



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

## PLANNING AND RESOURCE COUNCIL MINUTES

May 19, 2010

### IN ATTENDANCE:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS – HUEG

Kurt expressed his pride, appreciation and accolades for his staff that designed the new Foothill College website. It was completed with no additional cost to the college. The new design was developed with the guidance of a task force of students/faculty and staff. Congratulations and thank you to: Carleen Bruins, Lee Collings, & Shelly Schreiber.

ANDERSON – mentioned that his Fine Arts faculty and staff thought the new site was stunning and beautiful.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 5, 2010

APPROVED WITH CORRECTIONS:

CORRECT “WEIGHTLIST” TO “WAIT LISTED” PG. 1

CHANGE “FT” TO “FTEF” PG. 2

CHANGE: “THE TOP 6 WILL GO FORWARD...” “11-12” ACADEMIC YEAR NOT “10-11” PG. 2

CHANGE: “PERKINS UPDATE” – FROM “WEFAC” TO “WEAG” PG. 4

CORRECT: SPELLING OF NAME FROM “SERNIA” TO “SERNIUK” PG. 4

APPROVED AS AMENDED

GUESTS: DARYA GILANI, PETER MURRAY

### **ITEM I** - TREANOR (FORMERLY BARKER)

TREANOR – the OPC update is postponed.

SIP Reports included:

Building a Community of Scholars – 75 requests were received with 31 that were on-going B-budget augmentations. The committees ranked each category – Darya compiled a prioritization that averaged the rankings that came out of each SIP committee by category. OPC will be taking another look at the process.

MINER – wanted to note that good work was done. Added that further review needs to take place to see what finally emerges as “fundable.” Many of the requests could be covered by Measure C dollars, i.e. accessibility requests.

TREANOR – suggested that Cabinet take a look at list and remove those that are inappropriate or have been funded. Also need to review the process itself. The math is not as important as how we use the list. Next year we will clean list prior to distribution.

SPRAGGE – noted that facilities requests should be removed.

WILKES – her group (Building a Community of Scholars) took them out of division organization and moved to categories. Then created a spreadsheet to review them in one view. Deans seem to come at it from different angles – so only selective things were submitted. Some already funded, some decisions based on hearsay. Suggested developing a really consistent set of directions for the deans making the requests so they would know what to include or not. Her committee tried to respect priority of the divisions.

GARRIDO – felt there was not enough information to make meaningful prioritizations - what his group came up with was not with complete confidence.

PETER – Collaborative Decision Making – committee never met. Attended by only one or two people – others saying they couldn't get away from their work to participate. Supposed to be discussion at SIPS and then PaRC and instead went to OPC and OPC is informing PaRC.

MINER – that is the intention

TREANOR – OPC was just looking at the process, not necessarily trying to jump the process and would be waiting to hear from PaRC as to what to do next.

WHITE – there is a huge disconnect between what the SIPS are charged with vs. what they are doing.

STARER – Access into Action – it was illuminating and became very apparent how the campus works at cross purposes – ie. Counseling runs a calendar software completely separate from the college wide Meeting Maker. If we are going to work as a campus we need to be working with the same tools. Shouldn't lose the lesson that this reveals. There are many places that need student tutoring – so how much do you want to leave to divisions to support vs campus wide support – needs to be coordinated across campus.

GARRIDO – noticed the same disconnect – items were overlapped or related ie. checking out computers...why fund for a department vs. going to AV for a loaner? What group should be looking at that?

STARER – SIPS should coordinate facilities requests but do need to have a way so that people know how it works. Noted lack of training on how to write/make requests. There were things tied to ADA or accreditation – in that case, need to see verification.

GARRIDO – couldn't see how important it was – if something truly needs to exist then why aren't they already funded?

STARER - the committee felt as if they had been reduced to a "ranking machine" and felt that their purpose was loftier than that. Lost sight of the more philosophical questions of who are we vs. who gets how much of the pie?

MINER – need to look at re-purposing the function of SIPS. It is not about ranking resources it is about asking, "what is the work we need to do?" PaRC could be the place where we would ask, "is this important enough to take campus time to do?" Discussions are about what we do, not about how we pay for it. We can return to the concept of SIPS which

sounded very good in conception but is very difficult to execute....we need to ask where the lessons are learned and be sure those lessons don't get lost. "We also need to honor the work that has been done so far and what has emerged I fully support. My hope is that you can come away knowing that the complexity of this decision making is to provide the best programs and services."

#### **MAY REVISE - MINER**

With regard to the "May Revise" from Sacramento – will probably see some other cuts for 10-11 – don't know where or the way they will come down. We are prepared to have no cash from the State until September. We can be grateful for our reserves, our stability fund and balances along with eligibility for Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRAN) that would allow us to borrow to meet obligations. Confident that our fiscal conservativeness will serve us well in the coming months as the state struggles with their budget decisions.

Budgetary objective for 10-11 is that we retain everyone on Escrow I. We need to manage our dollars so that people are our first priority as we prioritize these requests.

STARER – are there any changes or further cuts?

MINER – No change, but CAL WORKS could go away – could also be some cuts in EOPS

MOSTAFA – what classes would the state not support?

MINER – haven't see what they are recommending but do believe they have their sights set on PE and athletics. We will monitor and will do what we can to preserve those areas.

Also want to commend the ASFC on maintaining such a large reserve – if there was an area that the students really wanted to support, you would be in a better financial situation to support it with your reserves.

TREANOR – clarified that OPC need not meet – will simply bring that list to PaRC.

### **ITEM II - ESMP 2<sup>ND</sup> DRAFT**

ORRELL – Did get some additional information especially in basic skills. On the website under "planning" - take a look and give feedback and then we will bring it back for another pass by PaRC June 2 meeting – revision won't be added until after June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Darya Gilani was commended on her graphic arts skills and outstanding contributions to compiling this report.

### **ITEM III**

QUESTIONS/RUMORS – Miner

MOSTAFA – encourage leaders of our community to attend town hall meetings in the future especially to support no raise to student fees.