

PERT

Date: 02/28/12

Room: 431

Attended: Thomas Watkins; Tracy Schneider; Connie Barron-Griffin;; Ruth Fuller; Yulian Ligioso; Jeffrey Lamb

Proposal Process

- Review of proposed process
 - Funding
 - The group discussed the sources of funding and recognized the need to move towards modified zero based budgeting for discretionary allocations. Concern was expressed that, with impending budget cuts, the amount of discretionary funds may be so little as to make wide participation difficult.
 - VP Ligioso reiterated that this process is only planning for discretionary funds, separate mechanisms exist to plan for facilities and salaries & benefits expenditure.
 - It was suggested that certain pots of money, such as prop 20 funds be used in this process.
 - The group suggested that the process confirms that funding allocations be made into a separate accounting code for audit and tracking purposes.
 - The group recommended that FABPAC and SGC could define recommendations and conditions for dealing with multiple year proposals. For example funding could be agreed for more than one year with annual evaluation reported.
 - The group acknowledged the need for SP to make funding allocations outside of this process when specific needs arise. However, it was felt that these allocations should be documented and shared with SGC so that proposal participants do not feel that a separate funding process exists.
 - The group discussed the need to discuss within departments what funds are essential to operations and what may be termed discretionary.
- Rubrics
 - Brief discussion of the rubrics to be used, including some minor changes.

- The rubrics should go out to SGC and FABPAC for final approval

Actions

- Peter and Yulian to discuss sources and amounts of funding for the process.
- Peter to amend draft process in light of comments.
- Peter to make recommendation to SP Laguerre regarding ad-hoc special funding (*Ad hoc, in year and/or unplanned funding requests will occur, and can be made at SPs discretion. However, to strengthen the proposal process – it is recommended that these sorts of decisions still go through SGC for information purposes and documentation*)
- Peter to send rubrics to chair of FABPAC and SGC for discussion / approval