

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Integrated Planning & Budgeting (IP&B) Task Force
Tuesday, July 25, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

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

ITEM	TOPICS	OUTCOME
1	Review minutes	Discussion
2	Student Equity Workgroup (SEW) program review recommendations	Discussion
3	Faculty prioritization process	Discussion
4	Notification of intent to develop a new initiative	Discussion

ATTENDANCE:

Andrew LaManque, Adrienne Hypolite, Cara Miyasaki, Craig Gawlick, Carolyn Holcroft, Dawn Girardelli (by phone), Debbie Lee, Denise Swett, Karen Smith, Kathy Perino, Lan Troung, Micaela Agyare, Paul Starer, Ram Subramanian, and Ruby Sodhi.

1) Review minutes

Debbie noted the IPB also discussed disaggregating data between international and non-international students, which was not reflected in the minutes; the minutes will be revised to include this.

2) Student Equity Workgroup recommended revisions to Program Review

Micaela outlined the Student Equity Workgroup recommendations regarding program review. The workgroup’s focus was on connecting the identification of student course achievement gaps to departmental action plans and resource requests to address the gaps.

One proposal is to share with departments “[Appendix A](#)” - Effective Practices for Increasing Student Success in the Classroom. The SEW also recommended including disaggregated achievement data for online courses. Andrew asked if SEW is suggesting the use of another prompt. Micaela said yes, adding that a new prompt would ask authors to address these gaps and the prompt would also link to effective strategies (e.g. draft Appendix A).

Comments on specific items included:

- #6 - Give departments bonuses for resources for resource requests if a strategy to address the gap is provided – the group expressed concern that action plans and resource requests are already part of what is required, not extra. Potential

modification to this idea would be a higher prioritization for resource requests to implement action plans, especially those known to be effective.

- #7 – Revise 3 A, 3B, and 3C (on the PRC evaluation rubric) to tie program objectives to the Student Equity Plan (SEP) and the Educational Master Plan (EMP) goals – Micaela noted that the workgroup agreed it would be good to tie program objectives to EMP goals.
- #8 – Add “Help” link to the template for suggestions on how to address achievement gaps – Micaela noted that this could be an appendix too.

Andrew noted that some of the recommendations on the list may need further refinement. Members discussed using a prompt which adds language to the student services, and creating an appendix that provide examples for both academic and student services. Andrew asked the group how they felt about changing or modifying the current comprehensive program review template. There were mixed responses. Andrew suggested a mockup of this for the next meeting.

Summary

The SEP program review recommendations need to be discussed further. The plan is to mock up what the template might look like to give clarity and how the recommendations could help better integrate student equity with college planning and budgeting.

3) SEW Recommendation 4.a

This recommendation states: the 3 courses with the greatest gaps can be automatically provided when distributing program data.

Summary

Lengthy discussion on how the Program Review Committee would use a “red” rating on part/all of a program review, or require action plan to make improvements. Members agreed that while no one size fits all, departments should make a constructive effort to better understand the data and use it as an opportunity to address the gaps.

Members agreed that IPB would not recommend a change to the PRC Charge that included an “automatic trigger” if success rates were below the institution set standard. Instead it was agreed that the current Charge provided the flexibility for PRC to follow up with departments in a variety of ways.

3) Faculty Prioritization Process

Andrew gave a brief overview of the process. There is no formula in place, instead, the idea is to share, justify, and guide the position hiring process to make it more transparent. Members discussed at length some of the guidelines on page 2 & 3 of the form:

- Challenge in hiring good part-timers.
- Concerns about using ADTs as criteria on the form.
- Consider looking at FTES increase and percentage increase.
- Consider labor market needs and trends.

Summary

The members agreed on need to make the process transparent and better help faculty and staff understand the basis for hiring decisions, address the challenges and concerns noted above. Plan for Andrew to do a mockup based on these suggestions (with available data).

4) Notification of Intent to Develop a New Initiative (doc)

Members voiced concerns about new initiatives (Law pathway and Early College Promise) that gave little to no opportunity to provide input or even inform them about what's happening. Andrew responded that the governance handbook in 2011 did identify a general process for developing new program initiatives. He added that last year there were questions about whether such initiatives should go through the OPC but then it was decided that new initiatives should be a "notifications" process, although not formally approving it. Andrew noted that the discussions around this topic last year revolved around what is a 'new initiative,' which led us to a definition of a program that would have college-wide impact, and the proposal should capture what would be included in the initiative, resources needed, etc. He added the taskforce now has an opportunity to discuss what we've done so far and consider bringing the form back to PaRC again.

Andrew reminded the group that Thuy suggested postponing considerations of the [form](#) until the IP&B task force had the opportunity to discuss it in summer 2017, and now it's up for discussion as part of our charge. IP&B members agreed that something like this is needed. Carolyn noted that such a form communicates that we need to pause and get feedback, invite wider perspective and analysis that will surface issues early rather than later.

Summary

The members agreed that widespread communication about new initiatives is essential and support discussing again at a future meeting, especially the definition of what initiatives would be included in the process.

The action item/s for next IP&B meeting are:

- Develop guidance about who should fill out the Notification of Intent to Develop a New Initiative form, whether the language is tight enough or if it needs to be refined, and approve this form for PaRC review.

Next meeting is scheduled for August 15, 2017.