1. Approval of Minutes of February 27, 2015 Meeting  
m/sc Slattery-Farrell/Searl-Chapin  
Moved to approve the minutes of February 27, 2015.  
Motion passed.  
(The minutes were addressed following agenda item 2a – waiting to reach quorum)

2. Resource Allocation  
RAP/PAR  
a. RAP/PAR Update  
Paul – we are in the process of scoring 50 RAPs. We have 3 RAPs from the Business Service sector, 9 from Student Services and 38 from Instruction. We have about 35 people scoring including 2 students. Most of the volunteers are scoring between 4-6 RAPs with a deadline of May 1st. Paul will meet with those scoring the RAPs if they need help. So far so good.

Rebecca – the results will go to the next budget committee meeting which falls the week before the board meeting and then to IPC the following week.
b. Personnel Prioritization (RAP) Modified Submission Timeline
Roger – We would like to propose to have personnel prioritization become a new process and have this come forward in alignment with the faculty hiring. Rebecca – there was conversation during the trainings and admitted confusion with staff wanting to know if the RAPs would be scored for personnel this cycle. We gave everyone a yellow light and said to proceed with caution because we didn’t really know. We then felt that it was unfair because if some decided to error on the side of waiting they would miss out on an opportunity, if in fact some personnel items were filled. So we recommended that we push the RAP for personnel to the fall and remove it from being scored during the spring cycle. This would allow everyone to have a level playing field and be advised of the criteria and measurements. It also coincides with the faculty hiring and gives us a better indication of where our budget is for next year. We will use the summer to build in that structure, have it ready and know how we will integrate it into the process.

c. Personnel Hiring Prioritization Development and Integration Ad-Hoc
Roger – this is a complex issue, the classified side of the house isn’t as straight forward as the faculty. There are a whole host of areas that need to be looked at and even with a rubric it is going to be difficult. We want to try and have an informed process that provides information. At the recent CEO conference he found that some institutions work off a recommendation to the cabinet and it looks like that is where we are headed because there needs to be greater latitude with the operational purview and the management of the District from an administration standpoint. We still want to honor the process so that it is informed. What we want to do is to come up with an ad-hoc committee to work on it so by the time we get to fall we will have a good process. A process that we will be able to pilot and have people feel they have an opportunity for input and a good chance to be funded. We need to discuss what size the group should be. Fred, Lorraine, Stacy, Dawn volunteered to work on the committee.
Roger – these cannot be hard set numbers, it will depend on the budget and we will look to recommendations from the budget committee to frame the discussion going into the fall.

Becky – agreed and believes the ad-hoc task force needs to look at it much like what we do with the faculty, looking at the budget and data to determine how much revenue we can earmark for positions. We need to look at the compliance element, the affordable care act, the technology advancements, new buildings and new sites that impact that discussion as well as overtime actuals. Many of our areas do regular overtime that provides the data that tells us we really need to review that area for enhanced staffing. In joint hiring we determine how much money and how many. The discussion then moves to which disciplines. In that same regard after we determine the budget for classified we would determine which department and which positions because the dollar amount will only go so far depending on the position.

Rebecca – you may want Nik in that conversation to see how we can quantify whether a positions is because of enrollment increases or site specific changes or scheduling or the data relevant to all of those components which would help inform the staffing plan.

Fred – we may want to look at positions we elected not to refill during the tough economic times and would those that we need to rehire get a special consideration. Union issues may be involved.

Roger – it would need to be data driven but Fred has a good point and that is why people need to be informed of the process and how the scoring will be applied.

Rebecca – the ad-hoc committee would not only come up with the tool to recommend the priority but it has to show how it fits into our planning process, what other bodies are involved or at what point do they become involved in the process.
Roger – asked to include Jeannine Stokes from HR to be on the committee.

Dr. Pat – this will not be an easy task. We need to identify the kinds of triggers that will indicate a lack of personnel in a particular area. The problem is that there are so many different areas within the classified staff and it is not easy to compare them. We really need to look for the objectives that will indicate the need for staff. There are certain areas that garner an immediate level of support from people over other areas and those that support the institution. As an example, janitors can’t compete against those more obvious areas.

Brian – maybe we could use a locally defined metric. We have to define our performance indicators in our program review. If we can allow those performance indicators to be included and have that be a metric that is scored on the rubric, perhaps that helps level the playing field. We would have the mandates like safety, the strategic plan and the program review performance indicators as part of the rubric.

Roger – is this the time to look at a multi-year list creation or come up with a rolling 2 year cycle?

Stacey – we started that with faculty and they will revisit it but it doesn’t guarantee anything.

Rebecca – we will do this for next year where people received a score but were not funded. If they were satisfied with that score they could just resubmit for the following year. They are allowed to revise and update.

Roger – we will ask the committee to come up with some criteria for a multi-year, 2 year cycle.

Rebecca – the team is Fred, Lorraine, Dawn, Stacy, Nik and Rebecca

Becky – asked to have Julie Venable added to the team.
3. **CCSSE and Faculty Engagement Survey**  
Rebecca – 55 sections were targeted, more at MVC but some at SJC, SGP and TEC. As of last week, there were 10 faculty members that have not responded but they have been notified. Overall, everyone has been very helpful and wanted to participate. Half of the surveys have been sent to CCSSE and we are waiting on the next half to be completed by May 5th. We actually had over 18 staff members go and sit in the classrooms for an hour and disseminate the surveys, go through the script, collect the surveys and answer any questions the students might have. The faculty participated in the survey administration so it has been a team effort. She hopes the survey completion rates will be very high. CCSSE will send the information back and we will work on disaggregating it based on student identifiers.

The faculty engagements survey will be released to all faculty, fulltime and associate, on April 27th. Dr. Pat sent out an e-mail alerting them that it is coming and that it is a voluntary 30 minute survey to complete online. CCSSE will communicate with us daily on the participation rate and if we are not responding she will work with A/S to get a word of encouragement out. We will provide reports off the data and copies will be available.

Rebecca – we submitted the Annual Financial Report. Julie Venable did a fabulous job presenting it to the Board of Trustees. We also submitted the Annual Report that will be used when the ACCJC reviews our status in 2018.

Lorraine – she would like anything that involves faculty to run through the Senate as an information item so they can document that they have seen the report and are aware of the content.

Rebecca – none of this is new. The only area that would be new is in regards to the Substantive Change Report and that report at this institution is based on what has already happened and is completely faculty driven.
5. **Institutional Set-Standards**
Rebecca – just an FYI – you need to be aware of these standards. In the Annual Report and through IPC we set Institutional Set Standards for a variety of performance indicators. They didn’t change for this cycle. We take a five year average. The standards are lower level, they aren’t aspirational and we never want to fall below these levels. If we do fall below, we must create an improvement plan for ACCJC outlining our steps for progress. The institution may set standards on anything we would like. We embedded the Institutional Set Standards, developed through IPC, into program review so everyone could look at all of the different rates and measure against the district’s average and our institution set standards to have a dialogue if a course was below the standard.

Brian – what would be the mechanism to add, modify or remove a standard?

Rebecca – ACCJC has several set standards that you can’t change or remove but the institution has complete freedom to do whatever they would like with the others. We ask that it goes through IPC for discussion and you will be held accountable for anything that is set.

6. **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative – Presentation and Review of Key Indicators**
Rebecca – the Chancellors Office has created an Institutional Effectiveness Division. They have created this initiative and received $2.5M to do an initiative with all 112 colleges to minimize the number of institutions going on accreditation sanction. This is to help us improve our overall effectiveness as an institution and create this lobby to get 112 institutions to commit to endorsing, adopting performance these 18 indicators (handout). These are aspirational rather than floor metrics and they want it done by June 30th. We just received training a month ago. Out of the 18 they want the institutions to adopt 4 (course completion rate, accreditation status, fund balance, overall audit opinion/unqualified). These are pretty easy except for the course completion rate where we will need to have a good dialogue before the June 30th deadline. It must also go to the Board prior to the June 30th date. It’s good for those
institutions in need of this assistance but she doesn’t believe we are at that point at this time.

Roger – so what is our timeline? Can we come back to the next meeting to adopt this and get it to our board on time? He would suggest we have an ad-hoc committee and would like to thank Lorraine, Stacy, Nik, Brian, Brandon and Rebecca and Michelle Stewart for volunteering.

Fred – let just make the floor also our ceiling and not get too ambitious. Rebecca – we just found this out and we will need to provide information on this to the Board. The Chancellor’s office has created the portal and has all of the tools ready for use. Every measure we create has to go to the Board for approval.

Rebecca – we need to set baselines for our goals and objectives to verify we have continuous quality improvement.

Roger – this ad-hoc committee will include the same group as above: Lorraine, Stacy, Nik, Brian, Brandon and Rebecca and Michelle Stewart.

Lorraine and Stacey – they participated on the Strategic Plan but were left off the list in the final document. Rebecca will update the website.

8. Other Information/Updates
Becky – the Board will hold a Special Meeting on April 30th to discuss the Measure AA projects for Series A, the first $70M issuance. The Trustees were eager to have their input on the prioritization plan. We will talk about the CEQA, the implications on the projects and the projects we are able to start now for the next 3 years.

Roger – people will need to understand that the litigation, some of the laws, and the changing dynamics of not having state facilities matching funds available have really held us back. This lawsuit has slowed us down in regards to building until we clear the CEQAs. But, perhaps this will let the state funding catch up to
us. Meanwhile, we will do some of the infrastructure, remods, safety issues and move towards solar projects that won’t trigger CEQA. On the SJC campus we had the cultural arts center prioritized first but with the uncertainty of state funds and the cost of that facility our recommendation will be to flip that building with the math/science building to be the first on SJC. The item for MVC will be retrofitting of the 3000 building. It will allow us to create a lot of additional instructional space.

Brian – ICTC and ETC are having discussions on technology standards and will develop standards documents to be taken through shared governance.

Fred – he would like to be included in the conversation regarding new facilities to represent the campus ADA issues.

9. Next Meeting – May 19, 2015

10. Adjourn
m/s Slattery-Farrell/Searl-Chapin
Moved to adjourn.
Motion passed
Adjourned 3:30