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STAFF PRESENT:  Lydia Gonzales, Instruction
I. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES UPDATE

No report.

II. CLASSIFIED HIRING PRIORITY LIST

June Cressy reminded the council that President’s Council approved the Classified hiring criteria and scoring rubric. The next step is to develop a priority hiring list. June asked the deans for a list of current contract classified positions to compare with a list from Vice President of Administrative Services. Minou said that the instructional deans are working on developing their lists from department master plans and it will be done within two weeks. June anticipates that the Chancellor’s Cabinet will give a green light for hiring classified and the college needs to be ready. It was noted that Mesa and Miramar are hiring classified staff. Additionally, the decision to hire classified positions no longer resides with the Chancellor’s Cabinet, but rather with the College Presidents. June suggested that the college needs floater positions now that deans and faculty are spread out on campus. Minou said there are two lists, one for replacement positions and one for new position requests. June suggested the college compare our workload to other institutions. Lori Erreca reminded the group that the college does not have any vacant positions because vacant positions were defunded early in the budget crisis. Minou suggested that deans send position information to Randy so that it can be compiled. Minou said the deans will prioritize the positions in one of dean meetings. June agreed to send the rubric to the deans. Salley Deaton volunteered to put rubric in TaskStream.

III. PRIORITIZATION ALLOCATION RUBRIC (PAR)

Subcommittee is finished with the first draft of the Prioritization Allocation Rubric (PAR). The PAR is written to be used for any kind of request for resources. Salley said the PAR is a tool to determine needs and then it is up to administration to determine the best source of funds. Minou shared an early draft of the PAR with department chairs and Fred Julian said “make it easy”. Salley acknowledged Dotti for her hard work and input into the process.

The subcommittee said points differ in the “Essential” column because not everything deserves equal points. Salley explained further, some things that are campus-wide get 10 points, things that are department specific get 8 points.

The college has not had a consistent way of assigning resources to activities and departments. This is not just for reassigned time. Resource could be a person. For new events, we think people could come up with a benchmark to determine if the new event is successful, meaningful.

The council discussed who and when PAR would be used. The subcommittee recommends that PAR be used at the dean level. No one wants MPAROC to score the needs for other departments. It was suggested that department faculty submit requests utilizing PAR, department chairs and deans will
score and prioritize needs within the school. Deans negotiate with the respective vice president and the vice presidents and president agree on priorities and the best funding source.

Lori Erreca shared that the subcommittee knows that faculty know best what is needed for their programs so the deans honor that and we all bring it forward and box it out. Lori – the recent budget cycle is the really the first time we are addressing college-wide needs.

Susi Fontana expressed, in the spirit of shared governance, instead of management only decisions, a representative each from Classified Senate and Academic Senate should also be present during negotiations.

June Cressy asked the subcommittee members to define the term “resource” to include people and financial. Lori recommended the word “resource” be removed from each box or perhaps a one-page description of the how to use PAR should be penned. Susi asked if PAR includes people as a resource, is it circumventing our rubrics for hiring faculty and hiring classified. The council agreed to define resource (as it relates to people) as reassigned time and hourly staff.

Xi Zhang commented that some of the statements are positively stated and others are negatively stated. She recommended having consistent positive statements and agreed to edit the language. Xi further commended the group for the point scale. Lori shared that the subcommittee considered having a scale for each box. For example, a box worth 10 points, could an item be scored between 1 and 10? The subcommittee decided that doing so would not yield clear priority and it could result in multiple ties.

The council agreed that the definition for “student equity” is the definition given in the college’s Student Equity Plan. Doing so will allow faculty to use existing data when completing PAR. The definition needs to be included on the one-page information sheet.

The council agreed that not every need will be ranked in each box. 74 is the maximum score. We should try this out.

Edwin Hiel said that when a department puts their wish list into the master plan, it doesn’t go in as a package because the outcome this would be that everything would get a ten. The council agreed that each of the needs is scored separately. Every request will fit into one of the Planning boxes and both Outcome Measures and Assessment Measures will be required.

The council hypothesized needing to replace a digital print machine. PAR appears to indicate that replacing a digital print machine is a high priority.

Xi suggested that perhaps the needs ought to be categorized into tiers first and then use the rubric for each category use the rubric. First tier category does not go through the process. E. G. health and safety, institutional need. Denise suggested having a fast track for emergencies and health and safety. Minou agreed and thinks AED machines, digital print, and infrastructure needs could be in the top tier.

Helen said that when a request is at the point of assigning budget, there will be a place for rainy day needs. The funding source will decide what is purchased. Elva said that if there is a tier system she could get around the PAR system by letting equipment die, then it will surely be funded as an emergency. A tier system doesn’t allow for crisis management. Minou said biology cannot operate
without autoclaves, if autoclave dies and is beyond repair all of the sudden, it needs to be replaced. Elva responded that if biology faculty are doing master planning correctly, then the request for replacement should be in the department master plan before the warranty expires. Denise said that PAR is good for 98% of the requests. PAR is not an expeditious process and would not be used for the 2% of real emergencies, e.g. if the theater ceiling falls.

Susi will take this Chairs Cabinet on Monday. Lori reminded the group that PAR is not intended to tie our hands from doing the things we want to do, rather it is verifying the path we have taken in deciding how to utilize precious resources. She suggested MPAROC revisit next year how the college handle’s the 2% emergencies.

Send suggestions to improve PAR to Randy Barnes.

MPAROC recommended edits to PAR dated 4/29/14:
- Delete the bottom row
- Correction to PLANNING BOX – Add “Division Plans and Department Plans”
- Add “Need is clearly documented evidence to support the Campus Safety Plan or required to meet industry safety standard”