Minutes

March 29, 2011
2:00-3:30, AC 108

Minutes

Present: Yolanda Bellisimo, Tom Burke, Angelina Duarte (Co-Chair), Jon Gudmundsson, Chialin Hsieh (Staff Resource), Mike Irvine, Peggy Isozaki, Sara Lefkowitz, Sara McKinnon (Co-Chair), Michele Martinisi, Marshall Northcott (Staff Resource), Nanda Schorske, Carol Scialli (Staff Resource), Kathleen Smyth

Absent: Earl Hagstrom, Michele Martinisi, Nathaniel Parker

Others Present: David Wain Coon, Jim Arnold, Laurie Ordin, Irina Roderick

Agenda Review
- Agenda approved.

Budget Engagement
David Wain Coon
- The college is $800,000 to $1.2 million over on expenses over revenues and will need to adjust the gap to balance the budget. Closing an $800,000 gap seems doable to me based on past experience.
- Board would like to add to reserves. Basic Aid districts may have to offer percentage to help other schools that are not Basic Aid. This is one reason for Board’s conservative stance on having an ample reserve.
- Hopes as we move towards budget planning and balancing process that all individuals will be engaged. He is open to receiving ideas from all re: cost savings, efficiencies. Some of best ideas can come from those on front lines.
- He prefers to err on the side of transparency.
- Has reviewed areas/issues PRAC recommendations; great foundation point.
- Players missing from conversation: Department Chairs need to have voice and be engaged in process.
- Hiring new faculty should be a collaborative dialogue with budget managers, chairs; Academic Senate.
- Under new contract and will change dynamic of how we hire faculty. We have list resulting from retirements etc. and we will look at how many positions we have to fill and process to do so.
  - Per Yolanda:
  - Academic Senate has a process just revamped and will bring to Academic Senate next week as beginning of that procedure.
  - Data has been pulled from Program Reviews.
  - Moved from Senate/District through Governance process.
- Would like to see list of part-time versus full-time faculty per discipline.
- Tentative budget will go to Board in June.
- Big piece that must be considered is DSPS support, about $250,000. Want sense of where Board is on this issue before looking at other budget assumptions.

Comments
- Unit allocations: started to develop a process how to allocate units looking at master schedule and blueprint:
  - Per AD:
  - Looking at how to prioritize and shape curriculum; Deans are working on this right now.
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- Master schedule is a basic IGETC CSU GE template; blueprint descriptions are rough; working to get all on same page.
- Not there but moving in same direction.
- Finding cumbersome getting a snapshot with all the data; critical to streamline process. Otherwise, process doesn’t seem transparent.
- Per AD: Need to look at WASC recommendations some of which require resources. This will drive some of our decision making because need to respond.
- We are using existing Program Review to make decisions but also using other data:
  - WASC recommendations i.e., DE infrastructure, Library/Student Services to evenings, IVC and online students.
  - Last year’s PRAC recommendations.
  - Unit allocations.
- VP of Operations had a good meeting with Technology Committee. WASC is requiring we have plans in place and only have bits and pieces.
  - Hiring consulting firm to write a new version of the Technology Plan. Tech Committee will drive the process.
  - Technology Committee would like more faculty participation.
  - IT Director working on various initiatives that resulted from Technology Plan, including WiFi, and hope to develop spending plan in next couple weeks.
- Committee member concerned that needs pressing now; want to be sure those will be addressed. Per President: Agrees

Discussion Re: Proposed Learning Community: Math 95A with ECE
Jim Arnold, Laurie Ordin, Irina Roderick on Behalf of Math Department

Background
- Peggy Dodge (Childhood Development) and Maula Allen (Mathematics) are collaborating in developing a linked Learning Community with 95A/B and ECE 226 (Discoveries in Mathematics and Science). This is a response to the need for Math and Science literacy, a critical ECE student learning outcome.
- Learning Community would ensure ECE students take Math and also learn how to teach children Math.
- PRAC approved the learning community in concept at its March 22 meeting.

Comments:
- Dean is confused because proposal did not include Dean or Math Department so murky how this is proceeding. If additional units were made available to Math Department, Deans and Chairs would decide how to spend units most wisely. This does not appear to be the case.
- Would have preferred to have a department wide conversation how to use units; confused that one instructor came to PRAC.
  - Partnership is designed to improve SLOs for ECE. In considering proposal, committee was not thinking about giving more units to Math but how to meet SLOs for ECE.
- Dean over ECE is enthusiastic but did raise issue re: process. Others might want to be involved in this type of innovation mandated by WASC. Maybe our task is to talk about process rather than unit allocation. How do we do something innovative but with a transparent process?
- Two departments would mean equal buy-in. It’s not just about ECE and SLOs but more on connection between SLO assessment and resource allocation. In concept felt comfortable but maybe is a broader issue than ECE.
- Committee is looking at a higher level of connecting planning with resource allocation so felt comfortable in concept.
- There were 13 full wait listed sections a year ago. Most are Math 103 or Math 115.
- Suggestion if ECE has a finite number of units, why not take one of their classes and switch it to a Math class.
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- **Per Math Chairs Ordin and Roderick:**
  - Lower level courses up to Math 103 are difficult for students and roadblock for transfer.
  - Started Math 101 awhile ago (stretch version, two semesters). Did this with some success.
  - After 7 years, did it with Math 103, Intermediate Algebra, roadblock to transfer. Did stretch version of this and more success with it.
  - ECE students are placing at Math 95 level.
  - Unless ECE students are exceptional, they are not placing into Math 95 level.
  - 87% of students need Math 85. Suggest experiment with Math 85. Chairs would be more likely to support this experiment.
  - No detailed description of teaching method being employed. Want all students to meet prerequisites or waters down program.
  - Math Chairs would like to know more about pedagogy of learning community experiment. Maybe experiment using Math 85/95 as more appropriate. Communication with department about this.
- **Per AD:** What if we allow ECE students not to test, suspend for a group and see what happens? Need to create spaces for ourselves outside our paradigm. Remember Jaime Escalante and what he did.
- How much contextualization in other Math classes? Are there opportunities for students for contextualization?
- This is experimental. If it works, the college has to decide if this is something we choose to fund. We need to look at units more globally and think about what are we trying to accomplish for students.
- This conversation should have occurred before it came to PRAC, but consider what we can learn from this learning community, in a contextualized environment, if it succeeds.

1. **Committee still supports, in concept, experimental approach for units.**
2. **Committee also supports Math Department’s recommendation to go with 85/95 Math.**
3. **A conversation should take place among faculty. If conversation supports idea of Math 85/95, PRAC would like to be advised of this. AD will facilitate this.**
4. **AD will meet with Math Department Dean and Chairs to have initial conversation re: desired protocols. This could be used by PRAC to that is, set up a process so others can have same access.**

**Planning Cycle Revisions**
*Chialin Hsieh*
- Updated 3 documents (distributed). These documents were also sent via e-mail:
  - Planning cycle
  - Timeline At-A-Glance
  - Revised Integrated Planning Manual (revised Page 20 & 21)

**Budget Development Plan**
*Yolanda Bellísimo*
- Sara put Yolanda’s recommendations in a table format. Think about what type of data we would need; fill in the table and bring to next meeting.
- We use *Program Review* for IEC, technology, staffing but not only driver of planning. Must look at WASC recommendations.

**Revisions to PRAC’s Charge**
*Budget Assumption Recommendations; Special Meetings when Necessary*
- Hold for future meeting.

**Computer Replacement Plan**
Rubrics (Marshall Northcott)
- Addressed this with VP of Operations but currently no funds for Plan.
- Where is PRAC concerning Computer Replacement Plan?
  - PRAC forwarded as recommendation to President but nothing was done about it. Include in future recommendations.
- We want a plan recommendation first. Then, there is an allocation process. These are two separate parts of process.
- We have immediate needs that need to be addressed.
- $3M for technology infrastructure. Let’s find out more about it.
  - Set aside for smart classrooms for Modernized buildings.
  - Multimedia Lab came out of Bond to fund selected labs.
  - FA 315 space got all new equipment.
  - PE got all new computers.
- Think about questions, compile, and ask VP of Operations for answers.

Response to Academic Senate Letter re: Computer Replacement Plan (Marshall Northcott)
- Hold for future meeting.

Subcommittee Reports
Technology Planning (Mike Irvine)
- Hold.

Student Access & Success
- Hold.

Educational Planning
- Hold.

Facilities Planning
- Hold.

Instructional Equipment (Angelina Duarte)
- Hold.

Professional Development
- Hold.

Other Reports & Updates
SLOs Update (Academic/Student Services)
- Hold for future meeting.

Wrap Up/Assignments
- Committee members work to fill in Sara’s PRAC recommendations table.

Next Meeting Agenda (April 5, April 19, April 26)
- Meet every week in April. No meeting during spring break.
- Carol send meeting reminders.