



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

Present: Sue Johnson (*co-chair*), Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Ishita Edwards, Jeannette Redding, Alex Lynch, Jeff Hiben, Leo Orange, Karen Engelsen, Carmen Guerrero, Diane Eberhardy, Tom O'Neil, Carolyn Inouye, Erika Endrijonas (*ex-officio*), Alan Hayashi, Ralph Smith

Absent:

Guests: Gail Warner, Tami Crudo, Denielle Wiley

Meeting Date: **08/29/2012** Minutes Approved: **05/02/12** 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 2:11 p.m. |
| II. Public Comment | I | No Public Comment |
| III. Approval of Meeting Minutes | I,AT | R. Cabral asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes so that they could be discussed. J. Redding moved to approve the meeting minutes of April 18, 2012 and R. Smith seconded. |
| | I,AT | The following changes were requested to the minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I. Edwards asked that her comment on cost factors and the importance be included.• Item IV:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 3rd paragraph – change “cost” to funding.○ 7th paragraph – last sentence – A. Valle would like the discussion of how the guidelines were developed be included. |
| | | <i>The minutes were accepted by the committee with one abstention.</i> |
| IV. PBC Recommendations & Guidelines | I | R. Cabral stated that the intent was to come up with refinements, have the constituents review and bring back and questions or comments so we could readopt. S. Johnson discussed the importance of including FTES component in the recommendations to ensure you meet your FTES target otherwise you will get less out of the budget model. She said it really drives your program decisions and schedule building. |

I S. Johnson talked about the timeline and that the budget is going to be presented to the board in 5 weeks – 12-13 is over so when you're working towards your budget, you are really developing your guidelines for FY2013-14.

I,D,AT The council reviewed the Planning & Budget Council Goals and Budget Recommendations and after much discussion the following changes were made:

- **Planning & Budget Council Goals**

- 1st through 4th bullets: no change.
- New 5th bullet: "To ensure that the college meets its FTES target".

- **FY 2012-13 Guidelines for Budget Recommendations**

- Change "FY2012-13" to read "FY2013-14".
- 1st bullet: go back to original wording and take out (e.g., FON obligation). The bullet will read "Vacant General Fund positions will not be filled unless they are critical to the college".
- 2nd bullet: no change.
- 3rd bullet: no change.
- 4th bullet: change to "All areas will be considered in the budget reduction process".
- New 5th bullet: "Budget deliberations will occur as outlined in the Participatory Governance Manual".
- 6th bullet (prev. 5th bullet) change "included" to "considered".

R. Cabral asked for a motion to accept the Planning and Budget Council Goals and FY2013-14 Guidelines for Budget Recommendations document with refinements.

J. Redding made the motion to approve, I. Edwards seconded and *the motion carried unanimously*.

V. Report on Program Rating from PEPC

I R. Cabral reported to the council the efforts of PEPC to create some type of rating process. He provided PBC with where PEPC started and where they are at, which is that PEPC took the lead of taking the eleven elements of AB4021 and embedding them into the program review process. Additionally, all departments undertook a program review process which was done in the fall and agreed to do again in the spring. PEPC wanted to satisfy the needs of PBC and identify some type of rating matrix so L. Kamaila introduced a proposed matrix. PEPC made some refinements and proposed to use the

document. The intention was for PEPC to read all the program review documents and also analyze them using the matrix. He said that PEPC just completed their last session and now need to decide what these numbers mean. He used Business as an example of what we've done and explained that this has been done for all programs. He reviewed the PEPR and the Program Review Rating sheet with the council and addressed the score interpretation portion of the form and said that PEPC is still trying to determine the grade points and the interpretation of what these points mean to PEPC. E. Endrijonas added that in August when PEPC returns and has their first meeting, they will discuss the interpretation of these numbers and will forward it on to PBC.

I C. Inouye provided an interpretation of the Program Review Rating for Instructional Programs document and the breakdown between CTE and non-CTE programs. She also stated that there was very detailed information provided for each program to rate.

I,D The council discussed anonymity of the ratings and D. Eberhardy felt there should be accountability for the scores to know what the thinking process was. R. Cabral responded PEPC made the decision to remain anonymous because we felt that we would be able to identify the outliers. E. Endrijonas added that the goal was to come up with ratings, which was done and that if anyone has questions they can refer to the PEPRs.

I,AT R. Cabral addressed the Guiding Principles for Identifying Core Courses document and stated that it was vetted and reaffirmed at the last PEPC meeting and brought forward to PBC for reconsideration. He asked the council for a consensus on accepting the reaffirmed document and all members agreed.

VI. Business Services & Student Services Recap of Resource Requests

I,D R. Cabral stated that these are items that have been completed but haven't been discussed and these will be used for 2013-14 guidance as the budget for this year is done. E. Endrijonas said that this is similar to the list in January that came from PEPC to PBC, which listed items based on what funding is available. Even though there is none available, in the event there is, we have a Business Services, Student Services and Instructional list of items to be fulfilled. She added that separate from that are IELM and restricted lottery allocations, which were made at the direction of PBC and show how the allocations match up with the resource requests. S. Johnson asked about the timeline and said that the

group needs to identify what they want to add early on so that cuts can be figured out if needed.

R. Cabral stated the recommendation of PEPC to PBC is to have refined resource requests no later than September 2012.

VII. Accreditation

- I There was a meeting today about District Functional Mapping and some of the proposed governance committee refinements. Everyone on campus received copies of the mapping and guidelines that go along with it. Academic Senate spoke about it have some suggestions and refinements.

VIII. Adjournment

- I,AT The meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

IX. Future PBC Meetings

- I
 - o August 29, 2012