

**STRATEGIC PLANNING BUDGET COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

**March 7, 2012
3:00 – 4:30 pm
Room 9202**

Members	Present?
Camila Anzi	No
Bob Francis, Chair	Yes
Ann Garnsey-Harter	Yes
Elizabeth Hanson	Yes
David Holmes	No
Ernest Johnson	Yes
Gary Kalbfleisch	Yes
Amy Kinsel	No
Linda Lui	Yes
Ann Martin-Cummins	Yes
Claire Murata	No
Doug Palmer	Yes
Lynette Peters	No
Kye Stephens-Terry	No
Arlene Strong	Yes
Kanpong Thaweek	Yes
Bern Wegeleben	Yes
Linda Weir, Vice Chair	No
Kira Wennstrom	Yes
Holly Woodmansee	Yes

Others
Joe Duggan, <i>ex officio</i> , note taker

- Agenda item #1: Call for note taker Bob – Joe D volunteered.
- Agenda Item #2: Review and adjust agenda -Bob- Approved with adjustments
- Agenda Item #3: Review and approve minutes from previous meeting – Bob- Approved with adjustment.

Agenda Item #4: Action Items – Bob
Holly was due to report on budget initiatives by the legislature, but this has been postponed until April 18th as the legislature is still mulling over various proposals, making anything we decide to act on premature.

Agenda Item # 5: Budget Update – Bob
There are multiple budget proposals in the legislature, some requiring a \$1/.2 m cut split over this and next year, others asking for it to be done next year, so we (the college) are essentially waiting for concrete news from the legislators.

Agenda Item #6: International Education Action Plan Presentation – Doug

Presentation of IE action plan.

Samira and Mari went through a detailed presentation of their Action Plan (AP) for International Education.

They reported that after some initial confusion, the department elected to involve all departmental staff in completing the AP at a retreat. The general consensus was the AP helped, given the diversity of the department, to focus the department on their workload and priorities. It also served to help integrate new hires into the department.

Samira noted that some areas of the plan are less complete than others as some staff members are elsewhere on outreach duties, but that elements will get filled in as information becomes available. Samira and Mari also appreciated having other completed plans to refer to and that these helped in filling out their plan.

The presentation was well received but there was some discussion both during and after, about the desirability of having more information on budget and resource needs (using TSS for example eats into TSS resources, and their needs/plans need to be taken into account also.)

It was also noted that the AP is useful in identifying cross-pollination of effort; it became apparent during the presentation that the IE efforts also tie in closely in some areas with VCIT and CILT plans.

Agenda Item #7 – Report back – Action Plan presentation to SET. - Bob

The presentation was generally well received, and SET passed along their appreciation of SPB efforts in this area.

There was some discussion (At SET) over who should/should not receive the AP forms; the initial thinking was that some task forces were initiatives while others were not. And also around how to introduce new initiatives.

The upshot was that all task forces should receive the APs as, even if the area is not an initiative, they were formed to address an issue and as such would be something that strategic planning should be aware of/involved in (And the AP is a feedback form to SPB). As regards the introduction of new initiatives, it was recognized that the AP form itself could form a major part of the proposal of such. Decision was that all task forces identified in their charging document as reporting back to SPB should be asked to complete the APs.

The language used for the AP, and the advisability of changing the language to avoid confusion with other efforts (such as accreditation) was discussed both at SET and at the SPB, but the general

consensus appears to be that we should not change the wording, particularly as the current plan is a limited release of the AP to selected groups, and we should see how that goes before changing anything.

Action: Bob will talk to Daryl and Deans to try and confirm whether changes to the glossary/language in AP should be altered.

Action Item #8: Sub Committee report back

- a. Budget cutting recommendations
 - a. On hold until more concrete information from legislature becomes available.
- b. Strategic Plan

The subcommittee has started the information gathering process by visiting the Social Science Division and conducting their first focus group.

The questions to the group were sent out ahead of time (if at short notice) asking for major activities, goals and challenges the division had.

There was limited feedback regarding 'goals' as there was some confusion as to whether we were referring to 'goals' or 'initiatives'. But good feedback was received on activities and challenges.

The focus group took up about 25 minutes of the division meeting's time.

By way of improvements, the focus group facilitators suggested to include Core Theme Objectives in the question sheet sent out to help people focus better. They also noted that many of the items brought up were reflected in the current Task Forces in operation by the college.

The Workforce division will be visited on March 8th, with the Math Science division being met on March 9th.

The subcommittee is planning to finish the focus groups by April 6, and then provide results back to the SPB as regards initiatives under way and possible new initiatives that may be identified, from which the SPB can start drafting a strategic plan by end of spring quarter.

Agenda item #9: Next meeting April 4