



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

**PLANNING AND RESOURCE COUNCIL  
MINUTES**

May 16, 2012

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Anderson, Balducci, Bourquin, Casey, Cellilo, Chenoweth, Courtney, Davison, Day, Dobbins, Dye, Gilani, Heiser, Hueg, Kuo, Larhimi, McGee, McKellar, Messina, Miner, Mummert, Murray, Ong, Patyk, Starer, Stenger, Swett, Taketa, Tran, Treanor, White

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS – MINER**

Guests:

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 2, 2012**

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

**ITEM I - OPC /RESOURCE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS  
1<sup>ST</sup> READ – (TREANOR)**

See attachment

The OPC completed the rankings according to the rubric. As suspected, things that didn't fit the rubric didn't rank very high. Division/VP/OPC rankings are listed separately: Columns F, G, H. Some rankings were done by OPC only because they didn't have a division.

It was suggested we open a survey for voting members so we have PaRC's input on rankings for high/med/low. Purpose is to see if PaRC is in agreement with the three group rankings.

It was asked if there was agreement with OPC ranking of reassigned time? If not, suggestions or reasons for disagreement should be shared.

It was noted that the Academic Senate has not seen rankings and should review them before anything goes forward.

**ACTION:** Will take list to constituents and gather viewpoints, noting that aligning on-going dollars is an important goal. Discussion will then take place at PaRC.

It was asked why ones that are "a given" to continue are on the list and can they be highlighted?

We recognize that we have no money and we are weighing keeping people vs. "items" on the list. This is an evolving process and will become easier as the years go by.

Most detail is being seen for the first time during a time of diminished resources. It is a very high stakes game. This is the best we can do to identify our priorities. Then we must determine how we will support that work.

## **ITEM II - FACULTY STAFF SURVEY RESULTS – 1<sup>ST</sup> READ - KUO**

See handout

Faculty Ranking by Priority – Results

Twelve out of 18 voting members responded. They were asked to score each 1 through 20.

It is unknown at this time if we will be authorized to fill ANY positions as we are at our obligation. We will need to account for the 50% law. Some of 2012 positions were predicated on retirements for June 2012. Wanted to be sure we captured them now since 2013 is unknown. It was noted there is no danger to faculty on tenure track being released.

Staff Ranking by Priority

There are 21 positions – priority ranking was a raise of hands - high/medium/low

ACTION: PaRC to discuss at next meeting – 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.

## **ITEM III – TRANSFER WORKGROUP UPDATE – STARER/CHENOWETH/DAY**

See handout

Shared goal to: “Increase the number of students from all student populations on the pathway to transfer.” It was found that underrepresented students are not succeeding at a greater rate.

See “action plan” in template

There is overlap with basic skills and transfer student populations.....if we make headway with underrepresented in basic skills, transfer will also reap the rewards. This concern was pointed out in our Accreditation report as a charge and is being addressed there as well.

Recommendation – a Financial Aid representative should be added to the workgroup participants. Should also have faculty members from English and math as well.

## **ITEM IV - IPB SUMMER TASK FORCE – GILANI**

See list

It was suggested that the membership be reduced from 12 to nine.

ACTION: Will adjust number of membership to 9 OR 12 evenly distributed constituents. Will recruit for summer participants.

ACTION: students will be added to the Program Review Committee in an advisory capacity and also added to IPB. Members will be identified before Fall 2012. The action was approved by consensus.

## **ITEM IV- MINER**

### **QUESTIONS/RUMORS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Judy shared a preview for Thursday's emergency budget meeting.

The "May Revise" announced more bad news should the November initiative not pass. It was also shared that there will be a competing initiative - the "Molly Munger Tax Initiative." That initiative benefits K-12 only. Whichever initiative gets the higher percentage wins.

Students announced that they have actively opposed the Munger Initiative.

If the November initiative does not pass, \$313M in cuts would be added back to CCC budget. If it passes, \$300M goes away. And if the "Munger Initiative" beats the K-14 Initiative, \$4-5M will be added to our present college struggle.

Classified position eliminations would take effect March 2013 rather than June 30 2013. Those people will be notified by December 2012.

DeAnza proposed that they would eliminate four counselors. It was noted that a large portion of their present cuts was elimination of course sections.

A timeline should be available soon as to when various decision points will be made. Not clear yet if decisions will need to be made over the summer. Would like to suggest that we have a set of "ad hoc" PaRC meetings during summer quarter. Dates will be announced (see agenda) and posted on Meeting Maker.

We were reminded that student fees cannot be considered as source of income. Even with the fee increase 12-13, we only get \$2 of student enrollment fee, the rest goes to the state. UC/CSU gets 100% of their tuition dollars. They can raise fees and pay for existing staff. We have to find alternative revenue sources or cut expenses. We need to stay the course, conserve \$\$ we have. Additionally, the BOG waiver has impacted our revenue negatively.

Q - Should we be looking for different solutions other than BOG waiver?

A - Honoring of Prop 98 guarantee – has not been an empty guarantee to colleges.

Q - Why are we making cuts before the November ballot results?

A –There are realities about the timing we have to be prepared for ....everyone should be looking at areas that must go away or stop regardless of what happens in November.

Communicating to the public and educating them as to what will happen if they don't approve the November initiative is essential. We were reminded, however, that we are NOT allowed to actively solicit votes or discuss initiative with public during work hours.

***Meeting adjourned***