



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes from Hybrid Meeting May 3, 2023

APPROVED May 17, 2023

Members Present: Co-Chairs: Daniel Berumen, Henry Hua; **Management Reps:** Anita Carlos; **Faculty Reps:** Jennifer Combs, Jeanette Rodriguez; **Classified Reps:** Nichole Crockrom, Carolina Santillan; **Resource Members:** Vivian Gaytan, Celina Gutierrez, Melisa McLellan; **Student Reps:** (Not yet appointed); **Members Absent:** Carlos Ayon; **Guests:** Cristina Arellano (Faculty), Monica Ernandes (VPSS Executive Assistant).

The meeting was held via hybrid format and commenced at 2:03 pm.

I. Approval of Meeting Notes: The April 5, 2023 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved with two edits by a motion from Henry Hua, seconded by Nichole Crockrom.

II. Administrative Services Update: Co-chair Henry stated that he and Anita have been conducting meetings with managers and programs to close out the fiscal year and looking at upcoming fiscal year to see what our needs are. Our goal is to be as transparent as possible as far as what funds are available, where people are in the process, and what expenditures are happening. We are getting a lot of information from different folks and so it is causing a little more confusion just because we are not getting all the information all at once. Anita and I are meeting with all the constituency groups to make sure we have that information. Building in a system of consistency for the upcoming fiscal year is one of the most important things for us, and ensuring that the campus has all the necessary information to make decisions based on the funds that we have. One of the things that I do urge for those performing financial processes is that since this is a busy part of the year (yearend) and folks are submitting many RQs and things of that nature, we really want to make sure that folks understand that this takes time and it is more than the Business Office just approving items. The items need to be vetted by approvers and presented in a certain way before being submitted to the District. The Business Office needs to follow certain guidelines as the District has final say as to what is accepted or not. We are working with our District partners to streamline our processes. We are currently working on closing the books for this fiscal year and working with our programs to develop budgets for next year.

Henry reported that his office is in the process of developing training to offer in the first part of August. Over the summer, our office is requesting feedback from folks as to where there are gaps and how the Business Office can help. Our office has a number of items we have been discussing. One being how we can revamp the existing Resource Guide at our website to be more user friendly and second, to ensure our Resource Guide meets the needs of the Purchasing Department. Henry is going to reach out to meet with our Faculty Senate members Jennifer Combs and Jeanette Rodriguez to discuss any input they may have regarding our budget process.

III. ER 2.0 Plan Update: Daniel reported that since our last discussion, he recently received a new plan from Jeanne Costello. He is still processing the Guided Exit Program and needs to meet with them to clarify what the funds will be used for. Daniel checked in with Dean Bridget Salzameda of Natural Sciences and she stated the campus is in the process of opening a STEM center/study space in the former Faculty Senate Lounge located in the 1200 Bldg. They are building it now and requested funding

in advance. The center will be a shared space for study groups, tutoring and to host events. This has been included in their instructional program reviews for years and we have a line item in our ER 2.0 that offers funds to support collaborative efforts around STEM in the enrollment and reengagement process. Daniel thought their request would fall under this funding source if they submit an application, as there currently are no plans under this line item for this year. However, the College is building it now and could use funding for the first three years in advance. The line item in the ER Plan reads “Funds to Support Expansion/Collaboration of STEAM Programs” with funding amounts: Year 1 \$50,000, Year 2 \$75,000, Year 3 \$75,000, and Year 4 \$75,000.

Jennifer asked if we front load projects for good reason does that create a potential issue for the funding for other programs as we move through the years or is this funding set aside and guaranteed regardless of when we distribute it? Daniel stated that the way the ER 2.0 plan was written, our committee has authority to pull back money if what they are doing is not working. We did not discuss what happens if we provide funding all at once. Daniel stated that for all plans, the funding for Year 4 and 5 are contingent on whether the state is providing the monies. Henry reported that if any other STEAM-related plans come forward they would not be funded using ER 2.0 funding. Jeanette asked have we consulted the faculty that are impacted by this decision to determine if they are all in agreement to use the funds in this manner, and were there program review funds allocated to be used for the STEAM project. Bridget has other funds already approved to be used to fund the entire STEAM project. This funding is to be used this summer to start the project and she secured SMP and Perkins funds to be available in Fall 2023. Jeanette was concerned that this project seems related to facilities and not enrollment and reengagement. Daniel replied that the reason he brought it forward for transparency is under Goal #2 on the plan based on the ER 2.0 objective “Improve a sense of belonging” and the STEAM center could help to recruit in other areas, be a “hub” in the community and would achieve that goal for students to connect. Daniel offered to ask Bridget if she would like to come and make a presentation. Jeanette asked if it is fair that we are asking Bridget to present when others did not. The responsible party listed is VPI for instructional purposes and the question is should it be under VPAS as related to space allocation. Henry stated Bridget presented at President’s Staff and the VPI is in support of this plan. Discussion ensued and the PBSC members discussed the item and came to the decision that Bridget would be invited to present to the group their rationale to support student enrollment and retention, and if faculty are on board to spend the entire allotment on STEAM. Related topic raised is that Faculty gave up their space for the students and Academic Senate needs a replacement location or an MOU in writing to have space for their Senate Meetings under the Brown Act.

IV. Summer Work to Address ASC Recommendation: The Academic Steering Committee (ASC) asked what the role of the PBSC in resource allocation is. IIC realized it is challenging to do work during the year and in order to develop a draft to bring back to the committee, they decided to meet in the Summer to develop a first draft to share with the committees in the fall, so that they can finalize a proposal through the shared governance groups in Fall 2023. Since faculty are off contract during the summer and require compensation, IIC will go through the Faculty Senate process for interested faculty to be paid for 2 days or 16 hours during the weeks of August 7 and August 14.

V. Program Review & Planning Committee – Review of SAPs: The PBSC will receive its first look at the official spreadsheet list containing the resource requests from the Program Review and Planning Committee. PBSC will begin their analysis in the Fall at their first meeting on September 6, 2023.

VI. Facilities Master Plan (FMP): Jennifer Combs asked for this item because in some conversations Dr. Olivo has shared with us about discussions around the FMP, specifically in response to faculty investment in the Welcome Center. Due to reality of escalating construction costs, it sounds like decisions have been made regarding projects that were on the list that might not happen or be delayed

like the parking structure and STEM (Natural Sciences, Math, Horticulture, Nutrition Food Lab, etc.). Jennifer wants to know the process and where the shared governance happens in terms of faculty involvement and how we can weigh-in or gather more information about projects that are being considered to be pushed back. Since this body is part of the budget/planning process, Jennifer thought we could discuss it. Henry stated those conversations took place for annual state reporting needs. Henry stated an audit firm came to the campus and asked for our priorities related to facilities managed by a program called FUSION. Since the annual audit came in Henry's first two weeks and Dr. Olivo was not familiar with the process, Fred, Dr. Olivo and Henry had to make a decision to prioritize the needs. The decision that was made is not permanent and conversations will take place with shared governance groups in the future. Henry's goal is to have a collegial consultation to develop a checklist and he welcomes faculty input to this process.

VII. Other / General Discussion: It was decided by the committee to have the last meeting over Zoom. Since Henry will not be in attendance, we will celebrate our last meeting at our first meeting in the Fall on September 6.

Meeting adjourned at 3:31 pm
Meeting Notes typed by Melisa McLellan
Next Meeting: May 17, 2023