

Budget Planning Revision Task Force  
Thursday, July 19, 2018 3:30 PM-4:30 PM  
The Boardroom  
Meeting Notes  
Begin: 3:30 PM

In attendance:

Julia Morrison, Debbie Topping, Michael Dennis, Bob Brown, Paul Chown, Angelina Hill, Keith Snow-Flamer, Ericka Barber, Peter Blakemore, Todd Olson, John Johnston

Task Force –

Check-in for each member, all good!

Discussed purpose and goals of task force

Set and agreed upon Ground Rules; John Johnston provided a starting point by sharing “College of the Redwoods Interest Based Problem Solving Ground Rules” in order to get a starting point to set Ground Rules for the Task Force.

The Ground Rules are as follows:

- Come to meeting prepared
- Be respectful “attack problems, not people”
- Team will use agreed-upon agenda
- Stay on task
- #16 Mutually agreed upon data
  - “The parties will mutually identify needed data and agree to appropriate data collection methods, including criteria and/or standards.”
- One person speaks at a time
  - Designated Facilitator for each meeting
- Keep meeting notes
- Start/Stop meetings on time
- Set agenda for next meeting before adjourning
- +/- Δ at end
- Respect request for confidentiality
- Support & promote solutions to constituency
- Process check at any time by anyone

Purpose:

Identify issues/problems and the interests (charge of the Task Force)

Todd Olsen requests that Michael Dennis and Bob Brown share past stories of the BPC.

4 Part Process:

- Tell the story - Bob Brown’s Story:

Previous BPC co-chair, serving as faculty, soon after Budget Advisory. During his first year the plan was to establish a process, he had no clear ties to how Program Review tied to the Budget Process.

Year 1 was cumbersome; there were a ton of request, and not enough money. There were considerations for the Rankings, Rubric, and Deferred Maintenance. There were also many complaints, such as:

- We're not going to get it anyway
- Reporting out was not good and/or non-existent
- Concerns about the monetary threshold (for example: a \$47 request)
- Justification and rationalization
  - Describe how funding will be available
- Improve how it was done and reported to the District
- Since the not a lot has changed in "how" things are done
- Rankings were changed by previous VP, Administrative Services, with some rationalization
- Not involved with the agenda, VP reported things to the BPC
- Not sure if allocations go better due to the rubric and the previous VP's actions

- Tell the story - Michael Dennis's Story:

- Presented with current year and 3-year projections
- Gaps in communication, VP was not a strong communicator
- Hard to get clear explanation on Interfund transfers and difficult to report back to constituent groups
- Agreed with Bob, frustration when Business Office priorities would jump to the top of the queue; this changed when the VP was no longer the co-chair – pushed for change, but is ambivalent regarding this decision
- People/participants lost motivation due to the Budget Review Process
- There was a struggle to make it work well in linking Budget Request to Assessments
- Some of the programs needed the funds to continue functioning

Bob interjects→ Initial process of how to write assessments in a way to meaningfully tie to what is needed

- Informing constituents of the outcomes

- Tell the story - Todd Olsens's Story:

- He knew nothing about the BPC, six (6) faculty members turned this position down

- He had no experience so he researched the website, and the CR Committee Handbook
- Issues with musical chairs on the committee, when he arrived Kintay Johnson was his co-chair as was soon replaced with Ericka Barber
- All the faculty members were new, other than his experience with Program Review, BPC was inclusive of the entire budget
- Found that recommendations as the BPC were not made to Administration
- Help to make the choice to change/modify and agree to change the rubric
- Found that Resource Requests were made based on prior rubric posted to CR Webpage
- The scope seemed narrowly focused; the rankings were meaningless process for requests that would not get funded
- Todd references a document that he previously shared with the BPC and discusses it further:
  1. It changes the budget process, Todd quotes a portion of the document
  2. References the Academic Senate Co-President
  3. Comments that it is a “telling” document; there should be a greater faculty role in the Budget Process

<Time Check>

- Definite Improvements in the ranking process; the TPC and FPC ranked separately without coming together
- Does not see integrated planning, its appears to be a venue for the CBO to come in with what the budget assumptions are

Peter Blakemore mentions that all should participate in telling the story.

The Task Force agrees that next time:

- Continue to tell the story/process
- Discuss how many meetings there will be; Program Review is due in October and we should follow-up in March

John Johnston brings up that the Task Force should define/do the following:

- What is BPC
- Budget Process
- Create educational system for constituents
- Develop a web-based tool

How do other California Community Colleges do this? John references Contra Costa Community College.

Define scope of the BPC – How do we share with constituents?

Paul Chown mentions the IEC Report – Integrated Planning Process – discussed how BPC should be followed, this was not done in fiscal year 17/18, make the BPC more visible.

John Johnston proposes that the Task Force take one year.

The next meeting time and facilitator are discussed.

Julia Morrison agrees to review the BPC at Contra Costa Community College as homework.

Peter Blakemore agrees to be the next meeting facilitator.

It is agreed that there will be a support person to take notes at the next and all following Task Force meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50PM.