Strategic Planning & Budget Committee Minutes

November 19, 2014 – 3:00pm

Room: 9202

Chair: Guy Hamilton

Vice-Chair: Samira Pardanani*

Note-taker: Julie Bathke*

Administrative/Exempt	**Classified Staff**
Mary Kelemen*	Jennifer Carnahan*
Chris Melton*	Paul Fernandez*
Samira Pardanani*	Ann Martin-Cummins*
David Pinter*	Linda Weir*
Veronica Zura	TBD

Faculty	**Students**
Shana Calaway	Justin Collins*
Guy Hamilton	Ashley Cowan*
Ernest Johnson*	Heather Ellis*
Amy Kinsel	Konstantin Grinev*
Aura Rios-Erickson*	TBD

Ex Officio
Bayta Maring*
Stuart Trippel*

*indicates attendance

I.   Approve minutes from meeting on November 5, 2014

        Samira Pardanani opened the meeting. She noted that Guy was out of town at a conference.

        The committee approved the minutes from the November 5, 2014 meeting. MSP Linda/Chris

II.   Sub-committee reports with votes

        a. Strategic Plan revision

Bayta reported that the sub-committee had received some input on verbiage used in the Strategic Plan revision; however, the group decided to keep the wording in line with the Board's Areas of Focus.

The group unanimously voted to approve the revision as presented and forward it to ELT.   MSP Chris/Paul

Samira requested that the subcommittee work to define the difference between strategic and operational funding. This will be used to make determinations during the aSAP process.

Stuart added that it may be helpful to review last year's submissions to find some natural dividing lines.

There was also a discussion about the idea of a manual to document the strategic planning process and how it is tied to budgeting. The importance of a process that allows equal opportunity for all constituencies to access the funds was emphasized.

It was mentioned that a consultant will be helping the college with its long-term strategic planning process.

b. aSAP revision

Linda Weir explained the proposed aSAP process timeline and the slight revisions that occurred since the last meeting. All submissions will go through an initial screening process done by Guy and Veronica; Veronica will specifically look at any missing elements for personnel requests. The proposals will be sorted so that review groups will look at similar proposals. The idea of assigning "experts" to the review groups is still being worked out.

The subcommittee decided not to schedule hearings; instead, submitters will be allowed to respond to questions from the committee, which will keep a written record of all information. This will also allow submitters time to formulate a response.

Konstantin added that the original submissions will be "frozen," and the additional comments will be submitted online.

Linda noted that there will be advance communication to the campus so that people can anticipate the process. In response to a question about whether aSAPs will be for strategic funding only, she said that it will be up to ELT but hopes that it will be part of the communication.

Stuart shared that ELT is in discussions about a process for requesting operational funding and that it should not burden the SPBC.

Linda also shared that they are looking into having a built-in approval process within the submission form.

The group unanimously approved the timeline as presented. MSP Chris/Ernest

III.   Sub-committee reports/updates

a. Innovation fund

Aura reiterated that the subcommittee's proposal is to create a separate committee for reviewing the Innovation & Opportunity Grant requests. She added that Guy was going to look into this possibility and report back.

Samira said that, per Guy, a separate committee is not currently feasible, and the idea can be revisited in the Spring.

There was a discussion as to whether those in the Innovation Fund subcommittee would be exempt from the aSAP review process due to workload. It was noted that this may depend on the number of submissions received and that it would be a challenge to review all of the aSAPs with a smaller number of committee members.

The group discussed setting up a separate website with submission information, as well as communicating with the campus once the website and submission forms have been set.

Stuart shared the text of the Board Resolution that created the fund. It was noted that a return on investment is not necessarily monetary and that if something is good for students it will presumably bring more money to the college in the long run.

The group collectively revised the length of textboxes in the submission form.

The committee was asked to further share feedback with the Innovation Grant subcommittee in preparation for a vote at the next meeting.

b. Close the loop

Ann distributed a timeline for closing the loop on awarded SAPs. The subcommittee is in process of contacting fund recipients to request follow-up reports.

The group agreed that the Close the Loop subcommittee will review the progress and follow-up reports.

IV.   Open Comments

No additional comments were shared.

Submitted by Julie Bathke