



Committee Name: Planning and Resource Allocation

Meeting Date: May 16, 2018

Meeting Chaired By: Ron Gerhard, Catherine Powell, Donna Gibson

Start time: 3:02 pm

End time: 5:02 pm

Minutes Prepared By: Donna Gibson

Present: Catherine Powell, Donna Gibson, Ron Gerhard, Amy Mattern, Yvonne Wu-Craig, Kirti Reddy, Jim Matthews, Bonnie Stipe, Bob Buell, Katie Messina, Ken Grace, Mark Anderson, Andrew Pierson, Blake Lewis, Chasity Whiteside, Christine Herrera, Heather Hernandez, Noell Adams, Rachael Tupper-Eoff, Gabriel Chaparro, Carolyn Arnold, Mon Khat, Deonne Kunkel Wu, and Bill delos Santos.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1. Welcome	Ron opened the meeting at 3:02 pm	
2. Review of Proposed Agenda	Jim Matthews motioned to accept the agenda, and Ken Grace seconded. Motion Passed	
3. Review and Approval of 5/2/18 Minutes	Jim Matthews moved to accept minutes as modified, Rachael Tupper-Eoff seconded, Motion Passed	
4a. Action Item: Draft Administrative Prioritization Process	Opened for Discussion: Concerns on how to include positions already requested in Program Review were raised. Believed that they would be inserted into the new process. Clarification that process is for general funded positions. Motion to recommend the Administrative Prioritization Process with only the change from PARC corrected to PAR was moved by Jim Matthews and seconded by Jan Novak. Motion passed unanimously.	Recommendation to be forwarded to President Sperling.
4b. Action Item: Emergent Needs Forms	Opened for Discussion: Stacy asked if the items being requested were included in the last cycle of Program Review. Deonne stated the items were not. Ron noted that there is instructional dollars set aside for emergent needs and that the items being requested would fall into the category. Deonne pointed out that there 5000 accounts have a zero balance in current budget and therefore, there is no money available within the division to fix the items. Heather asked if they dollar amount could fit into this year's budget or if it should be moved to next year's. Donna agreed with Deonne that there is an ongoing issue to find funding to repair items after warranties expire. It was requested that the kiln be taken off line so that it is not a danger to students. Jan Novak moved to approve all 3 requests. Yvonne Wu-Craig seconded. Motion passed unanimously.	Recommendation to be forwarded to President Sperling.

<p>4c. Action Item: Recommendations from Professional Development, Instructional Services and Technology, and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Workgroup</p>	<p>Noted this was discussed at previous meeting and just brought forward today for vote. However, discussion opened. Heather asked how the allocation of the current \$50K would be determined. PD committee representative suggested the money would all go to campus wide activities and that individual requests would be better served going through divisions. Andrew raised concern that this would take it away from shared governance. Stacy inquired on the rationale of the PD committee. PD representative stated that the Program Review requests greatly exceeded the budget and it was felt that they did not have enough information to make recommendations. Other issues raised included the current process not being equitable throughout the year and with unstable funding, difficulty in determining appropriate individual caps. Stacy provided history on funding the PD Committee. Possible concerns of moving funding of individual requests to divisions included the availability of funding for classified professionals and equitable funding across divisions. Jan noted that there is no money allocated specifically for PD within divisions. Amy suggested areas without funding still go through PD Committee. Yvonne raised question of if requests should be included in Program Review in future. Chasity suggested a work group analyze the situation and create recommendations for next year. Jim Matthews made motion #1 to support the Professional Development Committee Recommendations with amendment made. Andrew Pierson seconded. Motion Passed with 1 opposition vote. Motion #2 to form a workgroup from PRAC and Professional Development Committee to study the process of allocation of existing funds to existing areas was made by Jim Matthews, seconded by Andrew Pierson. Motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p>PRAC to form workgroup with Professional Development Committee to study allocation process.</p>
<p>4c. Action Item: Recommendations from Professional Development, Instructional Services and Technology, and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Workgroup</p>	<p>IEPI workgroup: Chairs funding Discussed in previous meeting. Amy pointed out that IEPI has the task to report the expenses, and made recommendation for modification after discussion with current chairs. Motion to approve the recommendation (approve the funds at this level from college funds – unrestricted general funds – with the exception of those supported by contract and district funded. Andrew asked if this includes a cap? Amy responded that this is a fairly accurate lens of the expense. Motion to approve made by Christine Herrera. Bob Buell seconded. Amy will update the chart to correct figure. Carolyn noted that when we say yes to the motion, what does it mean if we don't have the money? Jim stated this is why it's a recommendation. Motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p>Recommendation to be forwarded to President Sperling.</p>

	<p>IST recommendation: This was also discussed in previous meeting. Amy asked for clarification: if we approve, what are the funding sources – question to PRAC? Stacy responded these are items not funded by district IT, so they would come from other identified funds. Nathaniel had a very complete process laid out. Motion to approve the prioritized list for recommendation to the president made by Jim Matthews, seconded by Stacy Thompson. Motion passed.</p> <p>Discussion after: If an item is not on final prioritized list developed by IST, it was because it wasn't technology or it was already funded. We need to support the process of prioritization in PRAC. The next step is for the list to be culled.</p>	<p>Recommendation to be forwarded to President Sperling.</p>
<p>5a. Information/ Discussion Item: Planning Resource and Allocation Committee Evaluation</p>	<p>Committee evaluation – Chairs asked that we not rework the document during the meeting, but please give us your feedback. Stated that major themes throughout the evaluation include that PRAC has too many charges and we should look to restructure, have subgroups and have more presentations.</p>	
<p>5b. Information/ Discussion Item: Budget Update: May Revision</p>	<p>The May Revise came out last Friday, and it's very different from governor's proposal from last week. Buckets are 60%/20%/20% and range is expanded to any students, not just first-time students. Other major changes – this version gives power for the chancellor to make subjective decisions to make changes. This is very significant. Another item: they could take money away for students who finish at college at proprietary private locations, so they would want us to influence against those types of transfers.</p> <p>Ron: 3 year rolling average on the credit FTES side. We would lose stability and restoration. That would be huge for us and for many other districts who are on stability or restoration. There is the "two year hold harmless", but really it isn't because if implemented we would get COLA but only as one-time money. This goes against the idea of a simplified manner. See handout: even under this we are still at \$9.7M reduction, as is with other districts around the state. There is a lot of opposition to this. The state chancellor's office has gone to great length to create a way for "fewer losers" – under this there are fewer losing districts.</p> <p>Dave looked at this: Bay 10 is negatively impacted disproportionately; in terms of % reduction, we have the highest impact in the state, just after Foothill-DeAnza.</p> <p>Andrew: CA Assembly is meeting 5/23 so there's time to weigh in. Jan: is there a correlation with cost of living? Yes. Yvonne: related to headcount for completion: can we count some of the students twice? No we can't. We have to remove them.</p> <p>Bob: why was the formula changing? Emphasis on completions within 3 years. Financial Aid component is what hits us most – \$6M of the \$9M – students not getting Pell-promise grants. FTES brings us down \$900K. It's whether they take the grants. Noell: do stackable certificates fall into the double counting? It depends on when they get them -- this is what we are asking the chancellor's office. The language in bill says we can't count annually. We are asking about this gently.</p>	

	<p>President Sperling noted three things we need to do:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Analysis critique/organizing and actively expressing flaws as related to needs of our students. People have been vocal about the damage and the unintended consequences. 2- When facing this and not knowing the future at state level, we need to analyze based on what these questions raise. What can improve our metrics as applied to this reality? 3- What we can do without turning into something we aren't ie a certificate mill. How at district and college can we do modifications without doing crazy things? <p>Jim: we can create parts of the story by actions on campus. This is just the first year. Bob: are legislators hearing that this model is not good? Yes. Andrew: communication should be ongoing. Carolyn: what we can do easily: focus on Financial Aid, but degrees and transfers are a conundrum. We are at our highest peak for our transfers, so how much more could we do?</p>	
<p>5c. Information/ Discussion Item: College Budget Reports</p>	<p>Tabled to future meeting</p>	
<p>5d. Information/ Discussion Item: Peer Financial Comparison Study</p>	<p>Tabled to future meeting</p>	
<p>5e. Information/ Discussion Item: Strategic Plan Goal Themes</p>	<p>Jan stated the Vice Presidents' White Papers which will be presented at the beginning of the year and will provide the overall lens for upcoming year. The President will also present a White Paper.</p>	
<p>6. Good of the Order</p>	<p>Dale acknowledged the committee in giving the deans the opportunity to discuss resource allocation. Stated there are potential issues of some divisions being harmed. We haven't talked about funding the library with measure A funds as a committee; PRAC should take a look at this so that lottery funds could be opened up. Idea: commit to funding our library like LPC. Chasity added to this that we need to think about institutionalizing library funding. Donna asked what weight a motion to do so holds and what follow up is needed to ensure it happens? There is a \$6M pot of money that Dave points to. Dale stated that if this committee does make that recommendation and then it goes to the administration. Chasity: how much of Measure B is allocated annually? \$100K off the top guaranteed, then supplemented more up to \$250K. Can we decide this so quickly at May meeting?</p>	

	<p>Jim Matthews moved that this become an action item; seconded by Ken Grace. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion to fund the library \$300K per year using Measure A funds was made by Heather Hernandez. Ken Grace seconded. Motion passed unanimously.</p>	<p>Recommendation to be forwarded to President Sperling.</p>
7. Next Meeting	August 29, 2018	
8. Adjournment	Donna closed the meeting at 5:15 pm.	

Mission Statement

Chabot College is a public comprehensive community college that prepares students to succeed in their education, progress in the workplace, and engage in the civic and cultural life of the community. Our students contribute to the intellectual, cultural, physical, and economic vitality of the region. The college responds to the educational and workforce development needs of our regional population and economy. As a leader in higher education, we promote excellence and equity in our academic and student support services. We are dedicated to student learning inside and outside the classroom to support students' achievement of their educational goals.