Minutes – Prioritization Retreat

Friday, March 14, 2014
9:00 am-3:00 pm
SSB-414, Multipurpose Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agyeman Boateng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Dones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalamon Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Goltermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Jacinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Morrissette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Sprague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Apigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agyeman Boateng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Welcome and Overview.** Rebecca Tillberg welcomed and thanked the group for participating in the prioritization retreat. She described the task at hand: to develop a prioritized list of the 135 resource requests that were submitted through the extended program review process. An additional 27 resource requests had been submitted for regular faculty positions. These positions are prioritized by the Faculty Position Identification and Prioritization (FPIP) Committee. The FPIP policy requires that requests to fill regular faculty positions must be initially justified and submitted through program review.

2. **Proposed process.**

   a. **Resources available.** R. Tillberg described the contents of the resource folder each person received: the Agenda, the Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services, the Vice Presidents’ priority lists, reports, and a Prioritization Scoring Worksheet. The reports included the following:

      i. General Reports

          1. Resource Request Descriptions
          2. Summary of Planning Section: Unit Goals, Planned Actions and Resource Requests

      ii. Reports Focused on Rubric Items

          1. Linked Plans: Unit Goals, Planned Actions and Resource Requests *(Rubric Item II.7)*
2. Unit Goals: Meeting Needs and Measuring Achievement (Rubric Items II.8, II.9, II.10)
3. SLO Assessment and Change (Rubric Item II.9)
4. Planned Action Details (Rubric Item II.11)
   iii. Resource Request Lists (Permanent Personnel, Other Resource Requests)
      1. Sort by Area and Program/Unit
      2. Sort by Estimated Annual Cost

b. Use of giant sticky notes. The group agreed to use giant sticky notes as a parking lot for items to which we had no answer or conclusion during the retreat. They are items that will need attention in the future.

c. Funding sources. One of the issues that has been under discussion is how the resource request prioritization process should consider funding sources. In addition to the general fund, 10100, there are Categorical funds, including the new SSSP funding, Instructional Equipment, VTEA, grants, etc. Following extended discussion, the group decided to not consider possible funding sources. Last year, committee members volunteered to pay for several appropriate resource requests out of grant funding. There was no follow up to determine whether or not the items were actually funded, and at the same time, they were lost from the official priority lists. We plan to follow up on all resource requests to identify how the need was either met or not met.

d. Use 2 Categories for prioritization: Permanent Personnel and Other. R. Tillberg suggested that the 135 resource requests be prioritized in two groups: permanent personnel and other (to include temporary staffing, student workers, tutors, supplies and equipment, etc.). It was further recommended that the group prioritize the ‘Other’ category first, in the morning, and move on to the Permanent Personnel category in the afternoon.

There was extensive discussion about whether or not to take the cost of a request into consideration in the prioritization. The real cost of an item is not known at this time, only a rough estimate. The cost of a resource request is not part of the scoring rubric, and to add that factor would represent a modification to the rubric without appropriate discussion.

One request had an estimated cost of $2,000,000 for construction. Although it did not seem realistic for PIE to prioritize a construction project that would be prioritized by the Facilities Committee and whose cost was out of alignment with the cost of any other resource request, we decided to retain the request with the others. The importance of relying on the agreed-to process was emphasized, and so we kept the request despite its size.

The facilities request raised the issue of other campus processes that may overlap with the work of PIE and prioritizing resource requests. For example, facilities requests could be referred to the Facilities Committee for
consideration and computer technology requests could be referred to the Technology Committee for their review and prioritization. We decided that these were questions that we could not resolve during the prioritization retreat, and need to be held over for further discussion.

We reviewed the VP’s prioritized lists. The Vice President of Student Services had 12 items, including both personnel and non-personnel. The Vice President of Administrative Services prioritized 10 requests, totaling an estimated $501,600. Later in the day after we had begun the prioritization process, we received a list from the Vice President of Academic Affairs which included 18 requests, unprioritized. For each list, we identified which item on the working list matched the same item on the VP list. This proved to be difficult in some cases. Office/Program was identified on the VP, Academic Affairs list that did not match a unit that completed program review. We identified several requests that are duplicates, and so they were combined. Some requests have already been met, and so were deleted from consideration. The combined requests were: 72 + 73; 57+58; 63 + 66; 75 + 71; 64 + 65. Request 69 has already been completed.

A. Taylor noted that there were several requests for computer labs and smart classrooms in a number of different divisions. She suggested combining the requests, and asking the Technology Committee to see if any of the resources could be coordinated or shared, and to fund requests accordingly. B. Sprague disagreed because some of the smart technology is not cross-college, but instead is specific to the needs of the division. In addition, he was concerned that the combined approach could potentially delay infrastructure issues. Further, it’s not the process we agreed to.

There was an item on the VP list described as ‘Consumable supplies for administration and instructional support’ with a cost estimate of $25,000. Since there was no existing resource request for this item, it was explained that the idea was to pull supply requests from appropriate existing resource requests, and pool them in a central account; Academic Affairs would then distribute the funds to the offices that needed them. There was support for the concept of this process, and so the new resource request was considered along with others. This budgeting process of establishing a pooled supply account that Academic Affairs manages may be a suggestion that should be pursued as a modification to the budget preparation process. If such a pooled account is set up, the expenditure items should be transferred to the divisions that actually use specific supplies so that historical data can be built up about where the needs are, and how they change over time.

Another process related issue was raised related to the responsibility for AV equipment located in classrooms. One office is responsible for the equipment, but another division is responsible for the classroom. It was clarified that the budget center for AV equipment and supplies should be the Library, which houses the media center, rather than the division to whom the classroom belongs.
3. **Identify 'High Priority Principle' requests.** R. Tillberg described the concept contained in the 'Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services' of the 'High Priority Principle' requests. These are requests that have extra urgency due to meeting regulatory or accreditation standards, or health and safety. This year there were 44 requests that claimed this status. R. Tillberg pointed out that we cannot know the accuracy of the urgency claims, and suggested that the group prioritize items regardless of urgency. Later when requests are funded, the Vice Presidents can determine whether or not a request is required by regulation or accreditation requirements. The group agreed with this recommendation.

4. **Prioritize 'Other' category.** We decided to prioritize the 'Other' category first. We also decided to follow the same procedure we used last year: Identify the top half of requests and then prioritize those requests.

   a. **Identify High Importance Items by Category.** We identified the half of the group that was most important in the terms of the rubric criteria and the vice president lists using a version of ‘approval voting,’ as follows: each person identified the 20 requests they thought were the most important. Then as a group we voted on each request. The requests were listed in order by the number of votes received. The group decided that requests that received 4 or more votes would move to the next phase of prioritization.

   b. **Prioritize High Importance Items.** After we selected the high importance group, we prioritized each item using the rubric.

   We conducted the prioritization on the first several requests as a group using the prioritization rubric. The rubric was translated into a worksheet designed by Agyeman Boateng, which facilitated recording committee votes and scores. Using the rubric together enabled us to refine our understanding of the rubric and how to apply it, and to standardize the way we applied the rubric to each request. We scored each request according to the six criteria related to Quality of Program Review and Resource Request, the other six criteria in Principles II, and the two criteria in Principles III. We used reports created from program review data to score the criteria related to Quality of Program Review; we used college planning and mission documents available on the web to score the other criteria.

   After we completed the group norming for scoring the requests, we broke into small groups to score the remaining requests. Michael Goltermann facilitated this process by defining three breakout groups and assigning members to each one. Each group scored 5-8 requests. Scoring worksheets were used by each person to record their scores. When all groups were done, all the results were combined and a final ranking was identified.

Throughout the Prioritization Retreat we identified areas for improvement and further discussion:

- Various planning and budgeting processes can be reviewed and strengthened
  - Establishing a base supply budget at the time of budget preparation
Establishing a centralized supply account for Academic Affairs
- Connection between facilities planning and program review and resource request prioritization
- Connection between technology planning and program review and resource request prioritization
  - Need for technology replacement plan
  - Need to assess campus-wide need for computer labs and for smart classrooms, and plan for this need
- Connection between personnel planning and program review and resource request prioritization.

- Use of the program review extended process can be improved
  - Fall workshops need to focus on goal setting, how to create links, use of the prioritization rubric, importance of describing how the action plan will be accomplished.
  - Validators in particular should be trained on the rubric so they can help ensure that their program reviews address the rubric points.
  - The initial program review, as well as the validation and VP prioritization phases should be streamlined
  - Norming on the rubric would help with the scoring process. Perhaps there could be a norming session prior to the prioritization retreat.

5. **Prioritize 'Permanent Personnel' category.** It was clear that we would not be able to prioritize the resource requests for permanent personnel during the Prioritization Retreat. There was not a felt urgency to these requests because the budget outlook for 2014-15 is very uncertain and K. Takeda advised us that the college is not in a position to commit to new personnel at least until after the May revise.

At the end of the day, we reviewed the resulting prioritized list and talked about next steps. The prioritized list needs to be approved at the next PIE meeting, April 2. The next Budget Committee meeting is March 20, and the draft can be presented there. K. Takeda will identify the amount of money available for use with the prioritized list. Both items can then presented to College Council at their next meeting on April 3.

Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Rebecca Tillberg.
Parking Lot Notes
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- Rubric might account for requests that have been made in the past (esp. multiple times)
- Clarify budget centers for a.v./smart classrooms, etc.
- Have PR authors review list of RR a.s.a.p.
- Hold an orientation session for those new to this process with homework.
- Norm the rubric
- Review V.P. priorities
- Provide PR reports sorted by RR/rubric
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- Fran/Dionne/Michael : 23-37(5)
- Ken L./Agyeman/Joyce : 40-55(5)
- Ken T./Norma/Carmen : 58-74(5)
- Rebecca/Alice/Bob or Shalmon : 76-125(8) 5/8 worst is half done
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- College needs to see and understand how needs are met and to what extent (including all funding sources).
- Validation should address High Priority items (confirm that they need what they say is required)
- Should VP prioritization include rationalities?

Poster Page 4

- Refine explanation of rubric points for II. 3 & II.4 (etc.)
- Solicit ideas for examples in program review to be put into the Handbook