

Strategic Planning & Budget Committee Minutes

January 21, 2015 – 3:00pm

Room: 1402

Chair: Guy Hamilton*

Vice-Chair: Samira Pardanani*

Note-taker: Julie Bathke*

Administrative/Exempt

Mary Kelemen*

Chris Melton

Samira Pardanani*

David Pinter*

Veronica Zura*

Faculty

Shana Calaway*

Guy Hamilton*

Ernest Johnson*

Amy Kinsel*

Aura Rios-Erickson

Ex Officio

Bayta Maring*

Stuart Trippel*

Classified Staff

Jennifer Carnahan*

Paul Fernandez

Ann Martin-Cummins*

Linda Weir*

TBD

Students

Justin Collins*

Ashley Cowan

Heather Ellis

Konstantin Grinev

Alicia Lewis*

Guests

Dawn Vinberg*

*indicates attendance

- I. Approve minutes from meeting on January 7, 2015

The committee approved the minutes as presented. MSP Amy/Mary

- II. Close the loop update – submitted SAPs by 2014-2015 approved aSAPs

Guy reported that not all requestors who were awarded funds in the 2014-15 aSAP process have submitted a full SAP, which was due in Fall quarter. It was noted that this is important, especially if something has changed and needs amending.

The subcommittee will re-issue requests to those who have yet to submit a full SAP. It was discussed that an important part of the SAP was to see measurables, which is necessary for evaluation. It was also noted that while the awarded funds do not show up in FMS Query, the money is available.

III. Innovation fund update – new website and application “live”

The Innovation Fund website is now live and available. A timeline has been recommended by the subcommittee and is currently awaiting ELT approval.

IV. aSAP training sessions update

Guy reported that the training sessions are going well and that people are happy with the online format. It was clarified that the process is not open to all students, but student leaders can work on proposals with their director.

V. Discuss aSAP review process

Dawn shared some changes to the aSAP review process. This year there will be an opportunity for additional feedback from Dean Team as well as from the entire campus via open forums and an online survey. SPBC will look at both whether the proposals align to strategic plan, but also whether the idea will work and should be a priority for the college.

a. Categorizing the submitted proposals

The group had a brief discussion about categorizing the proposals but agreed that it was difficult without knowing more about the submissions. One suggestion was to categorize based on strategic goals; another idea was to group together academic positions, technology, etc.

b. Members of review sub-committees

The group discussed the potential composition of the review subcommittees.

Discussion points included:

- Balancing familiarity and advocacy of proposals
- Expertise of subcommittee members
- Use of the comments section to alleviate need for expertise
- Two reviews of each proposal
- A floating subcommittee, or ex-officio subcommittee members
- Potential change in subcommittee size
- Brief secondary reviews by entire committee

This will be further discussed at the next meeting.

c. Developing a rubric and ranking system

The group shared ideas about methods for evaluating and ranking the proposals. Guy suggested evaluating the proposals in two parts: whether they are strategic and whether they are realistic. There was discussion around potential verbiage of the evaluations; some members expressed hesitation around ranking the proposals and determining high vs. low value or priority.

The group further brainstormed some ideas for evaluation and scoring. Bayta shared a potential review sheet for the group to discuss. Guy requested that anyone with additional ideas can email him; the process will need to be finalized by the next meeting.

VI. Open comments

No additional comments were shared.

Submitted by Julie Bathke