Integrated Planning Meeting

Friday, October 20, 2017

BU 120; 11a to 12p

Agenda

Please note: all action items are indicated in ***red bold italicized font***

Present

M.Bresso, E.Cervantes, C.Cisneros, M.Dresch, W.Ellis, F.Lozano, K.Moberg, M.Sanidad, K.Warren; P.Wruck

1. **Discussion: Task force to review distribution of funds across initiatives** (needs member of Business Office)

K.Moberg and M.Bresso emphasized that one of the key purposes of Integrated Planning to is determine where there are funding duplications and where money is limited on non-existent.

W.Ellis reminded all that there are over 200 grants which are listed as state and federal.

W.Ellis will provide for review.

C.Cisneros asked W.Ellis if these grants can be differentiated between one-time or on-going grants.

***W.Ellis stated yes, they are differentiated. He stated he could further separate state/federal funded grants between one-time funded and ongoing.***

Rather than focusing on all grants, the committee decided to focus only on those grants that were $90,000 or more.

K.Moberg asked Wade if he would be able to provide information listing accounts 4s, 5, and 6s for those grants over $90,000. ***W.Ellis said he would bring this to the next meeting as well.***

M.Bresso asked if there is currently a formal grant application process.

***E.Cervantes stated that a process does currently exist. He will present this process at the next meeting***.

E.Cervantes did stated that the process (specifically for applying to smaller grants that are under larger grants) was also presented to Academic Senate. However, Senate does not seem to have time to discuss/review.

Per E.Cervantes and S.Carr, there are some smaller grants that did not go through the grant application/review process.

Both K.Moberg and M.Bresso agreed that all grants – small or large – must go through the application/review process

**Possible Professional Learning Day item/workshop?**

K.Warren ask how/will we integrate spending across the grants and is there a specialist that can help up out of our cylos.

M.Bresso indicated that the crosswalk is a starting point spelling out how funds in various grants are/can be spent.

K.Moberg stated as we develop, we will b able to use integrated funds better, and if there are things that we find that are not working we need to reassess and correct.

1. **Recent Audit Findings And Impact on FTES**

W.Ellis reported that this has been a rough year in regard to FTES reporting. The District may have reduced two of the 9 audit findings to 7 or 8.

The major issue, W.Ellis reported, had to do with census reports and the failure to submit them. Sadly, more full time than part time faculty are guilty of not submitting their class census reports.

There are two other additional factors:

* Continued difficulty on how to report hybrid courses
* Lack of recognition that an “hour” course in NOT 60 minutes…it is 50 minutes. Even with training, both full time and part time faculty are still miscalculating.

The result of all factors is a loss between $200,000 and $300,000.

S.Carr suggestion providing another training. However M.Bresso believes that training doesn’t seem to be working and that something different need to be done as the Superintendent/President expects 100% participation.

W.Ellis suggested there needs to be a consequence. For example: if a part time faculty member has not submitted census reports for more that 2 continual semesters, perhaps that individual is not to be re-hired.

All agreed that there needs to be some type of consequence.

P.Wruck informed all that a change in Enrollment Management should also be considered. Specifically when entering information into Banner/FLAC. According to P.Wruck, there are issues when calculation factors are adjusted (changed) manually. He noted that Michele Cortes spends far too much time correcting information entered by others. Perhaps she should be the only individual entering information and making any changes.

P.Wruck also suggested that Michele Cortes needs a back-up

***The group as a whole recognized this issue was to be reviewed again at the next meet to seek possible resolution.***

1. **Integrated Planning v Planning Page on Gavilan Website**

G.Cardinalli presented to all the draft Integrated Planning webpage and the current page on the Gavilan Website.

The group decided to start fresh and opted to go with the new page.

***Once the old page has been deleted, the new page will be published.***

***Meetings, minutes and other documents will be made available for all to review on this page.***

The group would like to take the Program Plan out of the intranet (internal) and make readily available externally.

Additionally, the group requested that the Strategic Planning Committee be linked to from the Integrated Planning page.

Finally, it was recognized that the chart on the decision-making process requires review.

The next Integrated Planning meeting is scheduled for December 15, 2017 at 11a