



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning and Budget Task Force

Minutes Draft
September 16, 2014

Present:

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

Absent:

Laureen Balducci; Meredith Heiser

I. Review minutes from last meeting

Minutes were reviewed and accepted.

II. Review and revise PRC charge

Discussion took place regarding the choice for a Dean to “flag” an annual program review for an out of cycle review, and if there needed to be action taken that year, instead of waiting for the next year’s cycle to begin. The idea was raised that if a Dean or VP flags an annual program review for a remediation process, that process should begin that winter/spring, and the revised remediation plan would be included in the next year’s program review. It was decided that the annual program review template would include a check box at the end of the document for “remediation plan needed.”

Discussion continued about the charge, which states that the follow-up of a program review might start with a remediation plan, or in the case of a “red” designation, the remediation plan could also be the beginning of the discontinuance process. PaRC makes recommendations to the President to decide whether the program is to be suspended, discontinued or another action taken.

Discussion also included the timing of when the remediation plan is due – whether should it be presented to PRC and PaRC before the end of the school year in June or in the fall. It was agreed that PRC should have the flexibility to differentiate programs with viability issues from programs that didn’t complete the program review in a way that clearly described their program.

It was also agreed that PRC recommendation should specify the type of follow-up needed. PRC should outline what steps it thinks the program should take to remedy any deficiencies, such as a remediation plan and another comprehensive review the next year, or a remediation plan and a detailed update in the next year’s annual review.

III. PRC rubric

A proposed PRC rubric for evaluating comprehensive program reviews was presented by Andrew LaManque. The rubric includes the “critical sections” from the comprehensive program review to be analyzed and evaluated. The criteria for each color designation of “green, yellow, red” is spelled out to aid the PRC committee in decisions. Instead of the current 8 page rubric for administrative, student services and instruction, this rubric would have 8 boxes for a color designation and a place for comments. This is to hopefully streamline the PRC process and lighten the workload for the group. The idea would be to apply the same broad guidelines of what was acceptable that would be applied to each section. The committee would then come together and make a holistic assessment of program viability.

The form will be presented for approval at PaRC.

IV. Other remarks

Carolyn Holcroft emphasized the importance of having professional development sessions early in the school year for faculty, before they begin writing their program reviews. Paul Starer suggested that training and discussion also take place at the division/department level. This is to aid the idea that program reviews are everyone’s responsibility, not just the few who write the document.

It was also discussed that the comprehensive student services template needs to have a section added that instruction and administrative programs have dealing with institutional standards. This would be a general questions that would have the programs speak to how their student services contribute to attainment of metrics like student persistence.

This was the final meeting of IP&B for 2014.