

President's Cabinet Review of Abbreviated Strategic Action Plans April 2014

BACKGROUND

This document summarizes results from the Shoreline Community College (SCC) President's Cabinet (PC) review of the college's Abbreviated Strategic Action Plans (aSAP). Deans and Directors wishing to request additional funds, either temporary or permanent, beyond their ongoing flatline budgets submitted these brief applications (aSAP's) indicating how their use of the proposed funding aligned with the college's strategic plans. For more information about Shoreline's ongoing efforts to align budgeting with the college strategic plan, please see the SCC Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee intranet website: <http://intranetnew.shoreline.edu/strategic-planning-committee/default.aspx>

The cabinet's review occurred after a review by the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee focusing primarily on how well each proposal aligned with the strategic plan. The Director of Institutional Assessment and Data Management served as facilitator for the PC review process, collating preliminary screening ratings, facilitating the in-person review, and analyzing voting results.

The attached spreadsheet provides summary data about all submitted aSAPs. Kerry Fondren served as note-taker, and notes from the meeting are part of the process documentation. Please see these notes for a complete list of participants.

PROCESS

The facilitator presented and revised the process described below over two successive cabinet meetings.

Screening

As a preliminary screening, members of the President's Cabinet were invited to review all of the aSAP's and rate them on a scale of 0 - 2 based on how strategic they considered the projects:

- 0: Minimally Strategic
- 1: Moderately Strategic
- 2: Very Strategic

Participants were given approximately 10 days to provide these screening ratings to the facilitator. Based on these ratings, 11 projects received low enough scores to be removed from the list of projects included in the in-person review (annotated with an 'E' in the attached spreadsheet).

In-person review

The in-person review occurred on April 22 from 1:30 – 5:00pm. The goals of the in-person review were as follows:

- To provide concrete, advisory information to the President to support decision-making related to Strategic Action Plans, including both quantitative and qualitative information.
- To provide documentation of the review process so as to increase transparency of budgeting decisions
- To provide comprehensive feedback from a representative leadership group.

One challenge faced by the PC in reviewing the proposals was that some of the aSAPs were submitted by members of the cabinet and some were not. To ensure that proposals from members of the cabinet were not afforded more extensive consideration, submitters were requested to remain tacit during in-person discussion about their projects. This rule was included in a list of “Ground Rules” presented at the beginning of the in-person session (presented in full below):

- Remember to take the college perspective, not just the perspective from your division or area
- Share opinions without a need to reach a consensus – part of the process is documenting differences of opinions as well as similarities
- Use caution when your project is under discussion -- not everyone is here to clarify, refute, or respond
- Recommendations will include questions for clarification, which may compensate for less extensive proposals
- Stay as focused on the topic as possible
- One person speak at a time
- Be respectful of the work put into all proposals
- Avoid arbitrary statement unfounded in data
- The final two items on this list were added by participants during the introductory phase of the discussion.

Given the limited time available, each project was discussed for 2- 10 minutes, with the facilitator requesting comments in response the following questions:

- What makes this particularly strategic?
- What makes this less strategic?
- What conditions, if any, do you think might be attached to this approval?
 - Funding
 - Clarification
- Other comments?

Voting

After the final session, participants were given 24 hours to provide their final votes about each project using the following guidelines:

- PRIORITY 1: Absolutely essential to fund
- PRIORITY 2: Recommend funding, but not essential to fund
- PRIORITY 3: Do not recommend funding

In addition, during the session, participants provided “Yes” or “No” votes for each of the proposed student fee changes.

Results from all votes are summarized in the attached spreadsheet.

PROCESS REVISION COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Process Revision

In considering the ballot results, it should be noted that strong concerns were expressed by multiple participants about the process as described below:

- The time-compressed discussion may not have allowed for adequate consideration of the projects.
- With submitters remaining tacit, much-needed expertise was unnecessarily ignored.
- Additional information and/or expertise was needed to inform sound recommendations; there were several instances in which members commented on the lack of sound information available.
- Although submitters were requested to be cautious in responding directly to their own projects, some submitters' supervisors were present to act as surrogates in the discussion while other submitters did not have anyone in that role, leading to inequity in the conversation.

Based on these comments, the following recommendations about process and next steps emerged:

- The facilitator committed to devoting upcoming cabinet meeting time to a full debrief of the process and revision for the following year.
- Extended follow-up for all projects will most likely be needed before they received funding, including clarification of strategic actions and possible budget revision.
- For many projects, particularly those in Groups B, C, and D, participants suggested ratings might be affected by additional information, such that final decisions about funding might be reserved until certain points were clarified.

Additional comments about the aSAPS in general were as follows:

- A number of proposals included budget anomalies or errors.
- It was difficult to know how to evaluate very small requests as strategic: if these small additions are absolutely essential to fund, couldn't they be fit into an existing budget?
- Proposals for permanent funding may need to include a built-in one-year assessment as a condition for approval – there was some discussion about whether this was in compliance with contracts
- There were three requests for release time for department chairs. The Dean Team needs to meet and discuss a consistent policy for funding these positions.
- There was some concern expressed about how projects were judged to be strategic. Specifically, some projects that were very closely linked to the strategic plan received low endorsement. If the strategy has changed, then the strategic plan needs to reflect those changes. If there are no changes, then judgments strategy seem not to be adequately tied to the strategic plan and based on other types of judgment.
- At times, it was difficult to evaluate the strategic value of proposals that involved funding of regular operations. There seemed to be two categories of proposals along these lines.

VOTING RESULTS

Based on final vote, the projects were separated into four primary groups (A through D in the attached spreadsheet). The sections below provide summaries of comments from Groups A through C, as well as information about voting on fee proposals.

Group A

The President's Cabinet showed fairly strong consensus on six projects. All members recommended the projects for funding (Priority 1 or Priority 2), and two-thirds or more ratings the projects as Priority 1.

ADVISING DIRECTOR

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-30 Division: Student Success Requestor: Kim Thompson Amount: \$225,685.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.85 Avg_BALLOT ¹ 1.93 % Priority 1 93.3% % Priority 2 6.7% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory (mixed) Rationale: Excellent Evaluation: Partial Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs more robust budget! Work out budget issues Adjust budget up to align with potential higher salary costs per budget office 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key to Dean Team retention plan Budget adjustments may be needed Integration/collaboration across all advising?

VETERANS' ADVISOR

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-25 Division: Student Success Requestor: Karen Ehnat Amount: \$74,441.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.77 Avg_BALLOT 1.93 % Priority 1 93.3% % Priority 2 6.7% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Excellent/Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory/Partial Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
NONE LISTED		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition of grant Veteran enrollment, retention, completion highlighted in strategic plan How many staff currently?

¹ For the purpose of comparison, participants' ballot ratings were converted to the same scale as the screening: Priority 1 = 2; Priority 2 = 1, and Priority 3 = 0.

INTERNET BANDWIDTH

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-41 Division: TSS Requestor: Gary Kalbfleisch Amount: \$47,400.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.46 Avg_BALLOT 1.80 % Priority 1 80.0% % Priority 2 20.0% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Partial Evaluation: Not clear Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
NONE LISTED		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic in terms of infrastructure and communication • "We have to do this."

STAFF WELCOME DESK

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-33 Division: Student Success Requestor: Kim Thompson Amount: \$10,323.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.31 Avg_BALLOT 1.80 % Priority 1 80.0% % Priority 2 20.0% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Partial Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Satisfactory/Partial Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore possible work-study funding first • Great use of engagement 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend a one-year pilot to assess effectiveness • More strategic to have hourly student instead of having administrative staff there. • Could be a central referral source, increase sense of belonging, enhance engagement

SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETER

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-28 Division: Student Success Requestor: Karen Ehnat Amount: \$50,000.00 14-15-28	Avg_SCREEN 1.69 Avg_BALLOT 1.73 % Priority 1 73.3% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Excellent Rationale: Excellent Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Excellent
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on hourly of pay needed • We have been complying. Don't see need to alter current budgeting. Perhaps we should look at several programs that are doing this. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongest alignment with stewardship • We will be compliant, question is how – this proposal describes a sound way to stay compliant • Need additional budget details (e.g., hourly rates)

WEB REDESIGN

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-19 Division: PIO Requestor: Jim Hills Amount: \$60,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.54 Avg_BALLOT 1.67 % Priority 1 66.7% % Priority 2 33.3% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Excellent Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spell out eval. w/ details • Additional details re: budget • Clarify contract amount • Justify why can't be done in-house 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Where else do people get information from the college?' • Strongly supports virtual college (strategic) • Additional details about budget & evaluation needed.

Group B

This second group of twelve projects included those for whom over 50% gave Priority 1 ratings, OR less than 7% (i.e., 0 or 1 person) did not recommend funding (Priority 3). In the attached spreadsheet, the projects are categorized as "moderate" meaning that only 0 or 1 individuals (less than 7%) gave Priority 3 rating, or "mixed" meaning that at least 2 participants gave a Priority 3 rating, indicating that the project might be somewhat more controversial.

ACCUTRACK

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-38 Division: TSS Requestor: Gary Kalbfleisch Amount: \$27,243.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.85 Avg_BALLOT 1.60 % Priority 1 73.3% % Priority 2 13.3% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Partial/Not Clear Rationale: Not Clear Evaluation: Partial/Not Clear Alignment: Satisfactory (mixed) Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial funding from assessment budget? • Key to moving to culture of measurement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application is very unclear about describing what Accutrack does • Explanation provided that it would allow student and academic service units track student participation – currently being done with pencil & paper. It also allows for "drilling down" into the data to explore which groups of students make use of which services. • Product was vetted – other options explored, it is expandable software. • Budget clarified \$20K one-time fee, \$3K licensing after that 	

COMMENCEMENT OVERTIME

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-31 Division: Student Success Requestor: Kim Thompson Amount: \$3,955.00 14-15-31	Avg_SCREEN 0.85 Avg_BALLOT 1.47 % Priority 1 66.7% % Priority 2 13.3% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Excellent Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 3 rating): Should be funded out of DSS operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Having a lot of people at commencement is important.</i> <i>People should want to attend.</i> Evaluation methods are unclear Clarification from HR about current practices "We pay legally, fairly, and comparably." Work at commencement is not part of planning work – it's an "add on," some question about supporting planning work. Classified staff have been so stretched: it's one time a year, small amount of money, the request indicates that it is needed. 	

50th ANNIVERSARY

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-16 Division: PIO Requestor: Jim Hills Amount: \$30,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.00 Avg_BALLOT 1.60 % Priority 1 66.7% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Partial/Satisfactory Rationale: Partial Evaluation: Partial Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund only with a defined, quick timelines as we are running out of time to do this! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to reach out to the community: party, celebrate, and capitalize on the opportunity Needs to be done before 51st anniversary! 	

PT & FT COUSELOR POSITION

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-34** Division: Student Success Requestor: Yvonne Terrell-Powell Amount: \$100,870.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.08 Avg_BALLOT 1.43 % Priority 1 60.0% % Priority 2 13.3% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Partial/Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Partial Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One part-time (Priority 1) • Partially fund (Priority 1) • One Part time we already have 1 ft & 2 pt • One full-time counselor only (Priority 2) • Condition: Counseling services are important. However, it would be helpful to provide more information re: best practices and study ways in which we can optimize the efficiency and extent to which we provide counseling as a college. This may already be done (I am not an expert by any means). For example, might there be levels of counseling we provide but also refer students to outside services? It would have been helpful to have heard directly from the department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No connection between this and advisor ask, but question of whether this projects draws focus away from advising. • Some discussion about the need for counseling and the college's role: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the college responsible for mental health counseling? No parallel in employee counseling. ○ Are there outside support services that could be utilized? ○ Strong affirmation of need for mental health professionals to assist with particular situations and student development ○ "Allows us to be better stewards to our students." ○ Need may increase once housing option available. ○ Counseling presence may reduce in liability • Is the need greater than what we have? • Diluting focus away from advising? 	

FULL-TIME MATH FACULTY

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-13 Division: Math Science Requestor: Susan Hoyne Amount: \$68,777.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.54 Avg_BALLOT 1.57 % Priority 1 60.0% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Partial Rationale: Partial Evaluation: Satisfactory/Partial Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important but not to level of Priority 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgeting question – need adequate funding for salary • Possible scheduling issues, timing of new sections • Some confusing/conflicting ideas about relation to SAI points • Discussion about need for full-time faculty vs. associate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need is there, is full-time faculty necessary? ○ Strategic by anticipating possible changing requirements ○ Difficult to find qualified associate faculty 	

CASHIER OPERATIONS

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-3 Division: Financial Services Requestor: Jennifer Fenske Amount: \$3,800.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.38 Avg_BALLOT 1.57 % Priority 1 60.0% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rationale: This appears to be something that the baseline budget needs to be adjusted to cover, not a "strategic" ask. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to stewardship "Seems like a basic bottom line need for the college." 	

ALL-HAZARD TRAINING

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-21 Division: Safety/Security Requestor: Robin Blacksmith Amount: \$23,651.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.54 Avg_BALLOT 1.53 % Priority 1 60.0% % Priority 2 33.3% % Priority 3 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Partial Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Satisfactory/Partial Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider need for college-supplied kits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Related to college stewardship Other possible funding sources? One year request – need for ongoing training. Possibly add assessment after one year to decide on permanent funding. Evaluation kits not included – funded by departments? 	

GYM STAFFING

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-1 Division: Athletics Requestor: Steve Eskridge Amount: \$41,790.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.38 Avg_BALLOT 1.43 % Priority 1 53.3% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Excellent Rationale: Satisfactory/Partial Evaluation: Satisfactory/Partial Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> explore other possible funding sources first (like SS & A fees) Safety issue Since this is a basic safety issue, it should be paid out of operations/maintenance funds. I don't see this as "strategic" but a basic need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitely need for additional safety in the gym. Clarification needed on code of conduct in context of campus policies Related to stewardship and in some ways all strategic initiatives Potential for enhanced student interaction. Possibility of funding from SS&A discussed 	

CAREER NAVIGATOR

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-51 Division: Workforce Requestor: Dan Fey Amount: \$56,400.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.54 Avg_BALLOT 1.33 % Priority 1 53.3% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Excellent/Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 2) could this come from earmarked \$? (Priority 3) alternate funding: workload balancing first? (Priority 2) explore existing workforce funding first per budget office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look to existing budget and staffing to accomplish the same objective. Possibly partially funded by SAI funds Need to check proposed salary related to other similar positions 	

ESL TEST PROCTORS

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-9 Division: International Education Requestor: Diana Sampson Amount: \$2,500.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.46 Avg_BALLOT 1.33 % Priority 1 53.3% % Priority 2 26.7% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory/Partial Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> why not use testing center recommend temporary funding to evaluate this and then decide on permanent funding in one year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification needed: how many proctors do we have now? What % of current students are taking tests Error in budget – no benefits Suggest one year assessment before made permanent 	

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-52 Division: Workforce Requestor: Dan Fey Amount: \$20,617.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.31 Avg_BALLOT 1.40 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 60.0% % Priority 3 0.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory (mixed) Rationale: Excellent Evaluation: Partial Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
NONE LISTED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification that the city is interested in renewing It is strongly related to community engagement. "It is a huge connection for the college with the city." 	

- Need clarification on timing of workshops, whether they are occurring now

THEATER ARTS MEDIA UPDGRADE

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-7 Division: Humanities Requestor: Kathie Hunt Amount: \$273,894.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.38 Avg_BALLOT 1.33 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 53.3% % Priority 3 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Partial Rationale: Excellent/Partial Evaluation: Satisfactory/Partial Alignment: Excellent/Partial Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Priority 1) Phased to 2 years? Partial upgrade? • (Priority 1) Partially fund • (Priority 3) Rationale: Cannot ascertain the need or the ROI on something like this. Need more information about impact and could be much more effective if there is additional revenue streams factored into this ask. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strategic related to community engagement • Could the budget be broken up over two years • New theater building part of Master Development Plan; media upgrade would work in a new building – some additional discussion about the state of the building which is "perfectly adequate" for what is proposed. • Is funding sustainable – continuous need for upgrades? • Budget error on salary

Group C

These 13 projects received between 20 – 40% Priority 1 votes (i.e., 3 – 6 individuals indicated they were essential to fund). They varied in the number of participants providing Priority 3 votes (from 13.3% - 66.7%), and, as with Group B were categorized as either "mixed" or "moderate" in their ratings.

FT FACULTY ABE/GED

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-6 Division: Humanities Requestor: Kathie Hunt Amount: \$68,777.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.54 Avg_BALLOT 1.33 % Priority 1 46.7% % Priority 2 40.0% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Excellent/Satisfactory Rationale: Excellent Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could we use CEO & Running Start \$ • Don't see tight connection with strategic plan. Can still serve these students with associate faculty. • Further information needed (FTEs for example). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another HS 21 position funded through previous aSAP • Possible funding from SAI • Strategic in addressing increasing SAI points • Clarification needed on whether there is increased demand • Noted that the state is emphasizing transition more strongly such that additional support will become necessary

ADDITIONAL PHONE NUMBERS

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-39 Division: TSS Requestor: Gary Kalbfleisch Amount: \$600.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.08 Avg_BALLOT 1.29 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 40.0% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 3) Should be funded out of TSS operations budget (No vote) Too low of an amount to be a "strategic" ask, in my opinion. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear why a permanent increase Strong concern about sinking money into a legacy system Is there are threshold at which you don't need to discuss strategy. If this funding is absolutely essential, it could be found elsewhere.

CAT 3 REPLACEMENT

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-48 Division: TSS Requestor: Gary Kalbfleisch Amount: \$33,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.08 Avg_BALLOT 1.29 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 40.0% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Partial/Not Clear Rationale: Not Clear Evaluation: Not Provided Alignment: Satisfactory/Partial Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify why this exact subscription is needed and how to evaluate Full funding may not be needed as eLearning student fees could help pay for the 1200 building, which houses eLearning staff. eLearning student fees as funding source? [no vote] Rationale: Operations/Maintenance funds seem more appropriate than having this as a strategic ask. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> eLearning funded 1200 building – if all faculty are using eLearning, could they fund FOSS as well? CAT6 is standard; somewhat "absurd" to be CAT3 Are faculty complaining about slow connections? Additional information needed before a decision is made

EMPLOYEE TRAINING CENTER

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-49 Division: VPASA Requestor: Bayta Maring Amount: \$20,867.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.69 Avg_BALLOT 1.27 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 46.7% % Priority 3 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Excellent Rationale: Excellent Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Excellent
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce budget - smaller screen? (Priority 2) Use of 15 times per month is very low compared to other labs. There are other labs available during off peak hours (Priority 2) Rationale: Further information needed: Could there be other reasons for the decline from 15 to 11?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant funding for 15 sessions/month Could allow for many types of employee training Currently could not be used for unsupervised student use 	

ADDITIONAL HANDSET CAPACITY

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-40 Division: TSS Requestor: Gary Kalbfleisch Amount: \$5,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.77 Avg_BALLOT 1.21 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 33.3% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Not Clear/Partial Rationale: Not Clear Evaluation: Not Clear Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 3) Should be funded out of TSS operations budget [no vote] Rationale: Operations/Maintenance funds more appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgement that this is a "band-aid" until a complete overhaul is feasible. Might have been nice to see a proposal for a more comprehensive solution – needs evaluation section to justify this option. This funding would allow for a physical "box" to allow for more hook-ups. Falls under basic operations/maintenance. 	

ADDITIONAL GROUNDS STAFF

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-2 Division: Facilities Requestor: Bob Roehl Amount: \$42,461.00 14-15-2	Avg_SCREEN 0.85 Avg_BALLOT 1.20 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 40.0% % Priority 3 20.0%	Strategic Objective: Excellent/Partial Rationale: Satisfactory/Partial Evaluation: Not Clear Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need further information on need. • Walk the north half of campus it is not well enough maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students choose Shoreline based on physical environment; feedback from student tours – feels like a small college. • Seems part of basic maintenance and operations • Could it be part-time? Noted that the time it takes to train work study and hourly makes it less strategic. • Additional comments about the unique selection of plants, representing all species in the Northwest. • Whatever is being done with limited resources is working – the campus is beautiful 	

FOUNDATION CPA AND HOURLY

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-4 Division: Foundation Requestor: Ann Garnsey-Harter Amount: \$34,793.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.77 Avg_BALLOT 1.00 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 20.0% % Priority 3 40.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Satisfactory/Partial Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NONE LISTED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on quid pro quo agreement between college and the foundation. • The question of whether the additional cost of managing funds should be borne by the college would be a condition of signing a contract even if the aSAP is approved. • Question of whether the additional staff could support the whole college; for CPA this level of skill is not needed anywhere else. • This aSAP represents an investment in the foundation, which will then be enabled to raise additional funds, and with the new building, much more funding will be needed. • Note that many funds coming into the foundation are restricted, so might not be able to fund these positions. 	

GAC SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-50 Division: VPASA Requestor: Larry Fuell Amount: \$1,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.08 Avg_BALLOT 0.93 % Priority 1 40.0% % Priority 2 13.3% % Priority 3 46.7%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory/Excellent Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Excellent/Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Excellent
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 3) Should be funded out of VPASA operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repeat of comments about whether this should be considered in the category of strategic Does fit with community engagement initiatives/goals 	

HEROES PEER MENTORS

	Ballot Results (moderate)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-54 Division: Humanities Requestor: Kathie Hunt Amount: \$7,494.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.17 Avg_BALLOT 1.00 % Priority 1 33.3% % Priority 2 33.3% % Priority 3 33.3%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about success from last year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was submitted on time, but in paper copy Aimed at population of focus in retention efforts Program open to all students: ABE/GED/ESL targeted Related to SAI points Addresses Access & Diversity most clearly of any other project Ample evidence that peer mentors work 	

IE AGENT COMMISSIONS

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-8 Division: International Education Requestor: Diana Sampson Amount: \$120,000.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.69 Avg_BALLOT 0.93 % Priority 1 33.3% % Priority 2 20.0% % Priority 3 40.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory/Partial Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially fund More information needed If college still wants to grow international student enrollment (as stated in the current Strategic Plan), this is one of the most reliable way of growing numbers... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly strategic – agents only paid if they enroll new students; there is also competition for students, so the agents are necessary for effective recruitment. Other aSAPs indicate that increased enrollment of International Students requires additional costs (e.g., remediation); Is quantity of students the sole goal? Additional analysis needed about strategic enrollment of international students Additional information about why this specific amount of money is needed 	

IELTS

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-29 Division: Student Success Requestor: Karen Ehnat Amount: \$36,806.00	Avg_SCREEN 1.15 Avg_BALLOT 0.87 % Priority 1 33.3% % Priority 2 20.0% % Priority 3 46.7%	Strategic Objective: Excellent/Satisfactory Rationale: Excellent/Satisfactory Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Excellent
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Priority 3) This will be difficult/impossible to make self-sustaining (Priority 1) Conduct market research first (Priority 1) Fund for two years and assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could yield additional revenue Error in action plan: 2015 instead of 2014 Testing at other sites may have proven untenable financially 	

TESTING CENTER ASSISTANT

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-27 Division: Student Success Requestor: Karen Ehnat Amount: \$19,838.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.69 Avg_BALLOT 0.71 % Priority 1 26.7% % Priority 2 13.3% % Priority 3 53.3%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Partial Evaluation: Partial Alignment: Satisfactory Action Plan: Partial
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Priority 3) Pursue self-support • [no vote] More information required. • (Priority 1) Further information about FTEs needed. Would have been helpful to hear from department that submitted this aSAP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Some comments regarding Testing Center Manager are included here] • Concerns expressed about the Testing Center's ability to remain self-sustaining and running a deficit each year. 	

EXTENDED DAYS

	Ballot Results (mixed)	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-10 Division: International Education Requestor: Diana Sampson Amount: \$35,636.00	Avg_SCREEN 0.92 Avg_BALLOT 0.57 % Priority 1 26.7% % Priority 2 0.0% % Priority 3 66.7%	Strategic Objective: Excellent Rationale: Excellent/Partial Evaluation: Excellent Alignment: Excellent Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Priority 3) Already have enough \$ to cover • (Priority 3) Table • (Priority 1) Fund only if consistency around extended days for all advisors at college is agreed upon. • [no vote] Dean team or union discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could existing advisors be staggered? • Questions and concerns raised about policy related to extended days for all advisors – were suspended at some point. This might be related to larger issues of advising reporting structure. • Additional questions raised about equitable services for all students. • Larger conversation may be needed to move forward on this. 	

Group D

Results about this group are provided in the summary spreadsheet. Additional comments about the in-person discussion can be found in the meeting notes.

FEES

Participants provided initial votes as part of their screening scores, and provided final votes during the in-person session. Below is a summary of the final votes, conditions/comments from ballots, and comments made during the session.

Parent-Child Center

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-54 Division: Fees Requestor: Darlene Bakes :	% YES 86.7% % NO 13.3%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Satisfactory Evaluation: Satisfactory Alignment: Excellent/Satisfactory Action Plan: Satisfactory
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> But concern regarding admin raise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about someone submitting for their own salary increase No other mechanism for this administrator to receive a raise; comparably lowest paid at Director level. Requests for increases come through every year. PCC reduced request from the student government and this request makes up the difference. 	

Student Music Fee Revision

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-55 Division: Fees Requestor: Kathie Hunt :	% YES 93.3% % NO 6.7%	Strategic Objective: Not clear Rationale: Not clear Evaluation: Not clear Alignment: Not clear Action Plan: Not clear
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)	Notes (from discussion)	
NONE LISTED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction has been running at a deficit; fees need to be fixed for private instruction to bring into balance. All students going through a degree must receive private instruction 	

Engineering Fee

	Ballot Results	Summary of SPBC review
Tracking #: 14-15-56 Division: Fees Requestor: Susan Hoyne :	% YES 60.0% % NO 40.0%	Strategic Objective: Satisfactory Rationale: Not clear Evaluation: Not clear Alignment: Not clear Action Plan: Not clear
Conditions/Comments (from ballot)		Notes (from discussion)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is clarification on what money is used for • Need significant clarification • Conditionally based on pending clarifications • Conditional if the revenue be clarified and it correlates to costs • conditional until revenue & expenditures are identified • Conditional on clear explanation of # of \$s and how they will be used. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear what the fee would fund. • All students going through a degree must receive private instruction