



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes from Zoom Meeting October 18, 2023

APPROVED November 1, 2023

Members Present: Co-Chairs: Daniel Berumen, Henry Hua; **Management Reps:** Carlos Ayon, Anita Carlos; **Faculty Reps:** Jennifer Combs, Jeanette Rodriguez; **Classified Reps:** Summer Marquardt; **Resource Members:** Vivian Gaytan, Celina Gutierrez, Melisa McLellan; **Student Reps:** Not yet appointed; **Guest:** Monica Ernandes.

The meeting was held via Zoom format and commenced at 2:04 pm.

I. Approval of Meeting Notes: The October 4, 2023 Summary Meeting Notes were approved by consensus vote after a motion from Carlos Ayon, seconded by Jennifer Combs.

II. Program Review Resource Requests – Approval Discussion: Henry screen-shared a document that was emailed along with the agenda to the committee. This list identifies the “filtered” and “ranked” resource request items. After Henry met with the Deans, several resource request items were removed for various reasons being 1) The item was no longer needed, 2) The item was funded by another funding source, 3) The item is for on-going funding and or full-time/permanent personnel, and 4) The item is for capital projects/construction/remodels.

The total amount of resource requests sent to the Program Review and Planning Committee from the Non-Instructional Program Reviews was \$26,916,856. That committee endorsed SAPs that totaled \$25,281,481. Of those requests, the one-time requests totaled \$1,254,951; this was the amount considered for endorsement by the PBSC. Similarly, for the Instructional Annual Program Review Update, the total sent to Program Review and Planning was \$9,590,781, of that \$9,321,470.73 was endorsed by the committee. Of that, only \$833,897 was reviewable by PBSC.

Daniel asked for clarification on the items that have another funding source identified in the column labeled “Notes” with verbiage “SWP or Perkins funding source”. Daniel asked if these are suggested funding sources. Henry replied they are possible funding sources and are not guaranteed as discussions still need to take place with the Deans. Carlos said Perkins has been fully allocated for this year and the group just met regarding SWP (Strong Workforce) and he will look into it and get back with the group later in the meeting.

Jeanette asked about the items where the column labeled “Funding Source” has no verbiage listed. Henry replied that we will use the traditional funding sources we have available such as IE, scheduled maintenance, Lotto, and program review. If the group approves these items, we will fill in the rest of the funding sources, all of which funds have been set aside.

Anita asked about one item – line 17 under Social Science - Geography - the \$15,900 Personnel to manage, the only issue she had is that people are hired for specific projects and then ask for on-going funding. So if they hire the person, we can only approve for one year and the job is done. Daniel said Anita is correct in that personnel is to provide PE contracts to faculty in geography to manage the

software licensing outside of their regular work hours. It's not to hire new folks, but existing faculty. This would be a one-time allocation for this fiscal year. It must be spent by June 30, 2024.

Jennifer asked Henry for confirmation that the Program Review & Planning Committee (PRPC) already vetted these and they support the items. Henry confirmed that we have the funding sources to fund all of these, and that no decisions need to be made by the PBSC because they are all appropriate to be funded. Henry stated the items total \$1.5M if we fund everything. We have about \$1.5M allocated to fund program review this year. So if PBSC approves this list, and we support these requests, they will be funded. Jennifer also asked if Henry would report back to us if other funding sources were used and he replied that he would. Henry stated Rod had funding sources and a funding FOAPAL that he used for Lotto, IE, and carryover and our approved list would have those funding sources identified.

Henry will send a memo to PAC and we do not need to have any future consideration unless we can't fund with Perkins and SWP. Henry stated he will send a memo to PAC that outlines if we need more funding.

Carlos said only the Bus and CIS Cybersecurity lab was funded, so the other Business & CIS Division items will need funding. As for the Campus Theater Operations items, a discussion will need to take place with Dean Grant Linsell. The process is that programs submit applications and detail the budget and what they are going to spend it on, and Carlos doesn't know if they submitted these items under the grant.

Melisa stated that in the past, those discussions had already taken place before the PBSC meeting to approve resource requests. In looking at the rankings, the divisions would already know what other funding sources could be used to cover the resource requests. In order for PBSC to send our recommendation, we need to know down to the dollar what we are approving. Henry stated he does not know the funding sources yet as he needs to see what is eligible for those funding sources. Henry stated that the divisions would not know what items are eligible and only ranked what items they knew they needed. Henry is asking that the committee approve the list and he will prepare the list of items under each funding source before it is presented to PAC. As a committee we can say that we have endorsed these and the pots of monies would be noted in the recommendation to PAC.

Jeanette stated there is a problem with the program review in that there is not a process for denying other than that it doesn't get funded. Should there be a column for the funding feasibility – should it be funded or unfunded. Some items we just cannot fund. Jeanette is concerned if the Perkins funding doesn't work out, then we will need to find money and then we lose transparency. Jeanette wants the PBSC to be mindful of this as we move forward knowing the limitations of program review. Even though it made the merit test, we are not budget experts and we do not know the limitations.

Henry asked what does funded and not funded mean. We removed items that are no longer needed or not feasible leaving the filtered list to consider one-time costs only. Jeanette asked what is the evaluative funding criteria as this is subjective. Henry and Jennifer agreed, although Melisa stated the PBSC criteria was used this year and that is how we identified the "filtered list". Then, the PBSC reviews each item because in some years there are more requests than available funding resulting in items left unfunded. Melisa stated the PBSC was going to identify a new rubric before this cycle started, but now we are using the same criteria. Daniel said the criteria we use to approve items includes: 1) Is this a one-time funding request, 2) Is this for one-time personnel expenditure (ongoing or permanent positions are not funded), 3) We remove capital project/construction, 4) Is the cost of the item reasonable comparable to total funding available, and 5) Are there other funding sources.

The committee had questions on the following items:

1. **Physical Education \$175,000 Kinesiology:** \$150k (intramural coach) plus related items totaling \$25,000 (Equipment, supplies, Computer hardware and software). The PBSC reviewed the self-study and it did not provide details. This is an update to a previous program review. It was determined the PBSC needs more information before endorsing these items. If you want to provide PAC with additional information on why this should be approved, then PAC can approve it. PAC's next meeting is Wednesday, October 25.
2. **Social Sciences Division Office** – Conduct a non-instructional program review survey to staff, faculty and students. The item was unranked because they only submitted one item. It was determined that since Daniel's team in OIE runs surveys, they could cover the cost.

Daniel brought to the group's attention line items where the ranking column area was filled with black means Daniel pulled the item because it was already funded by another funding source. For example, the Humanities item for two tutors - Kristine Nikkoo hired the embedded tutors for MIND 105, and the Financial Aid Chat Bot for \$80,000 was no longer needed.

PBSC Program Review Recommendation to PAC: Jennifer Combs made a motion to endorse funding for the 2022-23 Program Review Resource Requests items from the 2022-23 year and those left unfunded from last year for a total amount of \$1,317,000 with documentation of funding sources to come. Henry stated he would break out and identify the funding sources in the document sent to PAC. Summer Marquardt seconded the motion and all were in favor. Henry will send a memo including a list of the items to fund to the next PAC Meeting on Wednesday, October 25, 2023. The goal is to have the funds distributed to the identified budgets by the second week of November, with the stipulation that items must be purchased by March 2024. The VPAS Office will send out an award letter requesting the funding string for those items approved for funding, and the monies will be deposited into that FOAPAL.

III. Enrollment and Re-Engagement – Modifications Discussion: Item tabled for next meeting.

IV. Other / General Discussion: Daniel stated the IPWG Proposal (Integrated Planning Manual Work Group) will be on the next PAC agenda, and then he will bring it back to the PBSC.

Meeting adjourned at 3:43 pm
Meeting Notes typed by Melisa McLellan
Next Meeting: November 1, 2023