



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: M. Bush, C. Yang, A. Derdarian, T. O'Neil, L. Orange, J. Crawford, R. Williams, C. Flores, E. Carruth, A. Hayashi, C. Renbarger, K. Pierce, O. Cobian, L. Putnam, C. Inouye

Absent: L. Kama'ila, A. Edwards, L. Hopper (C. Renbarger, Proxy), L. Fa'asua

ExOfficio/Guest(s): A. Sandford, C. Herrera, C. Tafoya, D. Eberhardy, C. Azari

Meeting Date: **10/18/17** Minutes Approved: **10/4/17** Recorded By: Darlene Inda

AN = Action Needed AT = Action Taken D = Discussion I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

- | | | |
|---|------|---|
| I. Called to Order | I,AT | The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. |
| II. Public Comment | I | There were no public comments. |
| III. Adoption of the Agenda | I,AT | The Committee reviewed the agenda. A. Hayashi motioned to approve the agenda; C. Renbarger seconded and the agenda was approved. |
| IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes | I,AT | <p>The Committee reviewed the minutes of the October 4, 2017 meeting.</p> <p>C. Renbarger motioned to approve the minutes; A. Derdarian seconded. All in favor accepted, one abstention.</p> |
| V. Reaffirm Mission Statement - Dr. Azari | I,A | <p>Dr. Azari stated that according to the Participatory Governance Manual, the Planning and Budget Council has a responsibility of reaffirming the Mission Statement and the Vision and Values Statement. She asked C. Herrera and C. Renbarger to provide an update.</p> <p>C. Herrera spoke of All College Day regarding Vision and Value and received tremendous input. The college also had 3 charrettes. We just recently had a student charrette. C. Renbarger handed out information in the packet and C. Herrera discussed the planning framework. We are presenting today the revised Vision Statement and Values Statement as well as initiative and goals and ask to approve as written. We received some feedback from faculty. C. Herrera reviewed the Mission</p> |

**Handouts*

PBC Minutes: 10/18/17

Statement, Vision Statement and Values Statement.

There was a motion to reaffirm the Mission Statement. A. Derdarian so moved; J. Crawford seconded. All in favor with one abstention.

VI. Approve Vision & Values Statement – Dr. Azari

I,A

There was a motion to reaffirm the Vision and Values statement. A. Derdarian so moved; J. Crawford seconded. All in favor with one abstention.

Dr. Azari thanked everyone who has done work on these. This has been a challenge but very rewarding.

C. Herrera talked about the initiative and goals and that there are 4 initiatives and 13 goals. All of the information came from the environmental scan and it was decided that four initiatives were general enough and inclusive enough to address the goals on this campus. C. Herrera reviewed the four initiatives in depth:

Key: Oxnard College Initiatives (I-IV) and Goals (A-D)

- I. Innovate to achieve equitable and inclusive student success.
 - I.A. Actively identify current and future students' educational needs.
 - I.B. Improve enrollment management practices.
 - I.C. Accelerate student progression towards completion.
- II. Provide outstanding integrated college programs and services.
 - II.A. Strengthen the college's responsiveness to student needs.
 - 11.B. Focus on quality instruction.
 - 11.C. Provide comprehensive student support.
- III. Invest in people, planning, and support structures.
 - III.A. Enhance recruitment and professional development.
 - III.B. Focus on institutional effectiveness.
 - III.C. Continually refine the college's planning and resource allocation processes.
 - III.D. Optimize organizational support structures.
- IV. Actively partner with the community.
 - IV.A Enhance awareness and positive perception of the college.
 - IV.B. Foster collaborative community relations.
 - IV.C. Promote shared resources with educational partners.

There was discussion that the intention is to take the initiatives and goals and C. Renbarger is going to share information from the charrette with the college to develop objectives and action steps. The Strategic Planning Committee will be part of the sharing of the initiatives and goals. C. Renbarger briefly discussed the responses from the student charrette and what the Strategic Planning Committee are looking for in the college and this year.

C. Herrera said we would like to have this approved in April, 2018. What do we need to do to get there? C. Renbarger discussed the Strategic Plan, Objectives & Action Steps, the writing process, timeline and who it will be presented to. C. Herrera reviewed the Strategic Planning objectives and action steps submission form. The Strategic Planning Committee is recommending to the college that one or two objectives would be selected with no more than 5 action steps per year. We want to get the process moving but we also want everyone to be able to handle it. Address the objectives that are most pertinent to your division with action steps that get you to your objective. C. Renbarger stated that the objectives would be one year long. The following year we will look at what the college didn't get done and those will be the objectives for that year.

C. Herrera said the Strategic Planning forms are on SharePoint. An electronic email will be sent as well, whatever works for everyone. C. Herrera said she will send an electronic version to the Deans, and they can send it to the Department Chairs. L. Putnam asked if Student Learning/Academic Affairs could come and present at the next Department Chair meeting. C. Herrera said they will definitely come, and they want to provide a sort of training for this procedure to make it as simple as possible.

The Strategic Plan meeting will be integrated with the next Department Chair meeting. A. Hayashi stated that previously when we did this, the objectives were all a linear tie between all. If all these entities are putting together their objectives at the same time, you will not have the coordination between them. C. Renbarger stated that it is important for the objectives to match up to an initiative and goal in the plan but it's not important for the department's objective to match up to the Strategic Plan.

C. Herrera stated that if there are recommendations for

anyone else that should be included in this, let the Strategic Planning Committee know. A. Hayashi stated that if we're looking at November 2017, we have a blank week during this month. He thinks this is a little ambitious for these things to be done on the academic side. C. Renbarger said that the November dates are just for the Strategic Planning Committee to present all of this. C. Renbarger said it doesn't have to be finalized in November or December 2017, we just need feedback. A. Hayashi said that this may not be enough time with November and December holidays. C. Renbarger said they would like to have feedback by January 2018, toward the beginning would be better but mid-January would be fine.

D. Eberhardy stated that there may be some issues with this timeline in line with PEPC. She will put the Mission, Values & Vision Statement as an action item on the PEPC agenda. As for the Strategic Planning timeline it will be a discussion item.

VII. Faculty Hiring

- I M. Bush provided handouts, "Faculty Prioritization Assumptions" which is Moorpark College's document, "Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee" which is our current document and also "Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee" Pasadena College's document which our Student Services is using. M. Bush briefly discussed Oxnard College's version.

D. Eberhardy mentioned the AA-T and AS-T in that we would like to add certificates.

T. O'Neil stated that once we write in the numbers, are we adding them together? M. Bush said that we need to figure the language first.

It was decided to go through each box to discuss and make the following updates:

1. "Recommended for restoration".
2. PEPC Ranking recommendation. J. Crawford asked if this is redundant. D. Eberhardy agrees. C. Inouye thought it should read PEPC Recommendation. The number rankings should change to 1, 3, and 5.
3. Is fine as it is (Classes in discipline are highly impacted, students are unable to get essential courses.)

4. "This program has a demonstrated need for a full-time faculty."

A. Hayashi asked what is the intent with this particular criteria. Would the program run better if they had more full-time faculty as opposed to part-time faculty. What is this trying to measure? A. Derdarian stated that if the program were running solely with adjuncts and no one was overseeing the program, it is hard to oversee as well as it could be. E. Carruth said she oversees many part-time instructors of whom are unable to attend department meetings because they are working other places as well which makes it hard to get together regarding the program. She made the argument in favor of programs operating only with adjuncts. This is an important one to have and recognize.

D. Eberhardy stated that PEPC will be talking about their rubric and will bring this to the committee to make sure we are interwoven. We should have a rubric that is very close and additions to PBC. Right now we are only looking at faculty hiring and no other service units. Dr. Azari stated that we need our full-time and part-time faculty. You need adjunct faculty but she has concerns with programs that only have adjunct faculty. Decided to read: program has a demonstrated need for a full-time faculty member.

5. Box 5 should read "program offers degrees, certificates, and proficiency awards".

6. A. Hayashi said if you want it to read this way, it has to read as such that faculty bringing in a large number of WSCH are not disadvantaged by large aggregate numbers. M. Bush, stated that it is the total WSCH for the program divided by full-time faculty for the program, FTEF. A. Hayashi talked about numbers and examples. D. Eberhardy stated that this is addressed in PEPC and has to be evaluated so programs that have a cap will be addressed. C. Inouye recommended to cross out WSCH. We are talking about generating FTES, enrollments. J. Crawford asked to remove 6. The Committee agreed and it will be reviewed in PEPC. C. Inouye does not want to remove it. She feels it is another helpful piece for the program. C. Inouye asked about having just a check under the categories rather than a number ranking. D. Eberhardy said we will rank them at PEPC. L. Putnam asked what are the things that we need to do to hire faculty, not just the numbers. They have to articulate their need in the PEPR. We want to look at growth, demonstrated need and desire.

C. Herrera stated that it needs to tie to the Strategic Plan and goals. How are we connecting resource allocation to that? D. Eberhardy stated that in the PEPC report we talk about how it relates to our mission. After all the discussion, it was decided to remove 6.

D. Eberhardy said that PEPC will have their rubric done next week. M. Bush suggested that we bring PEPC's rubric back to the next meeting and revisit this. In the meantime O. Cobian provided another document which is a rubric for non-instructional. O. Cobian provided a document "Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee Non-Instructional Rubric". Student Services will need to revamp the language a bit. This is for counselors, librarians, etc. and non-instructional. We want this to align this with the Strategic Plan.

O. Cobian reviewed items 1 – 4 and said in reviewing the assumptions of the other form we could use some of these on this form for non-instructional. He also said this still needs some work and asked for feedback. M. Bush asked that to email changes to D. Inda. D. Eberhardy asked to bring it to PEPC as well.

M. Bush stated that we looked at a couple of rubrics. Let's address the assumption portion of the instructional rubrics. We took the assumptions from Moorpark:
Item I: A. Hayashi recommended that at the beginning of an academic year, the President advise what the hiring was for the completed year and what her reasoning to alter the listing is. M. Bush said previously a written notice was provided by the President on the decision.

II. E. Carruth stated that in the past if we got the retirement replacement, she had concerns for smaller departments if a retirement wasn't replaced.

III. See markup on form

IV. Remove

V. ok

Regarding Item I., A. Hayashi asked about a timeframe for the decision. When will this happen? It says the President will inform but when? President Azari said she would send something out in writing to everyone on what the decision is. A. Hayashi would like to have some sort of timing in the verbiage.

M. Bush stated that we will bring all this back and review again.

VIII. Adjournment

A The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

IX. Future PBC Meeting

- I
- November 15, 2017
 - January 17, 2018
 - February 21, 2018
 - March 21, 2018
 - April 18, 2018
 - May (TBD)

Handouts:

MOORPARK COLLEGE

Faculty Prioritization Assumptions

Assumptions for Prioritization

- I. The prioritization result serves as a recommendation to the President. If the President chooses to deviate from the order of the prioritization list, it is agreed that the President will discuss ^{with} the decision with both the Academic Senate Council, and the Deans Council. *INFORM OF THEIR FINAL DECISION*
- ✓ II. When a vacancy occurs due to retirement or resignation, there is no automatic replacement of that position in the same department. In the event of an unanticipated retirement or resignation, the President will make the decision whether to replace that full-time position immediately, or whether to use those funds to open the next position on the priority list.
- ✓ III. List of faculty priorities does not carry over from one year to the next. This process will generate a new list each year in the Fall in preparation for early advertisement in the Spring. Exceptions are made for a one-year extension in the following situations:
 - when positions cannot be filled for reasons other than a change in program needs (e.g. lack of adequate candidate pool)
 - when positions opened contingent on funding have completed the screening process and finalists have been named by the President.
- ✓ IV. In order to provide a balance between classroom and non-classroom faculty, within the priorities a ratio of at least 1 non-classroom faculty position to every 10 classroom faculty (hired) will be honored in non-classroom faculty positions that have been proposed.
- ✓ V. Positions that are legally mandated (e.g. for accreditation) will not be in the prioritization queue, and will be automatically filled based on need.

Suggested Criteria for Prioritization

Note: These are not listed in order of importance; each voting member determines which criteria are most important to them but are asked to be consistent in their determination.

- 1) Vital program will cease to exist if position not filled.
- 2) Need to fill position based on specific program need, such as specialization, area of expertise, or maintenance of program quality or safety concerns.
- 3) Full-time to Part-time (FT/PT) ratio (as indicated by % contract).
- 4) Position is FTE generating (considering % of productivity goal, aggregate WSCH, and other factors which indicate size and efficiency of program in generating FTE's).

OC Version

**Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee
Non-Instructional Rubric**

1. Need:	Strong Student Need (4 points)	Medium Student Need (3 points)	Low Student Need (0)
a) Student Demand/Need- Additional data indicating student demand/need b) Student to Position Ratio- Data indicating number of students to be served by position c) Student Success Contribution – Evidence indicating student use of relevant services contributing to student success d) Intangibles: Provide additional supporting evidence not covered by other sections that indicate a need for position Total points awarded for need:			
2. Alignment with the College Mission and Strategic Goals:	Strong Alignment (4 points)	Medium Alignment (3 points)	Low or no Alignment (0)
a) Evidence on how the position is aligned with the College's mission and strategic goals - Reference in program review b) Provide data indicating alignment with mission and strategic goals c) Include narrative explaining alignment with mission and strategic plans			

Total points awarded for alignment:				
		Strong Enhancement (4 points)	Medium Enhancement (3 points)	Low to no Enhancement (0)
3. Program Review:				
a) Enhancement of completion and retention rates, and/or access to services				
Points Awarded for Program Review:				
4. Programmatic Impacts:		Strong Connection (4 points)	Medium Connection (3 points)	Low Connection (0)
a) Position would have an impact on the completion of AD-T/AS-T, transfer completion b) Effect on student probation c) Part-time to full-time ratio d) Impact on legislation that impacts student success such as SSSP, Equity, Basic Skills. e) Full-time faculty on release time				

Points Awarded for Programmatic Impacts:	
GRAND TOTAL Points Awarded:	
Comments:	

DAVIDA VESTON

**Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee
Non-Instructional Rubric**

1. Need: 40 %	Strong Student Need (25-40)	Medium Student Need (12-24)	Low Student Need (0-11)
a) Student Demand/Need- Additional data indicating student demand/need b) Student to Position Ratio- Data indicating number of students to be served by position c) Student Success Contribution – Evidence indicating student use of relevant services contributing to student success d) Intangibles: Provide additional supporting evidence not covered by other sections Total points awarded for need: /40			
2. Alignment with the EMP: 20%	Strong EMP Alignment (15-20)	Medium EMP Alignment (8-14)	Low EMP Alignment (0-7)
a) Evidence on how the position is aligned with the EMP - Reference EMP section numbers b) Provide data indicating applicability c) Include narrative explaining applicability Total points awarded for alignment with the EMP: /20			
	Strong Enhancement (15-20)	Medium Enhancement (8-14)	Low Enhancement (0-7)

Points Awarded for Programmatic Impacts: /20			
GRAND TOTAL Points Awarded: /100			