

PIE Committee

Rebecca Tillberg, Co-Chair
Carmen Dones, Co-Chair

Academic Senate (4)

Adrienne Foster (Alternate)
Judy Chow
Carmen Dones
Norma Jacinto
Joyce Sweeney

AFT Guild (4)

Olga Shewfelt
Bonnie Blustein
Alice Taylor

Vice Presidents (3)

Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton
Bob Sprague

AFT Classified (2)

Dionne Morrissette
Ashanti Lyles

Other Classified Bargaining Unit (1)

Teamsters (1)
Ara Aguiar

ASO (1)

**Ex Officio
President**
Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

College Council, Chair
Fran Leonard

**Resource
Division Chair Rep.**

**Stu Serv/ Admin Serv
Program Review Rep.**
Celena Alcalá

SLO Rep.
Mary Jo Apigo

Budget Manager
Maureen O'Brien

Researcher
Agyeman Boateng

MINUTES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

3:00 pm-5:00 pm

SSB-414

ATTENDEES

Bob Sprague	Ken Takeda
Phyllis Braxton	Fran Leonard
Rebecca Tillberg	Adrienne Foster
Carmen Dones	Olga Shewfelt
Alice Taylor	Abel Rodriguez
Mary-Jo Apigo	Eric Ichon
Michael Goltermann	Judy Chow
Joyce Sweeney	Norma Jacinto
Ken Lin	Hansel Tsai
Dionne Morrissette	Maureen O'Brien
Bonnie Blustein	Agyeman Boateng

The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm

Review Results of July, 2013 Meeting

R. Tillberg began the meeting reviewing the purpose of the meeting. This meeting is one of two annual meetings where PIE meets jointly with the Budget Committee with the aim of institutional improvement. As a basis for continuing the work begun by the group last year, the Meeting Notes and Recommendations from the meeting last year were briefly discussed. R. Tillberg explained that we would return to the recommendations later in the meeting in order to evaluate progress made over the intervening year, and to update them.

Review Existing Documents

In order to evaluate our processes, it is important to understand what the current processes are. To that end, we reviewed the Shared Governance Diagram, the Diagram: Linking Planning to Budgeting; and several calendars.

Shared Governance Diagram

The Shared Governance Diagram illustrates the connections among the various committees and constituency groups in making recommendations to the President, and in linking planning and budgeting across the college.

Diagram: Linking Planning to Budgeting

This diagram shows in detail the process flow of mission and master planning to program review and unit planning, including validation and prioritization of resource requests, and continuing through the shared governance process to approve recommendations for financial expenditures.

Calendars: Budget, Program Review, SLO Assessment

R. Tillberg highlighted the program review calendar and the budget calendar; there was discussion about the extent to which they are aligned. Reviewing these calendars raised questions about the timing of the budget cycle. K. Takeda clarified the following:

- Each annual budget is created in three stages: preliminary, tentative, and final
- The preliminary budget is just that, an initial starting point.

Budget Committee

Ken Takeda, Chair

Academic Senate

Adrienne Foster
Vacant

AFT Faculty

Olga Shewfelt
Vidya Swaminathan

Administration

Phyllis Braxton, VP
Bob Sprague, VP

AFT Classified

Dionne Morrissette
Jo-Ann Haywood

SEIU Local 721

Abel Rodriguez

Teamsters

Eric Ichon

ASO

President

Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh

P.I.E. Committee Liaison

Rebecca Tillberg

Resource

Maureen O'Brien
Hansel Tsai
Helen Lin



- The tentative budget is the first budget with stake. Typically it is due early June; this year, May 21st is the last day to submit any changes in the tentative budget.
- The final budget is due in August.

In light of these dates, K. Takeda suggested placing May 21 as the tentative budget due date on the Program Review Calendar.

R. Tillberg emphasized that the program review calendar is set so that it aligns with the budget calendar, and is updated each year in response to any change in the budget calendar.

Sample SLO assessment calendars were shared. These calendars do not need to coordinate with the budget calendar, and also can flow independently of the program review calendar. The SLO assessment calendars are far more detailed, and are created by each division, including a calendar to assess each SLO for each course over a 3-4 year period.

Evaluation of Processes

R Tillberg described the current systems that are in place to evaluate processes: committee self-evaluations and program review.

Committee Self-Evaluations

All the committees that are part of the shared governance process have conducted annual self-evaluations over the past several years. Examples provided included the self-evaluations of the PIE Committee and of the Budget Committee. In the self-evaluation, committees have the opportunity to cite major accomplishments, as well as challenges and issues facing the committee, along with recommendations for improving committee process.

Program Review Evaluations – Program Review Survey

The results from the most recent Program Review Survey, which seeks evaluation and feedback from the campus community, were discussed. One suggestion that might help improve the connection between planning and budgeting was to extend the amount of time given to complete program review. Another issue with Program Review tied to the connection with budgeting is that the notification process for resource requests needs to be improved. Related to this, some respondents to the survey felt that more information in general needed to be communicated out of the process. Respondents also commented on the process to complete program review, expressing the need for clearer information with examples on how to approach and complete items in program review and having difficulty with the software. Some also wanted fewer questions or a condensed program review.

R. Tillberg also spent a moment to share a sentiment expressed in the survey feedback indicating that some staff did not feel a valued part of the process, felt they did not have a say in the goals or outcomes, or felt marginalized or left in the dark. She stated that one of the ideals of program review is to get more people involved and the conduct of program review should encourage that openness and involvement. She added that it was difficult to know how widespread the feeling of lack of involvement with program review was.

Some conversation followed considering how difficult it was to balance the discussion needed with the amount of time it took to complete program review, and the need for managers to understand their role beyond the questionnaire as facilitators and conduits of a discussion that informs their unit planning and progress-assessment responses. A few suggestions resulted. One suggestion was to stage a Program Review kickoff event for staff (similar to the Educational Master Plan strategic directions at the Spring Summit). Another was to create a component of program review to be distributed by email to be completed by staff.

A follow-up question regarding the trouble in getting units to complete the entire process of program review and validation and prioritization on schedule spawned another conversation about how the mode of program review was an impediment to some. One possibility is to have a Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire.

Program Review Evaluations – Unit evaluation of impact of resource request funding

R. Tillberg then directed the attendee's attention to a report of responses to program review questions regarding the impacts programs felt resulting from their resource requests being unfulfilled. Discussion of the report touched upon the following points:

- How is this information being used?
- The recognition that for those who did not get their resource requests fulfilled there was a risk of feeling the process was "useless"
- What reassurance could be given to units that were not getting resources but still facing challenges?
- Are there process issues that could alleviate the above issues, e.g. paring down the types of resource requests that come under this prioritization process, or factoring in if a resource request was asked for each year for several years

One attendee suggested that as a manager, she could take this information back to her unit, and suggested that the best we could do was for each attendee to take responsibility for these issues as best they could. Some of these issues should be identified in the validation process. One attendee who was also a validator lent support to the notion that managers had a lot on their plate, noting that that the reality of the workload and deadline made it difficult to be sensitive to those nuances.

The issue of staff participation and engagement in program review was cited as an important. One attendee mentioned that it is difficult both as a manager and as a staff member to create that sense of connection in the day-to-day of work. Another participant asked if there is an existing process or one that could be created to deliberately include staff in program review.

One faculty member offered the possibility that many rank-and-file may not be interested in participating, noting that in her department, many faculty would rather not be involved in program review. She noted that in some cases, a unit may be frustrated because it never gets its resource requests fulfilled, and another may get some requests fulfilled, but not the ones it truly wants or needs (it was noted that there is a field to note the unit's priority ranking of the resource request). Another mentioned that even at district discipline meetings many colleagues around the district express the same frustrations of not getting what they need.

R. Tillberg noted that she is exploring additional ways to share the data available in program review – what information and to which audiences.

Review of Recommendations from Previous Annual Joint Meeting to Evaluate Planning and Budgeting Processes

Recommendation I.a. Program review related – Start earlier in the fall to allow more time to complete.

While this was accomplished for the 2013-14, starting in September rather than October, there was a desire to begin even earlier. There was support among the group to open program review at the beginning of August and have the data available at the latest Flex Day. Even though the process is self-directed, one attendee wished there could be a way to partition the work into sections, perhaps opening one section at a time rather than everything at once.

Also brought out in discussion on this recommendation was the seeming usefulness of the program review section (part one) when the resource request prioritization rubric seemed mostly focused on the planning section (part two). The point was raised how units could frame goals (which may require resource requests) without understanding the questions posed in the program review section.

Recommendation I.b. Program review related – Have the Prioritization Rubric available before program reviews are prepared.

This recommendation was accomplished for the 2013-14 cycle.

Recommendation I.c. Program review related – Ensure that the Prioritization Rubric addresses the support function provided by Administrative Services.

This issue was reviewed and discussed by PIE Committee, which determined that the current Rubric does indeed address the support function provided by Administrative Services, although the requests must be framed in terms of how they support institution mission and goals.

Recommendation I.d. Program review related – Make public the allocation of funds resulting from Resource Requests promptly

This recommendation was not accomplished in the 2013-14 cycle. There was discussion of when the allocation should be announced. Because the mid-May budget revision is critical to knowing how much could be devoted to funding items on the final prioritized list of resource requests, it was suggested that this be placed on the Program Review Calendar. One participant noted the apparent incongruity that last year the amount available to fund prioritized requests was established in April. To this observation, K. Takeda clarified that last year's figure was based on certain revenue projections, particularly rent revenue, while this year it will be based on general fund revenue: this is why the amount available to fund prioritized requests will not be established until the mid-May budget revise for this cycle. Based on this information, another attendee proposed late June as a deadline for the president's decision, especially since July begins the new fiscal year in which the funds will be spent. The need for some response to the list and some statement on the rationale for deciding to fund some things and not others was reiterated.

Recommendation I.e. Program review related – Work toward broader participation within units in the preparation of the unit program review and plan

This issue was discussed in the context of the evaluation of the program review process. The recommendation remains an on-going effort, to continue each year.

Recommendation II.a. Clarify how Divisions can request and have funded their on-going supply and other ongoing operating needs (based on historical spending)

This recommendation has not yet been fully addressed. Discussion focused on the unintended negative effects of the majority of requests being unfunded. Some requests are made year after year. In addition, completion of program review is very detailed work, and people may not appreciate doing that hard work and not getting something out of it. However, it was pointed out that getting funding is not the only reason to do program review. It's to develop goals and review our programs. One suggestion to address this issue was to set as a priority factor the number of consecutive years requested. One critique of this was that a unit could repeatedly request something that was either unfeasible or unreasonable and shouldn't be rewarded for persistence against reality and good sense. The group agreed that the rubric priorities or the rubric itself could be revisited to see if it was meeting the needs of the institution.

There was discussion about which part of the budget PIE is prioritizing. A crucial underlying issue was identified: the crisis of funding for supplies in the instructional units since budgets have been slashed in the recent economic downturn. To answer the initial question, R. Tillberg stated the decision by PIE to split the list of resource requests into two groups: one for permanent staff, and another for any other request (which the committee will consider as one-time requests).

K. Takeda addressed the more general budgetary question that some operating costs currently have to be requested in program review. He explained that in the district budget the presumption is that whatever a college or unit needs to operate is based on last year. The organization got through the year, then looking retrospectively, the only thing needed as an increase is whatever has changed. One example of what could have changed might be a software that was paid from a grant before but the grant has expired. Given this presumption, if a unit somehow made it through the year with the given budget, then there would not be a basis to increase that unit's budget.

The reality expressed by several attendees is that faculty are spending their own money to purchase supplies. Other faculty present mentioned other critical expenses that were not strictly supplies but that are in jeopardy. When

asked if his explanation meant that when faculty spend their own money they should save their receipts, K. Takeda replied that, yes—there should be a revolving fund that reimburses those that buy their own supplies. This would at least record the additional cost of supplies not covered by the base budget. The alternative, he noted, would be to do a zero-base budget in which each unit's budget is built from the ground up where every expense is itemized. This, he reported, is a terrible, grueling process. If we chose this path, we would have to start now for the 2015-16 year. The reason for this was that it was difficult from a budgetary perspective to distinguish what units truly need from what they want. If units were simply asked about their needs, he noted, inevitably "wants" would be included and the budget would be millions higher than it is in reality. O. Shewfelt volunteered to work with K. Takeda on this issue, noting that it was an issue of the obligation of the college to provide instructional materials

Recommendation II.b. Identify funding sources, including VTEA, grants, categorical and other to be used before Program 100 funds are prioritized for Resource Requests.

The issue of identifying funding sources for resource requests was thought to be an artifact of the prioritization process last year, and that funding source would be ignored at this year's retreat. PIE will prioritize Resource Requests regardless of funding source.

Recommendation III.a. Make sure FPIP priorities are aligned with program review resource request priorities

There was a suggestion that the recommendation should be reversed to better communicate the idea that resources and faculty hires should be aligned.

Recommendation III.b. Develop a prioritization process including a rubric for filling new and/or vacant Classified staff positions

This recommendation is in process. A committee has begun work to develop a classified staffing plan, but is waiting for the completion of the new Educational Master Plan in order to align its work with the new strategic directions and goals.

Recommendation III.c. Develop a technology replacement plan and implement it (total cost of ownership)

This has not yet been accomplished. There was a suggestion to involve the Facilities Committee and Technology Committee in the prioritization process for facilities and technology resource requests.

Recommendation III.d. Develop a process to respond to unplanned resource requests

This recommendation is in process under the direction of the Budget Committee.

Recommendation III.e. Centralize management of instructional technology repair

This recommendation is in process.

Recommendations and Next Steps

The recommendations that emerged from the work of the Joint PIE/Budget Committee Meeting are summarized in the Recommendations document.

R. Tillberg suggested that the PIE and Budget Committees separately address the recommendations from last year that have not yet been accomplished, in addition to the new recommendations resulting from the current discussions.

Meeting adjourned at 4:52pm