Chancellor's Work Group (CWG) Notes

October 4, 2013

Introductions

Review of Ground Rules

Committee Charge

Review of Existing Processes:

Chabot Process

- New Environmental Climate being led by President Sperling
- Discussion has occurred at all levels and innovative strategies are being discussed, (PRBC Process)
  - o Disciplines worked together with the Deans to determine elimination of instructional courses (during workload reduction process-PRE-Prop 30). Student support services was also included in this collaborative discussion and this collaborative discussion will be continued as part of the planning process. (this included Administrators, Faculty & Classified Professional Staff)
  - o Committee membership consists of Chairs of Committees—this is an open committee meeting
  - o This committee also helps to guide staff development
  - o The College's Strategic Plan has been developed
  - o This committee also reviews the program reviews and makes concise lists of new initiatives
  - o This committee is also reviewing the mission statement and making recommendations to other committees on campus
  - o Institutional data review drives scheduling determinations. We identified 5 student types to include students that are swirling round in the system unable to get the essential English and/or Math classes, reviewing bottlenecks, e.g. basic skills courses, etc. and other issues pertaining to institutional effectiveness.
  - o Yvonne to provide graphical overview of Chabot process (draft)

Las Positas Process

- (next meeting 10/11/2013 @ 1:00pm in Green Room)

Discussion on critical dates

Mid March would be the deadline for preliminary budget requests submitted to the District Office (tentative)

Note: May revise will come out

Draft Budget is due by June 30th of each year to BoT.

Problem Definitions:

Affordable Health Care what will be the impact on the district in terms of health premiums ??? Outstanding issue-costs TBD

How can the colleges incorporate long term and short term planning into the planning model?

How and what type of process can we develop:

- It needs to be a system that will work within the context of the BAM and still allow for autonomy
- It must address the needs of all constituencies, while still allowing for a level of transparency
- It must allow for quantitative analysis. (Ex. Dirty classrooms and where is the money going, ex budget reports and open/honest status reports/presentations as part of the Planning Process we build for the district).
- There needs to be a consistent review of data, at a minimum an annual review.
- We need to establish indicators – e.g. headcount, dollars spent, FTES and FTEF, etc. and this needs to be compared in a similar fashion so that there is continuity

Informational Item:

- School Services of California (SSC) to provide a detailed breakdown of costs that are associated with each area in order to be able to do a true comparison of apples to apples. SSC was provided the FY 2008-09 --- a picture of the district before the cuts so that there is a comparison of 2008 to 2013.
  - o As part of our planning development process, recommend we look at the indicators and methodology that SSC is using in their current analysis of district services and M&O.
  - o SSC should provide a historical review of what services were discontinued, what stayed and what shifted to the colleges, example: Chabot's Foundation. Dr J to follow up with SSC

* An analysis of positions and look at the 3.39% cut (Year2009/10) and look at new hires and how this is reflected in the budget…5 year analysis   (clarification provided at the 10-11 meeting was to ask for the dollar flow between the departments, e.g. labor and expenses.)Lorenzo to provide .

Chancellor's Work Group (CWG)

Meeting Notes for October 11, 2013

CWG Attendees: Cody Peterson, David Fouquet, Diana Rodriguez, Jannett Jackson, Jeannine Methe, Kathy Kelley, LaVaughn Hart, Linda Wilson, Rajinder Samra, Susan Sperling, Todd Steffen, Tom Orff, Wyman Fong, Yvonne Wu-Craig

1. Reviewed Dropbox procedures and gave handout for CWG to create own dropbox since no one had received email to share

2. Review of Last Meeting 10-4 Notes with Edits Made:
    a) Chabot presented planning process last meeting and Yvonne will put the process into graphical format
    b) LPC will present today their planning process and then will take 2 college inputs and see where overlaps occur and how to combine
    c) Wyman & Lorenzo to provide data on Health care ACA impact

3. Discussion on Prior Budget Topics:
    a) School Services organizational review recommended by DBSG – Dr. Jackson meeting to be held next week with District staff, Have 5 different colleges to compare to CLPCCD, Will do 5-year comparison from 2008 to 2013.
    b) Mentioned that in DBSB 2012 meeting had breakout for district expenses by department like M&O, Business Services, HR, IT, etc. so saw total expenses for that year and want the same for all 5 years.
    c) Want to know how money was spent & how decided to make the decision on what to buy & were there any lasting effects of the budget determinations made.
    d) Group agreed that there were problems with the prior administration but they have now left and the new admin leadership will involve all constituencies. Dr. Jackson stated the same will "not happen on her watch" and that it is good to go back and look to see what we don't want to do.
    e) Noted that the purpose of CWG is planning district-wide with integration of planning for all locations. The inquiry on budgets is not leading to this. Remember our ground rules "do not beat a dead horse".
    f) Dr. Jackson noted that in 2008 through 2012 that a lot happened and this was before the BAM when all funds were in one pot. Now with the BAM, the colleges must live within their allocation and the district does not tell the colleges how to spend and the colleges should follow their own plan.
    g) It was noted that a 5-yr analysis will help to move us forward and ensure transparency. We should have a group discussion of the budget elements we want to review.
    h) We have allocation model, and there are19 BAM questions that still need to be answered since the unrestricted general apportionment dollars have no wiggle room.
    i) LPC indicated that last year was a difficult time; and we need to reinstate trust.

j) All agreed that all college and district staff are still impacted from what happened even though the individuals are gone.

k) Want to make sure that DEMC is involved for setting FTEF targets if the colleges are growing differently.

4. Discussion on Accreditation and Functional Map:

a) Chabot expressed concern about Accreditation. At Chabot Senate, Jim Matthews had a presentation on the Accreditation visit for Fall 2015. Jim said CLPCCD needs to address the Functional Map. The worst consequence for failing to do so could be sanction. Referred to the February 2013 letter from Barbara Beno to college presidents indicating that they should "develop and update a functional map".

b) Dr. Jackson agrees that we need the functional map to run effectively and we need it to effectively assess our distribution of resources not just accreditation.

c) Dr. Jackson said you can go to the self-study and there is a narrative for each standard and shows how shared between colleges and district. Jeff Kingston is working on accreditation updates with the colleges and we need to make public and share with all.

d) It was noted that Accreditation is looking at the process, how we follow the process, and does everyone know the process. Dr. Jackson said we should look at how did we assess and process to make changes and how that is integrated into our planning for implementation.

5. Sample of Integrated Planning & Budget Model:

a) Dr. Jackson distributed a sample template from College of Alameda which is the "Integrated Planning & Budget Model". She demonstrated the Powerpoint with the dynamic inserts to display the various steps in the process. Key points included:

   a. Discussion on Academic Senate & College Council recommendations are forwarded to the CEO for consideration
   b. Determined which priorities aligns with our vision & goals
   c. Looked at data so there was no emotion and everyone could see what's growing, what other disciplines were impacted, and what needs should be a priority
   d. Review of institutional outcomes with the Program Review and SLOs
   e. Brought in all committees like PBRC, Facilities, and Technology
   f. Summarized data into 4 major areas: Human Resources, Technology, Facilities, Equipment, and then determine how much each priority would cost
   g. District looked at lists to make sure process was followed and recommendation could not be changed

b) Dr. Jackson wants transparency and wants to follow "the process" whatever is adopted as part of the recommendation by the CWG. We must acknowledge that the process is ethical and is being followed even if we all don't agree.

c) Chabot has a planning process and Chabot is great at collecting and synthesizing data and doing the planning documents input. The next step is to do the meaningful data analysis. This process could strengthen how to use data to allow committees to roll out and integrate it.

d) It was agreed that the diagram was great for the college to map their processes and a similar process is needed for district services.

e) Dr. Jackson said that once the college plan was completed it went to district committees not to change but to review the priorities and see where they intersect and overlap. The district looks at what can be leveraged and does not change college priorities.

f) Dr. Jackson will get other sample of planning integration models.

g) LPC wanted to make sure that they had meaningful input into technology acquisitions as they do today.

h) Dr. Jackson said that if the college has needs that exceeds the budget, then we look at are there other resources we can pull in and then this is the part that the District Budget & Planning Committee could review.

i) Thought that the Functional map should answer some of our questions. We need to modify the CLPCCD functional map, and we need to add DEMC & CEMC on the new map.

j) Dr. Jackson noted that whatever document we get from School Services, we can use it to help us develop our processes.

k) LPC asked that if we proceed with doing a similar chart to the template presented, then it appears as though whatever process we do at LPC we must also do at Chabot & the district. It was agreed that they don't need to be the same for both colleges. We can make committees that are not the same and indicate with the functional map how the colleges would operate as long as the functions are addressed.

l) Dr. Jackson emphasized that she will listen as a leader and will not shut down discussion. She wants to instill trust by listening to others. She says we can have separate processes on each campus, but we need to be able to explain that process. For priorities, we need to have Program Review, SLOs, and Program Outcomes and then we have a priority that emerges from those planning tools.

6. Review of College Planning Processes

a) Rajinder Samra and Diana Rodriguez gave the LPC Presentation on Planning.   For Chabot they need to put the infrastructure in place, but at LPC they had Accreditation recommendation because they did not have a model in place. LPC needs to do assessment; this is the biggest challenge since the structure is not in place.

b) Dr. Jackson agreed that research & assessment has to be in place in accordance with the ACCJC rubrics for institutional effectiveness.   It was recommended that the IR function needs to be local and not done district-wide like some other colleges do.

c) In spring 2013, LPC had a planning group and they looked at rubrics from ACCJC to identify planning and identify gaps. Then the Integrated Planning Committee proposal will be going to College Council.

d) Rajinder gave a history perspective on where LPC has been and what direction that they are now going for their planning process. LPC has a 3-yr Program Review with yearly updates and they will do Program Reviews in the future in Fall vs. Spring. They will do programs feedback with deans and then the deans will do a summary of areas. The VPs will do a summary of their areas for Instructional, Student Services, and Administration. In the Spring, LPC will go to an Integrated Planning committee for all summaries – Strategic Plan, Facilities, and Accreditation plan. LPC started with a Planning Task Force and then started a new committee similar to Chabot's PBRC. The Planning Task Force will set short and long term priorities, and then go into an annual budget process on how to allocate resources.

e) Dr. Jackson asked if LPC should streamline into components of the budget like HR, Technology, & Facilities and bring subject matter experts together first, and then go to the Planning Task Force for final disposition.

f) Diana Rodriguez and Rajinder Samra are putting the Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) process into a flowchart along with a narrative that gives the full scope. That will be used as a check and balance for budget cycle so there will be an integrated planning with the Technology Plan and HR Plan to incorporate together and Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) will play a role with the budget.

g) Dr. Jackson said that when LPC has a graphic of their model, we will then bring up the graphic representation for both colleges to review. Constituent groups can then take this back and we can determine how to do this at the district level. The process for review and assessment will be a district-wide process.

h) If we develop a process, how would that work, and where would be the glitches and how would we talk about what to do if there is extra money at the end? Do we allocate evenly? Or roll over? Or do we need to pay back what we borrow? Dr. Jackson wants this to be a decision by all not just a Chancellor decision.

7. Establish Meeting Dates – next 2 Fridays do not work for CWG, so selected Tuesday, October 22 from 3-5 at the Dublin office for next meeting.

8. Review B.A.M. (LLegaspi) – next meeting since Lorenzo was not in attendance.
   a. Review Adoption Budget Presentation from 9/17/13 Board of Trustees Meeting

CWG Attendees: Cody Peterson, David Fouquet, Diana Rodriguez, Jannett Jackson, Jeannine Methe, Jeffrey Kingston, Kathy Kelley, LaVaughn Hart, Linda Wilson, Lorenzo Legaspi   Rajinder Samra, Susan Sperling, Todd Steffen, Tom Orff, Wyman Fong, Yvonne Wu-Craig

6. Reviewed Draft of Meeting Notes from October 11, 2013 and suggested edits were made.

7. Reviewed the "Guiding Principles" document and the group recommended some edits for clarification. All members approved the proposed calendar dates for the Development Process, with the draft recommendation targeted for December 15, 2013 and the final recommendation to be completed by March 30, 2014. It was agreed that the CWG would designate a smaller subgroup to meet and come up with a "draft" recommendation for the CLPCCD Planning, Budget, & Assessment Model. They will utilize the Chabot and Las Positas models as well as samples from other colleges to develop our new model. This subgroup will include Dave Fouquet, Rajinder Samra, Yvonne Wu-Craig, and Jannett Jackson. They will meet on Saturdays and then they will bring back to the CWG group the results of their work for discussion and comments.

8. Dr. Jackson commented that we follow procedures for Program Review, Program Outcomes, Institutional Outcomes, and Student Learning Outcomes at the colleges, but then it stops there and we need to go to the district for the services and resources that are required. We need to have a district-wide body, not for the purpose of changing anything but so that all see the processes for the campuses and district. The process would include indicators that would be used to determine priorities and then do the work followed by feedback. She noted that we need inputs from the colleges and external constituencies before we can do a Strategic Plan and that we want to focus on our planning process and budget first. We have DEMC and DBSG, but we don't have these committees integrated to make recommendations to the Chancellor. We want to develop a process that is transparent and that all must follow and not-go-around.

9. The need for a functional map as part of the Accreditation process came up again to identify and assess services at the college, district, and M&O. As stated in previous meetings, this will be addressed by Jeff Kingston who is working on accreditation updates for the narratives of the functional map in coordination with the AOLs for the colleges and district.

10. The CWG process will be in place to allow us to review the potential for more growth revenue in 2014-2015 and to restore functionality at the colleges based on available funds.

11. Lorenzo Legaspi will provide the 5-year trend for budgets, expenses, and staffing at the next CWG.

12. There was discussion on what indicators and metrics should be used to assess our progress, and the point was made that we should focus on looking at the process in this short time frame and then the committee can determine the metrics to be used.

13. Chabot clarified their comments about how they were great at collecting data, but they now need to look at the next steps for analyzing the data and determining the procedures for action. They commented that much of their data that is collected comes from diverse directions and often the kind of data collected does not match up with history to easily compare.

14. It was noted that CLPCCD does not have the infrastructure in place currently to handle all the issues related to an Integrated Planning, Budget, & Assessment Model. We have Planning and Budget at the colleges with the SLOs, but we don't have the Assessment portion in place.

15. ITS commented on the new Chabot Technology Request form that was implemented last year in response to an Accreditation recommendation. The new process was documented through the Chabot Technology Committee and all technology requests received by the Chabot Budget Committee come through their Technology Committee for review and recommended action.

16. Dr. Jackson discussed the need for the colleges to have an Institutional Effectiveness Committee for program reviews, priorities, and SLO assessment, which LPC indicated is in place at their college.

17. Chabot presented their "Planning & Budget Model" to the CWG group, noting some areas that needed to be inserted for the new model being developed, such as including "Integration". There was a lot of discussion on the various committees, their functions, and how they need to be integrated. For the next CWG Meeting, the subgroup will review the planning charts for both colleges and samples from other districts to develop a preliminary chart which will include both colleges and the district.

18. Dr. Jackson reiterated the need at CLPCCD for an "Integrated Planning & Budget" process similar to what she utilized at the College of Alameda, which is our goal to develop. The key points mentioned in a previous meeting include:
    a. Discussion on Academic Senate & College Council recommendations are forwarded to the CEO for consideration
    b. Determined which priorities aligns with our vision & goals
    c. Looked at data so there was no emotion and everyone could see what's growing, what other disciplines were impacted, and what needs should be a priority
    d. Review of institutional outcomes with the Program Review and SLOs
    e. Brought in all committees like PBRC, Facilities, and Technology
    f. Summarized data into 4 major areas: Human Resources, Technology, Facilities, Equipment, and then determine how much each priority would cost
    g. District looked at lists to make sure process was followed and recommendation could not be changed

19. Review Adoption Budget Presentation from 9/17/13 Board of Trustees Meeting – It was determined that all the CWG members had seen Lorenzo's Adoption Budget Presentation already with the exception of Cody Peterson who Lorenzo will follow up with.

20. It was noted that Erica Cortez who is a Chabot student will be joining the CWG group at the next meeting.

Chancellor's Work Group (CWG)

Meeting Notes for November 20, 2013

CWG Attendees: Cody Peterson, David Fouquet, Diana Rodriguez, Jannett Jackson, Jeannine Methe, Jeffrey Kingston, LaVaughn Hart, Lorenzo Legaspi, Rajinder Samra, Todd Steffen, Tom Orff, Yvonne Wu-Craig

1. Dr. Jackson distributed meeting notes from October 22, 2013 and Guiding Principles with suggested edits.

2. The majority of the meeting was spent reviewing the draft documents created by the Subcommittee members – Jannett Jackson, David Fouquet, Rajinder Samra, and Yvonne Wu-Craig.

3. Dr. Jackson reviewed the "Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee" document and CWG members and recommended a few edits. This document outlined the structure of the **Integrated Planning and Budget (IPB)** process. Highlights of the discussion on this document include:

   a. The subcommittee reviewed IPB plans from 7 colleges/districts to use as samples. It was noted that Skyline had a district-wide model that had a rich assessment model with performance indicators.
   b. The subcommittee looked at college surveys from School Services of California (SSCal) for 8 colleges where SSCal looked at how the colleges allocate resources to their campuses and how they focused on the planning portion.
   c. Lorenzo Legaspi was given an action to do a narrative for "Section II. Background" for the CLPCCD approved Budget Allocation Model (BAM). He will also include copies of any presentations made to DBSG, the colleges, and the Board approved agenda item as well as an explanation of what the consultant, Mike Hill, did to facilitate the development of the BAM. These materials will become part of the CLPCCD Accreditation Self Study report.
   d. Completion of a Mission Statement for the colleges – Las Positas has updated theirs and Chabot is in the process of doing so.
   e. Diagrams will be included in the IPB for the District Allocation process. Chabot has completed their diagram for their Planning, Budget, & Assessment model. Las Positas is still completing their diagram which is almost ready. District needs to develop their process and diagram.
   f. The Guiding Principles reviewed by the CWG in our previous meeting were incorporated into this IPB document.
   g. Dr. Jackson indicated that she wants the district processes to be transparent and documented. The District is not trying to tell the colleges how to plan. We want a

forum to vet the college plans and have district be able to provide resources for those plans. We want a clear pathway for the process even if the item is not funded -- so we know who to go to for resolution.

    h.   The colleges currently have Committees for Planning, Budget, Technology, and Facilities.

    i.   The subcommittee came up with 4 new district-wide committees to be formed – District Planning & Budget Committee, District Educational Support Services Committee, District Technology Committee, and District Facilities Committee. These new Committees may replace and augment the existing district committees for DBSG and DCC. The current DEMC is contractual and will remain as the committee to set FTES goals and activity targets, but this committee does not do integrated planning.

    j.   The purpose of the new district-wide committees is <u>not</u> to veto college recommendations, but to gain broad based support district wide for the funding of college approved prioritized items.

    k.   If the two colleges have conflicting priorities, then the district-wide committees will give the pros and cons for the requests with their recommendation to the Chancellor.

4. Each of the subcommittee members reviewed their initial drafts for the new district committees.

    a.   Dave Fouquet presented the CLPCCD Facilities Committee
    b.   Rajinder Samra presented the CLPCCD Technology Committee
    c.   Yvonne Wu-Craig presented the CLPCCD Education (TBD) Committee
    d.   Dr. Jackson is responsible for the CLPCCD Planning & Budget Committee, but she was not able to do an initial draft for this meeting.

5. Dave Fouquet will work with Jeff Kingston on updates to the CLPCCD Facilities Committee draft and they will identify the key performance indicators (KPI). Jeff will come up with the standards in facilities that can be used for KPI such as square footage and ratio. Some preliminary comments regarding the draft noted by the CWG include:

    a.   Add that "college prioritizations are reviewed".
    b.   Add "Conduct annual review of M&O services and prioritize based on needs assessment."
    c.   Add comment on "sustainability issues".
    d.   Review the Core Representatives and determine who should appoint.
    e.   Key Performance Indicators should include # of students affected which is important.
    f.   Add "student demand needs" and "projected growth" to KPI for Program Capacity.
    g.   Add "space usage" to KPI for Sustainability.
    h.   Clarify how Procedural Effectiveness KPI is measured.
    i.   Add capacity load ratios as KPI.
    j.   Add project delivery to KPI.

6. Rajinder Samra will work with Jeannine Methe on updates to the CLPCCD Technology Committee draft, which will be named the District Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC). Some preliminary comments noted by the CWG are as follows:

    a.   Add "Assure that the technology planning and maintenance is aligned to the district mission, goals, and community expectations".

b. Note that the Technology Committee will provide a forum for the district-wide sharing of technology projects and status. Rajinder commented that from the feedback that he received that some of this is done today at each of the College Technology Committees with district ITS staff in attendance.

c. Add that committee addresses "common enterprise systems" including hardware and software.

d. Add "making recommendations on the Technology Master Plans" and add "District ITS Strategic Plan" after the Technology Master Plan.

e. Include bullet to "Identify milestones for implementation of technology projects".

f. Review Core Representatives and change the list to include the Vice Presidents of Business Services at colleges since they handle budgets.

g. Review and update Key Performance Indicators for assessment of technology projects.

7. Yvonne Wu-Craig presented the CLPCCD Education Committee draft, which the CWG decided would be named Educational Support Services (ESS) Committee.

a. Remove "technological" reference following the "allocation of human resources" since this is covered in the Technology Committee.

b. Remove "budget development" which should be moved to the Planning & Budget Committee.

c. Revise "educational planning is responsive to and aligned with the district mission, goals, community expectations, and student profiles."

d. Remove reference to "Technology Plan" and leave Education Master Plan and CLPCCD Strategic Plan.

e. Remove reference to "District IT".

f. Note that Accreditation should be for colleges and district.

g. Add bullet for curriculum DCC coordination and determine scope of current DCC and if this would be a committee change to be referenced in the Board Policy.

h. Need to determine how Curriculum DCC and DEMC relate to the new ESS Committee.

i. It was noted that the current DEMC and Calendar Committees are contractual.