

Planning, Review and Budget Council

Regular Meeting
September 4, 2013
Building 400, Room 405
3:00 – 4:00 PM

MINUTES

Present: Jan Novak, Kristen Land, Ken Grace, Tom Clark, Jim Matthews, Eric Schultz, Marcia Corcoran, Tom DeWit, Jane Valleley, Meriella Giovanova, Andrew Pierson, Luis Flores (student), Sandra Genera, Kathy Kelly, Becky Plaza, Carey Kopay, Deonne Kunkel, Jennifer Lange, Patricia Shannon, Carolyn Arnold, Susan Sperling, Gerald Shimada, Dale Wagoner, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Donna Gibson, Christine Warda, Wayne Pitcher, Yvonne Wu-Craig, Catherine Powell, Matthew Kritscher, Sara Parker

Jan started meeting at 3:07 pm, room 405

Jan passed out minutes of May 15 meeting to review and be approved.

Motion to by Kathy K to pass the minutes and seconded by Deonne K

Jan proceeded with meeting agenda items

1. first item on agenda program review timeline
2. second item on agenda who's going to co-chair
3. third item on agenda is to look at PRBC goals for the year

Jan started off with the reason to move program review to fall semester was to connect to the Resource allocation

Tom Clark said that this was a good idea and there was no update on budget committee over summer;

- it was a good idea to move program review in the fall semester to tie it into the budget program reviews and good to update on requests from IT and the spreadsheets with FTE F and faculty and resources

Carey gave an update on status and SLOAC committee had a handout addressing the three-year cycle of assessment. So by having program review in on the fall cycle it will slow down the SLO cycle and create a 3 1/2 year cycle. She and the committee is recommending a SLO addendum so if you're in the first year you have a one year the first year addendum's SLOAC requests for PRBC to review the revised SLO reporting schedule they recommend to keep the "close the loop" form and extend current year and include assessment from last spring don't have good program learning outcomes reporting

Tram asked to please define what a program is

Carey looked at the handout and read verbatim out of the hand out, stating,

A Program is defined as a course of study leading to a certificate or degree. Additionally, a collegiate "program" may be a group of related courses, a course sequence, or other college activities that align with a cohesive set of Student Learning Outcomes.

Kathy asked should IR track outcomes

Answer: for example ECD offers the certificate they have a SLO and/or a program level outcome that needs to be assessed by the program, the program staff, faculty, either formal or informal however the program decides, but they need to be reporting all of the information needs to go into eLumen and eLumen gives the opportunity to aggregate the data

Jennifer needs to clarify reading SLO the chart addresses recency addendum addresses only if it was assessed for closed the loop section B needs to be done by everyone and will let you know if you need to do B2 section

Marcia – Thinking of integrated planning to connect SLO assessment to Program Review through fall addendum tying together faculty positions, retirements and prioritization by October to fit the timeline.

Question to Dale from Marcia – “Will we have new faculty positions?”

Dale – Doesn’t have an answer, it is dependent on a lot of things.

Tram - regardless we shouldn’t wait for a number, the goal should be to have Program Review addendum done by November 1, 2013.

Christy – Question- Is the budget allocation connected to SLO’s?

Conversation continued on having guidelines for Program Review and worksheets so that there is a fair assessment for funding to be allocated. Example on how other schools have a point system in place that they use, others have guiding principles, others have training for PRBC Chair, but Chabot doesn’t have anything in place so far.

Conversation on retirement replacements: there is a form for the dean to use as soon as they are informed of a retirement. If the dean is informed by December 15, there is a replacement, but oftentimes, faculty don’t know until the spring semester and then there is no guarantee to go through faculty prioritization allocation process.

Jan – to clarify what needs to happen next for Program Review is that

1. What we are asking in Program Review?
2. What is the timeline?
3. How are we framing these together with Program Review, SLO’s, Budget?

The Program Review addendum needs to reflect funding plus FTEF plus positions plus SLO cycle updates

Jim: Reminder.... This Program Review is for 2014-2015 budget, not the current 2013-2014 budget!

Yvonne: Prioritization should be data driven, and there should be guidelines for defining priority vs. dream proposal. It will be important for the group to define this to go out soon. For example, Admin provides for classified professional prioritization 1, 2, 3 lists.

Kathy: How does the work of this committee get included to continue the conversation?

Tram: The conversation between PRBC and areas that need it to get addressed take the work done on strategic plan that connects to PRBC.

Christy: It will be important to articulate what the driving force is for funding before the PR forms go out

Kathy: Strategic plan needs to grow and connect to the whole

Christy: At the October 8th Flex Day Staff Development has built in time to work on Program Review and SLO process.

Jan: Great! Now we need someone to come up with a draft form needed for Program Review and a timeline. What do we do about the programs who did not submit Program Review last year?
Response by many people: We have them submit the whole thing this semester, by November 1st.

The next meeting, an agenda item will be to review a process for Program Review and a timeline.

Jan: Next agenda item... PRBC needs a chair or co-chairs for this year. We will start off by taking nominations.

Kathy: Nominates Deonne Kunkel and Sandra Genera as co-chairs

Ken: Nominates himself

Jennifer: How are we addressing the charter?

General conversation: The charter states that a "Chair: The committee shall select one of their representatives to be chair." Since this is a committee of chairs, and the chairs are all busy chairing their own committee, we are now faced with nominations of potential chairs that are not part of the stated charter membership.

Tram clarified that the reason the charter was written up this way was because there is a lot of learning that has to happen in this position and that if you are a chair of one of the committees, then you are already in the know/in the conversation and are able to address the key conversations and won't have a chair without experience.

Jim: This is why we have elections.

Donna: has a concern with changing the rule without proper notice. There might have been interested people on campus and they may not have stepped up because of the way the charter currently reads and so it might be important to open it up to the campus community now and continue to take nominations vs. changing the rule now and having elections today.

Susan: There has been active discussion going on throughout campus all summer long, since May, when the position came vacant, and if you didn't know that PRBC was looking for a new chair, then you probably weren't clued into the campus climate.

Marcia read from the minutes in May that stated, "But, the membership needs to be asked for nominations. If there are none, then I would appoint an administrative chair. It's not an ideal solution, but that's how it will go." Quoting from Susan.

Various voices had concerns on the style of voting and nominations for PRBC chair. The new chair will be able to change the charter. What if the nominees have not been involved in the PRBC conversation? Can we change the charter without notifying the college community? Should it be proposed to college council for approval?

Eric moves that the nominations get accepted and that it be noted that the charter is broken and not being followed, we will address that at a later time, but for the sake of moving forward, let's get the nominations approved.

Jan proposes suggestions for how the charter should read in order for us to move forward and vote. It is noted that no nominees' names have moved forward that fit the current charter so suggestions for the charter to be changed are:

Option 1: The committee shall select member(s) of the college community to be chair

Option 2: The committee shall select member(s) that have been regularly attending PRBC to be chair

Dale has a concern that to create rules after the fact, in general, goes against the democratic process and is bad bad business.

Jennifer answers that if anyone followed the notes and minutes last year they are aware of the issues without having attended the meetings.

Carey states that maybe a status quo should also be an option. No one answers.

Jan states that PRBC has practiced moving on consensus, not voting, she proposes continue the practice through this vote. Everyone can vote.

Now let's hear from the nominees:

Ken Grace introduced himself on how he is a Chabot baby, having been a student at Chabot, grew up in San Lorenzo, came back to Chabot as an administrator. This was during a time when Chabot was going through many changes and was asked to go into the classroom, which he loves. Cautions to pay attention to your leadership (in general). Recently he has been able to free up some time and feels it is a good time to come back into the scene. He is ready to get things done. He has been attending facilities meetings and looks up to how Scott moves a meeting along and learned from Scott that it is your vision that drives the meeting.

Deonne Kunkel introduced herself. She has been attending PRBC for two years. The work she has been doing in the Learning Connections has been under the wire. She sees herself stepping up to be more public. She is well versed on the many different initiatives that PRBC has been working on. She sees herself working more outside her division than within her division. She is WASC trained and active on SLOAC. In the past, she has written part of accreditation. She will

be attending CEMC and DBSG this upcoming year because she needs to see how it all works and again is trying to be more public.

Sandra Genera introduced herself. This is her tenth year here at Chabot, but feels this past year was the first year that she was really stepping out of the Student Services side to work on campus wide initiatives. She is also very familiar with the PRBC initiatives, as she has been attending PRBC the past year. She will be able to bring a Student Services perspective to the conversation. She had agreed, back in June to co-chair PRBC with someone else, and is looking forward to that opportunity.

Jan and Susan then clarified that Sandra is a co-chair, and so voting today would be for someone else to co-chair with her.

Voting will be blind and Jan passed out index cards.

Sara Parker and Jim Matthews volunteered to collect the votes and count them. Jim announced that there were 26 votes and that Ken Grace was voted co-chair.

Congratulations to all!

Jan announces that the next meeting is next Wednesday, September 11, 2013. It needs to be a short meeting because Dr. Sperling has called a Learning Communities Task Force meeting that starts at 4 pm. So PRBC will be meeting from 3-4 pm on Wednesday, September 11 in room 405.

Jan adjourns the PRBC meeting at 4:55 pm.

Notes submitted by Sandra Genera, September 6, 2013.