



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, March 18, 2026

In-Person and Via Zoom

Regular Meeting: 2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Members present: Maria Huning, Lisa Palmer, Nick Carr, Alicia Aguirre, Julie Luu, Denise Erickson, Jose Zelaya, Alex Kramer, Megan Rodriguez Antone, Lizette Bricker, Ludmila Prisecar, Olivia Cortez-Figueroa, Roz Young, Rosie Mendoza Morrison, Diana Tedone-Goldstone, Chanel Meanor, Julian Taylor, Chialin Hsieh, Kassie Alexander, Christopher Wardell, Chantal Sosa, Shanda DeRosans, Karen Engel

Members absent: Kim Lopez

Guests and others present: Wissem Bennani, DeVon Scott, Breanna Castro, Kat Sullivan-Torrez, Ameer Thompson, Allison Hughes, Dave Eck, Max Hartman, Jasmine Jaciw

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
<p>Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Consent Agenda</p>	<p>The meeting began with introductions from Maria Huning, the Classified Senate President, and Diana Tedone-Goldstone, the Academic Senate President, who welcomed attendees and noted that the meeting agenda would be quite full. They then moved to the consent agenda, which included two items: the March 4th meeting minutes and board-approved staffing updates. It was clarified that there were no staffing updates available to approve due to timing between board meetings, leaving only the minutes for review.</p> <p>The PBC consent agenda included the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes • Board-approved staffing updates: none <p>Motion: A motion to approve the Consent Agenda was made by Rosie Mendoza Morrison and seconded by Alex Kramer Discussion: none Abstentions: none Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p>	
<p>Certification that the Non-Personnel Resource Request Process has been followed presented by Division Deans and Vice</p>	<p>The meeting then transitioned to the regular agenda, where Maria introduced the certification of the non-personnel resource request process and invited vice presidents and division deans to report by division and area. VPI Chialin Hsieh</p>

<p>Presidents present on the processes they followed to prioritize non-personnel resource requests in their Divisions/Offices</p> <p>Proposed Action: PBC certifies that the prioritization process has been followed</p>	<p>shared that there were no non-personnel resource requests from the Office of Instruction.</p> <p>On behalf of the Business, Design, and Workforce Division, Dean Alex Kramer began by explaining that he had received 39 requests totaling over \$1 million. Due to the division’s ability to utilize federal and state grant funding to support career education programs, requests were narrowed to 6 prioritized options (just over \$200,000) through a structured review team composed of faculty, staff, and administrators. These included needs such as an interior design lab, digital art hardware and software, a Fashion Design station for Instructional Aide use, Paralegal funding to support the rental of the San Mateo County Law Library, and Business and Accounting requesting funds for mileage reimbursement and marketing collateral. Dean Kramer confirmed that the requests had been ranked and his division had completed the required process.</p> <p>Dean Max Hartman then described the Counseling Division’s approach, noting that 13 requests were submitted through program review, one was funded through existing resources, and the remaining 12 were discussed and ranked collectively during a division meeting. Dean Hartman confirmed that the required process had been followed.</p> <p>Dean Ameer Thompson explained that his division used breakout groups during meetings to prioritize requests, with fewer submissions this year due to an off-cycle review period. Requests were therefore received primarily from Chemistry, and faculty input was incorporated before rankings were finalized. Dean Thompson confirmed that the required process had been followed.</p> <p>Interim Dean Lisa Palmer shared that Humanities and Social Sciences reviewed their requests at a recent division meeting and reduced their requests to just two after identifying alternative funding. The division chose not to rank them, considering both equally important. Interim Dean Palmer confirmed that the required process had been followed.</p> <p>Dean Kat Sullivan-Torrez detailed a formal scoring process in the Kinesiology, Athletics, and Dance division, where members evaluated requests on a 1–5 scale based on criteria such as student impact, safety, and alignment with institutional goals, ensuring broad participation and alignment with the College mission. Dean Sullivan-Torrez confirmed that the required process had been followed.</p> <p>Allison Hughes, speaking on behalf of the Academic Support and Learning Technologies Division, explained that their prioritization was handled through email and a division meeting, with relatively few remaining requests. Diana Tedone-Goldstone confirmed that the required process had been followed by this division.</p> <p>Dean Wissem Bennani explained that the Enrollment Services division followed the established non-personnel resource request process by involving designated program representatives and using a formal prioritization tool to evaluate submissions. Their team met to review requests, considering key questions such</p>
--	--

	<p>as alignment with institutional goals and whether alternative funding sources were available, which influenced how items were ranked. In total, they reviewed 13 requests amounting to approximately \$350,000, including those related to the Health Center, which he directly oversees. Dean Bennani confirmed that the process had been completed and appropriately followed.</p> <p>VPSS Lizette Bricker shared that her area had very few requests, and that those in charge of areas which reported directly to the VPSS Office provided her with their prioritizations, and the appropriate process will follow.</p> <p>VPAS Ludmila Prisecar shared that there were no non-personnel requests submitted in her area. She also spoke on behalf of the President’s Office which included PRIE and Marketing, noting that 3 requests were submitted, and none were prioritized as one was no longer needed and 2 involved technology requests which followed a separate process.</p> <p>After all reports, Maria opened the floor for discussion. Roz Young expressed surprise that some areas had not prioritized their requests, but shared the perspective that other divisions may not have all information necessary to understand the rankings of other division’s needs and that across campus, there may be limited familiarity with other areas. Chanel Meanor asked how student voices were incorporated; it was clarified by leadership that student-related requests typically flow through the Student Life Office and follow the Counseling Division and Student Services processes.</p> <p>Karen Engel reminded the Council of their formal role in this process, referencing the requirement to certify that each division had followed the established prioritization process. Although there was some acknowledgment that steps had been discussed slightly out of order, it was agreed that all necessary components had been addressed. The item concluded with a final comment expressing appreciation for the clarity and robustness of the institution’s governance structure and defined roles in decision-making.</p> <p>Motion: A motion that PBC certifies that the prioritization process has been followed was made by Rosie Mendoza Morrison and seconded by Lisa Palmer</p> <p>Discussion: none</p> <p>Abstentions: one</p> <p>Approval: all other present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>Participatory Governance Survey Instrument Verification presented by Karen Engel, Dean of PRIE</p>	<p>The Council moved on to the participatory governance survey instrument verification, presented by Karen Engel. She began by noting that the College’s participatory governance handbook had been recently updated and was in strong shape, and she briefly shared positive news that the institution had received</p>

<p>Proposed Action: PBC approves the Participatory Governance Survey Instrument for 2025-26</p>	<p>excellent feedback from its accreditation review, with no major concerns identified.</p> <p>Transitioning to the task at hand, she explained that the survey is conducted annually to evaluate how effectively participatory governance is functioning across campus. The survey is distributed to all employees and to students who actively serve on governance bodies, as broader student distribution had previously yielded limited useful feedback.</p> <p>Karen then walked the group through the survey structure. She described how respondents are asked to identify their role and participation in councils, senates, or committees, after which they evaluate whether those groups are fulfilling their responsibilities according to their bylaws. The survey also includes questions about awareness of governance opportunities, whether participants feel they have enough time to engage, and whether roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. Additional sections assess perceptions of program review processes, understanding of resource allocation and budgeting, and awareness of institutional planning and goals. The survey further asks whether participants feel that the voices of different campus constituent groups are balanced, with follow-up questions if imbalance is perceived, and concludes with an overall evaluation of whether participatory governance is working effectively.</p> <p>During discussion, Chialin Hsieh asked clarifying questions about who receives the survey, particularly regarding student participation, which Karen confirmed is limited to students involved in governance roles. A suggestion by Chanel Meanor was made to include an open-ended question at the end of the survey to gather broader feedback. The group discussed how to frame this question so that responses would remain focused on participatory governance rather than unrelated concerns, ultimately agreeing it should invite input on what is working well and what could be improved.</p> <p>Motion: A motion that PBC approves the Participatory Governance Survey Instrument for 2025-26, with the correction of a minor date issue noted in the survey and the addition of the open-ended question, was made by Rosie Mendoza Morrison and seconded by Lisa Palmer</p> <p>Discussion: none</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p>Approve Timeline and Due Dates for 2026-27 Program Review Cycle presented by PBC Program Review Subcommittee (Tedone, Engel, Prisecar, Eck, Claxton, Irizarry)</p>	<p>The next agenda item focused on approving the timeline and due dates for the 2026–27 program review cycle. Karen Engel introduced the item on behalf of the Program Review Subcommittee, explaining that while there is an overall annual structure for program review, the group had found it helpful to establish specific dates each year to provide clarity and consistency. She noted that the proposed timeline had already been reviewed and approved by the Instructional Planning Council (IPC), and she invited colleagues to elaborate. Dave Eck confirmed that IPC had approved the dates, explaining that they largely mirrored</p>

<p>Proposed Action: PBC approves the timeline and due dates for the 2026-27 Program Review Cycle</p>	<p>previous years, with a minor flexibility built in for scheduling the peer review session, though it would most likely occur on November 20.</p> <p>However, it was then clarified by Lizette Bricker that the Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) had not yet reviewed or approved the timeline. In response, Karen suggested that the Council move forward by approving the timeline provisionally, pending SSPC’s review at their upcoming meeting, to avoid delays in the process. The group agreed with this approach.</p> <p>Motion: A motion that PBC approves the timeline and due dates for the 2026-2027 Program Review Cycle, pending review and approval by SSPC, was made by Rosie Mendoza Morrison and seconded by Chialin Hsieh.</p> <p>Discussion: none</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p> <p>Following the vote, Chialin Hsieh raised a question about the composition of the Program Review Subcommittee, specifically noting that no SSPC representative appeared to be listed. Karen clarified that this was an error in the agenda documentation and confirmed that an SSPC representative, Dr. Scott, had in fact been participating. She acknowledged the oversight and attributed it to a membership transition period.</p>
<p><u>SSPC Proposed Changes to the Student Services Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) and Annual Update Questionnaires for Resource Requests for the 2026-27 cycle</u> presented by SSPC Representatives, DeVon Scott and Wissem Bennani</p> <p>Proposed Action: PBC approves SSPC’s proposed changes to the Student Services CPR and Annual Update Questions.</p>	<p><u>SSPC CPR Question Revision for 2026 Cycle Presentation</u></p> <p>DeVon Scott and Wissem Bennani shared a presentation regarding proposed changes to the Student Services Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Update questionnaire for the 2026–27 cycle. They explained that the revisions stemmed from feedback received in Spring 2025, which highlighted issues such as repetitive questions, lack of clarity, and inefficiencies in the process. In response, a representative SSPC workgroup met throughout the fall to redesign the questions with several goals in mind: incorporating evidence-based responses using both quantitative and qualitative data, embedding equity through a transformational and anti-racist leadership framework, streamlining the process by reducing redundancy, and improving clarity and usability. The revised comprehensive program review now includes 23 questions designed to evaluate program effectiveness, equity outcomes, and resource needs, while the annual update consists of a shorter set of 7 questions to maintain progress between full review cycles. They also emphasized a new commitment to keep questions consistent for six years (two cycles) to allow for better longitudinal analysis and avoid constant changes.</p> <p>During discussion, members expressed support for the revisions, noting that the updated structure would improve consistency, reduce unnecessary repetition, and better support meaningful evaluation over time. Maria Huning highlighted that changing questions annually had previously made it difficult to assess progress, while the new approach would allow programs to track outcomes more effectively. A question was raised by Chialin Hsieh about whether the revised</p>

	<p>questions would help “close the loop” for accreditation purposes, and it was affirmed that the comprehensive set was thorough and addressed key evaluation areas. Lizette Bricker emphasized that annual updates would still allow flexibility, particularly for refining outcomes and adapting to evolving needs.</p> <p>Motion: A motion that PBC approves SSPC’s proposed changes to the Student Services CPR and Annual Update Questions was made by Rosie Mendoza Morrison and seconded by Chialin Hsieh.</p> <p>Discussion: none</p> <p>Abstentions: none</p> <p>Approval: all present members voted in favor of the motion; motion passed</p>
<p><u>Proposed Updates to the Critical Questions for Resource Requests for the 2026-27 cycle</u> presented by SSPC Representatives, DeVon Scott and Wissem Bennani</p>	<p><u>SSPC Critical Questions Proposal Presentation</u> (beginning on slide 6)</p> <p>The Council moved on to discuss proposed updates to the critical questions for resource requests for the 2026–27 cycle, following approval of the previous item. The same SSPC working group presented suggested revisions, emphasizing alignment with institutional equity plans and inviting broader campus input since the changes would affect all programs. Proposed edits included refining language to better connect resource requests to identified equity gaps and explicitly adding student populations such as Black and African American students. During discussion, members raised clarifying questions about wording and inclusivity, including whether additional groups—such as formerly incarcerated students—should be explicitly included. In response, Lizette Bricker, Karen Engel and Maria Huning spoke to the fact that the revisions were intentionally aligned with state-guided equity frameworks, which limit which populations are formally tracked, though other planning processes could address additional groups such as this population and other such as former foster youth. Concerns were also raised about terminology consistency and potential unintended exclusions of certain populations. In particular, the proposed transition from AANAPISI to AANHPI in Question 2, which would remove particular student populations as a focus, prompted suggestions to further review the language. Overall, the discussion was thoughtful and exploratory, with agreement that more refinement and collaboration would be beneficial before finalizing the proposed changes. Future action steps included the PBC subcommittee to work closely with SSPC on these changes and to ensure IPC is involved in the process. Official changes would be reviewed and approved at all planning councils prior to the changes being put into effect.</p>
<p><u>Financial Aid and Course Program of Study (CPOS)</u> presented by Lizette Bricker, VPSS Wissem Bennani, Dean of Enrollment Services and Breanna Castro, Director of Financial Aid Services</p>	<p>Lizette Bricker explained that the implementation of the federal Course Program of Study (CPOS) regulation would significantly affect upcoming registration cycles by limiting financial aid to only those courses that apply directly to a student’s officially declared program(s) of study. This policy, developed over the past two years at the district level, aimed to accelerate student completion, reduce excess coursework, and ensure more efficient use of financial aid. Lizette emphasized that this was a major institutional shift requiring broad campus awareness, noting that her involvement stemmed from prior experience</p>

implementing CPOS at a previous institution. Extensive preparation efforts had already taken place, including instructional reviews to remove hidden prerequisites, multiple campus presentations, and coordination with deans and student services.

A detailed communication plan was outlined, including targeted emails to students and employees, training sessions for counselors and staff, public demonstrations of the system, and a CPOS FAQ resource. Students would receive notifications—both before registration and nightly during the term—if enrolled courses did not align with their program of study. These messages would warn that aid such as Pell Grants, Cal Grants, work-study, and federal loans could be reduced or canceled, specify which courses were ineligible, and direct students to take action, such as updating their program in WebSmart or meeting with a counselor. Students were allowed to officially declare up to five programs of study, which could help preserve aid eligibility if courses aligned with any of them.

Wissem Bannani clarified that CPOS would only impact students receiving certain federal or state aid, while others using private scholarships, private loans, or fee waivers like the California College Promise Grant or SB893 would not be affected. Institutional data showed that in fall of 2025 approximately 1,190 students received some form of aid, though only a subset would be impacted—specifically those enrolled in non-applicable courses. Prior district analysis suggested around 1,450 students had such misalignments across all three campuses. To reduce negative impacts, financial aid and counseling teams planned proactive outreach before the first fall disbursement date (August 13, 2026), emphasizing that students must make program or course adjustments before aid is distributed, as changes cannot be made afterward for that term.

Breanna Castro shared that to support implementation, financial aid staff were undergoing training to confidently explain CPOS and refer students to counseling when needed, while counseling teams received in-depth training and developed shared resources, including FAQs. The College also planned to create standardized operating procedures (SOPs) to ensure consistent messaging and smooth referrals across departments. Max Hartman shared that Counseling services and the Welcome Center would prioritize CPOS-affected students, offering drop-in support and encouraging early advising. Additionally, broader campus efforts—including outreach through programs like TRIO, EOPS, and learning communities—would reinforce communication, recognizing that students are more likely to respond to trusted, familiar contacts than general emails.

Maria Huning recommended adding additional time for this agenda item due to the importance of the content being discussed.

The discussion addressed concerns about capacity and communication gaps, particularly for students not connected to specific programs. In response, presenters highlighted a multi-layered outreach approach, including automated notifications, “drip” email campaigns, and encouragement for all staff to act as

	<p>CPOS ambassadors by directing students to appropriate resources. While acknowledging potential strain on counseling and financial aid offices, they emphasized that early engagement and widespread staff awareness would be key to minimizing confusion and disruption. Ultimately, the goal was to ensure that all employees were prepared to recognize CPOS-related issues, guide students effectively, and support them in making informed decisions about their coursework and financial aid eligibility.</p>
STANDING ITEMS	<p>Due to the extended time of the last presentation, standing items were tabled for the remainder of this meeting. Representatives were asked to email their updates for inclusion in the minutes.</p>
Associated Students of Cañada College	<p>No updates at this time.</p>
Classified Senate of Cañada College	<p>Update received from Maria Huning via email:</p> <p>Classified Senate was able to meet to create a survey for our Pat Hanada memorial bench. We were able to discuss concerns regarding District Policy Changes regarding Professional Development, Conference Travel, and PARS. We also agreed to invite our VPAS to our next meeting and began developing questions for her. Our next meeting is 3/16/26.</p>
Academic Senate of Cañada College	<p>Update received from Diana Tedone-Goldstone via meeting chat:</p> <p>Academic Senate hosted other senate leaders from our area for State Academic Senate (ASCCC) resolution reading meeting last Friday. Our campus will be hosting two more State Academic Senate events- CTE Regional Meeting and ASCCC OERI's Northern California LibreTexts Workshop next month!</p> <p>We also discussed a Spring Submission Option for Tenure-Tract faculty. https://www.canadacollege.edu/academicsenate/2526/springuploadoptionwriteup.pdf</p>
Planning Council Reports: IPC, SSPC, EAPC	<p>IPC:</p> <p>No updates at this time.</p> <p>SSPC:</p> <p>No updates at this time.</p> <p>EAPC:</p> <p>No updates at this time.</p>
President's Update	<p>No updates at this time.</p>
Matters of Public Interest and Upcoming Events	<p>none</p>

ADJOURNMENT	Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be held on April 15, 2026