Present: Rick Vrem (Co-Chair), Ken Fulgham (Co-Chair), Saeed Mortazavi, Judith Little, Greg Crawford, Wayne Perryman, Laurie Sheppard, Susie Dodson, Nancy Kelly, Carol Terry, Karen Earls, Randi Darnall-Burke, Lori Rudebock, Burt Nordstrom.


Proxies: Nicole Alvarado for Christopher Thomas.

Guests: Tom Dewey, Ralph McFarland, David Rowe.

A spreadsheet with the results of the vote on which items to eliminate from consideration was distributed. Asterisks indicate that the vote was for partial funding. In the tally, these were counted as “no” votes.

It was suggested that any item with five or more votes be eliminated, unless someone wanted to defend a particular item.

It was agreed that names of those who voted and how they voted would be made available, so that the voting is not anonymous.

Q: Can the amount of funding requested be discussed? The issue of partial funding was raised, an example being the Classroom Restoration/Rehabilitation (AD6).

Q: What is the intention now? What happens to the remaining items on the list? Are we prioritizing?

Other suggestions for decision-making included:

- The sum of the top two funding priorities for each division equals ca. $2.6 million.
- Look at the how many votes for items in each category (Diversity, Recruitment, Retention, etc.)

It was noted that the idea behind voting was to only reduce the number of initiatives on the list, so that a shorter list could be considered for prioritization. The listing by number of votes should not be viewed as a prioritization.

M/S/P (Crawford/Mortazavi) to remove all initiatives with five or more votes from the list. This removed twelve initiatives from the list.
Discussion of how to review the remaining initiatives included:

- Go through the list and vote for each item; the end result would be a prioritized list and extend beyond the $2.5 million available.

- Develop groupings of items by priority: high, medium, low.

- Rank the categories of initiatives (Diversity, Recruitment, Enrollment, etc.) and then prioritize under each category: Do Not Fund, Should Fund, Partial Fund, Must Fund.

- Spend the remainder of the meeting discussing and deciding on a methodology and vote in between this meeting and next week’s meeting.

- Discuss the proposals during this meeting and share ideas.

M/S/P (Crawford/Mortazavi) to review all items on the spreadsheet that received four votes and decided whether or not to keep on the list or remove.

- Information Technology Consultant (P4) – Remove
- VP for Advancement Staff Support and OE (UA1) – Keep (will look at removing other Advancement initiatives instead)
- Faculty Director of International Programs (AC12) – Keep (revenue from two new students would pay for this position)
- Classroom Restoration/Rehabilitation (AD6) – Keep (need to establish some funding on an annual basis)
- Director of Academic Support Services (SA4) – Remove
- Director, Learning Center (SA5) – Keep (noted that this is not a management position)

Items on the spreadsheet receiving three votes were reviewed:

- Training Associate (P1) – Keep
  Discussion: Not a direct service to students; results of a recent student satisfaction survey suggests that this is an area that is problematic; need more diverse faculty and staff as well as students; diversity is a major issue for students; need to acknowledge activities already occurring on campus that support diversity; could this be considered for one-time funding?

- Mentor Teacher Stipends (AC11) – Keep
  Discussion: Lack of stipends has caused some dissatisfaction among local K-12 educators; there has been some decline in local teachers offering their services; would this be a good use of a course fee? Can’t fiscally do; additional fees go through the Student Fee Advisory Committee.
• CMS Project-Operations and Training Support (AD5) – Keep
  Discussion: Is there overlap with other CMS funding initiatives → No, the three
  projects are distinct; CMS affects everything on campus, the current lack of
  training and reports impacts the campus in serious ways.

• Counselor/Psychologist (SA9) – Remove
  Discussion: This category overlaps with Health & Safety; keep in mind for the
  future, there is a long-term need.

Other initiatives removed from the list:

Graduate Student Recruiting (AC8) – this was removed because the funding that was
granted this year was not used and will be rolled forward and used FY05/06.

Hazardous Waste Program (AD7) – amount requested small ($2,400) and should be
found elsewhere; it was noted the money is for required re-certification of individuals
involved in hazardous waste removal.

Next Steps:

• Decisions must be made by next week and published to the campus. Carol will
  compile a list of the remaining initiatives and distribute for a vote. Committee
  members will vote “Yes” or “No” on whether or not to fund and will indicate full
  versus partial funding. Partial funding will NOT be considered low priority.

• In addition, committee members will rank initiatives in order of importance on a four
  point scale.

• Carol will gather information on whether or not partial funding would fulfill needs and
  what the break points are.

• It was agreed to rank all mandatory initiatives; the work is mandatory, the funding is
  not.