



## PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

### Summary Meeting Notes from ZOOM Meeting

December 2, 2020

APPROVED February 3, 2021

**Members Present:** **Co-Chairs:** Rod Garcia, Joseph Ramirez; **Management Reps:** Rich Hartmann; **Faculty Reps:** Kim Orlijan, Marcus Wilson; **Classified Reps:** Nichole Crockrom; **Student Reps:** Lucas Aguirre, Nikita Martin; **Resource Members:** Vivian Gaytan, Melisa McLellan, and Catalina Olmedo. **Members Absent:** Cyndi Grein, Monica Hagmaier; **Resource Members Absent:** Gil Contreras.

The meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

**I. Introduction of Student Representatives:** Rod welcomed the new student representatives Nikita and Lucas to the PBSC committee. The existing members then introduced themselves and identified the shared governance group they represent.

**II. Approval of Meeting Notes:** The November 4, 2020 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved by a motion from Marcus Wilson and seconded by Nichole Crockrom; all were in favor.

**III. Planning Update:** Co-chair Joe Ramirez reported that the Integrated Planning Manual is a document that identifies the planning processes that take place at Fullerton College. Discussions and input identified in the Fall 2020 will be incorporated into a new draft that will be available for review and comment in Spring 2021. The goal is to move to campus approval late Spring 2021. Joe also reported that the College's Mission, Vision, and Values will be reviewed in Spring 2021. A workgroup may be formed with a call from PAC to propose updates, if there is an interest to review and edit this document. Related to the Mission, Vision, and Values, Joe stated that the College's goals were last updated in May 2019. There are four high level goals and specific objectives under each goal (*see [www.fullcoll.edu/president](http://www.fullcoll.edu/president)*). It is important to review these goals and objectives and have an understanding how it relates to our work in the process of allocating resources.

Lastly, Joe described the Program Review Process and spoke how it relates to the PBSC. The PBSC is responsible for reviewing department requests endorsed by the Program Review Committee (PRC) and makes a Resource Allocation Funding recommendation to PAC. The PRC wants to know how resources are selected for funding and how the PRC can be informed of our work and outcomes. Discussion ensued. The PBSC reviews the entire list of endorsed items sent by the PRC. The Vice President of Administrative Services also engages in discussions with Deans' Council and managers to prioritize the funding needs when limited funds are available to allocate. The PBSC makes a resource allocation recommendation to PAC for approval by PAC

and the College President. Some view Program Review as a mechanism for requesting funding, however, it was created as a method to develop a “self study report” to self-reflect and identify how to improve. It also provides a section to identify strengths, weaknesses, and resource needs. The goal should be to review the programs and not just focus on budget/resource requests.

Marcus stated that certain campus agreements have been approved between the Faculty Senate and the College President and should be incorporated into the Integrated Planning Manual (IPM). Kim stated that there are Board Policies in place, but agrees with Marcus that local decision-making can be included in the IPM or at least identify where to access that information at minimum. Kim referenced Faculty Senate meeting notes dated April 4, 2019, which identifies the processes adopted for reassigned time, interim deans, and Vice Presidents.

**IV. Budget Update:** Rod did not have any update to the budget, but reported the status of the faculty negotiations are unknown and there has not been a vote. Rod reported that a link to the Campus Design Standards was presented at the last PAC meeting and is on the agenda for the December 15 District Board meeting. This will be a living document. Unique standards are required for each campus to maintain the landscape and architectural structures and styles exclusive at each site. Our campus wants to phase out blocks and bricks and keep the 1930’s design style. Marcus asked if the new Performing Arts project will have an ultra-modern style and Rod replied that architects will incorporate our standards while offering a unique style within those parameters to be a modern “performance-like” building as this structure will be in public view because the site is located at the corner of Chapman and Lemon. The District, NOCE and Cypress have not developed unique campus standards of their own. Rod asked Melisa to send a link to the members.

**V. Other/General Discussion:** Marcus asked if the College has considered adding a material fee for electronic books to certain sections at the discretion of the professor. He reported Cerritos College is currently offering this service and Saddleback is in process of developing this service. He reported that the e-books would be loaded into Canvas and be readily available to students. This would help save money for students. Joe reported Jane Ishibashi of the library is looking at OER (open educational resources) free uploads of books into canvas. Nick Karvia (FC Bookstore Manager) had previously made a presentation to Faculty Senate for potential items where faculty can decide to use this process to purchase books at a significant discount. Rod will contact Nick and ask that he attend a faculty senate meeting in the spring to speak about this topic.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm  
Meeting Notes taken by Melisa McLellan  
Next Meeting: February 3, 2021

NOTE from Melisa McLellan, Secretary: On December 3, 2020, Melisa McLellan emailed the PBSC members, the **College Design Standards** shared at the PAC meeting on November 25, 2020. These standards will be presented at the December Board Meeting. Due to the large file size, a Google Drive link to access the final draft is provided below:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1e5oDDKOqhXBOh7TYtm2hHPknUexFQLis?usp=sharing>