FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B) Task Force
Tuesday, September 5, 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 Timeline
3	Comprehensive Program Review Template
4	New Initiative Form
5	Faculty Prioritization

ATTENDANCE:
Andrew LaManque, Adrienne Hypolite, Bret Watson, Carolyn Holcroft, Craig Gawlick, Dawn Girardelli, Debbie Lee, Elaine Kuo, Kurt Hueg, Lan Troung, Lisa Ly, Kristy Lisle and Ruby Sodhi.

The following attachments were included with the agenda

1. Faculty Prioritization from 2012 Gov Handbook
2. Anthropology Program Review Observations Example V2
3. IPB Proposed Instructional Program Review Template - PDF | WORD
4. New Initiative Proposal V4
5. Program Review Timeline 2016-17
6. Program Review FAQs Draft

1) Review minutes
Andrew reviewed the minutes from July 25 and August 29. There were no suggestions for change.

2) OPC Process

In a a change to the agenda, Debbie shared a draft of a timeline she put together for the Operations and Planning Committee (OPC).

The timeline depicted the current process.

A suggestion was made to ask the OPC to inform college constituents whether departments received and used the funds requested through the program review process. Closing this information loop was deemed important for transparency and also to give departments enough time to request funds again.

There was discussion around the need to bring the new deans up to speed on the resource prioritization process so they can share this information with faculty early and often. Kristy advocated for a better two-way communication among college constituents to support the college's goal to improve its participatory governance process and to build accountability around metrics.

Summary
Members agreed that having a document that outlined the current OPC process was helpful and thanked Debbie for her work. Bret agreed to refine the document, share it with OPC in the fall and post to the OPC website.

3) Program Review Timeline

Andrew presented a revised timeline for program review which proposed that program review be due at the end of January instead of December. The idea was to give programs more time for dialogue and discussion. The downside of the proposal is that it leaves less time for PRC and OPC to do their work. Another suggestion was to have program due in the spring. Several members mentioned that it would result in a lag to departments in terms of receiving feedback – they would already be in to a new academic year (fall).

Other ideas brought up:
- Limited time to give thoughtful feedback.
- The challenge with winter and spring program reviews and funding deadlines.
- Possibility of changing the comprehensive program review to 5 years instead of the existing 3-year cycle to allow adequate time to implement and evaluate program plans.
- No current mechanism for PRC to have a dialogue with OPC, no discussion of goal or standards of practice.
- Extensive amount of time it takes for the deans and the VPs to go through the comprehensive program reviews and not enough time for a conversation about their data.
- Possibility of doing just the annual program reviews for all departments and programs this year.

Summary
After lengthy discussion the consensus was to leave the December deadline but to discuss further during our Quality Focus Essay work this year.

4) Program Review Template

An issue was raised about requiring the faculty to drill down into the data instead of giving it to them. Holcroft advocated strongly that faculty receive data and some pre-analysis from our IR Office, and opposed requiring faculty to retrieve and analyze their own data. A lengthy discussion revolved around using data to tell each department's story.

The group spoke at length about the purpose of program review as a tool for improvement. Some members expressed the feeling that PR was seen as more of a burden than an opportunity for dialogue. The group spoke about creating the time and space for departmental discussion. One suggestion was to move the cycle from 3 to 5 years to allow more time for a richer discussion and review. Another suggestion was to take a break this year and perhaps have everyone only do an annual program review. There was also discussion about including a redesign of program review processes as part of our Governance QFE. Some reminded the group of our charge from PaRC in June and the work of the Student Equity Workgroup and Program Review Committee last year to focus attention on equity in the program review template.

Summary
The group ran out of time before reaching consensus on the proposed template so after the meeting Kristy sent out a survey asking members to vote on one of three alternatives:

	Comprehensive Program Review	Annual Program Review	Annual Resource Request
Choice Number One	Do Not Complete	Do Not Complete	Complete
Choice Number Two	Do Not Complete	Complete	Complete as a Part of Annual Program Review
Choice Number Three	Complete Comprehensives on Revised Template	Complete	Complete as a Part of Annual Program Review

The consensus after the vote was for Choice Number Three.

Action Item: IP&B proposal to PaRC on a revised Comprehensive Instructional Template.

5) New Initiative form
Discussion revolved around the following points:
- A lot of this information is already in the governance handbook so perhaps we can propose that PaRC continue the work with the Governance QFE which includes improvements in the way we communicate and collaborate.
- While the proposed form lets everyone know about a new initiative and directs them to the governance process, what about people who don't know about this when they work on a new initiative.

- The importance of being able to make quick decisions (such as a new initiative) in a collaborative way at a time of leaner budget.
- Need more open forums instead of a piece of paper to create extra layers of work.

Summary
Members agreed this form provides guidelines, and a forum to work with others to share ideas and gather feedback early in the process of new program development.

Action item: Bring the New Initiative Form to PaRC for discussion.

6) Faculty prioritization
Andrew briefly pointed out that a list of principals for faculty prioritization was already included in the Governance Handbook and since we are reviewing our Governance process and handbook the general consensus was to wait to make any changes for that discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.