FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning and Budget Task Force

Minutes Draft
September 3, 2014

Present:
Craig Gawlick; Carolyn Holcroft; Pat Hyland; Andrew LaManque; Bruce McLeod; Paul Starer

Absent:
Laureen Balducci; Meredith Heiser; Kimberlee Messina; Cara Miyasaki

I.   Review minutes from last meeting
Minutes were reviewed and accepted, pending minor punctuation change in attendees.

II.   Review latest draft of annual program review
The group reviewed the changes and suggestions made at the August 27 meeting, drafted by Andrew LaManque. Page one had no changes, and page two changed to separate the charts about data analysis into separate questions about instructional, student services and administrative. Page three had the wording changed to be more neutral, and was noted to hopefully bring out a more thoughtful response.

Page four has the prompt on student equity, and small changes were noted, including changing "submitted" to "is submitting," in regards to the equity plan. An apostrophe is needed in the word "Chancellors." It was suggested to add wording about the student equity piece in terms of student services.

A discussion followed about the issue with "soft data" in the student services area, and how it can be asked of those departments to speak to the data.

Suggestions about the student services issue in student equity include:

How does your area contribute to closing the gap?
Looking at the student equity plan to use similar language about equity in terms of student services.
Doing outreach in student services about how to use data appropriately.

Andrew LaManque will work to revise the paragraph on page four, section two.

The title of section 4 on page 5 will have "SLO Assessment" changed to "Outcomes," to reflect the change of addressing all three components (instructional, student services and administrative) in program review. Item d in section 4 was removed entirely, as it was deemed redundant.

Discussion about the order of section 5 on page 7 took place, specifically about the mention of prior resource requests in the goals section. Discussion centered on the possible need to keep the mention of resource requests separate from goals, but also the need for some accountability for resource requests.

Page 10, section 7 (which needs to be renumbered accordingly) also had lengthy discussion about the last item on the program review, item d. A third line in the check off list was suggested, one that recommended acceptance, one that recommended a comprehensive review, and one that recommended a remediation plan. This bled into the next section for discussion.

III.   Review proposed changes to PRC charge

Andrew LaManque passed out a revised PRC charge and flow chart. Discussion about PRC and the process for annual and comprehensive templates touched on the following:

- If there is an urgent issue with an annual program review, how can it be flagged so that follow up does not wait until the next comprehensive review in the cycle?
- Should PRC just review those programs flagged by the Deans and VP's as having issues?
- When does the remediation process kick in, and does having a plan due before the end of Spring quarter seem reasonable? Is there a need for both a remediation plan AND a program that received a yellow or red to do a comprehensive the very next year? Further discussion needed on this issue.
- What is PaRC's role in the process of remediation? Do they decide about remediation plans, or decide on anything in this area?

Next meeting:

Comprehensive program reviews will be looked at for changes. Andrew LaManque noted that student services comprehensive program review is the only template that doesn't address institutional standards, and that will be added. There will also be a draft of a rubric for PRC at the next meeting.