

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B) Task Force
Tuesday, August 29, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

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

ITEM	TOPICS
1	Review minutes
2	Program Review Template – Equity Suggestions
3	Faculty Prioritization Possible Data Elements
4	New Initiatives Notification

ATTENDANCE:

Andrew LaManque, Bret Watson, Cara Miyasaki, Carolyn Holcroft, Debbie Lee, Lisa Ly, Paul Starer, Ram Subramanian, Ruby Sodhi, Kurt Hueg.

1) Review minutes

Andrew did not review the minutes from July 25, as he needed to resend the updated notes to the committee.

2) Program review template

The members agreed to discuss the Program Review template and prioritize it for today’s work.

Andrew noted that a few members from this committee (Carolyn, Elaine, and Andrew) have reviewed the template to incorporate the suggestions from SEW.

A question was raised about the check box on the instructional template for **Pathways**. According to the 2012 Governance Handbook **instructional program reviews** cover those departments that offer a degree or certificate or a basic skills pathway to the collegiate level. This would include, for example, the ESL program. Carolyn noted that it would be helpful to include this on a definitions page.

Paul noted that the STEM Center does not have a pathway, and that the number of ‘pathways’ seems to be increasing. Andrew agreed suggested that the Program Review Committee should look at this. While, for example, the learning communities may not do an instructional program review, an administrative or student services program review would allow them to examine their work, including program learning outcomes, to make improvements.

There was a question about which cycle year was represented when using 2017-2018 program review cycle. Andrew noted that if the comprehensive program review for the year 2017-18 is through the 16-17 year. The template header can be changed to read “2017.”

Summary

Members agreed that the Program Review Committee should examine the list of programs needing to complete program reviews in a given year.

a) Program Review Template - Productivity Prompt

The group discussed the prompt that asks programs to respond if they are below the college level productivity by outlining steps for improvement. A member had raised an example of the English program that’s always below the college average and wondered what we are looking to get out of the productivity questions?

Some members expressed the importance of the second productivity question. Productivity is a component of program viability. The curriculum does impact productivity and thus should be part of the discussion around program improvement and viability. While it is related to enrollment there are changes that can be made that impact programs productivity separate from enrollment trends.

Summary

The members agreed to maintain the existing productivity questions with minor revisions (adding the word “trend”).

b) Course Completion and Student Achievement - Program Review Template

Andrew provided an overview of this section and how it is related to the college’s equity agenda by disaggregating data for ethnicity, success by age, gender, modality, etc.. Debbie noted that in the previous meeting we discussed separating the international and domestic student data. There was a discussion about the purpose / use of such disaggregation especially given that it would likely produce some very small N’s. There is an assumption that international students do better on average than other students and we are thus masking an equity gap. Andrew wondered how big the gap needed to be for departments to take action – we already see significant gaps in some areas.

Andrew wondered if it might be more useful to disaggregate the Asian subgroups. Elaine pointed out that we currently don’t have an agreed upon methodology to disaggregate data by Asian groups.

It was suggested the Institutional Research (IR) to do a separate analysis comparing success rates for international and other students (rather than including it in PR). Elaine will talk with the VP of Instruction regarding this study. Elaine suggested that if we do that with Asian groups why not with the Latino groups since they are the fastest growing pop on this campus. Everyone agreed.

Summary

The members agreed to ask IR to come up with a methodology to look at Asian sub-groups and Latino groups and conduct a study on the success rates for these sub-populations as well as for international students. For program review this year we will continue with the current groups.

c) Gap Analysis Tool & Success Rate Compared to the Average - Program Review Template

Andrew provided background on two different gap analysis methodologies. The approach we are using compares the success rate for the group to the rate for the program that includes all students in the program. Another approach is to compare the group to the highest performing group. Elaine noted that in most cases both approaches will show a gap.

The template had been changed two years ago to include check boxes around trends as a mechanism to get faculty and staff to engage with the data. The feedback has been that some areas have a hard time doing this as they are not trained in data analysis. It is hard for some to know when a difference is significant and when a small N might mean less weight should be given to the numbers. All agreed that faculty were looking for support in the analysis and dialogue around the meaning of the numbers.

Summary

A proposal to remove the data and check boxes in favor of an individual analysis from the Office of Instruction or IRP was made. All agreed that having a short analysis for each program up for a comprehensive program review would be very helpful. The analysis might be limited to equity data or could include all the data on the program review data sheets – including enrollment trends. The analysis could consist of bullet points outlining trends and suggestions for areas of discussion.

d) Summary of Program Objectives and Resource Requests – Program Review Template

Carolyn noted a problem that occurred in the last program review cycle - when asked for new goals, the resources were not tied to new goals in the same table, which has been updated for this cycle. Members discussed the challenge of requesting resources such as software, which need to be tied to a goal as a one-time request, but they may be recurring needs. Elaine agreed and gave examples of purchase of microscopes that come up every year to OPC.

Bret described the different types of budget funds available to buy resources. Andrew suggested that OPC address the larger training issue but we should leave the question for this year.

Summary

The members agreed to do another mockup of this section for the next meeting.

3) Faculty Prioritization Possible Data Elements

Members discussed the list of possible data elements to inform faculty prioritization. One of the elements included labor market information. The idea is that the rationale for a new faculty position might include labor market data that shows an emerging job need.

Many of the data elements are included in the out of cycle request form. The goal of the data would be to inform and support the VPIs recommendation to PaRC. There would be no formula but enough data to show key trends for each department.

Summary

The group agreed to consider a revised list at the next meeting.

4) New Initiative Form

Members agreed that it was important to take the opportunity to inform the campus about new initiatives.

Summary

The consensus was to recommend to PaRC that new initiatives involving significant campus resources be communicated to the campus.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 pm.