PERT

Date: 02/14/12

Room: 431

Attended: Thomas Watkins; Connie Barron-Griffin; Cynthia Simon; Ruth Fuller; Arturo Reyes; Jeffrey Lamb

Proposal Process

Discussion of:

- o Who should review?
    - Departments
    - FABPAC
    - SGC
    - SPC
- o What are the criteria for review?
- o How to review?

The group felt that one of the most important aspects of the proposal process is that the amount of funding that is available is clearly publicized at the start of the academic year.

The group feels that initial review of proposals should be made by a special "Proposal Technical Review Group". This group could be comprised of SLO Coordinators, representation from Student Services, Representation from ALG and Representation from Staff. The purpose of this group will be simply to review the proposal in terms of quality of the documentation. A rubric could be provided to aid the speedy review.

The proposal would next go to SGC. The purpose of this group is to quantify the quality of the idea. SGC would rank the proposals along only 3 or 4 dimensions. Primarily looking at whether the proposal fits with the strategic direction of the institution, represents an area of priority for the college and how much the proposal impacts students. SGC will not be concerned with financial details.

The next group would be FABPAC. FABPAC would be rating the proposals in terms of financial viability and accuracy.

The group felt that this process would compile all the necessary decision for a decision to be made by the President.

Fast track process

Discussion of

- o Amount
- o Review
- o Form

The group felt that $1000 would be a suitable amount for a fast track process. Fast Track would provide money for proposals within the financial year (no later than the spring semester). This process would utilize the same form and would go to "Proposal Technical Review Group" for initial feedback on quality of documentation and then on SGC for a simple yes/no response.

The group felt that the same form should be used for all proposals.

Timetables

The group suggested

Regular Proposals will be for funding in the next academic year and can follow the pre-existing timetable

Fast track proposals need a decision on funding before the spring semester.

Funding

The group reiterated the need for funding to be publicized before the proposal cycle begins.

Actions

Peter to draft a revised process in light of the discussion for group feedback

Peter to contact Mostafa for student rep in place of Lexi Palmer

Peter to remove Susanna Gunther from distribution as Faculty Senate rep