



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

PLANNING AND RESOURCE COUNCIL MINUTES

May 5, 2010

IN ATTENDANCE:

Anderson M., Balducci, Barker, Dunlap/Bourquin, Casey, Chan, White, Courtney, Davison, Day, Erickson, Olsen, Galope, Garrido, Hueg, McAlpin, Meade, Mostafa, Miner, Myers, Noone, Oropeza, Orrell, Patyk, Peck, Peter, Schreiber, Sias, Spragge, Starer, Stenger, Swett, Wilkes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR APRIL 21, 2010

APPROVED WITH CORRECTIONS:

The following corrections to attendance were:

Pam Wilkes was in attendance

Eloise Orrell was not in attendance

Karen Erickson was not in attendance

Minutes approved with changes.

GUESTS: Gigi Gallagher, Peter Murray

ITEM I

FTE REQUESTS – SURVEY RESULTS

Anderson – noted that Fine Arts would be withdrawing the request for the Music Technology Instructor. The job announcement was written incorrectly and not sure what will happen with the position since it is being covered by a temp at the present time.

Barker – shared the 4.19.10 weighted FTEF ranking list.

Miner – Noted that when she saw the top six, she had the same reaction to the fall prioritization and that was that PaRC had done a great job. It was clear that there was a lot of thought given to the rankings within the divisions and that it included discussion about the elements that contribute to student success. All positions have good reason to have some consideration. She recommended that we keep the top 6 as the group that would be our prioritization for 11/12 academic year. We won't know how many positions we can fill until the summer – will be contingent on state budget for 10-11 and close out for 9-10 year as a district. We can hit the ground running in the fall to start these committees - could advertise as early as October and interview January 2011. If a mid year cut comes 10-11 and we made offers, possible we could honor offers. With regard to positions that fell below the top 6 - cut off could be higher than 6 positions. She asked for comments from anyone who had strong feels about re-voting everything.

Mostafa – was happy that the English instructor made the top of the list as difficult for students to get English classes. From student perspective many English classes are weight listed.

Starer – noted that he asked for and received more FTEF and actually offered more classes. ENG 1C was offered in winter and spring. It is required at UC Berkeley, but when Berkeley announces who has been admitted, half of the students drop the class. If we were on a semester system it would be different - but 2 sections in spring would be difficult. It is true that all English classes were full and weight listed, but even with old schedule there has generally been more demand.

Miner – FTEF was discussed at Chancellor Staff yesterday – initial data from FH and DA about FT not used. Are looking forward to 10-11 with greater productivity and dollars left over that would fund 1320 – proposed that we allow that to roll over into 10-11 year giving us a greater capacity to offer more courses. We decreased schedule by 5% or 200 classes. CSU turning away 40,000 students. Will have to verify those dollars are there.

Garrido – if it didn't roll over what would happen to it?

Miner - would drop to bottom line at district and will hold on to to cover other expenses or stability fund.

Erickson - would roll over be campus specific?

Miner – no, although we would have more capacity to grow our schedule than DA.

Garrido – is FT hire directly related to offerings?

Miner – would mean more sections if we allocated more FTEF

Starer – Librarians have pointed out difference between director and coordinator – There will be a correction to title of librarian to “Coordinator.”

Miner – Engineering and English positions could have multiple qualifications. Those kinds of considerations should be noted.

Sias – not everyone replied to the positions ranking survey and that was to be revisited and if they did not speak up. Where is that before we move on? Did the students not understand what the process was?

Courtney – students are aware of the guidelines and did understand the process to base decision –can't speak as to why they didn't respond.

Miner – 12 out of 18 voting members voted – do we need to re vote the entire list?

By show of hands – who is willing to endorse the top 6?

13 yes, no oppositions, 1 abstention

The top 6 will go forward for hiring for the 10-11 academic year.

Miner – addressing the remainder of the list – do you want to go forward and vote again on those?

Davison – with changes made to the list that changes consideration of the list.

Starer – if we can get 8 instead of 6 also a factor for that decision.

Miner – still have 4 open positions - we might be looking at positions that could be filled mid year - not likely but prefer to be ready. We are filling 12 positions this year. Feel fairly confident that we can fill 6 positions on the list due to retirements, resignations etc.

Barker – would it be acceptable to do what we did last year....we would have another vote on what may happen in the next few months...ie retirements. Would give us some flexibility for future changes.

Miner – lets leave list alone and not try to re-rank it right now.

Starer – For people putting in requests that are currently not in existence - how do we insure it comes to PaRC?

Barker – would have to do this process in the fall.

Miner - if something is essential to a functioning program we would just move forward.

Sias – can we “fast track” a position if something comes up? How firm is this list as of today?

Miner – this is about more than just what we can afford....some we must hire for program to continue. It's reasonable to expect that the top 6 have a really good chance to go forward but can't guarantee until budget is firmed up this summer.

Davison – Maybe waiting until fall would help limit discontent over positions that got bumped.

Schreiber - how many are mandated?

Miner – based on district list, we are right at that number now with this list. If we have positions not filled we are below number and subject to penalty. But all is predicated on positions that become available.

Sindy – one June 30 you may have a whole new voting body. They may not be the same people in the fall. How do you bring them up to speed?

Miner –membership changes but hope that we built a system that is not “person dependent” and will provide same data that all of you had and have same discussion. We could revisit this at Leadership Retreat and set the stage for where we are headed.

Wilkes – should prioritize them as it feels like we are coming full circle with the process we have been trying to build this year. Would seem incomplete if we don't finish the list.

Miner – by a show of hands who would like to complete the reprioritizations now – By majority (11), will defer to October – will go forward with the 6 positions from first vote and in October will address the remainder of the list and any new positions that may become available.

ITEM II

PERKINS UPDATE – Galope

Galope – needed representation from classified and faculty on WEFAC to re-institute the committee.

Olsen - presented to OPC and requests met all requirements and were approved.

Miner – we are looking for endorsement from PaRC.

Davison – thanked Shirley and Richard for welcoming Faculty Senate representation.

By a show of hands, vote to accept recommendation from WEFAC

MSC

14 yes

0 opposed

0 abstention

ITEM III

QUESTIONS/RUMORS – Miner

Miner - congratulated classified staff for Staff Appreciation Week. Our board adopted a resolution to designate, along with the California Legislator, the 3rd week of May as Classified Appreciation Week.

Starer – discussion last meeting that PaRC needs to prioritize what needs to get on the agenda before end of year.

Miner - will consult with tri chairs to do that.

Miner – called a close to the meeting honoring our DeAnza classified staff member Gregg Sernia, photo lab tech, who passed away. Noted that it has been an especially tough year with our losses. We need to value each and every day and take care of each other.

Sias - Noted dedication of Chavez Park and requested clarification on Robert's Rules for ex-officio members of PaRC.

Miner – we can have ex-officio members who vote or don't vote. The word means “from the office of” or “by virtue of office or official position.” Appointment to this committee is a function of the office they hold. Other constituencies would have non-voting members because of role of senate vs. unions. As this being primary governance body they would not be voting members. Other ex-officio like Annette/Mia do not vote. Ex-officio does not mean that you automatically do not vote.

Olsen – reminded of the Classified Retreat 8:00-4:00, Friday at DeAnza campus and asked for campus wide support their attendance.

