



<b>STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE &amp; BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA</b>	<b>WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2025 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM SSV 236</b>
---	--

**TYPE OF MEETING:** SPC & BC Meeting  
**NOTE TAKERS:** Megan Aceves  
**PLEASE REVIEW/ BRING:** Agenda, Minutes, and Supporting Documents

**Strategic Planning and Budget Committee Members:**

1. Rebecca Farley Co-Chair (VP, Student Equity & Achievement)\*
2. Hal Huntsman, Co-Chair (AS: President)\*
3. Shami Brar, Co- Chair (VP, Administrative Services)\*
4. Jim Landreth (Classified Union: CTE)
5. James Nasipak (Director, Business Services)\*
6. Jenell Paul (Classified: Student Services)
7. Janet Diaz De Leon
8. Rodney Schilling (Academic Senate: Counseling Faculty)\*
9. Kim Sennett (AS: CTE/Vocational Faculty)
10. Veronica Sirotzki (Classified Union)
11. Jill Zimmerman (Dean, Student Health & Wellness)\*
12. Ethan Andrada (ASO Rep.)
13. Steve Benitez (ASO Rep.)
14. Michael Carey (Academic Senate: Adjunct Faculty)
15. Linda Parker (Academic Senate: Library Faculty)\*
16. Jessica Eaton (Co-Chair Enrollment Mgmt)
17. Marissa Latuno (Health & Safety Sciences)
18. Daniel Conner (ITS Designee)\*
19. Suzanne Olson (Classified Union)\*
20. Pamela Ford (Classified Union)\*
21. Svetlana Deplazes (Student Equity & Achievement)
- ~~22. Benjamin Partee~~
23. Marvin Guman
24. Karen Slaybaugh
25. Jim Firth\*
26. Harmony Miller\*
27. Kent Moser
28. Kevin North\*
29. Windy Franklin-Martinez\*
30. Angela Musial
31. Sarah Schneider\*

**Guest Attendee:**

Wendy Dumas\*

**Vacant**

Academic Affairs (CMSA)  
 Director, IR (CMSA) Faculty Union  
 Academic Senate: CTE/Vocational Faculty Classified: Academic Affairs  
 Classified: ITS

**Ex-Officios**

Jennifer Zellet (Superintendent/President)	Shami Brar (VP of Administrative Services) *
Kathy Bakhit (VP of Academic Affairs) *	Idania Padron (VP of Student Services)
Lauren Elan Helsper (VP of People, Culture & Talent)	Alejandro Guzman (Exec. Dir. of Marketing) *
Rebecca Farley (VP of Equity and Student Achievement) *	

AGENDA ITEMS	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	ISSUES DISCUSSED /ACTION ITEMS
<b>INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:</b>		

I. Approval of SPC Minutes for Meetings on April 23, 2025, February 5, 2025, & October 16, 2024	All	Unable to approve minutes as the committee did not reach a quorum.
II. Opening Comments from Co-Chairs	Hal, Rebecca	Dr. Farley thanked all attendees for joining the meeting.
III. Review of SPBC Resource Allocation		<p><b>Status of Scoring</b>” Scoring has not been completed due to a high number of questions and concerns regarding the appropriateness and consistency of the scoring criteria and process.</p> <p><b>Concerns Raised by Committee Members</b></p> <p><b>Inclusion of Positions in the Resource Allocation Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several members questioned why position requests (including classified staff, faculty, and CMS) were included in the scoring process. It was noted that such requests should be routed through Human Resources (HR) subgroups for proper review and vetting.</li> <li>• The number of student workers and Short-Term Hourly (STH) employees requested was described as “astronomical,” raising additional concerns. If there is such a need for STHs then more classified staff should be hired to fill the vacancies in the departments.</li> <li>• Questions were raised regarding the submission of the Paramedic Director, however, the request is for a temporary contract and the position is not permanent so this was the appropriate outlet for the request.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lack of Vetting by Campus Co-Chairs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee members expressed concern that position requests were not vetted by campus co-chairs who possess institutional knowledge and continuity.</li> <li>• It was acknowledged that some requestors were new to the campus and may not be familiar with the district’s established distribution process. However, it was emphasized that due diligence should have been conducted by those familiar with process knowledge prior to the call for scoring was sent out.</li> </ul> <p><b>Process Inconsistencies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members questioned whether the previously established \$7,500 threshold for submitting requests was in effect this round as well.</li> <li>• There have been inconsistencies across campus in terms of how the resource allocation process has been communicated and implemented.</li> </ul>

- Some departments were informed to include “all people and things” in their requests, while others were not given the same instruction.
- Members emphasized the need for standardized training on the process for all stakeholders.

**Process Improvement Recommendations**

- It was recommended that all position requests should be integrated into Program Review and then filtered through the resource allocation process for funding consideration.

**Clarification Between Mandates and Needs**

- Committee members advised against comparing state or institutional mandates directly with specific personnel or equipment needs, as this leads to confusion in scoring.

**Scoring System Issues**

- The scoring system did not include a selection option to indicate whether a request was for categorical or general fund support.
- Scorers were unable to submit their scoring with a combined score of zero. If a request receives all zeros, the system generates an error and prevents submission.
- Unlike past years, the current system does not allow users to revise scores once submitted.

**Lack of Clarity on General vs. Categorical Funding**

- There is a lack of shared understanding around general fund and categorical fund distinctions.
- What one co-chair believed last year appears to differ this year, highlighting the need for common clarity before starting the allocation request process.

**Recommendation: Bring Back HR Subgroup Chart**

- Members suggested reinstating the chart or documentation outlining how the HR subgroup process works to ensure consistency and transparency.

**Need for Broader Departmental Involvement**

- Current process appears to rely heavily on input from IT, Facilities, and Marketing.
- It was suggested that other departments should also be consulted, especially when proposals may overlap existing services.

- *Example:* A new Wellness and Zen Center was proposed through the HUB, even though a wellness center already exists on campus. No coordination with the current department was noted.

#### **Appropriate Use of STH Positions**

- Concerns were raised about departments using STH positions as foundational staffing.
- It was emphasized that STHs are not intended to function as permanent placeholders; departments should instead secure appropriate classified staffing.
- Clarification was given about the amount of hours and days that a STH can work (75% time) and is tracked monthly to ensure STH stay within the limits.

#### **Presentation: AVC Resource Allocation Process**

- **Presenter:** Shami Brar
- The presentation outlined the standard resource allocation process.
- The process remains largely unchanged from prior years, with the only modification being that the Budget Committee now submits requests to SPBC.
- It was reiterated that the committee should review *all* campus requests to ensure transparency and inclusivity.

#### **Clarification on Position Requests**

- Permanent position requests should not be part of this resource allocation process.
- If permanent positions were included, they need to be removed immediately.
- to ensure consistent understanding and application of the process campus-wide.

#### **Discussion on Short-Term Hourly (STH) Employees**

- STH hours and days worked are monitored across the calendar year.
- Vacancies across campus have led to greater reliance on STHs, who function similarly to substitutes.
- Updates on hours worked are provided monthly to ensure compliance and transparency.

		<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IT will re-open the scoring system to allow edits and corrections.</li> <li>• A new deadline to complete all scoring was set for May 23<sup>rd</sup>.</li> <li>• Tentative schedule indicates that the revised requests and scoring will be reviewed in approximately two weeks.</li> </ul>
<p>IV. ATD Spring 2025 Site Visit Outcomes Overview</p>		<p>The Committee did not reach this item on the agenda.</p>
<p>V. Equity Plan Development Preparation</p>		<p>Co-Chair, Dr. Farley shared that the current Equity Plan is concluding and there is a need to convene focus groups to help develop the new plan.</p>
<p>VI. Non-agendized discussions.</p>		<p>Quick overview of power point presentation by Dr. Farley that will be shared with the committee. Reviewed the recent English and Math performance.</p> <p>Celebrate AVC Day set for May 16<sup>th</sup> in Sage Hall. Event will be similar to last year with a poster walk followed by a deep dive into data analysis. Only difference this year, the event will conclude by 11:30am.</p>

**Upcoming Meetings: 5/28/25**

