



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes

November 6, 2013

Approved November 20, 2013

Members Present: Co-chairs: Jamail Carter; **Management Reps:** Greg Ryan, Dan Tesar; **Faculty Reps:** Samuel Foster; **Classified Reps:** Bev Pipkin, Chrystal Van Beynen, and **Student Reps:** Jose Solano, Alex Trigueros.

Members Absent: Claudette Dain and Rolando Sanabria.

Resource Members Present: Toni DuBois and Melisa Hunt.

The meeting commenced at 2:12 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes: In regards to the October 16, 2013 Meeting Notes, Dan Tesar made a motion to strike the first sentence of the fourth paragraph under Agenda Item #2 Program Review Resource Requests reading "This same rubric was successfully used for our review and endorsement for the instructional Program Review Cycle." and to modify the prior sentence by removing the text following "objectively". The meeting notes were approved as amended.

2. Jeff Horsley's Retirement Open House (Time Conflict): Since Vice Chancellor Jeff Horsley's Retirement Open House is scheduled for the same date and time as our December 4, 2013 meeting and the co-chairs and other members expressed their desire to attend this important event, it was discussed that the meeting will either be canceled or rescheduled. Since the members were unable to quickly find a replacement date and the members wanted to focus on making progress in reviewing the funding requests, it was decided to make a final decision at the next meeting on November 20.

3. Program Review Resource Requests: The committee finished their first-round review of the non-instructional funding requests. They identified four funding requests where it would be beneficial to request more information from the Program Review Committee. Melisa Hunt was asked to submit the request to the Program Review Committee (PRC) chair Jan Chadwick. It was also decided that any information received would then be emailed to all members prior to our next meeting so that members would have time to review the information and be prepared to discuss it on November 20. The requests are identified below:

a. AOS: Line Item #28 from Staff Development Office for a \$6,000 software upgrade for the TEC Computer Lab.

b. AOS: Line Items 33, 34 and 35 from Systems Technology Services for a total of \$40,000 to upgrade and migrate to Sharepoint 2010.

c. SSS: Line Item #7 from Assessment Center for \$4,000 in computer software to work with local H.S. Districts to encourage participation in College Readiness Program.

d. SSS: Line Item #25 from Financial Aid for \$30,000 to fix the counter, file cabinets, and several repairs.

4. Other/General Discussion: Jamail provided an overview of the joint meeting that was held on October 24, 2013 between the Program Review Committee and some of the PBSC members. It was acknowledged that there is still a lot of work to be done between the two committees as it relates to the program review information that PRC currently shares/provides to PBSC. PBSC expressed that they would like to receive more data in order to make more informed decisions when allocating program review funds.

Dan commented that Claudette did a good job in relaying PBSC's quandary of using the limited data provided from PRC to fill out PBSC's rubric. Since the meeting was only one hour, it was mutually agreed by both committees that they should meet again. Also, for each Program Review Self-Study submitted, Dan stated the PRC rates Sections 1-7 with a checkmark, and he suggested that the PRC should provide that page to the PBSC to assist the committee in filling out its rubric. A concern was raised that handing over too much information could result in a group being criticized by its colleagues. For example: faculty grading faculty regarding money. However, a comment was made that the PRC is a collaborative group.

Bev suggested that since this is a planning year for the PRC, she believes the two committees should continue to have meetings throughout the year.

Jamail raised the question of why isn't the chair of the PRC a resource member on PBSC. Since co-chair Dain was not present at today's meeting, the members decided to discuss this at a future meeting. Another idea was suggested that the PRC complete a cutoff score on each self-study and then meet jointly with the PBSC to determine whether departments met their goals.

A question was asked, "When the PBSC operated as the BDC, were the VPs resource members?" Melisa said she would research the question and provide a response at the next meeting.

It was stated that the PRC believes that they made a step in prioritizing allocation of funds when they identified recurring themes. For example, one year supplemental instruction was identified as a recurring theme. If themes would drive the allocation of funds, then why not have the PRC identify five common items to drive PBSC's decision.

Meeting adjourned at 3:12 pm.

Meeting Notes taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: November 20, 2013.