1. **CALL TO ORDER**
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 2:06 pm.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - January 18, 2007
It was moved by Mr. Henry that the minutes of January 18, 2007 be approved as presented. Mr. Reece seconded the motion. The following committee members requested modifications to the January 18, 2007 minutes (please see modifications below):

- **Ms. Nolan:** Ms. Nolan commented ACCME has had a conversation about division supply funds and that on behalf of ACCME, they would like to make part of the record that supply funds at the unit level have been repeatedly slashed, and units cannot function—if supply dollars become an institution wide supply request process. (she clarified that this was not said at this planning and budget meeting) She acknowledged that no one has said that supply funds will become centralized; however section V of the draft document linking planning and resource allocation references supplies as a future by-request process. An institutional wide supply request process that impinges upon existing supply funds would hinder the functioning of many of the units to a stop.
**Dr. Reece.** Dr. Reece also voiced his frustration that the Faculty Senate had not yet been involved in preparing the Capital Outlay Timeline draft planning and resource allocation model.

**Dr. Vela.** Dr. Reece also voiced his frustration that the Faculty Senate had not yet been involved in preparing the draft planning and resource allocation model. Dr. Vela indicated that the planning and resource allocation model is a draft that will be brought to this committee that includes Senate representation for further discussion. She suggested that Mr. Farmer, Dr. Durdella, and Dr. Reece meet to try and think about how we can proceed in the short term.

The motion to approve the January 18, 2007 meeting minutes with the above modifications was approved.

### 3. DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDE TO PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION, INCLUDING PROGRAM REVIEW

Mr. Farmer acknowledged that Dr. Durdella was unable to make this scheduled meeting, but thanked him for his hard work in preparing the draft guide to planning and resource allocation.

Before discussion began, Ms. Nolan requested clarification that this committee was simply going to review the draft guide to planning and resource allocation, and not proceed with a formal adoption. Mr. Farmer replied that, at this time, this committee would be providing feedback only. As part of the shared governance process, it requires this committee to come to a mutual agreement regarding the processes for the planning and resource allocation with the Academic Senate in a shared governance forum.

Mr. Farmer provided an overview of the draft strategic planning and resource allocation process at Cerritos College. He noted that during the process, the question arises, “how does the College create a cycle of assessing, planning and evaluating without exhausting those people who will have to support this process?” The answer is by working on six-year (6) cycle. He briefly described this six-year (6) cycle to the committee.

The committee provided the following comments/suggestions:

- It was asked if there was a timeline for the 12 steps of the resource allocation process. The committee was referred to Appendix A – Proposed Unit Planning and Resource Allocation Timeline.

- In reviewing the program review process, it was noted that a unit plan is updated yearly, until it is time to do another program review. Dr. Vela noted that the unit plan would include not only the outcomes and recommendations of program review, but also initiatives discussed within the unit that may or may not be part of program review, the College’s strategic plan, and direction
by the Board. The unit plan is not only program review; it is more comprehensive than that.

- Student Learning Outcomes also need to be factored into the process and they may not all be able to be assessed in that 6 years.

- Dr. Reece commented that Step 7 of the Resource Allocation Process is where Planning and Budget gets involved in the process. It seems to the Senate, that this committee comes in too late in the decision making pathway. The Senate would like the Planning and Budget Committee to be more active in earlier stages of the process – somewhere between Steps 4 and 5. Dr. Vela commented that if there was a new Step 5, this committee, in essence, would be reviewing the five (5) “lists” from Business Services, Student Services, Academic Affairs, Human Resources, President’s Office.

- This began a discussion of what is the role of this committee? It was noted, that discussion has taken place at the Coordinating Committee that this committee be involved in strategic planning. The Planning and Budget Committee has been involved mainly in the budget aspect, and needs to take a more pro-active role in the planning. By interweaving strategic planning and planning and budget, this task can be accomplished. There was concern noted that members of the planning and budget committee were not aware of the possibility of adding strategic planning as a component of planning and budget. Dr. Vela explained that past planning and budget agendas have reflected mostly the budget aspect. Because accrediting standards require linkage between planning and budget, it makes sense to add strategic planning to planning and budget. She also noted that Coordinating Committee did unanimously support the combining of strategic planning and planning and budget. The role of the representatives on the Coordinating Committee is to go back to their representative groups and share the information, so that all groups are informed. It was also noted, that if strategic planning becomes a part of planning and budget, then this committee would in fact be setting institutional goals and priorities even earlier in the cycle, meaning, this committee would be receiving information earlier in the process.

Dr. Vela provided the following summary:

- It is important to look at as much information as possible to inform resource allocation. There should be a depiction of this on the diagram “Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation Process at Cerritos College.” This addition would help further emphasize that point.

- Insert a new step 5, which would provide an opportunity for the Planning and Budget Committee to review and study the five (5) areas prioritization.
After Step 5, the Executive Council does a college-wide prioritization with Step 7 having feedback to Units, Divisions and the Planning and Budget Committee from the area administrators.

Overall, the Planning and Budget Committee would have three (3) major involvement points.

Ms. Krichmar noted that the current capital outlay system has transparency built into the foundation of its application. She will ensure that all committee members have a read access to the system, so that they may review the capital outlay requests at their convenience.

4. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

Mr. Henry inquired regarding an update on the status of education. Dr. Vela reported the following:

- The Board met with all of our elected officials from our District in Washington, DC, and they are working hard to advocate for our College. Some of the items they are advocating for are:
  - To support bill HR 990 (Elimination of tuition sensitivity);
  - To ensure that Carl Perkins does not get eliminated. The College receives almost $1 million in Carl Perkins funds and these funds support all of the occupational programs, as well as professional development for faculty, curriculum development and equipment.

Dr. Vela also shared that Cerritos College was mentioned in a keynote address at the the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. In the keynote address, the President of the National Association of Manufacturers named the College and its partnership with Lockheed Martin as an example of a model industry and community college collaboration.

8. **NEXT MEETING - MARCH 1, 2007**

The next meeting will be March 1, 2007

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:47 pm.