

Planning, Review and Budget Council

Regular Meeting
September 25, 2013
Building 400, Room 405
3:00 – 5:00 PM

MINUTES

Meeting called to order at 3:11 p.m.

Minutes of 9/18 distributed. Corrections:

- Jan Novak attended the meeting.
- Correction on page 3, Jim's comment—should say 90+

Minutes approved as amended.

Sandra reviewed the PRBC membership as shown on the website, and noted vacancies in several areas. Sandra asked that we go back to committees to get representatives from these committees. Sara asked if we could have some rotation of SSCC reps instead of having the same 3 attend each week. Feedback was that one permanent rep would be helpful for consistency, but others could alternate.

Sandra reviewed the Program Review updated webpage. Carolyn noted that we need to provide a link to the data for Program Review.

Deonne requested that we correct the name of our committee on the webpage that lists all of the committees.

Next topic: Carolyn—IR agenda. (*Attach to minutes*)

Carolyn explained that this is being reviewed by PRBC because our charter calls for some oversight/review of IR priorities. Projects on handout are more or less in priority order, but everything needs to be done. But, some items are noted as “may not get done this year” just given limitations on resources and the need to train the new student researchers. Carolyn reviewed the overall agenda, noting new projects for accreditation and the strategic plan and other college priorities.

Marcia asked that the learning connection research, noted as may not get done this year, get done this year. It's relevant to accreditation. Deonne noted that it's less critical given that we're in year 3 of Program Review. Kathy asked how/if we're measuring/tracking the results of the new initiatives being generated out of PRBC. Trish explained how we're tracking T3 funded projects. She also noted the importance of Carolyn's new student groups and how we're tracking

them. Jan asked about the “may not get done this year” note for Distance Learning success and retention. Carolyn explained that we have the data; this just reflects the expiration of the FIG. Jennifer asked if the Student Survey ask questions relevant to our swirling/bottlenecks discussion. Discussion about whether this is the best way to get this data, as it will lengthen the survey.

A round of appreciation was expressed for all of Carolyn’s hard work. Donna noted in particular the presentation to the Basic Skills Committee, which compared the scorecard to our new student groups.

Next topic: PR Addendums (attach to minutes). Sandra noted that she has already sent out the timeline and the cycle to Chabot. Sandra also noted that we need to add a due date on the new Addendum form. That due date is November 1st—due to both PRBC and the Deans. Discussion about whether this simultaneous submission worked. General consensus seems to be that this is OK. If there are changes as a result of the Dean’s reviews, a revised Program Review can be submitted. November 1st date is very important given faculty prioritization and budget review timelines.

Eric asked if we could better match the forms to the needs of the Budget Committee. Tom C requested that we use a spreadsheet consistent with what we’ve used in prior Program Review years—but not last year. We will need both a spreadsheet and a narrative justification. Becky suggested that we embed a spreadsheet in the Word document that provides the narrative so that users can just copy and paste into the overall spreadsheet.

Sara asked that we clarify on the Addendum Form that if there are changes/updates to CLOs or PLOs, a submission will be required. Carolyn asked if we should call this “addendum” or “extension”. Trish suggested we note on the form “You are in the same cycle as last year!”. Next question to be addressed on the form is “Do I have to turn in paperwork?” Sara suggested identifying possible changes in the form of a checklist that would necessitate submitting paperwork, such as CLOs or changes in resource requests. Jim noted that presenting this at Division meetings will answer at least some of the questions that program reviewers will have. Clarification that you do NOT need to submit Program Review if you are making the exact same request this year as last year. Discussion about whether we should request the spreadsheet from everyone changes or not, as there will otherwise be a lot of work to extract last year’s requests, and something is bound to fall through the cracks. Christy requested a PowerPoint presentation for Flex Day division meetings to ensure that everyone gets consistent information.

Kathy asked who is responsible for ensuring that nothing falls through the cracks. Should that be a separate group? Tram suggested that this could be facilitated by the division offices so it’s not such a huge task. They can compile them, and send them back out to people to check that it’s all accurate. They can then be compiled and sent out to the committees to do their work. Jan noted that faculty prioritization may need to occur on a faster timetable.

Sandra tried to summarize the discussion as follows:

- We’ll develop a PowerPoint for the division meetings
- We’ll ask everyone to resubmit, even if only changing the date

- We'll ask people to highlight changes—new requests, removing requests that were funded
- Everyone will be asked to submit the spreadsheet
- Spreadsheets will be compiled by division/area offices, checked for accuracy, then compiled by PRBC, then sent to the entire college for both accuracy checking and for transparency. The college-wide resource requests will be transmitted to the relevant shared governance committees.

Jennifer suggested a simple checklist so reviewers could easily tell what has changed. (see Jennifer's checklist)

Jennifer kept the good ideas coming by showing a completed sample form for FTEF requests that tied those requests to our strategic plan. Trish also suggested that the Counseling Program Review was similarly data-driven and strategic, as was Math in requesting specifically Basic Skills Math instructors. Jan suggested we include this information in the PowerPoint, not in the actual forms. If people have other good examples to include in the PowerPoint, they should send them to Sandra and Ken by Monday morning.

Susan explained that the scheduling conflicts between College Council and PRBC were unintentional, based on the thought that PRBC would only meet every other week. Since we're now meeting every week for at least the foreseeable future, and the membership overlaps, College Council will be rescheduled to avoid that conflict, but it's important that College Council begin to meet regularly.

Conversation about PRBC minutes and if they can be on the Internet vs. the Intranet. Group agrees these should be publicly available. Jim suggested that College Council should have a discussion about whether all committee minutes should be publicly available.

Next topic was Chabot College Mission Statement.

Susan introduced the topic, noting that our official Vision, Mission and Value Statements are dated 2004. She noted that there are a lot of good things about this document. But, perhaps we need to add some content that better reflect our strategic goal, which has a large focus on completion. We definitely need to review this document frequently. Discussion about whether "comprehensive" is still accurate. Jim explained that compared with almost every other college, we are very, very comprehensive. Also questions about the phrase "creating a vibrant community of life-long learners". Does this mean only on our campus, or creating in our students a love of learning that occurs outside of our college, or might occur in Community Ed? Christy questioned how this statement should mesh with our College-Wide Learning Goals.

Jan questioned if we want this document to focus our efforts more, or leave it as broad as it currently is. It's currently very, very broad, supporting almost any activity. Carolyn emphasized that this document should help guide our strategic plan; does it? If not, does it need to change? Marcia asked about the connection between Board priorities and the vision, mission and value statements of the colleges. They don't currently seem to be connected.

Sandra suggested that we put together a task force to revisit the Vision, Mission and Values Statement. It would need to go through the shared governance structure, including College Council. And, it needs to be done by the end of the semester. Volunteers include Tram, Marcia, Carolyn, Jan, and Kathy. Also suggest that we should include reps from the Classified and Student Senates. Goal is to have a draft approved to PRBC by October 30th, then to the Senates, then to the January Board meeting. We should request being placed on the January Board agenda now, as it's likely that there will be changes to our document that will require Board approval.

Kathy requested that all components of the shared governance structure review the new Board Policies that are being proposed and provide feedback to Jeff Kingston.

Susan raised the topic of the Ed Master Plan. Jim said that our current plan expires in 2015, so it's important to have a new plan in place by Spring 2015. This is a district-wide plan, so we'll need to be in discussions with the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services at District to ensure this process is underway soon. Alternately, we could develop a Master Plan for the college. It doesn't need to be a district plan. Each college could develop a separate plan.

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.