



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, April 18, 2018
Room 2-10

Members present: Hyla Lacefield, Jeanne Stalker, Rachel Corrales, Tracy Huang, David Meckler, Melinda Day, Leonor Cabrera, James Carranza, Megan Rodriguez Antone, R Abd-aljawad, Martin Partlan, Jamillah Moore, Michelle Marquez, Max Hartman,

Members absent: Paul Naas, Luis Méndez, Karen Pinkham, Phillip King

Guests and others present: Dayo Diggs, David Reed, Mary Chries Concha Thia, Debbie Joy, Alex Kramer

AGENDA ITEM	
1. WELCOME, APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Meeting called to order at 2:15 PM. Motion to approve minutes of March 21 meeting passed unanimously.
BUSINESS 2. Annual Participatory Governance Survey: process and survey questions 3. Annual Participatory Governance Survey: approval	<p>Interim Dean PRIE Tracy Huang informed on the Annual Participatory Governance Process Survey. Tracy reminded that the purpose of this survey is to evaluate the current process, receive feedback, and discuss any adjustments as a result of the feedback. Also, this is consistent with the college's Accreditation efforts and with the current Participatory Governance Manual. The survey questions that address communications, effectiveness, and participation related to the college's participatory governance and integrated planning processes. The survey will be distributed to the college's administrators, faculty, and staff as well as students (via the student senate.) Tracy informed that these are existing questions, posed each year going back to the college's most recent accreditation. Questions, pertaining to the District's role and authority related to the college have been added at the District's request, mainly due to the current accreditation process. Respondent questions are also posed including: membership in planning councils, length of service, and whether the respondent is administration/faculty/staff/student.</p> <p>Discussion highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion was made to change Academic Senate to Academic Senate Governing Council. - Question posed on relevance of the length of service question, as this could be used to identify a respondent. Tracy informed that this helps to illustrate that the survey respondents represent employees of varying lengths of service and that the replies to this question have been reduced to three options: less than five years, 5-10 years, and over ten years. - Suggestion to include "Decline to State" in the respondent's information section. - Comment made that discussions with colleagues reveal that "lack of time/time management" is a common reason given for not participating in participatory governance activities though there are adequate participation opportunities. Hyla provided that this should be noted to include in the next survey and opportunity to compose the survey questions. <p>ACTION: Motion made to approve the Annual Participatory Governance Survey Process and Survey Questions presented, as amended. Motion passed unanimously</p>

<p>4. Self-Evaluation from Planning Councils: process and evaluation questions</p>	<p>Tracy Huang informed on the proposal to request the campus Planning Councils to complete a self-evaluation and submit the results to PBC. The questions pertain to the planning councils' effectiveness in fulfilling its purpose and objectives and communicating their activities to the campus community. These questions will be directed to the Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Planning Councils (IPC, SSPC, and APC) as well as PBC. Council representatives of will report on their Council's discussion on these questions at a future PBC meeting. PBC members will also discuss the self-evaluation questions for PBC's effectiveness, etc. at a future PBC meeting.</p> <p>Suggestions made on rewording the question on Council's purpose and charge, (question 2.) Question posed on the "annual planning process." Tracy advised this includes program reviews, new position proposals process, resource requests, and related activities.</p>
<p>5. Self-Evaluation from Planning Councils: approval</p>	<p>ACTION: Motion made to approve the Planning Councils' Self-Evaluation questions proposed, as amended. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>6. Updating New Positions Process</p>	<p>Co-chairs Hyla Lacefield and Jeanne Stalker informed on Updating New Position Proposals Process, and reviewed the timeline and activities for the 2017-18 cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hyla reviewed the timeline for the 2017-18: The following steps were completed. <p>Preparation: PBC establishes timeline and process for 2017-18 (completed in September 2017)</p> <p>STEP 1: Submit Proposals: Authors submit written proposals to Deans/supervising administrator. Deans submit final proposals to VPI/VPSS, then they are posted to the PBC website.</p> <p>STEP 2: Submit Presentations: Authors submit PowerPoint presentations to the Offices of VPI/VPSS to be posted on PBC website.</p> <p>STEP 3: Presentations and Discussions: Presentation and group discussion of strengths and weaknesses for each position proposal. Three sessions scheduled to accommodate number of position proposals.</p> <p>STEP 4: Academic Senate Analysis of Faculty Positions: Academic Senate reviews faculty positions and makes recommendation to College President.</p> <p>STEP 5: Review/Approve Process Integrity: PBC evaluates and makes decision on integrity of process. Submits Strengths and Weaknesses summary to College President.</p> <p>STEP 6: College President Decision: College President announces decision on new positions after consultation with College Cabinet</p> <p>STEP 7: Advertising/Screening Process: Appoint hiring committees.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline information should also describe the rationale for the timeline. Specifically, to describe the importance of having the process complete in time for recruitment to follow on in a timely manner (selection committees identified, advertising and screening processes, etc. • Included expected availability of budget information. Suggest this info is provided early in the process as it may help departments/programs determine submitting some position proposals.
<p>7. New Positions Process Information and Participatory Governance Manual</p>	<p>Discussion on Classified senate prioritization process that should be included on the timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference: Guidelines and Criteria for Recommending Permanent New Classified Positions - Jeanne Stalker advised that in 2017-18 cycle, Classified Senate called a special meeting to discuss prioritization of classified positions. No determination was completed. Jeanne advised that at this special meetings, the members present felt all positions proposed were equally important and put forward all the proposed positions for decision by the college president. Rachel Corrales added that members did not attend the proposal presentations and did not wish to provide uninformed opinions. • It is noted that the intention of the timeline is for proposing Fund 1 new positions. Michelle Marquez advised that previous PBC discussions related to the college receiving funding (such as innovation funds) for a specific program. Resulting positions may move forward outside the new positions proposal process. Michelle reminded that all classified positions

	<p>are considered permanent, though some may be funded through time-limited sources. For the most part, the new position proposal process relates to Fund 1 positions and will be included on the timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process and timeline describe that discussion takes on each position proposal. Suggestion that some provision is included for anonymous feedback. Members reminded that some feedback was considered inappropriate. President Moore reminded that in the 2017-18 cycle, the electronic documents were removed from the PBC website. Hard copies remain available for review in the administration office upon request. • The timeline/process refers to Process Integrity. PBC evaluates the process for a specific cycle mainly to determine that all steps were taken to insure campus-wide involvement. Suggestion to add to Step 5 sentence to clarify that Summary of Strengths and Weaknesses refer to the each of the position proposals from information gathered at the time of presentations. (This ties to the proposals' strengths and weaknesses as described in Step 3.) • Michelle Marquez advised that the position proposal form and presentation document that is available online in advance and after the presentation discussions is the main information source. These documents represent a lot of time and thoughtful efforts. Review of these documents should be encouraged in the timeline/process as well. • Jeanne Stalker advised that the prioritization of classified positions will be an agenda item at a May Classified Senate meeting.
8. 2018-2019 New Position Process Timeline	ACTION: Motion to approve the New Position Proposals Process Timeline, as amended. Motion passed unanimously.
9. Planning Council Reports	<p>James Carranza: <u>Instructional Planning Council</u> continues on Program Reviews discussion and Resource Requests and Prioritization. Will discuss Planning Council Self-Evaluation questions at a future meeting.</p> <p>Max Hartman: <u>Student Services Planning Council</u> has completed Program Reviews discussion, will continue Resource Requests and Prioritization, and will begin Planning Council Self-Evaluation questions and discussion at their next meeting.</p> <p>Michelle Marquez: <u>Administrative Planning Council</u> will meet on April 30 to discuss Program Reviews, Resource Requests and Prioritization, and Planning Council Self-Evaluation questions.</p>
10. President's Update	President Moore informed on the District's 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Report. This report holds useful information relevant to the ongoing campus discussion on Enrollment Management. As previously discussed at PBC, we look forward to re-introducing an enrollment workgroup at the college. President Moore reminded that enrollment management discussions should stem from this District information. PBC members are encouraged to include this resource in discussions with constituency groups. Also included on Construction and Capital Projects information that is relevant to the campus.
11. Staffing Update	Michelle Marquez reported on recent staffing addition: Araceli Arias, Office Assistant II, Academic Support and Learning Technologies Division, effective March 1.
12. Matters of Public Interest	David Meckler: Reminded that the Professional Learning Plan for the College will complete its first-year implementation period. The Professional Learning Committee will be working to evaluate the plan as well as request and review campus feedback. More information on this will be provided fall 2018.
	Meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm.