



Approved

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 16, 2020

Via Zoom

Regular Meeting: 2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Members present: Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Margarita Baez, Nick Carr, James Carranza, Rachel Corrales, Loretta Davis Rascon, Karen Engel, Denise Erickson, Salumeh Eslamieh, Nimsi Garcia, Max Hartman, Hyla Lacefield, Graciano Mendoza, Jamillah Moore, Manuel Alejandro Pérez, Tammy Robinson, Megan Rodriguez Antone, Nika Self, Chantal Sosa, Roslind Young.

Members absent: Jeanne Stalker, Michael Hoffman, Cynthia McCarthy, Peggy Perruccio.

Guests and others present: Mayra Arellano, Katie Chen, Mary Chries Concha Thia, Mary Ho, Jessica Kaven, Matt Lee, Adolfo Leiva, Joan Murphy, Matais Pouncil, David Reed.

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
<p>1. Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Minutes</p>	<p>Meeting called to order at 2:14 p.m.</p> <p>ACTION: A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Dean Hyla Lacefield seconded by Loretta Davis Rascon. Motion passed.</p> <p>Upcoming Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Library is holding a series of workshops throughout the semester, starting the week of September 21, on available resources, how to use the library databases, as well as introductory workshops. • Planning for Latinx Heritage Month is underway and events will be announced in an upcoming Marketing flyer.
<p>2. Program Review Proposed Improvements</p>	<p>In spring 2020, the IPC and SSPC talked about improving the program review process. Due to COVID-19, there are no Instructional, Student Services or Administrative comprehensive program reviews being held during 2020-21. However, if there are programs that are going to be requesting resources, including personnel, those programs will be required to submit an annual update.</p> <p>The Joint College-wide Program Review Improvement Task Force recommended that PBC authorize and establish an ongoing operational program review workgroup that will meet regularly to help coordinate and implement the program review process each year. The workgroup would include representatives from the Academic Senate, IPC, SSPC, the Office of Instruction, as well as the VPA and PRIE Dean.</p> <p>The Task Force also recommended an updated timeline for program review for 2020-21. The timeline will be presented to IPC for its approval on Friday, September 18.</p> <p><u>Process in 2019-20</u> Requests that were under \$500, did not go through the resource request process and would be taken care of at the division level. Requests for things pertaining to health and safety would be made through the division dean and the respective vice president. Once that pre-work was done, each program or service area would provide a ranked list of their biggest priorities to the division</p>

level and then a master list of needs would be prepared for each division. Divisions used an updated rubric and critical questions to center their work around questions of equity and supporting the campus' Latinx population. Feedback provided showed that people would have liked to know the critical questions in advance of creating their requests. The requests were presented to PBC where they were evaluated as a body using the two critical questions. Feedback showed that the process may not have been as effective as had been hoped. They could not provide the right amount of input and support that each request needed and they were not able to flesh out how the requests connected fully to the critical questions.

Task Force recommended changes proposed for 2020-21

1. Suspend the rubric since Divisions will not have enough information to complete the rubric since there will be no comprehensive program reviews. Divisions will only be able to evaluate the resource requested based on the annual updates, which provide limited information.
2. The Divisions will prioritize all the resource requests from each program in their division based on their interpretation of how they align with this year's strategic priorities and evaluate them according to the two critical questions. The Task Force recommended that we use the same two critical questions as last year, which were:
 - Critical Question #1: Does the request contribute to closing the equity gap?
 - Critical Question #2: Does the request contribute to supporting Latinx, Asian American, Native American and Pacific Islander student success?
3. With PBC's approval, the work group would like to update the annual update section of the Instructional and Student Service program reviews to include the two critical questions.
4. After the Divisions complete the prioritization process, PBC's role would be to certify that the process has been followed effectively. Rather than compile the requests into a single college-wide list, PBC will forward prioritized lists of resource requests from each of the divisions to the College President.
5. The Task Force recommended that this a part of the process every year and the creation of an ongoing college-wide program review work group would continue the work for this next year and beyond.

Five Action Items

1. Establish a cross-functional program review workgroup with the following membership:
 - Academic Senate/IPC rep
 - Academic Senate
 - IPC rep
 - SSPC rep
 - Office of Instruction
 - Instructional Technologist (Office of Instruction) – by position
 - Classified Senate (CSEA member)
 - VPAS
 - PRIE

ACTION: A motion was made by Dean Max Hartman to establish a cross-functional program review workgroup with membership above. The motion was seconded by Dean Karen Engel.

Motion Passed.

2. Adopt an updated timeline for program review for 2020-21.

ACTION: A motion to adopt and update the timeline was made by Dean Engel and seconded by Loretta Davis Rascon.
Motion Passed

3. Suspend the existing resource request rubric.

ACTION: A motion to suspend the existing rubric was made by Roslind Young and seconded by Dean Engel.
Motion passed.

4. Establish critical questions and strategic priorities to be used, and how they are to be used, in the resource request prioritization process this year. They will be used by the division to help with prioritizing.
 - PBC guidance is requested to determine if the critical questions should be applied to each new resource or whether the questions should be applied to the program.
 - The Divisions are considering these questions and framing the resources in the context of this year's college strategic priorities.
 - PBC found it challenging to look at every request to see if it supported the questions. Dean Lacefield suggested that the group should consider giving priority to the things that are going to make the most difference to the most highly-impacted students because it will ultimately benefit all students. She suggests that people consider to what degree does this resource request help close the equity gap and support the College's Latinx students.
 - There was discussion around adding AANAPISI student success to the second critical question.
 - Vice President Graciano Mendoza reminded the group that the intent is that this will be the mechanism for the college to allocate funding to all of the college functions. It needs to enable any of our departments to request and have the same probability and possibility to receive funds as anyone else. If it is worded or defined in a way where certain functions will have trouble obtaining resources, it will impact how certain departments work in the long term.
 - Vice President Manuel Pérez said it will be important to distinguish the federal guidelines for what makes us a Latinx-serving institution and what makes us an AANAPISI-serving institution because they are different numbers. The enrollment data should be reviewed so that it guides those emphases and how we prioritize College resources.

The current proposal is to add the critical questions to the resource portion of the annual updates and then the divisions would evaluate/rank based on the answers to the questions and how they connect to this year's strategic priorities.

- One suggestion is that the rubric or narrative can be provided by the resource request authors. The narrative could show how the item supports the critical questions or how the program supports those critical questions.
- Another suggestion is that once the divisions do their prioritizations, only the top 10 resources that are ranked in each division would have to answer the questions.
- A Concern was raised that the critical questions should be answered for every resource requested, not just those that are ranked at the top.

ACTION: A motion was made by Dean Hartman to adopt the critical questions and strategic priorities to be used in the resource request prioritization process for each division. Departments can decide how they want to answer the critical questions, whether

	<p>relating them to their program as a whole or to the specific resource. The motion was seconded by Dean Lacefield. Motion Passed.</p> <p>5. Amend PBC's role in the resource prioritization process to certifying that the process was followed effectively at the Division level, rather than creating one, college-wide list of prioritized non-personnel requests.</p> <p>ACTION: A motion to accept the division rankings and require PBC to certify the process was made by Dean Hartman and seconded by Rachel Corrales. Vice President Pérez clarified that once the resource request process is certified by PBC, then the request is submitted to the Office of the President. PBC would not create a separate list, but would send the division's list to the Office of the President. Motion passed.</p>
<p>3. Administrative Planning Council</p>	<p>The Administrative Planning Council (APC) met in the spring semester to talk about its structure and the historical purpose and role of APC. Each fall semester, the APC was responsible for reviewing program plans and resource request items which were submitted to the Office of the President from offices reporting directly to the President: MCPR, PRIE, VPI, VPSS, VPA. Because the scope seemed to be fairly narrow, the APC proposed changing the standing of the council and replacing it with a workgroup that would be responsible for reviewing program plans and resource request items from the areas that report directly to the President. The role would be the same, but APC would change from a council to a workgroup to better fit the definitions discussed at the last meeting. The work group would report directly to the President and to make a distinction, a new name is proposed: President's Operational Group. Membership remains as is, with two exceptions, to add two new slots that are optional: a faculty representative and a student representative. President Moore suggested that the name could be changed to College's Operational Group.</p> <p>Membership suggestions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask that members disseminate the information/report back to their constituent groups. • Since it is a college operational group, a faculty rep should not be optional. • Add a part-time faculty member. • Add a Classified CSEA member. • The ASCC VP is a member but student representation can be discussed. <p>Recommendation: The proposal is to move APC from being a council to a workgroup, so it would not be a participatory governance group. There should be further discussion around the membership or participant list for the workgroup.</p> <p>ACTION: A motion was made by Roslind Young to bring the APC discussion back to a future PBC meeting and it was seconded by Dean Hyla Lacefield. Motion Passed.</p>
<p>4. Anti-Racism Framework and Recommendation for Next Steps</p>	<p><u>Classified Senate Input:</u> Loretta Davis Rascon reported that the Anti-Racism Framework was presented to the Senate on September 10. Senate members are requesting more time to review and discuss. They would like to have an expert in anti-racism facilitate the discussion. They would like to include an administrator and they would like to add three students, three faculty and three classified staff to the task force. They will bring it back to future meetings.</p> <p><u>Academic Senate Input:</u> Diana Tedone reported that the Academic Senate was very supportive of the framework and the task force. The Senate recommends bringing in an outsider who is an expert in anti-racism to be a part of the task force.</p>

	<p><u>SSPC Input:</u> Dean Max Hartman reported that SSPC is very supportive and comments suggest including the community in the College's discussion about how we are promoting anti-racism on campus. They are hoping the task force will look at the College's access points and how they may be impacting students. They suggest identifying statewide policies that might be getting in the way of the College becoming an anti-racist campus, acknowledging that our students are experiencing many challenges. SSPC approved adopting the task force and would like the task force to return with a refined framework.</p> <p><u>Additional comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One staff recommended that the task force should interview and select the outside facilitator/expert. • One staff would like to see more student representation going forward. Their opinion of what they see the college is doing should be something we consider and where our focus should be.
<p>5. Annual Plan for 2020-21</p>	<p>Feedback is requested from the various groups so the Annual Plan can be refined and approved at the October 7th meeting. Dean Engel reported that the Guided Pathways Steering Committee discussed it and will focus on the items that pertain to them. Various groups will be doing work on the initiatives. The topic will be brought to the next Classified and Academic Senate meetings.</p>
<p>6. Transfer Services Plan</p>	<p>This topic will be discussed at the October 7th PBC Meeting.</p>
<p>7. Task Force on Committee Structure Recommendation re: Bylaw and Plan Templates for All College Committees</p>	<p>The task force is drafting two documents which will be concise guidelines/tools that will help the participatory governance committees to organize their time and work and also align their work with the college Education Master Plan goals and strategies. Dean James Carranza reviewed what the PBC approved in spring 2020, which emphasized that the committees have plans which are less about which group they report to but more about the plan that they are adopting which would support the college goals and larger strategies. The different participatory governance committees will work with the councils and PBC to develop a three-year plan and provide an annual update.</p> <p><u>Planning Template:</u> The planning template provides information on committee purpose, responsibilities, timelines, objectives, brief college definitions for different committee plans and provides a template that committees can use in aligning their focus with the larger college goals, EMP initiatives and integrated strategies for the Strategic Enrollment Management plan and Guided Pathways.</p> <p><u>Bylaws Template:</u> The bylaws template can be used to align bylaws for participatory governance committees. It includes information on committee purpose, responsibilities, timelines for objectives, guiding principles for the committees, membership, how co-chairs are selected, dissemination of information and basic guidelines for how committees operate.</p> <p>The Planning Template and the Bylaws Template will be brought back to PBC on October 7th and finalized so committees can start adopting them. They will be included with the Compendium of Committees. Dean Carranza is requesting comments or feedback be emailed to him directly (and cc: the PBC co-chairs) by September 25. The task force will look at the suggestions and incorporate as necessary.</p>
<p>STANDING ITEMS</p>	
<p>8. Associated Students of Cañada College</p>	<p>Nika Self announced that Lauren Binder is now a second ASCC rep and will be attending the next meeting.</p>
<p>9. Academic Senate of Cañada College</p>	<p>The Academic Senate is using its membership dues to fund anti-racism events focused for faculty.</p>

10. Classified Senate of Cañada College	Vice President Tammy Robinson attended the September 10 th meeting and presented information on the proposed multicultural center locations.
11. Guided Pathways	Steering Committee members have started meeting and different success and interest area groups are mobilizing.
12. Planning Council Reports	<u>IPC</u> : The first meeting will be held on Friday, September 18. <u>SSPC</u> : The group met on September 11 and shared updates on grade changes around COVID-19 and the drive-up WiFi program. The anti-racist framework was discussed. <u>APC</u> : The group will meet toward the end of September.
13. President's Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board of Trustees has requested that the colleges add more faculty members to their hiring lists. Cañada and CSM will add three and Skyline will add four. The hiring will impact the College's resources, so those costs along with a timeline will be reviewed at a future PBC meeting. • The College will be preparing to hire a permanent Dean of Business, Design and Workforce, so people will be asked to participate on the hiring committees. • Facilities will be holding a college-wide forum on September 24 to review modernization of campus facilities, the district's ADA plan and other items. • Funding is allocated according to the Facilities Master Plan, which may be viewed on the College's website. Vice President Mendoza can present the plan at a future PBC meeting.
14. Matters of Public Interest	There were none to report.
ADJOURNMENT	4:09 PM