



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, May 4, 2016

Members present: Debbie Joy, Doug Hirzel, Gregory Anderson, Chialin Hsieh, Nick Carr, Anniqua Rana, Joanna Dai, Michelle Marquez. Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Peggy Perruccio, Paul Naas, Kim Lopez, Rachel Corrales, Megan Rodriguez Antone.

Members absent: Lezlee Ware, David Johnson, Jennifer Hughes, Magnolia Huang, Supinda Sirihekaphong,

Guests and others present: Jeanne Stalker, Lizette Bricker, Michael Hoffman, Heidi Diamond, Jessica Kaven, Max Hartman, Vickie Nunes, Leonor Cabrera, Barbara Bucton

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES	Meeting called to order at 2:10 PM Motion to approve Minutes of the April 18 meeting, passed with two members abstaining.
2) BUSINESS A. Midterm Report	Motion to approve ACCJC Midterm Report. Chialin Hsieh informed that the draft of ACCJC Midterm Report has been presented at college planning councils and governance groups, as encouraged at the February 17 PBC meeting. Chialin advised no changes were received during or after her presentations to these groups. Motion to approve ACCJC Midterm Report passed unanimously.
B. IEPI Goalsetting (Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative)	Motion to approve, as recommended, 2% increase (2014-2015) in IEPI Goalsetting metrics for Overall Completion Rate and Math, English, and ESL Remedial Rates. Dean Anniqua Rana informed that ACES group recommends that basic skills metric be consistent with the Basic Skills Plan and recommend a 2% increase over 2014-15 number. This is ambitious, considering all the data as a whole. Admittedly, looking at individual programs (ESL, as an example) 2% is an unimposing goal. Anniqua explained that until we scale up all interventions to the level of some programs, 2% is a realistic goal. Professor Michael Hoffman added that the data reflects six-year cohorts, and the ESL program was restructured in 2009 – we would not expect, every year, to match increase that is reflected here. Question raised if there was a penalty in not achieving stated goal? VP Gregory Anderson advised that there is not a penalty. However, there is question raised if goals don't make sense as they relate to plans that are in place. Gregory informed that the discussions support the stated goals. Chialin advised that the recommendations from the other planning councils and groups were at or near the same value. Motion to approve, as recommended, 2% increase in IEPI Goalsetting metrics for Overall Completion Rate and Math, English, and ESL Remedial Rates passed unanimously. VP Michelle Marquez advised that the District financial data is the same as our goals last year. The optional goals are populated with information received through the State

<p>C. EMP Process (Educational Master Plan)</p>	<p>Chancellor’s office from the College. Our goals next year will remain at 15% for reserves and no audit findings.</p> <p>Motion to approve the process presented today related to College’s Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>Plan. Doug Hirzel advised that the current EMP five-year period is 2012-2017. Thus, the 2016-17 academic year is this plan’s final year.</p> <p>Presentation highlights</p> <p>I. Both internal and external stakeholders are identified and include:</p> <p>Internal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Cabinet • Planning Councils • Divisions and Departments • Academic and Classified Senates • District staff • College committees: (Curriculum, Marketing, ACES) • Students <p>External:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory groups • K-12 districts • JobTrain and adult schools • Community and business partners • Government agencies <p>II. Propose ten-member planning team, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tri-chairs: Dean of PRIE, PBC co-chairs (Academic and Classified Senate Presidents) (3 chairs) • Faculty representatives, representing each of the four divisions (4 members) • Classified staff (academic support and administrative services support (2 members) • Student representative (1 member) • President (when invited as a guest) • VPs and Deans (when invited as guests) <p>Planning Team proposed with the objective to achieve sufficient representation among the fewest number of members.</p> <p>III. Timeline presented includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2016: Planning Team charge, role, and responsibilities {PBC} • June 2016: SCUP Planning Institute Training • July 2016: Outline Communication Plan and Planning Team Tasks • August Flex: seeking feedback from the College • August and September 2016: Seek feedback from all groups. • September and October 2016: Seek feedback from all groups. • November 2016: Starting to write the draft EMP • January 2017: Draft EMP shared at FLEX Day and to PBC for feedback • February through April 2017: Draft EMP to all groups for feedback • May 2017: Final EMP to PBC for approval • July 2017: Implementation of the EMP <p>Discussion on proposed process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question on planning team composition: Consider other Classified and Academic Senate representatives other than the senate presidents? Allow for other individuals to participate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Can be addressed by revising to: (Classified and Academic) President <i>or designee</i>.
---	--

<p>D. Common Assessment Update</p>	<p>Motion to amend the proposed process to (Classified or Academic) President <i>or designee</i></p> <p>Discussion on motion to amend proposed process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chialin opined that this (amendment) is a good idea, however, the Classified and Academic Presidents, in their roles as PBC co-chairs, have a “big picture” approach and monitor other college-level plans. ○ Gregory spoke in support of the amendment, as the PBC co-chairs are entrusted with the authority to designate representation appropriately within their respective senates. <p>Motion to amend the proposed process to (Classified and Academic) Senate President <i>or designee</i> passed unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Question on the (2) Classified staff members representing academic support and administrative services, should also include student services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative services representation is important to provide budget office perspective. Michelle noted that this should be defined as “budget office” representation - administrative services includes units other than budget office. - Debbie Joy noted that it is assumed student services has representation through her role as tri-chair. She could, however, designate another classified staff member to serve as tri-chair, who would not necessarily represent student services. - After some discussion, it was determined that because there are three members on this EMP Planning Team representing classified staff, it is understood and expected that one of these members represent student services. <p>Motion to approve the process presented today related to College’s Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>Plan passed unanimously. Doug advised that an email will be sent to recruit members, deadline for submitting names for consideration is Friday, May 13. The reason for the tight deadline is that there is training (SCUP Planning Institute one-day training) sometime in June related to the Educational Master Plan. It was requested that the email describe the commitment and involvement required of planning team members.</p> <p>Interim Dean of Counseling Lizette Bricker updated on the Common Assessment. College has been using the COMPASS system for assessment. We are switching to Common Assessment, which would be a help to those students who may enroll in other community colleges and districts.</p> <p>We are mandated to begin offering Common Assessment to our newly-enrolled students in November, which would impact those entering in spring 2017. However, much of the groundwork needs to happen over the summer.</p> <p>Lizette noted that it has been determined that the cut scores will be set for the district as a whole, not set separately for each college. The timeline for determining the cut scores has begun. A consultant has been hired to assist with this process. Dr. Jamillah Moore, is leading the effort, and involves discussion and decisions among District staff, deans, counselors, and faculty members. (Any faculty member interested in participating should contact their Dean.) Solicitation for participants in this process has been discussed within college cabinet (vetting relevant representation), division meetings and the Academic Senate.</p> <p>We need to determine the cut scores for English, Reading, Math, ESL Placement. Kim Lopez advised that faculty members among English, ESL and Math faculty who are available during first two weeks in August are being sought to participate. Lizette added that faculty members will be compensated for their time spent on this over the</p>
------------------------------------	---

summer. Participating faculty members will report and request feedback from their college colleagues early in the fall semester.

Discussion highlights:

- Professor Michael Hoffman commented that the transition to common assessment is an important educational moment and it's important for faculty to become familiar with the placement process. Data supports that placement is a major determinant in the success of a student.
- Orientation Jeanne Stalker added that this will be beneficial to track students who seek placement among many institutions, provide an opportunity to standardize the number of retakes and generally streamline the process.
- Districts and colleges are encouraged to work with neighboring colleges and districts on common cut scores and retake policies.

E. Loss of BOG

Lizette informed on the Loss of BOG.

Background: California Community Colleges Board of Governors offer a waiver of fees to eligible students. Many of our students participate in this program so it's important we are aware of this process. One of items recommended by the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) for review in the overall efforts to advance student success was to require students receiving Board of Governors Fee Waivers to meet various conditions and requirements.

Presentation highlights:

- New rules (starting fall 2016) state that if a student is in probation for (2) consecutive semesters, they are at risk of losing their BOG Waiver.
- Typically, those students receiving BOG waivers are low-income and at-risk students.
- If a student loses their BOG waiver, the likelihood is high that they will no longer attend classes.
- Notices have been sent to students (who could be affected) advising of the new rules.
- There are two types of probation:
 1. Academic: GPA <2.0
 2. Progress: does not complete at least 50% of their classes.Both types are relevant to the potential loss of BOG waiver.
- The College is implementing a number of support services to try to help affected students.
- Most important – there is an appeal process. We want 100% of the students who lose their BOG to participate in the appeal process. The initiation of the process included creating and appeal form and establishing an appeals committee. The appeal is directed to Admissions & Records and involves an updated Ed plan and other supporting documents.
- Note that this appeal process provides that CalWORKs, EOPS, DRC, Veterans, FFYSI students will be exempted from the Loss of BOG. There are wrap-around and support services in place already for these students.
- The appeals committee includes: Dean of Counseling, Financial Aid Director, EOPS and others. The objective is to keep these students enrolled and engaged in classes. The efforts that this consists of are to be determined.
- Student success retention efforts – related to students on probation 1, probation 2 and dismissal students - were already in place. This “Loss of BOG” is an additional component to those existing efforts.

<p>F. ILO Equity Recommendations</p>	<p>Dean Anniqua Rana and Professor Michael Hoffman presented on Instructional Learning Outcomes Equity Recommendation.</p> <p>Background: ACES Group was tasked to review 2015 Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Assessment, provide supporting narrative, and make relevant recommendations.</p> <p>Presentation highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations will include some level of training to really understand student-related data. • Group looked at disaggregated data. These outcomes resulted from surveys of students who were finishing programs and/or transferring. Information was disaggregated by gender, age and ethnicity. • Students were asked their confidence level in different learning objectives. • Generally, students felt good in their accomplishing of these learning outcomes. • Reviewing data that is disaggregated by age, ethnicity and gender provides an opportunity to raise important questions about helping the most vulnerable students. • Self-reported data has its limitations if we do not link it with other information. • The group shared narratives about the data – people tend to come up with explanations, based on their own assumptions. • It was noted that the accreditation standards requires disaggregate student learning outcomes (SLOS) – though they haven’t specified what level. We have chosen to do ILOS. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRIE can provide some guidance in the kinds of conversations that would occur within programs surrounding this data. • PBC could provide support for college-level discussions of data AND include more than just self-reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surface assumptions and narratives surrounding gaps • PBC could request PD to address disparities (PD Director involved in identifying PD opportunities in this vein.) • Incorporate Equity-minded data discussions into Program Review and Planning
<p>G. IEPI PRT Visit</p>	<p>VPs Gregory Anderson and Michelle Marquez informed on the IEPI PRT visit that is scheduled in the fall.</p> <p>Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEPI Partnership Resource Team Initiative came from the objectives to reduce the number of accreditation sanctions and audit issues, and serve students effectively. These efforts draw from existing expertise and experience within the community college system to advance best practices throughout the state • Our College expressed an interest and was accepted for assistance in the areas of professional development and integrated planning and resource allocation. The team visit will occur in fall 2016, likely in October. • We need to complete some preparatory steps prior to their visit. Two key steps are to determine the key takeaways we would like from this team and who should be involved in the discussions when the team is on-campus. • Generally, an IEPI PRT team can make recommendations and identify opportunities and resources that address College needs in the specified areas. Then, they provide guidance in developing a framework for the College to follow through on the strategies that were discussed.

<p>H. Hiring Timeline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Initiative also provides the College with \$150K to implement the strategies. It can be allocated at the College’s discretion toward any aspect of the implementation. • IEPI PRT is a one-time opportunity. • One or two follow up visits are made by the team to take a look at the College’s progress. • Presently, summaries of the (2) focus areas we requested are in process. They include: overall objectives, suggested groups and individuals to participate, resources available/needed, etc. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question raised on when the staff and faculty will learn more of the details? Michelle advised that Jennifer Hughes will send an initial campus-wide email. Updates will follow. As soon as visit dates are firm, participation and feedback will be solicited, and preparatory timeline and tasks can be formalized. • Question raised on how the two focus areas, professional development and integrated planning and resource allocation, were identified? Michelle advised that integrated planning and resource allocation focus requested will be of great assistance in the Educational Master Plan process as discussed at today’s meeting. Professional development focus came from the consistent discussions among planning councils, constituency groups, and individuals on the scope and importance of this issue and its present impact throughout the campus community as well as the months ahead. This is a good way to research other colleges’ philosophies and approaches related to professional development. It was noted that the Initiative prevents the funds use toward direct aid to students and a few other areas. Preliminary discussions did take place on what areas were allowed and of these areas, what was of the most need at our college as well as what areas could be addressed and receive funding from other sources. <p>Motion to act on constituency groups’ feedback on proposed recommendations to condense hiring process to once-a-year cycle.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Anniqua Rana advised IPC has not met yet but it is on the agenda on May 6 meeting Kim Lopez and Max Hartman reported on SSPC discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We realize we may propose positions knowing that few, or none, may rise to level of moving forward in the process. Regardless of available funding, there must be a case made for the need to move a position forward. • The value of proposing positions, again and again, create an awareness of the program and its needs. The process allows for discussion and collaboration opportunities about programs across the institution - there are few, if any, no other avenues for this. Sometimes useful and valuable spring forward from the process. • We recognize the hiring process for is Fund 1 funding. During the process, other sources may be suggested as well as other collaborative opportunities, such as combining positions or using, categorical or other grant funds. • Compliance issues also come forward during the process. For example, the request for athletic trainer position, surfaced compliance items we did not know before. • We don’t share the position that the budget should drive the process. The exercise has value as a forum to discuss the present states of College programs and raise awareness of the levels and needs related to resources and staffing. • Need, with regard to best serving students, should be the top consideration for a proposed position to move forward.
---------------------------	---

	<p>Chialin Hsieh reported on APC discussion:</p> <p>Arguments in favor of twice-a-year process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives program the opportunity to share needs with the college • Process allows staff and faculty the opportunity to collaborate toward the benefit of the program • Understand there is no guarantee that any position(s) will move forward, the process is still valuable • Process is about building awareness and community for your program • Twice-a-year frequency provides twice the opportunity to participate in the process. • We should focus on students’ needs not budget restraints. <p>Argument in favor of once-a-year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are not giving ourselves the opportunity to prioritize positions annually, in relation to the budget year, if proposal process is twice a year. • Twice-a-year does not make sense from a resource allocation perspective. • Twice-a-year too frequent, second-round work and efforts follow too quickly on the heels of first-round work and efforts. Too much strain on staff time and energies. <p>Doug Hirzel reported on Academic Senate discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty lean towards supporting once-a-year process and primarily based on budget availability. Knowing how many positions can move forward is a major factor. • The strain on work time and energies is a consideration that outweighs the process’s other value factors – especially if the reality is none, or few, positions can move forward. • Leaning toward once-a-year, November-December-January process, makes the most sense. <p>On a related note, Doug advised that most of the recent Innovation Fund Proposals requested funding for positions (or reassigned time) and only one requested position had been previously proposed in a hiring process cycle. So, these positions were not discussed anywhere else. This introduced the need for an inclusive and transparent discussion and, therefore, a possible third forum on hiring positions. Include reassigned time discussions and the topic become quite burdensome for the college.</p> <p>Motion to act on constituency groups’ feedback on proposed recommendations to condense hiring process to once-a-year cycle is tabled until IPC discussion occurs and is reported. It is noted that a decision can be made next meeting or if necessary, early in the fall semester.</p> <p>I. Staffing Update No staffing changes to report</p> <p>J. Matters of Public Interest Presidential Search Update: Three finalists have been selected. Campus forums will be held Monday and Tuesday, May 9 and 10. Jennifer Hughes will be sending campus-wide announcement soon. Kim Lopez advised that every effort is being made to close student services during the forums to allow staff to participate at the forums.</p>
3)	Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.