



Approved

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 29, 2020

Building 2, Room 10

Regular Meeting: 2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Members present: Diana Tedone, Jeanne Stalker, Nick Carr, James Carranza, Rachel Corrales, JT Eden, Karen Engel, Salumeh Eslamieh, Max Hartman, Michael Hoffman, Hyla Lacefield, Nick Martin, Graciano Mendoza, Manuel Alejandro Pérez, Peggy Perruccio, Megan Rodriguez Antone, Chantal Sosa, Roslind Young.

Members absent: Loretta Davis, Jeri Eznekier, Aleen Ghanem, Jamillah Moore, Tammy Robinson

Guests and others present: Doniella Maher, Dave Meckler, Mary Chries Concha Thia

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
<p>1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes</p>	<p>Meeting called to order at 2:18 p.m. This is the first meeting of the semester. Faculty representative Paul Naas, who has been representing the Business, Design and Workforce Development Division, has withdrawn from the committee and his position will be filled by Peggy Perruccio. Two additional classified staff representatives will soon be appointed.</p> <p>ACTION: a motion to approve of the Consent Agenda items was made. Motion passed.</p>
<p>2. English Department Faculty Replacement Request</p>	<p>Doniella Maher, English Department Coordinator, presented a Vacancy Replacement Request to hire a full-time English faculty following the retirement of David McLain. Sections are increasing and fill rates are high and the work cannot be done by an adjunct faculty. A full-time faculty is needed to replace the load. The Academic Senate unanimously approved the replacement request at its December meeting and the English Dean approved. The position is currently vacant as of December 12, 2019.</p> <p>ACTION: a motion to support filling the English faculty vacancy was made. Motion passed with one abstention.</p>
<p>3. Academic Senate Program Review Improvement Recommendations</p>	<p>Diana Tedone-Goldstone announced that the Academic Senate is starting a task force made up of faculty to address issues around program review. This is one of the College's recommendations for improvement following the accreditation report. The Instruction task force will periodically meet with the Student Services task force and there will be joint college-wide program review meetings. The Instruction task force will develop proposals and the groups will meet and take recommendations to campus planning councils. They will discuss the rubric, how to better align things with curriculum and allow for more Dean feedback.</p> <p>The Academic Senate wants an approved and improved process by the end of the semester since the SLO process starts this fall and it should align timing-wise with faculty responsibilities. The PBC was asked to approve the joint college-wide program review group meetings. SSPC would like to work with Academic Senate to co-draft a proposal to bring back to PBC. The revised wording from the ACCJC recommendation was read and that wording should be addressed and integrated in the SSPC/AS proposal.</p> <p>NO ACTION WAS TAKEN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion to extend the timing so other groups can get on board was made.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion was made to support the importance of program review and endorse the work of the Academic Senate with the inclusion of SSPC, acknowledging that it has to be a joint process that is beneficial for everyone, that it needs to be under the guidance of the PBC and that the accreditation recommendation should be addressed.
<p>4. Task Force on Committee Structure – report out</p>	<p>On behalf of the Task Force, James Carranza reported that the Task Force is reviewing and recommending improvements to the College’s committee reporting structure. They reviewed the preliminary recommendations from the October 7 task force meeting that were approved by the PBC. At its December meeting, the task force reviewed all committee and Council bylaws, and defined participatory governance councils and senates, college committees, task forces or <i>ad hoc</i> work groups, as well as operational groups, which help the college function. They looked at what types of structures there are, what the other colleges in the district are doing and they also looked carefully at the ACCJC definitions.</p> <p>They concluded that most committees are college-wide committees which exist to create and monitor college plans (e.g., Technology) and these plans should align with the College’s overall goals and accreditation standards. The Task Force recommends that the planning process be transparent and clear so that the college can be more effective. James indicated that the Task Force will review the Compendium of Committees and make recommendations for updating and revising it.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Task Force will come back with more formal recommendations for PBC to consider. The recommendations will consider the membership of any college-wide committees, and make recommendation regarding the structure of the various committees and their relationship to the Planning Councils. • The Task Force recommends that the PBC require all college-wide committees to have representation from the four participatory groups: students, staff, faculty and administrators. Any changes would be communicated to the committees. • The Task Force will return with a revised organizational chart of the College’s Planning Councils and college-wide committees to help people as they consider the structure. • The Task Force recommends that PBC view the Planning Councils’ structure through a student success lens and that it be clear about each Council’s and college-wide committee’s purpose. <p>ACTION: a motion was made to ask the Task Force to develop a draft with more clear and direct recommendations for PBC adoption. Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>5. Task Force on Program Review Resource Prioritization Process Improvements</p>	<p>On behalf of the Task Force, Vice President Pérez explained that this Task Force was charged with revising the rubric for evaluating resources requested as part of the College’s Program Review process. Vice President Pérez presented the goals which focus on the educational component, values and resource alignment and ways to localize the prioritization process. The Task Force recommended that the PBC never see resource requests under \$500 or those that are related to health and safety. Resource requests should then be ranked by program or area in sequential order and then ranked by Division (in sequential order) using the updated rubric and spreadsheet.</p> <p>The Task Force recommended a few changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first level of prioritization of resource requests would be a local conversation by program • The second level of prioritization would also be local at the Division level. • PBC would be the third level and would review the results of the Division prioritizations. • In evaluating each Division’s proposed priorities, PBC would consider two critical questions to inform the ranking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contributes to closing the equity gap.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contributes to supporting Latinx student success since Cañada is a Hispanic Serving Institution. ● PBC’s overall recommended ranking is then submitted to the President for review. <p>A suggestion was made to edit the first critical question to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contributes to closing the equity gaps. <p>The PBC approved of the idea of it evaluating all requests on the basis of two critical questions and noted: (1) it would be PBC’s purview as to what those were; and (2) these could change each year and PBC would need to communicate what they were at the outset of each Program Review Cycle.</p> <p>Action: A motion was made to accept the Task Force’s recommendations with direction that the two critical questions be integrated into the rubric which Divisions will apply this year to their prioritization; and the PBC accepted the two critical questions proposed by the Task Force for this year.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p>
STANDING ITEMS	
6. Guided Pathways	To be presented at next meeting
7. ACES Committee	To be presented at next meeting
8. SEM Committee	To be presented at next meeting
9. Planning Council Reports	To be presented at next meeting
10. Proposed new or renewed grant and categorically-funded positions	To be presented at next meeting
11. President’s Update	To be presented at next meeting
12. Matters of Public Interest	To be presented at next meeting
ADJOURNMENT	4:13 PM