review.
3. Improve comprehensive program review templates.
4. Improve alignment of the comprehensive review templates and the program review rating rubrics.
5. Annual program review templates should be shorter and better aligned with the comprehensive program review templates.
6. Members of the PRC need to be identified early and available to attend meetings.
7. PRC should meet with deans, faculty and staff of programs rated yellow or red.

II. Review of existing program review processes, timelines and PRC charge

The group began by looking at the ACCJC rubric for Program Review and noted that ACCJC does not dictate specifics like how often a college does a comprehensive review- some do 3 years others are on a 6 year cycle. The rubric does speak to using program review for improving student learning outcomes and achievement.

There was a discussion about how the current process tends to inspire a defensive response rather than a dialogue about where the department might go in the future.

Some questions for program review:

- What are the purposes / goals of the department – who is it serving?
- How is it serving students?
- What evidence exists that shows it is successful?
- What changes could be made to make the program more successful?

Other discussion points:

- It might be helpful to separate out what is needed for accreditation – that we can't change – and items that we can change. Establish Foothill's alignment with the standards: how we tie our resource requests to the program review, etc.
- Establishing the annual program review as a “cycle of inquiry” process that gives a broad overview of the year, cutting down on the current length.
- Establishing the definition of program review as the Foothill community sees it, one member noting that student success and enrollment should be the most important pieces. Original purpose was to “justify your existence,” which may have worked originally but the focus may need to shift.
- Clarify the “themes” for the comprehensive program review based on the Educational Master plan goals. Perhaps for the annual review they could pick one of the several themes to write about?
- For the annual review, what does (PaRC, the College, etc) want to know about what the department is doing that year?
- Perhaps the annual review could have just one question on SLO's – what is currently taking place, with the comprehensive a more thorough review of SLO's and their impact on student success.
- Simpler prompts were discussed. What do you want your program to look like in 5 years?
- What if the annual looked at what was going on currently in the program, and the 3 year comprehensive looked at what happened in the program, and what's coming up?
- The idea of a pair / share activity between departments that have written a comprehensive program review was suggested. For example, the political science faculty could review and provide feedback on the math department's program review (and vice versa).
- One suggestion was to reframe the role of PRC to look at only the programs flagged by Deans or VPs as in trouble to validate that assessment.

III. Plan next meeting's agenda

The committee agreed with Pat's summation of the overall revisions needed this summer:

- a) Revisit templates
- b) Revisit cycle
- c) Revisit review process

The committee also thought that looking at the annual template and then the comprehensive might be the best approach for the summer.

Next time will be the last meeting Meredith can make.

Paul Starer agreed to bring language for the annual prompts for discussion at the next meeting.