

To: OPC

From: Kimberlee Messsina, John Mummert and Denise Swett

Subject: Resource allocation criteria and rationale for Vice Presidential prioritization

Date: March 19, 2012

VP prioritization process: Each vice president read and reviewed all of the program reviews in his or her area, and provided feedback to the deans. In addition, the vice presidents met with each of the deans to go over the resource requests from each division. Finally, the three vice presidents met together on three separate occasions to review the resource requests. We then placed all requests into an integrated list of bands of priority, with the exception of Faculty requests, which were compiled in rank order. In every case, data from the program reviews was a key element in the decision making process. The rationale that we used for our prioritization process is listed by category below.

Full Time Faculty: PaRC will prioritize the full time faculty requests and recommend the list to the President in spring, 2012. In Fall, the President will inform PaRC of how many positions the college will be able to hire. We have no way of anticipating the exact Full Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) for 2013-2014, given the reduction in enrollment and FTES, as well as the workload reduction imposed by the state. In making our recommendations the Vice Presidents have considered several factors including the divisional priority, the FT/PT ratio, the ability to hire qualified adjuncts, the balance of transfer, basic skills, workforce and student services, and the number of students served. In addition, we have prioritized areas that would bring enrollment and FTES growth. We have also taken into account the potential ramifications of our recommendations with regards to the 50% Law (**Education Code Section 84362**

T5, CCR Section 59200 et seq.) as well as any areas of potential reductions identified by De Anza College, given the potential bumping scenarios that could impact Foothill.

FT/PT Classified Staff: Given the increasingly dire budgetary outlook, and in light of recent layoffs and reductions, we have approached requests for new classified positions very cautiously. We are actively looking at our existing staffing at the college, and will be working to evaluate whether there are opportunities to share or shift support staff to where the need is greatest. In this category, we considered several factors, such as whether the requirements of the position were highly specialized, whether there was a clear safety or regulatory concern, and whether the lack of the position would mean that we could no longer offer an instructional or support program.

Reassigned Time: Foothill/De Anza spends over one million dollars a year in reassigned time. The time that Full time faculty spend doing non-instructional duties does not count against the college for the FON. However it does count against the college in terms of the 50% Law, as do any Librarian or Counselor positions, as

well as all staff and administrative salaries, and any other item not explicitly instructional according to the State of CA. Foothill currently has approximately 9 FTEF in reassigned time. In making our recommendations we asked the following questions regarding non-contractual reassigned time: 1) Is reassigned time required for external accreditation? 2) Does the reassigned time serve the institution as a whole, or one program? 3) Is there another way to accomplish the goals of the request, without using reassigned time?

B Budget: Given that the college is only going to release 50% of the allocated B budgets for the upcoming fiscal year, we did not feel that it was appropriate in most cases to prioritize B budget augmentation at this time. We also know that we cannot continue to live on one-time monies, especially since we are relying on them to carry positions and prevent layoffs. We did prioritize the requests in bands of high, medium and low. However, we are asking that OPC consider identifying alternate funding sources, such as lottery, Measure C, Perkins, or one time money for the requests that you affirm as High, rather than recommending an ongoing augmentation to the B budget at this time.

Facilities: The facilities requests were for dedicated space on campus, such as a classroom or meeting space. Given the shortage of available classroom space, and the need for swing space during this time of construction, we do not think that reserving space for a very narrow purpose is advisable at this time. Rather, we need to find ways of increasing our capacity.

Equipment: We approached the equipment requests asking the following questions: 1) Is the request absolutely necessary to offer or maintain the quality of the program? 2) Are there other options other than purchasing the equipment? And, if at all possible, 3) Is there existing instructional equipment or Perkins that can fund these requests.

One-time requests: These requests were also evaluated based on the criteria mentioned in the other categories above. We considered how essential the request was for the program, whether there was a benefit across the institution, how many students were served as well.