PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: M. Bush, L. Kama'ila, C. Yang, A. Derdiarian, T. O'Neil, L. Orange, J. Crawford, C. Flores, E. Carruth, A. Hayashi, C. Renbarger, K. Pierce, O. Cobian, L. Putnam, C. Inouye, L. Hopper, A. Edwards, L. Fa'asua

Absent: R. Williams, G. Casillas-Tortorelli

ExOfficio/Guest(s): A. Sandford, C. Herrera

Meeting Date: **11/15/17**	Minutes Approved: **10/18/17**	Recorded By: Lori Jay

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 2:02 p.m. M. Bush announced that Lori Jay is now the Administrative Assistant for the Business Services Department and that Darlene Inda is now the College Services Supervisor.
II.	Public Comment	I	There were no public comments.
III.	Adoption of the Agenda	I,AT	T. O'Neil moved to approve the Agenda; L. Orange seconded and the agenda was accepted.
IV.	Approval of Meeting Minutes	I,AT	There were some revisions needed to the minutes of October 18, 2017; the approval of the minutes was tabled for the next meeting. Get any updates to Lori Jay.
V.	Classified Hiring	I,AN	M. Bush discussed creating an Ad Hoc Committee to review classified hiring. He took ideas on why we could hire classified staff. Some issues were workload, compliance issues, a position needed for growth, quality of service. There was discussion of student loan issues, default rates need to be posted, the need to protect the students, debt counseling, financial aid issues, financial literacy. L. Hopper asked about institutionalizing as grants run out. O. Cobian discussed the California

| | | | Promise and Guided Pathways. The Committee also discussed private loans and default management.

M. Bush stated there should be a process that goes both ways on classified hiring and reduction. L. Putnam stated that we should have a process similar to Program Discontinuance, something that is separate. M. Bush discussed "Position Upgrade", (an internal reclassification) and "department reclass".

M. Bush discussed a possible data program that everyone could look at. L. Kama'ila stated that we are the ears to hear what the process is.

Future Agenda item: Hiring Reduction and Re-hiring. |
|---|---|---|---|
| VI. | Ad Hoc Committee Discussion | I,AN | M. Bush stated that we have many different types of requests. We have personnel faculty, personnel classified, supplies & equipment, instructional supplies and equipment, non-instructional supplies and equipment, facilities requests (different types of facilities requests) such as redoing electrical lighting, computer labs, kitchen upgrades, replacing the Marine Center, things that are attached to a building or the ground. We also have technology (software, tech refresh items, infrastructure and hardware).

M. Bush listed some committees who could each take some requests to review and discuss them. We could have the Dean's Council possibly look at instructional equipment and supplies, CUDS could possibly look at facilities requests. PEPC could retain the faculty hiring. In addition, there would need to be a group to look at classified, non-instructional equipment and technology requests.

L. Kama'ila discussed what came up at Academic Senate, that there is a perceived need for more funds for Professional Development. She stated that we may only need one new Ad Hoc Committee. She stated that we still have the situation of new resources for new programs.

M. Bush discussed the Honors Program submitted through PEPC, the process of a new program and how do we propose new programs. L. Putnam stated that the Honors Program request has been submitted through the Resource Request and adopted into another discipline. She stated that we need to discuss how we propose new programs. Her recommendation is to do |

this through the PEPR's.

C. Renbarger asked if PEPC will review both instructional and non-instructional faculty. M. Bush said that it depends. L. Kama'ila stated that there are 5 sub-committees that are specialized. PEPC should be the body that would look at this. We need one more Ad Hoc group to discuss non-instructional supplies, equipment and technology and then recommendations to the President on Professional Development. A. Edwards asked if CUDS would be a good place to discuss this. L. Kama'ila said probably not; M. Bush said some of those in the CUDS Committee could be the ones to discuss it. The President has asked us to develop a technology task force which Robert Cabral said he would Co-Chair along with Mike Alexander. This could possibly include technology. They will look at infrastructure issues to users such as Distance Ed and what new programs are coming up and that we have the tools needed.

What group will discuss Classified hiring? We could ask for volunteers from various Committees. If you would like to serve on a committee for this, email M. Bush or L. Kama'ila and CC: Lori Jay. You do not have to be a member of the PBC Committee to serve. L. Kama'ila would also like to know when the Committees will be meeting. It was decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee meeting immediately after this meeting today; in attendance will be M. Bush, L. Kama'ila, L. Faasua and C. Renbarger.

M. Bush discussed resource requests in that we could invite those who submitted the request to the meeting to discuss it. A "Feedback Form" that exists in PEPC was discussed. When a Resource Request comes in you get the form along with it. L. Putnam discussed the PEPR "Feedback" form summary and provided a handout. Could the Professional Development Committee discuss this? There was discussion of Classified Professional Development and where the funding comes from. Some staff are required to attend certain conferences for their positions. There was discussion of funding options.

L. Kama'ila suggested doing a Survey Monkey to find out what kinds of things are not being funded. Professional Certifications could be upgraded with Professional Development funds. L. Kama'ila stated that Technology would do Technology. We could put non-instructional in with CUDS (golf carts, furniture).

Regarding classified issues, we will find a group to take them. We could possibly have that Ad Hoc meet right after the PBC meeting, L. Kama'ila will Co-Chair. M. Bush stated that there are not a large number of classified hiring requests and that we can go over the ones that come in.

A Hayashi asked what an Ad Hoc Committee would look at. M. Bush stated it would be everything regarding classified (clerical, maintenance, a classified person involved in instructional program). There was discussion of the amount of classified positions in question but not as many of instructional materials list. Ranking was discussed along with the process. M. Bush said that the needs of the college will be greater than our ability to meet them and that we will continue to discuss this.

The Committee discussed student workers. M. Bush said that they are technically classified workers and are in categorical funding. Some departments rely on them heavily. Student workers will fall under a Classified Ad Hoc Committee.

A Hayashi asked about Capital Projects and what group these projects fall under. M. Bush said that this would be under the facilities group. We need to bring our fusion reports here. There was discussion of adding other facilities related to sustainability such as a solar farm or add another athletic field so we can rotate them when one is not in service. We are focusing on Resource Requests currently.

A Hayashi discussed classroom space, usage and designation. M. Bush said that the state does not recognize this as a need. L. Kama'ila requested that the minutes of this meeting reflect that the Committee discussed Capital Projects.

L. Kama'ila also asked that the minutes reflect that we discussed having the PG Committees do the Ad Hoc work and to let the PBC members know when this work will be done so that those who want to watch the work being done, can. She would like the public not to be present during this process and would like at least one non-Dean to be present. The meetings will be run as regular meetings. We will have an Ad Hoc Committee Classified meeting today immediately after this meeting. All of the mentioned committees will need to report back to PBC after the Program Review is completed. We will

			have an annual report out of this PBC Committee on our final determination and where the gaps are. L. Putnam stated that this is a step towards doctrineating the review of the process possibly in March or April 2018, to state that this is in the minutes. L. Kama'ila stated that Program Review should be completed by the end of January 2018, so that Committees can meet during February and so that we are done before the budget of March, 2018.
VII.	Adjournment	I	The meeting adjourned at 3:09 p.m.
VIII.	Future PBC Meeting	I	o ~~December 20, 2017~~ Preemptedly Adjourned o January 17, 2018 o February 21, 2018 o March 21, 2018 o April 18, 2018 o May (TBD)

Handouts:

2017-18 PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS PLANNING AND REVIEW/FEEDBACK

Program Status Recommendation

Annual Review ☐   Multi-Year Review ☐

In Growth-Mode ☐

Name of Reviewer: _____   Date of Review: _____

Is Stable ☐

Is In Need of Attention ☐

Program under review: _____

Program Review Criteria (All Programs/Annual & Multi-Year Reports)

Evidence of campus-need, student-demand, or employee-demand	Strong ☐	OK ☐	No ☐

Instructional Programs Only (Annual & Multi-Year Reports)

Course enrollments are consistently strong or increasing each year	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Course retention rates are consistently strong or increasing each year	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Course success rates are consistently strong or increasing each year	Yes ☐	No ☐	

Program Review Criteria (All Programs/Multi-Year Reports Only)

Evidence that program advances the district/college mission	Strong ☐	OK ☐	No ☐
Evidence that program addresses district/college strategic initiatives and goals	Strong ☐	OK ☐	No ☐
Program Review analysis is thoughtful and complete	Strong ☐	OK ☐	No ☐
Evidence of review & analysis of Outcomes Assessment (SLOs/SUOs)	Strong ☐	OK ☐	No ☐

Future Items (Do not score in 2017-18)

Evidence that program met their previously identified strategic objectives & action steps	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Program received and utilized resources as prioritized	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Degree/Certificate completion rates are as expected for this program	Yes ☐	Higher/Increasing ☐	Lower/Decreasing ☐
Course "productivity" is consistently at a level as expected for this program	Yes ☐	Higher/Increasing ☐	Lower/Decreasing ☐
Transfer rates are as expected for this program	Yes ☐	Higher/Increasing ☐	Lower/Decreasing ☐
Evidence that program addresses needs identified through environmental scans & LMI data	Yes ☐	No ☐	
Evidence of review of courses & services offered via distance education	Yes ☐	No ☐	

2017-18 PEPR Feedback Form: Version 11/7/2017

What are the principal strengths of this program?

What are some ways that you believe this program could improve?

Rationale for Program Status Recommendation

** Program faculty/staff may respond to the provided feedback

** List of program faculty/staff who have reviewed this feedback (please post to SharePoint **by Jan 19, 2018 for Multi-Year Reviews, and by Feb 20 for Annual Reviews**)

2017-18 PEPR Feedback Form: Version 11/7/2017