



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes from Zoom Meeting

November 20, 2024

APPROVED on February 19, 2025

Members Present: **Co-Chairs:** Henry Hua, Bridget Kominek; **Faculty Senate Rep:** Heather Halverson; **Management Reps:** Anita Carlos, Grant Linsell; **Classified Rep:** Summer Marquardt; **Student Rep:** Denise Leonen (Absent); **Resource Members:** Melisa McLellan, Daniel Berumen; **Guest:** Cristina Arellano.

Call to Order: The meeting began at 2:03 pm.

Motion to Approve Agenda by Heather; second by Grant; all in favor; no abstentions.

Motion to Approve Notes: The **November 6, 2024 meeting** notes were presented for approval. Motion to approve by Heather; Second by Summer; all in favor; no abstentions.

Public Comments: None.

Co-chair report: Bridget reported that follow-up is needed to determine the student rep and classified rep on this committee. The **ER Year 3 Funding recommendation** was approved by Faculty Senate on November 7 and by PAC on November 13. Both committees approved after a first read. Henry stated that emails will be sent to those awarded funding. Once budget strings are provided by the departments awarded funding, budget transfers will take place to make funds available for spending.

Emergency Funding Request Process: Based on discussion at the last PBSC meeting, Bridget drafted the paragraph below to propose to PAC for inclusion in the Integrated Planning Manual. Motion to approve by Grant; Second by Summer; all in favor; no abstentions.

In response to the concern that a process is not documented for members of the campus community to request funding for time-sensitive and unanticipated needs, the Planning and Budget Steering Committee is making a recommendation to the President's Advisory Council that the following paragraph be added to the Integrated Planning Manual in the Budget Allocation section (page 15-16):

While the College makes every attempt to use the program review and planning process to guide resource allocation decisions, there are times when time-sensitive and unanticipated needs arise. When a member of the campus community identifies a time-sensitive and unanticipated need, they should report the need to their immediate management supervisor (IMS). If the cost of addressing the problem exceeds the budget of the IMS, the need should be brought to the area's vice president. If the cost of addressing the problem exceeds the budget of the vice president or a solution cannot be found working with the president's staff, the vice president should request to be on the agenda of the next Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) to present the need. PBSC will use its position as a recommending body to the President's Advisory Council and Faculty Senate to make a recommendation to the campus regarding the need.

Henry will email the paragraph to Jean Foster and request it be placed on the next PAC Agenda.

Program Review and Resource Allocation Software Overview: The committee discussed the software that is currently being considered. Daniel presented the following:

1) Weave: \$14,750 annually or \$1,250 monthly; Users – no limits; We have eLumen and CurricUNET. Focuses on assessment, accreditation, curriculum mapping, program review and strategic management. Pro: collaborative and cheap; Con: not customizable; no data integration. He shared a video. Our accreditation team used it.

2) Precision Campus: \$30,000 annually; Focuses on building dashboards; Pro: A Program Review form can be built, and the system can generate emails like in Argos. Dashboards are pre-built, and institution uploads data. There is a Program Review component. He shared a video from Santa Monica College. Pro: Fully customizable; Con: Pricey, OIE and District already have dashboards built in Tableau, District already pays for Tableau, and the enrollment management module, including nightly updates is an additional \$20,000.

3) Nuventive: \$10,000 one-time plus \$40,000 annually; Comprehensive planning service including Strategic Plan, Program Review, and anything with measurable outcomes (ISLO, Strategic goals, and KPIs). This is a managed service with a dedicated contact person with the ability to build out form and dashboards for you. Technical in that single sign-on and Azure Cloud. He shared a video. Pro: Easy to use and works with existing systems that we utilize including Tableau, eLumen, and CurricUNET. It has a reporting tool which allows for interaction. Con: Pricey!

4) eLumen: eLumen has a form builder that the campus would need to modify for program review. Pro: It's free and exports as PDFs. Con: Campus dislikes eLumen.

5) Invento: Daniel and others met with Microsoft. They have underlying software, and we would need to contract out for someone to build it out and then ACT would maintain the software.

Daniel's recommendation was either Nuventive or build it out ourselves. Henry stated that if we build it ourselves, it will need to be built over time. The expectation is to choose an option by January 2025 so we can have a system in place to test in Summer 2025. People will need to access the system in Fall 2025.

The committee came to consensus to select the Microsoft option based on the needs of the campus. The recommendation will be presented to the Program Review and Planning Committee.

Fall 2025 PBSC Resource Request Rubric: The Instructional Program Review Self-Study (that occurs every 4 years) and the Student Services Annual Update (will occur in Fall 2025), will have resource requests included. Rather than starting with Program Review looking at the self-studies, this is the first time the PBSC will be the first step. Bridget expects our goal as a group is to build a rubric and have one in place by the end of Spring 2025.

DRAFT PBSC Resource Request Rubric: Bridget presented the DRAFT Rubric below for consideration for use in Fall 2025 to evaluate resource requests submitted in the instructional program review comprehensive self-studies and student services/administrative operational program review annual updates

Scoring Area	Scoring Considerations	Scoring Guidelines	Score
Maintaining current instruction or student support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this request necessary for maintaining existing classroom instruction? Is this request necessary for maintaining existing direct student support? 	<p>2: The request is necessary and directly impacts students</p> <p>1: The request is necessary and indirectly impacts students</p> <p>0: The request is not necessary or does not directly or indirectly impact students</p>	
Program enhancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will this request allow for growth, supplementation, or innovation in classroom instruction? Will this request allow for growth, supplementation, or innovation in direct student support? 	<p>2: The request will allow for growth, supplementation, or innovation and will directly impact students</p> <p>1: The request will allow for growth, supplementation, or innovation that will indirectly impact students</p> <p>0: The request will not allow for growth, supplementation, or innovation or it will not directly or indirectly impact students</p>	
Enrollment and retention efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will this request support the college's efforts to increase enrollment and retain students? 	<p>2: The request directly aligns with the college's enrollment and retention efforts</p> <p>1: The request indirectly connects to the college's and retention efforts</p> <p>0: the request does not align with the college's enrollment and retention efforts</p>	

Support for SEA Plan target groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this request support the goals of the SEA Plan? 	<p>2. The request supports a group identified in the SEA Plan</p> <p>0: The request does not support a group identified in the SEA Plan</p>	
Connection to priorities in the College's Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the request align with priorities identified in the College's Strategic Plan? 	<p>2: The request aligns with multiple priorities identified in the College's Strategic Plan</p> <p>1. The request aligns with one priority identified in the College's Strategic Plan</p> <p>0: The request does not align with any priorities identified in the College's Strategic Plan</p>	
Total Points			

Considerations/Questions/Concerns:

- We haven't yet gone through the process (happening in Spring 2025) of drafting the college's next strategic plan. Ideally, the rubric we create to evaluate resource requests will align with the new strategic plan. The same goes for the SEA Plan. What about other related initiatives, such as our HSI status?*
- Do we want to find a way to skim requests that relate to safety/risk and legal requirements off the top to prioritize for funding? What does that look like in the rubric? Is that a different rubric for requests that members of the campus community identify as fitting in to that category?*
- What about requests for things that are needed to maintain operations? A lot of what we see in comprehensive program review self-studies and annual updates are things that are more operational needs for offices and programs to keep their doors open—copy machines, carpet, furniture, etc. Is there a way to filter these out in the process and evaluate them separately? We might need to decide as a committee if we want to prioritize these or not—I can see arguments for both making them a top priority and a lower priority.*
- Will we have a new ER plan or some other kind of official plan (maybe what's coming from the RNL workgroup) to link? It should be concrete what we're asking people to connect to.*

Discussion and review of the DRAFT rubric will be brought back for discussion at our first meeting in Spring 2025.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for February 5, 2025. The members discussed the committee's priorities for Spring 2025. Meetings will take place in person, in room 227, to align with Brown Act requirements. Henry would like to keep the Zoom option so we can record the meetings and have the Zoom Room available as a backup.

Meeting adjourned at 3:43 pm.

Meeting notes submitted by Melisa McLellan, Secretary