R. Tillberg explained the purpose of the meeting is to plan for the Prioritization Retreat on February 27.

**Budget Considerations**

K. Takeda gave an overview of the budget. The block grant for Instructional Equipment for 2014-2015 is $467,000. We must spend it this year, and only the audio-visual requests that were on the 2013-2014 prioritized request list have been spent. It makes sense to prioritize items that can be funded under this grant. Any equipment must be used for instruction.

For next year (2015-2016) we expect similar block grant amounts; more precise estimates will be available after the second quarter review on 2/24/2015.

The governor’s proposed budget proposes more funding for community colleges. Furthermore, the growth we experienced in 2013-2014 will be credited later, and it adds to the 2014-2015 base—all adding up to more funding. However, it is not clear how much the district will keep in reserves. If it is not credited to the colleges, West will be 2 million in the red.

The trend is for more categorical funds, so we need to be strategic in how we use those funds. For example, since SSSP can pay for counselors, we should use those funds, rather than program 100 funds.
Categorical funds may be cut, which suggests it is prudent to use hourly assignments. However, we must also consider the impact on our faculty obligation number.

D. Morrissette reminded the committee of the need for classified staff to support expanded programs.

In response to a question from H Bailey-Hofmann K. Takeda explained that when we deploy new instructional equipment, the old equipment can be put to non-instructional uses.

It was agreed that the prioritization retreat should focus first on items that could be funded through the instructional equipment grant. The next priority would be other requests, with the exception of staffing. (Faculty positions are handled under the FPIP process.)

**Program Review Status**

R. Tillberg presented a report showing that 89% of all program reviews have been submitted, although 27% of those have not been validated. A. Taylor asked whether the committee should prioritize all program review that were submitted, or just those that were validated. After some discussion the committee decided to consider all the program reviews that are validated by 2/24/2015, in time for R. Tillberg to run a report.

**Review of Materials of the Prioritization Retreat**

R. Tillberg walked the committee through the materials to be used at the retreat on 2/27/2015.

**Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services** has been used for several years, and is reflected in the prioritization rubric. Since interpretations of the principles vary, our goal today is to refine our consensus on them. Resource requests meeting high priority principles must be funded, but the committee has not had a method to verify such claims. Linking planning and budget is a key theme.

**Rubric for Prioritizing Program Review Resource Requests:** The committee adopted a clarification to the rubric: for linking a Request with Planned Action and a Unit Goal, 0 points means it is not clear how the request links with a unit goal or a planned action; 1 point means that the request clearly pertains to a unit goal or a planned action, and 2 points means the program review itself links the request with a unit goal or a planned action.

The **Summary of Planning Section** program review report shows all the unit goals, planned actions and resource requests. It does not show whether these are linked. At the prioritization retreat, it would be useful in considering whether the request clearly pertains to a unit goal or planned action.

**Linked Plans: Planned Actions Linked with Unit Goals and Resource Requests** does show whether the program review linked the three elements. The committee expressed concern about whether this indicated the strength of the linkages, or the program review author’s ability to navigate the IES. Adjusting the rubric helped mitigate this unintended effect.

The **Program Review Resource Requests: Complete List** document displays each request by name and description, and provides the answers to each question in program review. At the retreat, it will be helpful to have laptops available to match the answers to the questions. Each request should have a unique number.
R. Tillberg will prepare a list of the requests that can use Instructional Equipment block grants for the retreat.

K. Takeda recalled that requests involving technology were to have gone to the tech committee before the retreat, and R. Tillberg clarified that the committee would have had to consider requests before validation in order to be in time for the retreat.

K. Takeda undertook to take facilities requests to the facilities committee before the retreat.

SLO Assessment and Change report closes the loop between SLO assessment and planning. It will help the committee to complete section II of the rubric, which addresses SLO assessments.

Implications for Subsequent Program Review Cycles

R. Tillberg noted that the Puente Program has requested supply funds. Since it is no longer covered by a grant, this is a step towards institutionalizing the program. Similarly, the project LEARN might consider completing program review to document its ongoing needs, for the time when it will no longer be grant-supported.

A. Taylor noted that this would help the college to plan for the future and increase transparency.

D. Morrissette offered the example of how Puente’s transition into the ongoing college processes has added to the workload in EOP&S. Fully participating in program review can help the college anticipate ancillary costs.

Resource Retreat Process

R. Tillberg noted that the 2014 retreat began with a vote to decide which requests to rank. A. Taylor expressed discomfort at the fact that we did not rank all the requests. This year, we rank all the requests for instructional equipment (about 45 requests). Various approaches were suggested.

R. Sprague suggested that the attendees break into small groups to rank a set of requests, or that we move through each request together, discussing the options as we go.

A. Taylor suggested that we all rank a small set of requests and then discuss any rankings that seemed to be outliers. The committee agreed to adopt this approach.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 2:40PM.