



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes

November 20, 2013

Approved February 5, 2014

Members Present: Co-chairs: Claudette Dain; **Management Reps:** Dan Tesar; **Faculty Reps:** Samuel Foster, Rolando Sanabria; **Classified Reps:** Bev Pipkin, and **Student Reps:** Jose Solano.

Members Absent: Jamail Carter, Greg Ryan, Chrystal Van Beynen, and Alex Trigueros.

Resource Members Present: Melisa Hunt.

The meeting commenced at 2:12 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes: In regards to the November 6, 2013 Summary Meeting Notes, under the section "Approval of Minutes", Bev Pipkin made a motion to change the sentence stating that "Bev Pipkin made a motion" to "Dan Tesar made a motion". The meeting notes were approved with the name correction.

2. Program Review Resource Requests: At the last meeting, the committee members requested additional information from the Program Review Committee (PRC) on four resource funding requests. Melisa requested that information from the PRC and the PRC did provide the information. Melisa emailed the information to the members so that they could review it prior to today's meeting. The committee discussed the four funding requests and voted.

PBSC's recommendation of 2012-13 Non-instructional Program Review Resource Funding Allocations total \$83,450, of which \$49,250 is for Student Support Services and \$34,200 is for Administrative and Operational Services. A spreadsheet will be prepared to include the resource requests recommended for funding and then it will be submitted to PAC for approval at their next meeting, which is scheduled for either November 27 or December 11. The recommendation will be emailed to the PBSC members for informational purposes only.

3. Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee Survey: Jamail was going to lead the discussion for Agenda Item #3, but since he had a family emergency, he will email the committee members the draft PBSC Response he prepares to the Institutional Research Effectiveness Committee survey request. He asked the committee to discuss the five questions posed by the IREC and asked Melisa to email the discussion points that the members would like included in the response. The following bullet points for each of the five questions were emailed to Jamail:

1. **What is the mission/function of your group?** The committee would like the PBSC's Mission, Purpose and Guidelines attached to our response because it defines our mission/function.

2. **What is the output produced by the group?** Our output includes items found in our guidelines and those listed below:
 - Various funding recommendations to PAC as listed in our mission/purpose.
 - After reviewing the Program Review Report submitted to Faculty Senate that summarizes the themes and resource requests from the self-studies, the PBSC may submit a Program Review Funding Allocation Recommendations to PAC.
 - The PBSC utilizes the “Planning” Calendar, which is currently in DRAFT format.
 - In defining our mission, we added co-chairs this year so that we can cover both the Planning and Budget pieces.
 - The PBSC and PRC participated in a joint meeting in order to discuss ways to assist each other in sharing information to make better decisions during the Program Review Process. We are separate committees, but the PRC supports us and we complete the process.

3. **What is the role of your group in the planning process?** The PBSC plays a significant role in the planning process at the college, for example:
 - The committee recommends funding resource allocations that have been identified as campus needs in the areas of personnel, equipment, supplies, etc.
 - It was suggested that Jamail refer back to ACCJC Standards and tie into that.
 - The committee would also like Jamail to look at planning as a cycle (Planning—Implementation—Evaluation).

4. **How does your group receive information about planning decisions?**
 - The PBSC receives program review information from PAC.
 - The committee would like Jamail to discuss environment scans, statewide trends, and things that support our mission and goals.
 - We play an integral role in college planning as information comes to and from the PBSC.
 - Since the PBSC co-chairs attend weekly President’s Staff Meetings, they are exposed to and involved in some planning decisions.

5. **From your group’s perspective, where does your group’s feedback and/or decisions proceed within the planning process?** The committee discussed what goes into making our decisions.
 - As a committee, we receive some information about planning from PAC.
 - The IREC survey has given the PBSC the opportunity to self-reflect and self-evaluate, and it has been determined that we have more work to do for questions #4 and #5.
 - On the budget side, the vice president is heavily involved in budget planning and decisions that impact the campus. However, on the college planning side, we have more work to do.
 - Program Review is planning, and up to this point, the PBSC has only been involved in making recommendations to allocate funds. As a committee, we have been efficient, but there is a lot more we can do.
 - Now that we’re in the third year of the 3-year Program Review Cycle, as a group, the PBSC needs to think more about planning.
 - A member asked, “What is it that we are planning for?” In response, the college has not had a consistent or well-defined planning process. The college should link the processes and evaluate the work.

- It was suggested that the PBSC develop a sub-committee to streamline the program review process by going through the resource requests so we spend less time in the regular meeting discussing the items.
- A comment was made that the PBSC should be made aware of all planning that takes place on the college campus, and to do so, every year the PBSC should request that every committee chair submit a report to the PBSC. Since the PBSC is the “planning and steering” committee, we need to know what the campus committees are thinking in order to help steer the college during discussions that take place in President’s Staff and other planning meetings. As a recommending body to PAC, the PBSC has a role in that when presented with a request, PBSC can look at the dollar amount and determine what to recommend to PAC. The committee may recommend less or more than the amount requested and may recommend to phase-in an allocation over several semesters or years.
- The President is the decision-maker, and he gets recommendations from a number of sources and reports back at PAC as to what decisions were made.

4. 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, the members unanimously voted to cancel the December 4, 2013 meeting in order to attend the retirement event. As a result, our next meeting will be February 5, 2014.

5. Other/General Discussion: At the last meeting, Jamail raised the question of why the chair of the PRC is not a resource member on PBSC. Since Claudette was absent at that meeting, she responded to Jamail’s question as follows: PBSC and PRC are two different committees. It seems like we spend a lot of time on Program Review, and some feel it’s not productive use of our time. If the PBSC were to add the chair of the PRC, then we would have to add the chairs of all committees to serve as resource members. Program Review is not our only purpose, and we are having the necessary discussions at the joint meetings. Once we define and complete one Program Review Process, it would not be feasible to have the chair as a resource member.

At the last meeting, Melisa was asked to research if the VPs served as resource members when the PBSC operated as the BDC (Budget Development Committee). Per her research, there was no evidence that the VPs served as resource members.

Meeting adjourned at 3:37 pm.

Meeting Notes taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: February 5, 2014.