



SANTA ANA

C O L L E G E

Santa Ana College

Planning & Budget Meeting

December 6, 2016



THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE is the participatory governance committee responsible for recommending budget priorities, procedures, and processes to the College Council. The Planning and Budget Committee also functions as a community liaison for fiscal affairs with the college community.

Santa Ana College Participatory Governance Structure Handbook

(May 27, 2015)

Agenda

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | |
| 2. Public Comments | |
| 3. Approval of Minutes for November 1, 2016 | ACTION |
| 4. Budget Update | INFORMATION |
| 5. Enrollment Update | INFORMATION |
| 6. Student Update | INFORMATION |
| 7. SACTAC | INFORMATION |
| 8. Accreditation | INFORMATION |
| 9. Old Business | |
| • One-Time Innovation Grant language | INFORMATION |
| 10. New Business | |
| • Technology Inventory Report/Upgrade Planning | INFORMATION |
| • RARs Assessment Survey | INFORMATION |
| • Campus Wide Furniture needs | INFORMATION |
| 11. Future Agenda Items | |
| 12. Other Business | |

Next Meeting – February 7, 2017

The mission of Santa Ana College is to be a leader and partner in meeting the intellectual, cultural, technological and workforce development needs of our diverse community. Santa Ana College provides access and equity in a dynamic learning environment that prepares students for transfer, careers and lifelong intellectual pursuits in a global community.



The mission of Santa Ana College is to be a leader and partner in meeting the intellectual, cultural, technological and workforce development needs of our diverse community. Santa Ana College provides access and equity in a dynamic learning environment that prepares students for transfer, careers and lifelong intellectual pursuits in a global community.

Administrators	Academic Senate		CLASSIFIED	GUESTS	
Mike Collins, co-chair	Ray Hicks co-chair	John Zarske	Omelina Garcia	Esmeralda Abejar	Teresa Mercado-Cota
Jim Kennedy	Elliott Jones	Monica Zarske	Denise Hatakeyama	Madeline Grant	TingMing Zhang
Carlos Lopez	Brian Sos	George Wright	Jimmy Nguyen	Jose Andrade	
Lilia Tanakeyowma	Student Rep.		Leslie Wood-Rogers(a)		
	Viridiana Munoz(a)				
1. WELCOME				Meeting called to order 1:34p.m. Meeting adjourned – 2:58p.m.	
	Self-introductions were made.				
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	There were no public comments				
3. MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	The meeting minutes were presented for approval: October 4 were presented for approval			<u>ACTION</u> Motion was moved by M. Grant to approve the Oct. 4, 2016 Planning & Budget Committee minutes. 2 nd –J. Nguyen The minutes were unanimously approved.	
4. BUDGET UPDATE	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	State Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STATEWIDE BUDGET UPDATE - The Department of Finance (DOF) recently reported that state General Fund revenues are down \$217 million for the first three months of the fiscal year. The 2015-16 fiscal year ended \$706 million short of the May Revision forecast; therefore, the beginning fund balance for the current fiscal year will be short by that same amount. Thus, combining the 2016-17 year-to-date shortfall of \$217 million with the shortfall in the beginning fund balance of \$706 million, revenues are off \$923 million compared to the May Revision forecast. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With this bad revenue news, good news still exists related to our State’s strong economic indicators. SAC is taking this information as a reference point, not a conclusion, in order to plan our on-going expenditures into the out years. We track this information monthly as we do our cash flow and budget planning activities. Members watched a State wide update video. 				

BUDGET UPDATE (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>District Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BAM Assessment/Evaluation is occurring in FRC. • SAC BAM “RESERVES CAP” - Regarding the FRC BAM language analysis “taskforce”, Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Collins were asked to develop draft language related to a potential “college reserves cap” for consideration by FRC. It will be discussed in concept today at the SAC P&B meeting, and then will be discussed in FRC pending any concerns noted by the SAC P&B committee. <p>After any draft language is discussed by FRC, it will be sent back to SAC P&B Committee for further discussion and financial situational analysis.</p> <p>SAC Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIRST QUARTER BUDGET PERFORMANCE- The first quarter of the SAC budget performed well, and is under budget by about 8%. This is to be expected as the first quarter includes the summer and our instructional expenditures are not at normal levels during this time. We are tracking our cash flow very closely month-to-month. • INCREASED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLY ALLOCATION- This FY we have increases to our instructional supply (lottery) allocation from the State (approx. \$56,000), which has been provided to VP Academic Affairs. VP Lopez is working with the divisions to allocate the additional supply funds as needed. • FUNDED RARs (with account strings) have been sent out to all the divisions for FY 16/17. This early approval allows the divisions to finalize their quotes, produce the requisitions, order the equipment/technology, and receive the items that they have requested quickly in order to best serve our students’ needs. Funded RARs for 16/17 are posted on the Planning and Budget webpage for college review. • DIVISION BUDGET PERFORMANCE- SAC Budget office is currently analyzing the extent as to which each division expended their budget in FY 15/16. This information will lead Academic Affairs in assessing division funding levels, and planning for the out-years in a sustainable manner. • SAC PERSONNEL GAME PLAN- At this point, the college has funded all the personnel additions and reorganizations that have been discussed in SAC Planning & Budget, and approved in College Council. • SAC TAC/Archana/John Tran are working to complete a revised inventory of all computers on campus, as well as our mediation needs. SAC classrooms are currently 85% mediated (exceeding the 80% performance goal outlined in the SAC Strategic Plan for year-end 2015-16) so a plan is being developed to bring this to 100% in FY 16/17, as well as to update aged equipment. • DIST CREDIT CARDS- The college has audited and updated our Home Depot credit card list to include only necessary holders of the card, and having the employees sign an acknowledgement of their responsibilities related to the card. Dr. Collins has met with all the deans. 	

BUDGET UPDATE (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● INSTRUCTIONAL FURNITURE - Dr. Collins currently working with VP Lopez to determine which buildings/classrooms need immediate upgrades to instructional furniture. Carlos has worked with the deans to determine what seats/tables the deans would like to try out (in alignment with what we are looking at for the Science Center), and Dr. Collins is walking with a vendor on Nov. 1 to measure out specific rooms identified by Carlos and the deans. Dr. Collins will then place the order (using Fund 13) for 7 new classroom sets of “tablet-arm-like” chairs, and 2-3 classrooms of lecture desks and chairs...most likely in D building and R building- where the need appears to be the greatest. We will then gather feedback from the faculty and students, which will guide us in another purchase in the spring (Fund 13), as well as our long-term needs in the Science Center and Johnson Student Center. 	
5. ENROLLMENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>The college is experiencing significant enrollment challenges. SCC is down 2.3% and the District overall is down 3.3%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fall Credit is down 61 FTES (about 1%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public Safety curriculum has not been as versatile or flexible as in the past that has created a gap. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes are being made to the curriculum to provide our training partners more versatility. ▪ There is a projection that the college will be able to generate close to what was generated last spring. ○ The Police Academy performing well with an additional class running. ○ The college is investing in the schedule for intersession and spring focused on high demand classes. ○ Given all the factors, Vice President Lopez estimates that the college could end up being down in the 3% range. ● Non-credit down 84 FTES (about 10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No longer receiving apportionment from the Academic Computing Center which accounts for about 5% of FTES in non-credit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dr. Kennedy noted that while this is a huge hit to non-credit, there are plans to utilize the center in supporting students in the spring. ○ The college’s 3rd largest non-credit site is experiencing a significant challenge as well as some of the other sites. ○ Dr. Kennedy noted that if things continue in the same pattern, non-credit could end up down possibly 7%. However, he and his team are committed not to let that happen and if the plans that are in the works come to fruition, non-credit could end up in the 3% range. <p>Vice President Lopez discussed Stabilization and what it could mean for the college. In additions he shared the following strategies to come back from it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grow Online Education. 	

ENROLLMENT UPDATE (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The college has begun doubling the training and certification for both and full-time faculty. o Allows for the flexibility to add more online sections. • Looking to additional sections for Intersession and spring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The waitlist data from this spring and last Intersession to ensure that courses offered are courses that students need. • The college is also involved in a major Dual Enrollment Initiative with SAUSD. This initiative will help with the high school capture rate. • Members were advised that the county is set to lose more K-12 over the next 10 years, however the overall population in OC will continue to grow. Vice President Lopez noted that this could provide an opportunity for the college to re-focus on populations that the college haven't sought out in a major way such as the working adult population. <p>Members were reminded that it is important for the college to have one-time funds to allow for one-time opportunities that allow the college to market and compete for FTES and maximize the student experience. The importance of marketing SAC's programs and faculty was stressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an inquiry if funds were available to allow divisions to show videos and showcase their programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It was noted that funds have been set aside in the carryover balance to improve and revitalized the college's home page, the next step will Admissions and Records page. o Members were advised that student input and analytics are providing information to the team on what works best for our end users and how the pages are currently being navigated. o Videos can be uploaded to the division pages. Members were advised that all videos must be ADA compliant. o Student focus groups will be invited to provide input once there are a couple of website mock ups to review. <p>It was recommended that the SAC Outreach team be included for input.</p>	
6. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	No update.	
7. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>The following was reported on behalf of SACTAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee reviewed and provided input to the RSCCD Technology Plan. • The college Mission Statement was reviewed. • Minor updates to the SAC Technology Plan were made. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Those updates will be presented to the Academic Senate and will move forward to College Council. 	

8. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Dr. Bonnie Jaros met with the members and explained that work is now underway on the Educational Master Plan and the Mid-Term Report. This work requires that the college mission statement be reviewed. The review of the mission statement be aligned with the new June 2014 Accreditation Standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current mission statement was provided to the members as well as the new Standard 1: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness. • Members were asked to focus on the 4 elements of Standard 1A. Mission as they considered revisions. • The members were advised that as they discussed each element, Dr. Jaros would note their input and integrate it into a chart. Input from each of the participatory governance committees will be included in the chart. Once the chart is completed the information will be provided back to the committee. • The chart would be shared at a Mission Statement Review Session in the spring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o At the review session, a statement will be created. o The statement will then be presented to all constituencies for approval leading to final approval by the Board of Trustees. 	
9. OLD BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>One-Time Innovation Grant language The language will be emailed to the committee for discussion at the December 6, 2016 meeting. Any revisions or edits should be provided to Dr. Collins prior to the December 6 meeting.</p>	
10. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>SAC 17/18 Budget Priorities The membership was presented with the approved 16/17 Budget Priorities for review and recommendations were made for the 17/18 Budget Priorities. Members were reminded that the budget priorities are a critical component of the budgeting process. Discussion ensued and recommendations were made.</p>	<p>It was moved by L. Tanakeyowma to approve the 17/18 Budget Priorities as presented with the addition of the following: FTES Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under #2 – add Online Instruction and Course Management Support System. • Add #3. Marketing 2nd – E. Jones <p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
	<p>Budget Performance Report The quarterly cash flow report was presented and reviewed by the committee. It was reported that the report reflects at 8% under budget. Members were reminded that the college’s instructional agreement funding has not been expended in proper proportion as well as in July and August there are limited instructional salaries that are paid.</p>	

NEW BUSINESS (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>RARS Esmeralda Abejar provided the membership with a summary of the RARs for 16/17.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$771, 847 was allocated from Instructional Equipment. • \$59, 250 in additional funds were allocated for Instructional Supplies from Lottery funds. • \$40, 290 was allocated from Fund 11. • \$1,467,486 was allocated from Fund 13. <p>She noted the following additional allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$70,000 was funded from Instructional Equipment for equipment repairs. • \$356,039 from Fund 13 for FTES based allocation for discretionary division needs. • \$80,000 from Fund 13 for Innovation Grants <p>RAR TOTAL ALLOCATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Equipment - \$841,847 • Lottery - \$59,250 • Fund 11 - \$40,290 • Fund 13 - \$1,903,525 <p>Ms. Abejar noted that the RARs have been sent back to the divisions/departments along with account strings.</p> <p>It was noted that \$1.9mil of the carryover budget has been committed and allocated to fund all the unfunded items that could not be funded through Instructional Equipment, or through Lottery.</p> <p>A discussion ensued regarding the RARs process, funding and communication. Dr. Collins noted that the results from the RARs Assessment survey had been received and would be shared with the membership at the December 6 meeting. He also noted that the survey received a low response from the end users.</p> <p>Members were advised that the RARS for next year have been sent out to the departments and divisions.</p>	
	<p>BAM Revisions It was reported that a workgroup of the FRC committee is conducting a review of the Budget Allocation Model. This review is required by Accreditation as well as a good business practice.</p> <p>Currently there is a discussion to add language to the model regarding a cap on college reserves. Specifically, any revenue over the cap would be returned to the district. There were strong concerns shared by the membership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the intent? • Is it realistic to stay within 10% of our expenditures? • Important that the cap does not harm the college. • Do not implement the first year over the cap. • Provide the college one year to build a plan and spend the funds responsibly and thoughtfully to serve students. <p>The importance of the Planning & Budget committee being advised of the proposal was noted.</p>	

NEW BUSINESS (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRC will discuss this item in more detail. • The workgroup will meet to discuss the language. • Any draft language will be brought back to the Planning and Budget committee for further discussion and agreement. <p>Members were reminded that this work is part of the evaluation phase of the model.</p>	
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus-wide furniture needs • RARs Assessment Survey • Innovation Grant Language • Mission Statement Review 	
12. OTHER	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>It was reported that an in-depth inventory is being coordinated through Archana Bhardari and her team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inventory will identify the current state of the college's administrative and academic computing technology. • In addition, a life cycle costing analysis has been requested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The analysis will provide information that will allow the college to look towards the next 3 – 4 years. • Members were advised that the inventory information will be brought back to the committee for review once its completed. 	

Submitted by Geni Lusk
Next Meeting – December 6, 2016



SANTA ANA

COLLEGE

Innovate for Student Success @ SAC OVERVIEW

Supporting collaborative student persistence and success initiatives throughout the academic year

Santa Ana College is launching the Innovate for Student Success competition to encourage educators throughout the college to cross traditional boundaries between programs and departments in the service of student success. Our priority will be to fund one-time projects that support the transformation of less effective practices into new standards in the service of students, with baseline and progress/impact data drawn from existing sources. We have intentionally designed a lean process to encourage submissions SAC-wide. **We are excited to provide college leaders with the opportunity to seek funds ranging from \$5,000 to \$20,000 total for a period ranging from 1-2 years.**

Who is eligible to apply?

Any member of the SAC community (faculty, staff, and students) is eligible to submit an application, but the area dean or immediate manager's signature is required because they will partner with grantees to help manage funds that are awarded through this program. Please be as detailed as possible in explaining the need and expected results.

What are the program requirements?

- ***Student-Centeredness:*** The purpose of the program is to expand and sustain student success and persistence where possible. Therefore, students should be the direct beneficiaries of the projects proposed.
- ***Evidence of Effectiveness/Impact:*** Applicants must submit a proposal with detailed evidence of the need for the project and expected results. The SAC Research Department will conduct workshops to help proposal leaders confirm need and measure progress but they do not have the capacity to actually conduct that analysis for the Innovate project leaders.
- ***Timeframe:*** Projects may be from 1-2 years in duration.
- ***Funding Amount:*** We are seeking projects to fund that range from \$5,000 to \$20,000 total.

When and exactly how can I apply?

- Interested parties should complete the brief application form and submit it to their area VP for review and processing via SAC Cabinet and SAC College Council.
- Applications will be accepted through the end of the fall 2016 semester or until available funding are allocated, whichever is first.

IF I AM FUNDED, when will the money be available?

We are committed to getting the funds out to successful applicants 2-4 weeks after the complete application is received.



SANTA ANA COLLEGE

Innovate for Student Success @ SAC APPLICATION

Please respond to the items outlined below in no more than 3 pages total.

Title of Specific Funding Request _____

1. Please describe the request and the major associated activities, including a start and end date.
2. Please provide evidence supporting the importance of your proposal. Include baseline data and expected improvements.
3. What are the specific benefits that you are anticipating for students and how many students will be served each year?
4. After the proposed work is completed, how will the benefits to students be sustained?

Budget Request Detail:

AREA	AMOUNT REQUESTED	PURPOSE
Personnel		
Supplies		
Equipment		
Student Stipends		
Conference/Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

Requesting Faculty or Staff Member

Name: _____ Title: _____

Department: _____

Campus Phone: _____ Campus E-mail: _____

Concurrence of the Management Partner: The signature of your area manager below signifies their willingness to support the project management including and related budget or personnel paperwork.

Dean or Director: _____ Date _____

Santa Ana College

Technology Upgrade Planning 2016-2021

Draft

ITS Budget

- ▶ The total ITS budget from DO is \$200,000 and is split 70/30.
- ▶ SAC - \$140,000
- ▶ SCC - \$60,000

New Technology Costs

- ▶ Current HP ProBook 470 G4 Notebook(i7 core) Laptop with 5 year warranty costs about \$1000
- ▶ HP Elitedesk 800 Desktop Computer with E232 23" LED LCD Monitor and peripherals and 5 year on site warranty - standard configuration is \$1015
- ▶ Lockdowns are approximately \$35 per computer
- ▶ Power, network and cabling depends on existing
- ▶ Networking costs about \$350 per new drop

Windows Computers

AREA	COMPUTERS
SAC I-SIDE	1559
SAC N-SIDE	798
CEC	424
DMC	74
Sheriff Academy	14
Delhi	25
Corbin Center	20
OC Jail	25
Sac B21 from Washington Elementary	10
Esqueda Elementary	11
SER	30
Santa Ana Senior Center	19
Child Dev East	4
Occtac (Orange County Children therapeutic Art Center)	19
Santa Ana Public Library	3
Fire Tech Huntington Beach	3
TOTAL	3038
Digital Dons at SAC- HP 2-in-1	1100
TOTAL Windows devices	4138

Mac Computers and iPads

OTHER: Types of Mobile devices	Number of mobile devices
SAC iPads	536
CEC iPads	100
TOTAL iPads	636
Apple Mac -still being counted	
Macs at DMC Fine Arts lab	51
*Music Room Mac	20
Fashion T213 Building Macs	20
Macs in A building - A219/217	27
Macs in N building- Music room	7
L Building - publications L119	3
Macs in AV media office	4
TOTAL Apple Devices	132

The Larger Picture

- ▶ Total Computers and Tablets - 4885
- ▶ Total Windows Instructional Computers out of Warranty (old need replacement) - 683, Faculty and staff - 200 estimated
- ▶ Total printers - 305, 283 are owned by us (count under progress)
- ▶ Mac Computers needing replacement at least 63(count under progress)

Years past Warranty	SAC i-Side Computer Numbers	CEC i-Side Computer Numbers
1	15	1
2	55	35
3	73	53
4	45	32
5	220	42
6	115	0
11	2	0
TOTAL COMPUTERS OUT OF WARRANTY I SIDE	525	163

This does not include iPads, Surface Pro that are now getting old.

Faculty and Staff

- ▶ Total of 798 computers
- ▶ About a third were too old for Windows 10 (moving target snapshot Sept 2016)
- ▶ We are replacing as we roll out Windows 10
- ▶ 50 computers are in the process of being replaced by Fall 2017
- ▶ New faculty are getting new computers allocated from DO
- ▶ New staff are getting what the department allocates
- ▶ Surface Pro and iPads are becoming very popular

Next 5 Years Projected Figures

-These are Estimates

Instructional

Year to replace	SAC Computer Numbers	CEC Computer Numbers	TOTALS
2016	68	0	68
2017	70	145	215
2018	39	118	157
2019	450	33	483
2020	111	6	117
2021	207	0	207

Faculty and Staff

Year to replace	Number of Computers
2016	70
2017	150
2018	150
2019	220
2020	100
2021	100

How Many Computers Need Replacing

Year by which Computer Replacements are Due	Number of Computers	Total Computers
2016	68 + 70 + 688(already out of warranty)	826
2017	215 + 150	365
2018	157 + 150	307
2019	483 + 220	703
2020	117 + 100	217
2021	207 + 100	307

Points to Ponder

- ▶ This year 826 computers need replacing
- ▶ The large number that need replacing straightaway means we may need to spread the purchases
- ▶ Deciding Priorities
- ▶ Future one time funds purchases
 - ▶ Grants and one time funds
 - ▶ Silos in purchasing
 - ▶ There needs to be planned for replacing
- ▶ Current Macs versus PC asset inventory
- ▶ Going mobile
- ▶ Support of variety and numbers

Some Possible Solutions

- ▶ Inventory, MDM program such as AirWatch for the future costs need to be built in
- ▶ Standardizing equipment where possible
- ▶ Buying warranty support from vendors
- ▶ Plan adequate support levels
- ▶ Plan rotation with input from stakeholders
- ▶ Guidance for future requests for grants to include support and replacement plan

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1.	I am familiar with the SAC Resource Allocation Request (RARs) process?	54%	23%	12%	8%	8%	
2.	The communication throughout the Resource Allocation Request process was satisfactory.	15%	15%	35%	31%	4%	
3.	The intent of the Resource Allocation Request process is clear, and I believe the RAR process has a high level of validity.	15%	27%	38%	12%	12%	
4.	I was satisfied with the RAR process outcomes at the end of the funding cycle.	8%	19%	46%	23%	8%	
	If you disagreed or strongly disagreed with #4, please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have no idea what the outcomes have been! That doesn't seem to be shared with all faculty, just those who get what they asked for, I guess. I would be nice to know the results, how non-funded requests were evaluated, etc. There seems to be no follow-up. • I think the departments, and the division, are underfunded. Departments don't even have budgets to work with. We have no monies for supplies or professional development. We need more input on how to use these resources, if we even had them to begin with. Also, we need more information from our deans explaining how that money is allocated to each division and each department. That has not been made clear. • I fill out a RAR and get no feedback as to why nothing was funded. It's possible that nothing requested should be funded; however, to be left hanging with no feedback is not appropriate. • The process changes each year, along with the due dates, form, etc. Decisions related to how the requests are prioritized is never clear or transparent. • The process is not transparent to all levels of the institution. • The process is obscure beyond the department level. I don't know how the final decisions are made. • I have requested items for many years and have had little response. • The lack of satisfaction is with the lack of communication when requests have not been approved. RAR's are turned in but information as to why the request was denied etc. never comes back to the originator in any form. • Feels like the RAR is turned in but never any further information. 					
5.	I participated in the RARs process at the division/department level.	54%	35%	8%	0%	8%	

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6.	I was kept informed by my supervisor as we progressed through the RARs process.	24%	24%	20%	16%	20%	
7.	The RAR process effectively linked our division/department goals to our program review objectives.	19%	27%	31%	19%	8%	
8.	Once the overall RARs process was complete, the funded division/department requests information was shared within our department.	19%	42%	12%	8%	19%	
9.	Did you experience any challenges with the overall RAR process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing was shared with any COMPLETE status. • the form itself is sometimes hard to work with. • The challenge was filling it out correctly in order to get funds. • None • Had no idea what was going on • The form is difficult to complete and not user friendly • It took a long time from submission to final funding. • The only challenge was how time consuming it was to complete. • Yes. The process is not transparent, timing is limited and the form changes regularly. • No • After the funding is approved, and stuff bought and paid for, what is the result of intended outcomes? This would guide us in producing RARs for the following year. • The process changes frequently. • What belongs in a RAR? All identified instructional materials? We've been told too many varying explanations of what is and what isn't a RAR associated equipment and instructional materials request. • Not really. Is pretty straight forward. 					
10.	What changes to the RAR process, if any, would benefit the effectiveness and/or efficiency of the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put the entire process online. So that I can look for myself what was prioritized, by whom and the results. • The form is somewhat daunting to complete. can we have a more streamline form? • Educate the deans, clerical staff, and especially the faculty on what this is, what the process is and what the actual budget numbers are. • N/A • More explanation 					

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have more transparency related to organizational priorities for funding, timelines and timeframes that are standardized and articulated clearly, developing a user friendly form. • RARs need to include only those items that are above & beyond operating budget. The ranking process should work by category of funding (personnel, facilities, equipment, etc) rather than as an over ll. • None • It would be great if the RARs for each department could be tied electronically to program review SLOs, and institutional information. • My Department is very thoughtful when it comes to requesting resources. We only ask for items that are truly critical to success of our program and students. So it feels abandoned sometimes when our requests which have been put in RARs for a couple of years and not approved. In addition, any guidance on why items are not approved would be helpful. • The RAR process is one of many processes in place. There are separate processes for lottery funds, one time purchases, and maybe others. The RAR requests are often bypassed by these other processes. • Program review should impact decisions. It appears that funds are distributing based upon program size, FTES generation, or something? • Closing the loop whether the request was approved or NOT approved. 					
11.	To better evaluate our data, please indicate your job classification below.	16 Faculty	1 Staff	9 Administrators			