De Anza College IPBT Notes 🏝 February 21, 2006

Present: Alves de Lima, Bradshaw, Harral, Jenkins, Kubo, Leskinen, Miner, Mowrey, Setziol, Sherman, Swensson

Absent: Espinosa-Pieb, Griffin, LaManque, McCarthy, Woodward

- I. <u>Instructional Deans' Meeting with Board Members</u>: Judy reported on the excellent meeting held with the Instructional Deans and two of the Board members—Bruce Swenson and Laura Casas Frier—on February 16. At this meeting the Deans were able to speak to their Division's needs—which were summarized into three general areas—staffing, restoration of "B" budget and instructional equipment. Some good outcomes are expected as a result of this meeting.
- II. <u>Program Reviews and Resource Requests</u>: During the week of 2/14, Program Reviews from the Instructional Deans were distributed to the IPBT members. Additional materials were given out as an addendum to the program reviews: They were as follows:
 - DAC 2005-06 Administrative Function Chart;
 - College Totals—DAC Program Review;
 - DAC 2005-06 FTES/Productivity Simulation Version 2.7.06;
 - Informational Sheet for each Division along with their instructional equipment needs request;
 - DAC Beginning (Original) Operating B Budget per FTES—flow chart;
 - DAC Office of Instruction Tenure Track 2006-07—February 9, 2006 and
 - DAC Office of Instruction 2005-2010 Master Plan Calendar—2/21/06.

The topic of a possible reallocation of an FTE to another division where growth is occurring led to a conversation—addressing the "process" whereby that change might occur. Changing the process was stated as being worrisome because no process is in place to address this issue. The importance of having criteria established to determine who should have the FTE was emphasized. Judy will work with Paul to outline some criteria for "special circumstances" for moving an FTE. The dean who "owns" the FTE in question should have an opportunity to defend his/her position to qualify for ownership was acknowledged.

There were lots of questions pertaining to the Program Reviews. The committee stated that they were looking for answers. For example: should the committee be looking at an "all college" theme versus a "division/department" need? The importance of staff needs was emphasized—especially with the implementation of new technological teaching equipment--which need staff to train and to provide technical support.

The Master Plan Calendar was addressed—noting dates for making recommendations. March 7 is the next meeting date for IPBT to make a suggestion regarding a faculty FTE. March 28 is the meeting date for IPBT to discuss a plan for student learning outcomes—in response to the Accreditation Report.

III. <u>Conclusion</u>: The meeting ended with Paul Seziol sharing one of his long-range goals--looking at comparative student success results between different schools.