



**Resource Allocation Committee
Thursday, December 4, 2014
2:30 – 4:30 p.m. – Room 1687
Minutes**

LPC Mission Statement

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.

LPC Focus Goals

- ❖ Equity
- ❖ Completion
- ❖ Excellence

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Support for the curriculum process
- ❖ Technology utilization with an emphasis on staff development
- ❖ Success and persistence through the Basic Skills sequence
- ❖ Accreditation

Voting Members: Quorum = 7

Position	Name		Position	Name	
Classified, Chair (non-voting)	Gerry Gire	X	Faculty, BSBA	David Everett	
Classified	Jennifer Farber	X	Faculty, ALSS	Cindy Rosefield	X
Classified	Cindy Balero	X	ASLPC Student	Keller O'Rourke	X
Classified	Janice Cantua		Dean	Dyan Miller	
Classified	Heidi Ulrech	X	VP Administrative Services	Jeffrey Kingston	X
Faculty, STEMPS	Ashley McHale	X	VP Academic Services	Renee Kilmer	X
Faculty, Student Services	Michael Schwarz	X	VP Student Services	Diana Rodriguez	X
GUESTS:		MINUTES TAKEN BY:		Sheri Moore	
Natasha Lang				Sean Prather	

1. Call to Order at 2:34 p.m.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda

Heidi Ulrech moved to approve agenda; Diana Rodriguez seconded; motion approved unanimously.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes – November 6, 2014

Jennifer Farber moved to approve minutes; Cindy Rosefield seconded; motion approved with two abstentions: Diana Rodriguez, Cindy Balero.

4. Old Business

a. Discuss and Recommend Ranked 2014/2015 Non-Instructional Positions

Committee found it difficult to rank the nineteen positions with an annual total cost of \$1,129,598. Some positions like the four Admin Asst. I's were identical and others like the new Dean and Admin II should probably be considered as a package. There is a clear need to fill positions but not enough funding. It was noted that most of these position requests were from previous cuts and are just being added back. The committee was reminded that its role was to prioritize the positions not determine whether they can be funded. Gerry Gire reminded the committee that they were

APPROVED

instructed to rank the positions from 1-19 with 1 as the highest. Although some members did not follow this direction fully, skipping some ranks or ranking several positions with the same rank, both Gire & Lang reviewed the impact and felt that it did not significantly change the outcome. However, next year, the data table will be set-up to avoid those duplicates.

Discussion ensued on the attempt to show extremes within one position ranking using standard deviation and somehow consider that influence or at least discuss the extremes. Gire suggested the better variability tool would have been the coefficient of variation. Schwartz offered that using the median (the ranking in the middle of the rankings) may have been a better separation of rankings in the top five places while McHale proffered that technically these positions are categorical types of rankings and therefore, governed by the mode statistic (the most frequently occurring ranking). While each of these ranking methods (using total points, means, medians or modes) made slight differences in the rankings, the top five positions ranked by total points still came out in the top five of most of these different ranking methods. They were clearly standouts from the remainder of the requests. Since the process was started using ranking by total points, the committee felt that the rankings would stand as total points. If the ranking tool were to change in the future, it should be done prior to the rankings not after, unless there was a significant error. Future considerations may include an analysis of extreme ranking differences and if another tool other than total points should be used to offset the extreme- total points, median or mode. The committee felt that the shared governance process worked and there was not a vested interest at the table on the positions.

Cindy Rosefield made a motion to submit the ranked list to the President. Diana Rodriguez seconded it. Discussion: Correct the division designation for #2014-19 Fiscal & Admin tech from Student Services to Administrative Services. Motion with the correction was approved unanimously. The President will get the prioritization and summary sheet which shows salary.

b. Assess 2014/2015 Non-Instructional Position Request Process

The committee discussed the ranking process and felt it worked. Gerry Gire asked for feedback on whether the process, not the outcome, was fair (i.e. "did it work") on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the fairest. Several committee members ranked the process as a 5 but felt we could also improve the process.

It was suggested that RAC do a process assessment using survey monkey allowing more confidentiality for the members and potentially send this to the community.

Items to include might be:

- 1) Were the time-lines acceptable?

APPROVED

- 2) How can the process be improved?
- 3) Do people feel that the process is too difficult such that some positions aren't even being requested?
- 4) Is it a conflict of interest for a committee member to make a presentation on their own position?
- 5) Can decisions be made on just the information submitted on the request and not need the dean presentations?

c. Update Non-Instructional Position Request form and

d. Update IER rubric & form

Suggestions for changes to the IER form/rubric:

- 1) Include on the request form possible other funding sources; some committee members felt that the committee's charge should not be influenced by the budget;
- 2) Include a date of request on the form;
- 3) Should safety/legal concerns be added back to the rubric?
- 4) If funds are not used within the timeline, indicate they will be lost
- 5) A completed purchase requisition must be attached to the request

Suggestions for changes to the Non-Instructional Position request form:

- 6) Include a date of request on the form;
- 7) Include LPC's Planning Priorities on the form;
- 8) Include a section on the form to describe how the position supports the Planning Priorities.

In general-

- 9) Review calendar; some committee members believe the calendar is confusing, others think it is clear.

Due to time constraints, the committee agreed that a survey on revisions to the equipment and position request form would work. A group was formed to begin in January to review the Instructional Equipment form. The group consists of Cindy Rosefield, Jennifer Farber and Gerry Gire. Jeff Kingston will review the form from the Administrative Services perspective to make sure it's in compliance.

e. Discuss process & evaluation period for previously funded IER reviews

This evaluation could support closing the loop for accreditation. Gerry Gire referenced an e-mail that Renee Pegues sent in November 2013 asking requesters to provide information about how the purchase impacted his/her program. Gerry Gire recommended starting with the nine pieces of equipment that were purchased in the Fall 2013. Requestors would be asked to briefly describe how the purchase impacted their program/students and how the process worked to get the item for your program.

5. New Business

APPROVED

a. **Clarify Procedure on filling replacement Non-Instructional Positions Budgeted on Position Control- funded vs. unfunded**

Need clarification on whether replacement and retirement positions are funded or non-funded and whether these positions go through the RAC process. Many requestors had questions about how to handle these positions or positions that had been left open, but were still on their organization chart. That clarification should be included on the web site and on the forms. Jeff Kingston and Natasha Lang will research position control and bring clarification back to the committee during the February 2015 RAC meeting.

b. **Discuss IPC Recommendation for College Council to handle budget Matters**

As an informational agenda item only, Rajinder Samra from IPC presented the background of the recommendation to the committee. Much discussion took place about the budget development process, the budget milestones, integrating and communicating the budget process, and the Budget Allocation Model. It would not change any information or input that RAC would normally receive.

6. **Good of the Order**

• **Classified Workgroup on Non-instructional prioritization process-**

Heidi Ulrech indicated that there are classified concerns on the non-instructional prioritization process. A group of classified staff have been meeting to discuss those concerns, document them, clear up misunderstandings on the process and to brain storm solutions. Their document went out to Classified Senate last month asking for feedback. It is on the agenda for January's Senate meeting with the hope to pare it down and see if there is an opportunity for change. She is planning to bring back the outcome to RAC for discussion and possible change in the RAC process.

• **RAC Chair reports on other activities**

- New Faculty Orientation- Gire lead a discussion on RAC's mission and procedures. With a strong group of new faculty, it was a very healthy dialogue.
- Integrated Planning Committee- is working on vetting new programs with steps and procedures for those programs. The Chair is looking to make sure there is some kind of allocation consideration included.
- Facilities- email communication between RAC & Facilities to clarify overlapping roles in new facility development. RAC's mission includes a review of relevant plans for equipment prioritizations in new facilities.

7. **Adjournment at 4:31 p.m.**

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