



DRAFT
Modesto Junior College
Planning & Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
September 7, 2012

Committee Member	Representing	Present	Absent
Jill Stearns	Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)	X	
John Zamora	Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)	X	
Jenni Abbott	Director Grants & Resource Development	X	
Kevin Alavezos	Academic Senate appointee	X	
Iris Carroll	Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee	X	
Paul Cripe	Academic Senate appointee	X	
Rosanne Faughn	CSEA appointee	X	
Susan Kincade	Vice President of Instruction		X
Michael Guerra	Vice President of College Administrative Services	X	
Rose LaMont	YFA Budget Analyst		X
Maurice McKinnon	Instructional Dean	X	
Martha Robles	Student Services Administrator	X	
Nancy Sill	YFA appointee	X	
Brenda Thames	Vice President of Student Services	X	
Joan Van Kuren	CSEA appointee	X	
Mike Sharif	ASMJC Student Rep	X	
Shayne Cooley	ASMJC Student Rep	X	

Vacant position

YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)
Faculty Career Technical Education Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Technology/Distance Education Liaison, Academic Senate appointee

Guest

Kevin Sabo, ASMJC President

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Iris Carroll amended her statement as follows: Iris Carroll stated that at the end of the semester, ~~the primary responsibility would be College Council.~~ College Council would be the main body bringing together institutional planning. Maurice McKinnon stated that her

comment was regarding the community, not committee on page 3. Jenni Abbott clarified that her statement regarded questions we are trying to answer as we develop a budget plan.

Iris Carroll moved to approve the minutes of August 21, 2012 as amended. Jenni Abbott seconded. The minutes of August 21, 2012 were approved as amended by aye vote.

2. Review of Agenda

John Zamora reviewed the agenda with members. Iris Carroll added *in relation to the decision-making document* to the agenda item Transition from Planning & Budget Committee to Resource Allocation Committee.

3. Enrollment Update (standing item)

Michael Guerra informed members that we are almost at our target. He expressed appreciation for the faculty taking care of the wait lists electronically. Michael also expressed appreciation for Mark Anglin and Brian Sanders testing the new process.

4. Transition from Planning & Budget Committee to Resource Allocation Committee in relation to the decision-making document - Revisit

John Zamora reminded members that he sent out budget committee resource samples from other Los Rios, Cerro Coso, MiraCosta, Mt. San Jacinto and West Hills College campuses. John distributed a document he felt was a starting point for the Planning & Budget Committee going to the Resource Allocation Committee. The document starts with a mission statement which is not formulated at this point. Core values, charge, committee co-chairs structure, members and products are identified in the document.

Iris Carroll pointed out that on page 17 of the September 6th decision-making document, it clearly states that program review is under the charge of the Resource Allocation Committee. She asked how the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee (AIE) gets into that process as she thought AIE would be taking a look at program review. John Zamora responded that AIE met yesterday and will be meeting again on how feedback will go out from program review to the Planning & Budget Committee.

Paul Cripe suggested adding review and refine to the first bullet which speaks to development and implementation of a process under the charge.

Jill Stearns stated that the management level in the Program Improvement graphic needs revision to reflect the process in the decision-making document. She clarified that ranking is not participatory in the first place, and then the ranking goes out. When it goes out, it would already have a lens of evaluation that is not participatory. She stressed that we need voices around the table and determination around those councils. We do not have a sufficient participatory process for those things to reside. There needs to be broad dialogue and collegiality.

Jill stated that accreditation needs to be an ongoing priority of the college and this document is not intended to change the role of the Senate. We are going to improve our processes by moving into a structure that really affords institutional effectiveness. The idea is to evaluate and revise as appropriate and implement. Jill asked are you going to fund programs that are thriving or those that are struggling? She added that we need to make sure it is a process that is transparent for everyone.

Jenni Abbott stated that maybe we can make it clear at the ground level that a participatory process has to be done.

Jill Stearns stressed that the other key piece that has to be done, is this has to be done in a short timeframe. When the district provides the number, we have a limited amount of time to work through the process of developing the budget. The process she is hearing here sounds pretty onerous and difficult to complete. Given this structure you would really place responsibility on the Instructional Council and the Student Services Council to make the recommendations to the Resource Allocation Council.

John Zamora reminded members that the Technology Committee was added last year.

Nancy Sill suggested a pilot test using the new document on the old information to see if it would have worked.

Kevin Alavezos felt that the process is pretty well developed. Requests are ranked by departments in program review, forwarded to the division manager where the division's shared governance process is used to rank all division requests. All division rankings are sent to the appropriate council to be ranked using a pre-established rubric. The rankings from each council are forwarded to the Planning & Budget Committee, now called Resource Allocation Committee, where all council's requests are ranked into one consolidated list. He concurred that students are not a part of the ranking process at the department or division level.

Jill Stearns suggested looking at this more holistically.

Michael Guerra stated that it seems to be unwieldy in the amount of staffing requests that are received.

Jill stated that it is an opportunity right now to develop process and allows ownership of program review to be set aside and really talk about what are the key elements of the rubric because money is not available. When money becomes available, the process has already been vetted.

Maurice McKinnon added that outside of the normal process for hiring, it goes to the Cabinet.

Paul Cripe said that we are always addressing normal, but in the end the abnormal comes up and then quickly we hire. He added that the disaster planning workshop was good, but didn't go anywhere.

Iris Carroll stated that we need to have processes in place for growth and processes in place for reduction. She added that we haven't really defined them.

Maurice McKinnon said that program review gives information about what is productive at the college and what is not. It should be providing us information about what is productive.

Jill Stearns stated that this group should be developing its own evaluation. What went really well at the end of the year? How can we make that better or what needs to be changed? She has seen both a lack of efficiency and effectiveness. Jill pointed out that this group has been working since December regarding changing to the Resource Allocation Committee. There needs to be a foundation and guiding principles. She hopes that everyone will come to the forum on Tuesday regarding the participatory document as she needs feedback. She added to really get where we need to be, it is going to take practice. She recommended leaving technology with the user/owner and have lines of communication with the Technology Committee so it is not isolated but can make wise decisions regarding technology.

Michael Guerra will bring Technology Committee information to the next meeting. He added that Jill's document is an effort to get us where we need to be.

Nancy Sill recommended changing the program review format so that financial requests were categorized into three areas: Urgent requests, short-term requests, and long-term requests.

John Zamora said that we need to decouple program viability from program review. He stressed that program viability is not intended to solve the budget.

Jill Stearns said that ultimately each council will have to develop their own process and need to be affirmed by the group themselves for how they work.

John Zamora expressed appreciation for Jill Stearns creating this document and for folks reading it. The document will go to College Council on Monday. He added that clarification and consistency is needed and these things need to be discussed.

Action Item

Joan Van Kuren moved that the name of the Planning & Budget Committee be Resource Planning Committee.

Joan withdrew her motion.

Martha Robles moved to rename the Planning & Budget Committee the Resource Allocation Committee. Maurice McKinnon seconded.

Paul Cripe stated that he likes the direction Jill's proposal is going and supports it. It is about trying to incorporate more people in the process and it is a starting point and it is going to be reworked. He added that the spirit of this is good.

Joan Van Kuren said that she likes the document and it is a living document and it can be changed.

Iris Carroll asked does it serve us well to talk about how things are broken or how we are going to proceed?

Maurice McKinnon called for the question. Calling for the question passed by aye vote.

Main Motion passed: 5 ayes, 2 nays and 1 abstention.

Future Agenda

1. Rewrite charge for RAC
2. Timeline for RAC
3. Goals, financial stewardship for the college

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT