FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B) Task Force
Thursday, July 11, 2017
MEETING MINUTES – <mark>Revised August 31, 2017</mark>

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

ITEM	TOPICS	OUTCOME
1	Review charge, role, membership, and products.	Discussion
2	Review 2017 Governance Survey.	Discussion
3	Review recommendations for IP&B from PaRC/PRC.	Discussion

ATTENDANCE:
Andrew LaManque, Adrienne Hypolite, Bret Watson, Craig Gawlick, Carolyn Holcroft, Dawn Girardelli, Debbie Lee, Denise Swett, Elaine Kuo, Karen Smith, Kent McGee, Kristy Lisle, Lisa Ly, Micaela Agyare, Paul Starer, Ram Subramanian, and Ruby Sodhi.

1) Introductions and Review Charge, Role, Membership, & Products
Since new members joined the 2017 Integrated Planning &Budgeting (IP&B) taskforce, everyone introduced themselves to the group. Andrew provided a brief overview of the taskforce and noted that it represents broad-based constituent groups. Andrew noted the IP&B taskforce only meets typically in the summer based on the agenda set by the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC). This taskforce gathers information regarding the agenda items, discusses, and then makes recommendations (accompanied by minutes and supporting documentation) to go back to PaRC in the fall.

2) Review 2017 Governance Survey (change of agenda)
As requested by members, Lisa Ly provided an overview of the top 5 items for IP&B consideration from the 2017 Governance Survey and reviewed some of the responses/comments. This list was prepared from the qualitative responses on the 2017 governance survey and top 5 items included:
- Faculty/staff prioritization process (*themes: transparency, criteria to evaluate requests*).
- Annual and comprehensive program review templates including program review process (*themes: shorter and simplified template, assistance with data, reassess cycle, and the need for adequate time to reflect/have a meaningful dialogue*).
- Resource prioritization process (*theme: transparency*).

The discussion revolved around the current metrics in use at the college, the possibility of Quality Focus Essay (QFE) action plans to address the governance survey findings, and available resources to help departments/divisions use effective student learning outcomes (SLOs).

3) Review Recommendations for IP&B from PaRC/PRC

Andrew noted that PaRC has directed this taskforce to consider the items approved in a June 19, 2017 agenda document. Members reviewed the document and the following discussions revolved around these topics:

- ❖ Governance Handbook - How and when the Governance Handbook should be reviewed since it is one of the action plans (Participatory Governance) in the Quality Focus Essay that the college begins to address soon.

- ❖ Program Review – how best to include the growing number of inter-disciplinary programs, and who would be responsible for those program reviews (e.g. General Studies: Science, Social Justice, etc.).

  Discussion about what the color ratings (green, yellow, and red) implied. For example, if a red for any individual rubric category (such as Equity) would automatically trigger the need for an action plan for that area even if the overall program review rating was yellow or green.

  Suggestions included:
     a) asking the department to set up an adhoc committee to come up with a plan to address the area,
     b) use a more detailed rubric.

  Members agreed on the need to develop a clear signal on the progress of a program.

- ❖ Institution-Set Standards - Whether a remediation plan should automatically be required of programs that are below the institution standard for course success rates, overall or for any subpopulation.

- ❖ Program Review Templates - Possible revisions to the student services unit program review template prompts to more clearly highlight services provided and students served. Perhaps have standardized data for student services. Will also review possible revisions recommended by the Student Equity Workgroup to more clearly communicate opportunities to include program plans addressing institution / classroom practices in addition to plans addressing student behaviors.

- ❖ Program Review Calendar - Look into the possibility of making Program Review templates available late January instead of December.

Related Discussion:

- Comment on no current place to ask how much professional development money is used by the various departments/divisions/programs. Would be helpful to have a central storehouse of all the professional development activities that take place at the college and outside for which various college constituents use the funds. Andrew has

already requested a report on this but it should be discussed elsewhere as it is not within the scope of this committee's work.

There was further discussion on 'top 5 items' on the 2017 Governance Survey. Highlights of the discussion:
- There was a discussion about campus understanding of how the OPC process works. This includes the process for feedback. When a department puts in a request they should know when they will hear whether it will be funded and on what basis that decision was made. It was agreed that there was a need to increase transparency in this area and this was also mentioned on the governance survey. While PaRC did not include a review of the OPC process and timelines in its charge to IPB this year it was agreed that the OPC timeline is related to the PRC timeline and thus it made sense to talk about the two together later in the summer. OPC will also be working this coming year to examine their processes and make recommendations for change to PaRC.

Andrew reviewed the Theater and Math department programs reviews, along with PRC's feedback (which were included as attachments) so that the committee could get a sense of what they looked like. Theater received a red rating because of enrollment issues and Math received a green. There was discussion at PaRC about why Math received a green even though the student course success rates, especially for some subpopulations, are near or below the institutional standard. Paul from PRC noted that Math had addressed the issue in the program review and had outlined a number of interventions to improve student success.

The discussion then moved on the best way to impact change – how do we best support the department in their efforts to increase success rates. What are the institutional responsibilities? How often do we look back to see if what has been tried has worked? While PRC does look back at the previous comprehensive program review this is not systematic – perhaps a review of the metrics and goals from the previous program review should be included more formally in the comprehensive program review?

The group then began reviewing the proposal from the Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) to change the program review template, including the addition of an "Appendix" of best practices for creating a welcoming classroom environment. The group talked about the level of data provided and the need for additional coaching of departments on interpreting the data.

Only the first couple items of the SEW proposal were reviewed so the group agreed to continue the discussion of the proposal at the next meeting.

4) Discussion on Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process

Andrew reviewed the data presented to PaRC last fall to support the faculty prioritization proposal. The data included trend information on student success and enrollment as well as a summary sheet on the trends using pluses and minuses as well as notes for those departments that had requested a faculty position. IPB reviewed the list of faculty prioritization positions from last year.

Discussion highlights:
- Current process has used many of the same data elements / criteria that are now incorporated in the out-of-cycle hiring prioritizations process.

- The process entails looking at program reviews for full-time faculty requests for this year. The number of new hires is based on direction from the district on the allowance of new hires (vacant and growth positions). Reminder that the list of position requests does not go to Operations Planning Committee (OPC). Instead, the deans and VPs review the list for ranking, and their prioritized list comes to PaRC along with relevant data and comments regarding how the prioritizations were made.

- There is no set formula was used for faculty hiring prioritizations so that the college has flexibility to adapt to changing needs. Departments do a good job of providing a rationale to argue for their needs.

- Even though last year was a year of transition in the Office of Instruction, the prioritization list was discussed multiple times by the Instructional Deans. A position in Graphic Design was ranked low and a new Library position received a high ranking. It did turn out that most positions ended up being replacement positions but that was after an examination and discussion of college needs.

  It was agreed last year to continue the practice that searches that were unsuccessful in the previous year would have the first priority of going out again the following year – assuming needs had not changed – based on the rationale that they had already received a high ranking by the college. Members agreed that this process needs to be communicated more widely to the search committees.

  Data elements included:
    1. Sole Full-Time Faculty Member
    2. Enrollment Trends
    3. 4 yr Enr Change in Enrollment
    4. Enr Trends in Targeted Student Groups
    5. Does the department offer an ADT
    6. Success Rate of Targeted Student Groups
    7. 4 yr Change in Success Rates for Targeted Student Groups
    8. Online Success Targeted Groups
    9. 4 yr Change Online Success Targeted Groups
    10. Notes / Rationale

Among the suggestions shared: putting specific metrics in place for this process, hosting open forums to share opinions, unpacking the available data, and invest in professional development activities because just hiring would not solve the problems.

The group agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

5) Next Meeting Discussion Topics

- Review SEW program review recommendations
- Discussion faculty prioritization metrics starting with the out of cycle request document.
- Review and reconsider a new initiative proposal form.

6) Other topics discussed / suggestions made:
- Suggestion to have data automatically included in the PR template for student services so that programs could discuss the gaps.
- Question about how data is currently disaggregated? Data comes from the student application in which students self-identify.
- Committee member suggested disaggregating data by international and non-international students.
- Importance of disaggregation of data - meaningful and provides trends.
- Ethnic categories are dictated by the state and do not include all possible categories but, do provide some entry points for discussions.