January 26, 2010
2:00-3:30, AC 108
Minutes

Present: Yolanda Bellisimo (Co-Chair), Ed Buckley (Staff Resource), Tom Burke, Nick Chang (Co-Chair), Win Cottle, Ron Gaiz, Mike Irvine, Peggy Isozaki, Sara McKinnon, Michele Martinisi, Nathaniel Parker, Nanda Schorske, Carol Scialli (Staff Resource), David Snyder

Absent: Jon Gudmundsson, Patrick Kelly, Sara Lefkowitz

Others Present: Aidan McWhinney

Welcome/Announcements
- Welcome to Aidan McWhinney, possible future student representative on PRAC.

Agenda Review
- Agenda approved.

Minutes
- Minutes of December 8 meeting approved.

Integrated Planning Timelines

Nick Chang & Yolanda Bellisimo
- Committee reviewed timeline of major activities.
- Sara continues to make changes to Program Review template.
- Program Review deadline moved to February 5.
  - Chairs and Deans can begin reviewing PRs now.
- Questions/Comments:
  - Administrative Unit is operating unit.
  - If Administrative Unit Reviews are response to instructional PRs, do timelines need to be adjusted?
    - Maybe stagger PRs so Administrative can respond.
    - Per Nanda:
      - Suggest informally go to departments and ask if anything should go in Administrative Unit Reviews.
      - Dean mentions department’s feedback in own PR in Deans’ comment section.
  - Administrative Unit Reviews would go to Cabinet then PRAC.
  - Will assessment of outcomes ever happen?
    - PR Committee received feedback about template and how things worked from last year’s comments. On basis of that feedback, Sara and Dong fine tuned template, an example of assessing outcomes.
  - Budget assumptions change continually; Peggy will provide updates to PRAC.

Program Review Update

Ed Buckley

Administrative Unit Reviews
- Program Reviews are on Internet for review:
  - Go to website.
  - Click on Institutional Planning.
Planning & Resource Allocation Committee

- Click on link, program review.marin.edu.
- Then, enter e-mail address and password.
- Some forms and questions were confusing.
- Each administrative unit required to have mission statement, major functions, connection to mission of college; request additional funding needed.
  - These needs will be extracted and Cabinet will filter, then go to PRAC from President with suggestions for general priorities.
- In Administrative Unit Review, must address evidence when asked how goals and objectives are measured.
- Surveys can be used as a tool to evaluate unit.

Student Services Program Review
Nick Chang
- Discussion about who is coordinating this, who monitors and who reviews.
- Suggest Dean of Student Development and a few others review the PRs.
- Point of review is to validate use of resources as effectively as possible.
- What is most effective group to do this? Group would need to have understanding of issues and review with quick turnaround time.
- Instructional Equipment would cover requests from Student Services.
  - Even though no money is coming from state, still can prioritize requests.
- People have to be assured there is outcome to justify their work.
- Decision is for SAS to look at Student Services PRs for all except budget. Budget portion would go to a PRAC subcommittee.

Instructional Program Review
Sara McKinnon
- Reviewed new Program Reviews; 23 disciplines submitted; another 23 have not yet submitted them.
- Kudos to Dean of Workforce—her folks did a great job.
- Worked with some departments who needed assistance.
- Program Review Committee will write review for department that does not want to do it.
- Discussion about adding additional box in template for administrator comments.
  - Sara will add another box to template for this purpose.
- Discussion about how to link PR to budget buildup when have complex budget, including grants. PRAC will be reviewing, prioritizing and make recommendations: what kind of process can we use that is practical? Suggestions offered:
  - Use instrument like (budget buildup tool).
  - Need to connect PR with regular budgeting; right now disconnected.
  - Problem because build up is wish list based on PR versus real budget.
- Goal in future is make sure one budget planning process.

Budget Survey
David Snyder
- Review of Budget Survey document. David met with Peggy for her perspective regarding possible questions we can ask other colleges for budget information. Possible questions with comments outlined in document:
  - Percent of budget used for IT staff; replacement of faculty and staff hardware/software; purchase of new technology; formula used when purchasing new technology.
  - Percent of budget used for facilities maintenance.
  - Supplies for maintenance & operations; instructional programs; non-instructional programs.
  - Use of Prop 20 monies.
Purchase of supplies for instructional and non-instructional departments; formula used.

Is budget online for anyone in college to view?
  - Micromanaging would be inefficient use of time.
  - Adoption budget is online but not fine grain budget.
  - Issue of transparency. With old budget tool, could view all budgets but not salaries. Some miss that transparency.

Peggy will bring printouts to next meeting of budget information that people used to have access to.

Ongoing Costs Task Group

Mike Irvine

- Task Group has not met yet because of Winter Break but e-mail has gone out to schedule a meeting.
  - Task Group composition: Mike Irvine, Peggy Isozaki, Patrick Kelly, Sara Lefkowitz, David Snyder.
- Find out from departments what items they have and what they have in Program Reviews.
- One tool might be screen shot showing what is spent at this time of year (discretionary like supplies and hourly employees) in all budgets for all areas.
- Purpose of task group is help us understand what are one time deals versus ongoing costs.
  - Many feel ongoing costs not adequately funded and are funded by one time money.
  - If can understand what ongoing cost needs are can make recommendations for ongoing costs versus one time costs.
  - Who would determine the priorities?
- Task group will come back with something in future meeting.

Committees

Ed Planning Committee

- Nothing to report.

Facilities Planning Committee

- Nothing to report.

Instructional Equipment Committee

- Nothing to report.

Technology Committee: Mike Irvine

- Making good progress trying to define what is needed in Tech Plan; going back to original strategic goals and relate to hardware/software, training and policy.
- Need a plan that would include ongoing costs, like software licenses.
- Right now will refer to past information to address these issues.
- Would some technological needs be addressed via Modernization?
- A recommendation to PRAC what be to advise what it would cost to put together a replacement plan.

Other

- Invite SAS to provide report to PRAC in February.

Meeting Wrap Up/Assignments

- Peggy will bring budget information noted above to next meeting.

Next Meeting Agenda: February 9

- Budget Updates (Budget Assumptions Update; Budget Transparency Tool)
- Student Services Program Review