

## APPROVED

 <b>LAS POSITAS</b> <small>COLLEGE</small>	<b>Resource Allocation Committee</b> <b>Thursday, February 5, 2015</b> <b>2:30 – 4:30 p.m. – Room 1687</b> <b>Minutes</b>
<b><u>LPC Mission Statement</u></b>	
<i>Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.</i>	

<u>LPC Focus Goals</u>	<u>LPC Planning Priorities</u>
❖ Equity	❖ Support for the curriculum process
❖ Completion	❖ Technology utilization with an emphasis on staff development
❖ Excellence	❖ Success and persistence through the Basic Skills sequence
	❖ Accreditation

  

Position	Name	Position	Name
Classified, Chair (non-voting)	Gerry Gire	X	Faculty, BSBA
Classified	Jennifer Farber	X	Faculty, ALSS
Classified	Cindy Balero		ASLPC Student
Classified	Janice Cantua	X	Dean
Classified	Heidi Ulreich	X	VP Administrative Services
Faculty, STEMPS	Ashley McHale	X	VP Academic Services
Faculty, Student Services	Michael Schwarz	X	VP Student Services
<b>GUESTS:</b>		<b>MINUTES TAKEN BY:</b>	
Natasha Lang	Bill Eddy		Sheri Moore

1. **Call to Order at 2:34 p.m.** Gire
2. **Review and Approval of Agenda**  
Switch agenda item 5b to 5a. Diana Rodriguez moved to approve agenda with said changes; Cindy Rosefield seconded; motion approved unanimously.
3. **Review and Approval of Minutes – December 4, 2014** Gire  
David Everett moved to approve minutes from December 2, 2014; Heidi Ulreich seconded; motion approved with one abstention.

**Introduction:** Claire Huestis was introduced as our new ASLPC rep, replacing Keller O'Rourke. She will not be able to arrive until after her class ends around 2:45pm.

4. **Old Business**
  - a. **Status on approved Fall IER's- need feedback loop closed** Lang

## APPROVED

Gerry commented that at College Council, Dr. Russell asked that a feedback loop be closed to update RAC on when requisitions were ordered. An update was given on the delay to the IERs from Fall 14. All requisitions were now being ordered or sent to Purchasing. Feedback to requesters and RAC on approved requisitions should be available within a couple of weeks after being signed by the President. Reminder: all IERs need a requisition submitted. The "R" number can be used to track the order. Jeff gave an overview on the different types of funding—bond, state, grant, and instructional equipment money and how they may have different qualifying definitions. A question was asked and discussion occurred on the difference between instructional equipment and supplies. This discussion should be included again for a future agenda item.

**b. Status on approved/recommended Fall 14 Positions**

**Gire**

According to Lydia Penaflor in HR, the part-time IT position is now in HR and expected to be posted the second week in February, pending her other assignments with contract increases and faculty hiring. The Campus Safety Officer has been written and is going to HR. There is an issue with the Athletic Trainer. The Stage Tech position appears to be held up in the Chancellor's office.

**c. Report & recommendation on funded vs. unfunded position process**

**& position Control**

**Kingston**

Due to budget demands in Administrative Services, this report was not available. There is a significant need to address a better definition of what positions should come to RAC. Questions which need addressing included- unfunded positions only, how long a vacant position is left open before it becomes unfunded, if the position still occupies a slot on the org chart is it funded, & how would requestors understand if the position was on position control and funded. Under "Request Process for Non-Instructional Positions" on the RAC web site is a working RAC definition that has been used for many years. It still needs fleshing out. Jeff indicates this is a college definition driven by position control.

**d. Discuss Non-Instructional Position survey results & next steps**

**Gire**

Survey was sent out to all RAC committee members in December with five questions. We had a 50% response rate. Gerry reviewed the results prior to the meeting with Rajinder Samra to see if the small number was still useful. He felt the "Were LPC Planning Priorities used?" response could be useful since it indicated a need for improvement. The other 4 questions seemed to meet or exceed expectations. The committee reviewed the results from the Survey of Position Ranking Prioritization Process (posted on RAC web site). Since the form is currently under revision, LPC Planning Priorities could be better incorporated in the request form. No other comments were made.

**APPROVED****e. Review comments received & act on IER request form and rubric Gire**

The committee reviewed the comments received and gave feedback as follows:

1. Include other possible funding sources- No, but include on website
2. Add date requested- clarify "Timeframe Request needed by \_\_\_\_" and add date of request
3. Safety/legal concerns be added to rubric- No
4. If funds are not used within the timeline, they will be lost- No
5. Add Completed purchase order must be attached- Yes & mention it in Sec. 7 Financial
6. Rubric- "limited evidence" of move points elsewhere- No
7. Same as 4
8. Approved IER feedback needed by when? Suggest adding a procedure page on the web site; need response within 2-6 months of installation/results

**f. Review comments received & act on Non-Instructional request form****Changes****Gire**

Committee feedback continued-

1. Classified Senate felt first couple of questions were relevant. Questions 5 and 7 were similar questions. Out of order of importance. Move salary and costs from top to bottom. Rank the need, don't necessarily take into consideration the cost.
2. Add Planning Priorities, etc.- No further comment
3. Combine Q5 & 7- No further comment
4. Move salary and costs from top to bottom- Yes
5. Change SD Review/Date to position not person- No further comment
6. Add an indicator of historical workload or change over time? This could be considered under "Why is this position necessary."
7. Add how many times the position has been requested- Yes (this could be relevant to rubric)
8. State categorically funded positions are info only & not ranked- No comments added
9. Add Entire college community is welcome to submit request- No comments added
10. Clarify signature lines as review & not approval- No comments added
11. Late requests to be penalized- No
12. Classified Senate should have review & input on request & rubric- Yes

Subcommittee (Cindy, Jennifer, Gerry) to continue working on this. Classified Senate wants to review any proposed changes. Would like a Non-Instructional Request rubric to correspond with questions on form.

## APPROVED

- g. Status on Fall 2013 IER reviews** **Gire**  
9 requests for feedback were sent out to seven different Fall 2013 approved IER requestors. Feedback from Mike Ansell on Organic Chemistry Equipment was received & reviewed by committee and noted as positive and supportive of the process. Others are due March 5.

## 5. New Business

- a. Classified Senate feedback on Non-Instructional Position process** **Ulrech**  
The Classified Senate Memo on the Prioritization Process dated Jan.30, 2015 was reviewed and discussed. The desire for increased communication to Classified staff and encouraged participation from the Classified staff in department meetings was clarified. A suggestion was made for RAC to include the status of positions on the RAC web site.
- b. Review status & discuss the development of a new position rubric** **Schwartz**  
The committee reviewed the Non-Instructional Request form and Mike provided the results of suggestions he documented during the RAC meetings. Ideas for consideration on the rubric:
1. Prior proposal been ranked or requested
  2. Funding source
  3. Safety
  4. Mission statement
  5. Planning priorities
  6. Accreditation survey results
  7. Accreditation standard
  8. Meeting institutional goals
  9. Replacement position vs. new position
  10. Get position into position control; screening process to see if it's in position control
  11. Does president decide based on our ranking and position control
  12. Should presentation itself count(deans, requesters, etc.)- Members felt strongly NO
- c. College Council requests- dates, running list, courage to not send forward** **Gire**  
Due to a fire alarm in the building, the meeting was disbanded at 4:25pm with items 5c and below not discussed.

## 6. Good of the Order

## 7. Adjournment

**Next Regular Meeting: March 5, 2015**  
Room - 1687  
2:30 -4:30 p.m.