In order to keep the meeting "paper-light", most of the materials had been emailed as attachments to the members of the Council and were not distributed at the meeting.

1. Review of February 21, 2013 meeting notes. These are posted online with the materials for February 21st at [http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/participatory_governance/meetings.html#Participatory](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/en/about-city-college/participatory_governance/meetings.html#Participatory)

2. Participatory Governance Committees logistics follow up. Membership rosters are being posted on the website. The calendar is also available online.

3. Show Cause and Closure Report. Gohar Momjian announced that the Show Cause Report is in the last stages of completion and both reports will soon go to ACCJC. Focus of activity turns to the Action Plans. In addition to being included in the Show Cause Report, these have been collected in a separate document.

4. Planning Committee update on Annual Assessment, Planning, Budgeting Timeline, including program review and prioritization of requests. Pam Mery described the process [Find outline of process at http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/AnnualTimeline.pdf](http://www.ccsf.edu/NEW/content/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Program%20Review/AnnualTimeline.pdf)

   Each of the Vice Chancellors have prioritized resource requests for their area, overall prioritization has not yet taken place. Program Review raw numbers will be added to data summary page. Instructional division has significantly more reviews to rank than the other divisions. Additional time, or process change may be needed so that each area will have sufficient time for working with the rubrics for prioritizing resource requests. Integrating staffing into the planning process is challenging. At this point there is neither criteria nor a process for urgent staffing needs. Vice Chancellors Goldstein and Low talked about using the rubric for the ranking of priorities. Overlapping requests, Perkins, faculty positions – still working on improving processes for these. Methods for providing input across divisions and units as to priorities include the employee survey and the student survey. Additional direction and opportunities may be needed to inform employees and students that survey data may be used to establish priorities and improvements.

   Overall, the process has worked well, but some refinements will be needed. There will be an initial assessment of the program review/planning process soon. The Program
Committee has transparency and dialogue about the planning process at the top of their “worry list” — how to build these in without encumbering the process.

Budget preparation and resource allocation. Peter Goldstein presented initial numbers for next years budget. Budget detail, restricted fund detail, specific line item detail was not provided. More information will be available prior to the Board meeting on March 21, 2013. Vice Chancellor Goldstein answered questions about the numbers and about the process.

5. RFP for Education Master Plan. Pam Mery reported that suggestions from the Academic Senate and the Planning Committee meeting had been incorporated into the RFP for awarding a contract for creating the Educational Master Plan for CCSF. $75,000 is included on the Chancellor’s rubric for the 2013-14 budget.

Next meeting will be April 18, 3:00-5:00 pm.

NOTES ON BUDGET INFORMATION [http://tinyurl.com/cu2pg99](http://tinyurl.com/cu2pg99)
This information comes from two sources – the three columns on the right were presented by Peter Goldstein at the PGC meeting on April 14. The two columns on the left (in gray) were published in the September 11, 2012 budget book. Useful information NOT on this chart is updated actual revenues and expenditures for 2012-13 (for instance, showing diminished apportionment revenue because of diminished enrollments)

This shows information about the unrestricted funds only — it does not include grant funding or restricted monies from the state. In some cases, that means the numbers given here are not true totals — for instance, faculty salaries, administrator salaries, and classified salaries are partially charged to restricted funds, NOT included on this chart.