

**Cypress College
Planning and Budget Committee
Minutes of December 3, 2020**

Present: Belinda Allan, Damon de la Cruz, Lee Douglas, Brian Gomber, Craig Goralski, Silvie Grote, Eileen Haddad, Thu Nguyen, Alexander Porter, Marc Posner, Bryan Seiling; Harley Tran, Barbara Woolner

Resource Advisors: Paul de Dios, Yongmi Han, Samreen Manjra, Thu Nguyen, Rick Rams, Katy Realista, Eldon Young

Guests: Kristina Oganessian

Absent:

Recorder: AeYoung Kim

1. **Public comment on agenda items**

2. **Approval of minutes from 11-19-20**

3. **Institution- Set Standards goal-setting- Eileen Haddad**

Continuation from last meeting where Eileen and Kristina shared their trend data and proposed possible floor goals, stretch goals and began conversation about a recommended methodology and set goals. Eileen shared the presentation as a starting point and after reviewing a few methodologies they suggest the Floor- 5 % below weighted average as this is low enough that it can alert them without being too low and Stretch- 5% above highest value based on the highest value to represent aspirational goals and striving for improvement. What this would look like is in regards to the data the last few years, would make the Floor for Course Success Rates at 69.2% and Aspirational 76.8%. The Associate Degrees Floor would be 1600 and 1900 for the Aspirational goal. Certificates Floor is 1670 and 2564 for the Aspirational goals and Transfer to UC or CSU 726 for the Floor goals and 863 for the Aspirational goals. For the baccalaureate degree was consistent with the proposed methodology and the Floor goals are 4 and Aspirational goal is 10. Eileen asked the committee if they all agree to move the item forward to PAC for approval.

Craig Goralski reiterated his concerns from the last meeting regarding the floor and stretch goals being set at 5% above and below and feels this is comparing apples to oranges and each should be revisited to find the appropriate measures but also realizes that the State Chancellors office has not looked at the metrics to review them in any statistically valid way and reluctantly agreed to show a thumbs up to move forward to PAC. Eileen shared what the other colleges are doing and reminded the committee that at this time this is discussion within this group.

Bryan Seiling asked if this will be revisited yearly and Eileen and Kristina clarified that some colleges keep the same goals for a few year period but our campus could review it each year. Kristina shared that next time they have decided to begin the meaningful discussions earlier to help shape in the direction the committee decides and Eileen feels it may be a good idea to dedicate an entire meeting towards these issues with more discussion and reflection. They currently note the Institutional Set Standards in the Program Review Form but agrees it is not done in a way that facilitates thoughts from a specific departments.

Damon de la Cruz agreed with Craig regarding the data and the importance to discuss and decide on the issues now rather than 4 years from now. Eileen shared that they reevaluate each year and can set new goals if the committee were to agree upon that.

Lee Douglas shared that he appreciates the dialogue at the Institutional Levels but feels the real work and conversation would be at the Program and Course and Department Level where the conversation would be held as to what we would like to accomplish with the Program, Department etc. Eileen agrees that it should be broken down a bit more at a Department Level and thinking of how it would contribute to the Institutional goal.

Craig feels that Eileen's approach of doing the current level of data analysis and then have a more robust data analysis is a good start though it raises concerns if the "bad data sets" are institutionalized, it will be a little too late unless these points are agreed upon from the beginning.

The Committee agreed to send the recommendation forward to PAC for approval.

4. **Classified Position Prioritization Process and Timeline- Alexander Porter**

Occurred once every three years and moving forward Alex would like to create a form which is more meaningful and more relevant with where we stand today. Previously it was discussed to use a similar form as the One-Time Funding Request process as well as linking it to Program Review in order to evaluate Classified Position needs

Bryan is currently working on summaries for the Program Reviews thus far and appreciates the dialogue in order to best track the information in Program Review.

Eldon Young asked if these will be for old positions or replacement positions. Alex shared from a budgetary perspective if it is a budgeted position there will be funds to cover the particular position.

This Committee is responsible to identify what the needs are.

Moving forward Alex is hoping that the Program Review would be first and then the One Time Funding Request form would assist in filling in the blanks and supplementing that. The idea is to have something similar to the Classified Positions.

Rick Rams would like to see a section that identifies if it is categorically funded and he believes that historically the district did not support short term full-time positions on soft money, Grant funded positions and others. Using the Veterans Center and Hunger and Homelessness and though there are large amounts of money to go towards building resources and direct student aid, the funds could also be used staffing to coordinate and support on a short term basis.

Alex asked if Eileen and Bryan could come to the next meeting and talk about how Classified positions are currently identified in Program Review.

Alex will attend the next Program Review meeting and opened the invitation to PBC.

5. **CARES ACT Review- Alexander Porter**

Alex shared that the college CARES Act spending fund has one year to spend funds and working with the departments to take care of all the needs on the institutional portion of the CARES Act Funds instruction, remote instruction and return to work activities which may be anticipated in the future. The remaining funds will be redirected to student aid. Alex shared a database of the CARES Act Funding opportunities. The District has received approximately \$7 million dollars from the Federal Government and split into 2 buckets of money. The first half of the funds went strictly towards direct student aid. This money was allocated to the Financial Aid Department and they chose a methodology that met the needs of the highest needs students and allocated those funds. The remaining \$3.5 million dollars went towards Institutional support related funds which would assist anything related to instruction and COVID-19 related issues. Approximately \$400K went towards Remote Learning Support such as technology, software lab kits, assessment tools, etc. \$1,050,000 went towards Faculty/Staff Tech support, \$750,000 towards Facility Adjustments and Modifications, \$200,000 for PPE/Cleaning/Sanitation Equipment and supplies, \$120,000 expenses for COVID-19 response. \$1million dollars was set aside for Revenue loss and Self Support functions. These funds were not a part of the CARES act funds. The District backfilled each of the colleges in order to offset revenue losses from the prior year. Alex also shared with the committee the current standing and an additional amount of \$489,544 was issued to the colleges as a Minority Serving Institution. The balance available CARES Act in the amount of \$434,676.51 will be applied to student aid related activity such as Housing, Food, Textbooks, Direct Aid, Transportation as well as other related items.

Bryan Seiling shared that while working on Program Reviews a department had technology requests for their COVID-19 remote short term needs and seems this should have been taken care of through the CARES Act funds. Alex asked Bryan to send him an email and he will follow up with Peter Maharaj. Lee Douglas will also follow up regarding what the needs may be.

Craig Goralski asked if the \$750,000 requested by Physical Plant/Facilities is the total amount or is there a hold on a certain amount which is just not being reflected in the number shared? Alex explained that the \$750 is a blocked number which is identified up front as a holding number for possible facility alterations which may be needed. There was a block of money from the state providing items such as masks, gowns, infrared thermometers etc. which has allowed the use of those funds. The goal is to make more available to Student Aid. Craig also recommended that with the balance of the \$434,679.51 is distributed to housing, food, Textbooks etc., that there is a concerted effort to reach out to the Divisions to be sure their needs are met. While attending the last COVID-19 ADHOC meeting last week they do not feel that their needs are being met and feels that some faculty are being shot down or ignored by their requests due to expense. Senate Exec has a meeting with Dr. Schilling this afternoon and Craig will bring this issue to Dr. Schilling's attention. Lee would be happy to reach out to the Deans and suggested if Craig could email Lee sharing what specific needs are being requested with the goal of meeting both Faculty and Staff needs.

Belinda Allen shared that certain Classified staff are in need of printers and scanners while working from home. Alex appreciated the feedback and would like to follow up with some more dialogue.

Bryan inquired if are the District is providing as much services as they did when we were on campus. Alex shared that yes, the District is still providing assistance in regards to requisitions, PO's are processed, Payroll, and other items that help support college operations.

Timeframe to decide how to allocate the funds will begin Spring 2021 decisions to be made by the May 1st deadline.

6. **Other**

Craig asked if there would be discussion regarding Faculty Hiring and he this is the first time a President of a college has disregarded the recommendation that came from an ADHOC meeting and then PBC and PAC ignoring their #1, 2, and 3 recommendations he feels this is disrespectful to the work done as a committee, disrespectful to the shared governance at the PBC and PAC level and have expressed already about the Counseling position and how it came before the committee and from his perspective looks like this was a singular effort of our college president to make sure that a particular position was supported this year. Though he supports the Counseling position theoretically, he feels strongly that he needs to support the process and though not perfect some reforms are coming and feels as though the process was not respected and rather transparently, corners were cut and process was violated in order to get this particular position approved. As flawed as it is and as in need of reform as it is it is still a process that has worked for a long time. Craig feels that it is incumbent upon the committee to make a statement because it was disrespectful of who they are as a governance group.

Bryan agreed that the process was not followed and felt that the president should have come to the committee and start a conversation about it which didn't happen but feels that was the intent and he would have supported that intent because he supported that position. The develop support and expand would be critical and it's a part of a larger problem with a bad administrator and it's no wonder there are issues cutting corners.

Craig feels that the gap between the recommendation and what she has decided to do is leaps and bounds greater this year than any other previous year that he is aware of. And that extraordinary departure from their recommendations requires extraordinary justification and feels strongly that this was not merited. Part of his concern is everything that took place before it came to the Faculty Prioritization Committee. The position in counseling was not written by counsellor and it initially came to the committee without anyone in counseling having seen it and a continued pattern of disrespect. He is carrying water for a whole division of counselors who feel that this started without them, and they feel as though they have been held hostage by this position from its genesis to its appointment and there are going to be real problems within that position with the acceptance of that position because of the way it was created, decided upon to be funded, supported and approved and will go forward for years and in the end of the day not sure if this is something they should perpetuate. This is reflective of a shift in how the college views accreditations, accreditation bodies and the process they follow and feels if Dr. Schilling would have more conversation and more communication in the beginning we would not have gotten here.

Craig would like to add this to the next PBC agenda in February.

Next Agenda: