

MIDTERM REPORT PLANNING AGENDA 3 DRAFT AUGUST 7, 2014

(Items 1- 10)

1. The College will work on a “Fast Track” for decisions that need to be made quickly so that they are still a part of the IPP.

Standard 1.B.6

The strategic proposal process has been significantly shortened from an annual process to a process that is usually complete within 5-6 months [[Evidence here...compare two years of Strategic Plans](#)].

As a result of analysis of planning processes in what was formerly PERT (Program Evaluation Review Team) or **is this still PERT?**, a new team was assembled to review the purchase of equipment and supplies in a more timely manner. [[evidence here on meeting](#)]

As a result, this group has recommended that a more efficient process will also be available to all faculty and staff based to allow for equipment and supplies through the adoption of a new system wherein the various Schools will be in charge of purchasing their own equipment and supplies. [[evidence here](#)]

2. The College will better document how it is using assessment results (SLO/SAO, Program Review, Strategic Goals and Objective outcomes, ARCC) to make improvements.

Standard 1.B.7

Assessment results from non-academic areas are fed into an annual program review. The program review collects assessment results data from linked service area outcomes as well as defined next steps. The program review format also shows projects and activities that may be linked to the outcome assessment and any highlighted areas of concern.

Since all of this data is recorded in database format there is minimal reporting burden on managers. [E 3.1] **THIS PLANNING AGENDA SEGMENT WILL BE REVISED CONSIDERABLY. AWAITING DATA TO CONTINUE NARRATIVE ANALYSIS.**

Academic Program Review has been revised altogether [[See Planning Agenda 3, Item 9](#)]

3. The College will evaluate how best to optimize resources in an economic downturn.

Standard II.C.1

To optimize resources in an economic downturn, the District has in the past utilized its Financial and Budget Planning Advisory Council (FaBPAC) to review, evaluate and recommend financial matters, including the institutional budgets, grants, as well as various initiatives, such as the placing of a facilities bond on the ballot and pursuing a solar installation, that have fiscal implications on the District's finances. Concurrently, the District also ran a Shared Governance Council (SGC) where related operational implications were disseminated, discussed and recommendations put forth to the Superintendent-President Cabinet (SPC). While both of these processes allowed for

broad constituency input and participation, it also resulted in much duplicated and redundant efforts, with reports given to essentially the same group participants, members of both committees. Thus in an effort to streamline these processes as well as optimizing staff resources, these two groups FaBPAC and SGC were merged effective February 2013 into SGC [E3.3.1: [Combined FaBPAC and Shared Governance Council, 2/20/13 \(Committee on Committees\)](#)]. The merger was intended to facilitate improved communications and to tie planning more cohesively to resource allocation.

SCC's budget development process is framed and guided by the Institution's Strategic Goals (to include the Mission) [E3.3.2: [Strategic Goals AY 2010-2013, 05/31/2013](#)], as well as annual Board of Trustees (BOT) and CEO goals, while also considering the three-prong programmatic directive from the State Chancellor's Office to emphasize Basic Skills, Transfer and Career Technical Education [E3.3.3: [Board and CEO Goals AY 2010-2011, 10/06/2010 Governing Board Meeting](#)], [E3.3.4: [Board and CEO Goals AY 2011-2012, 06/15/2011 Governing Board Meeting](#)], [E3.3.4: [Board and CEO Goals AY 2012-2013, 07/18/2012 Governing Board Meeting](#)].

During the current economic downturn/recession the District saw its workload measure or Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) be reduced by 344.34 FTES and 703.83 FTES, for FY 2009-10 and FY 2011-12, respectively [E3.3.6: [2009-10 SCC Recalculation Apportionment, Exhibit E, March Revision, CCCCCO](#)], [E3.3.7: [2011-12 SCC Recalculation Apportionment, Exhibit E, CCCCCO](#)], with the latter resulting in an approximate \$3.2 million funding cut. And in response to the State's budget woes, the District responded accordingly with various initiatives and budget reduction strategies to combat the cuts, attempting to optimize resources while preserving access

For FY 2011-12 for example, expense reduction strategies included elimination of about 500 course sections, roughly a 15% cut of the college's offerings, implementing a re-organization of Academic Affairs that merged six instructional divisions into four schools, reducing faculty release time, realizing significant salary savings [E3.3.8: [Academic Affairs Reorganization, 05/18/2011 Governing Board Meeting](#)].

The District also terminated the contract with the Solano College Theater Association [E3.3.9: [Termination of Contract between Solano College and Solano College Theater Association, 06/20/2012 Governing Board Meeting](#)]. Additionally, the District effected freezes in supplies, other operating expenditures, such as consulting services, travel, printing, postage, and equipment accounts as well as expenditure transfers to categorical grants to extent allowable. The aforementioned budget cuts, while austere, stopped short of more draconian measures including layoffs, which translated into the District moving forward with a deficit spending plan of about \$1.5 million. Revenue and expenditure activities were carefully monitored and the District did end up realizing the budget as adopted. In moving forward concessions were reached with the bargaining units, principally the transition from a self-insured health plan to the CalPERS health plan, resulting in significant operational savings [E3.3.10: [CalPERS health plan, 05/16/2012 Governing Board Meeting](#)], [E3.3.11: [SCFA July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2015 contract](#)].

The District does need to stay vigilant and continue to explore improved operating efficiencies, look at revenue stream outside the funding mechanism, and develop reserve level guidelines.

Additional Evidence:

- #1 – Combined FaBPAC and Shared Governance Council, 2/20/13 (Committee on Committees)
- #2 – CCCCCO, 2009-10 Recalculation Apportionment, Exhibit E, March Revision.
- #3 – CCCCCO, 2011-12 Recalculation Apportionment, Exhibit E.
- #4 – FaBPAC, September 1, 2010 (Budget, budget reductions)
- #5 – FaBPAC, July 20, 2011; (2011/12 State budget update, including cash flow; Grants & Revenue Update)
- #6 – FabPAC, September 7, 2011; (FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget)
- #7 – FabPAC, October 5, 2011; (Tentative 2010/11 close; 1st quarter financial update; budget calendar)
- #8 – FabPAC, November 2, 2011 (CCFS 311 2010-11 Annual Fiscal Report)
- #9 – FabPAC, November 16, 2011; (LAO Fiscal Outlook; “discretionary” budget distribution; CCFS 311Q Financial Report First Quarter 2011/12)
- #10 – FabPAC, December 7, 2011; (Faculty prioritization; 2010-11 Audit; “People & Things” review)
- #11 – FabPAC, January 18, 2012; (FY 2012/13 Budget Update; Child Development Programs)
- #12 – FabPAC, February 1, 2012; (Strategic Proposals; Budget Update – 2010/11 Audit; “People & Things”)
- #13 – FabPAC, February 15, 2012; (“People & Things”)
- #14 – FabPAC, March 7, 2012; (Strategic Proposals; Budget Update)
- #15 – FabPAC, March 21, 2012; (CalPERS Health Plans)
- #16 – FabPAC, April 4, 2012; (Strategic Proposals; SAN/Virtual Desktop; Grant Application Review)
- #17 – FabPAC, April 18, 2012; (Q3 Revenues and Expenditures; Budget Assumptions for 2012-13; Strategic Proposal Funding)
- #18 – FabPAC, May 2, 2012; (Grant Application Review; Solar Generation/Funding Allocation; Estimated 2012-13 Budget)
- #19 – FabPAC, May 16, 2012; (Strategic Proposal Update; Measure G Bond Audit; April Year-To-Date Report; CCFS 311-Q3; Budget Update; Vacant Campus Positions)
- #20 – FabPAC, June 6, 2012; (Tentative Budget – First Reading)
- #21 – FabPAC, June 18, 2012; (Strategic Proposal Funding Recommendations)
- #22 – FabPAC, July 18, 2012; (Strategic Proposal Funding Recommendations)
- #23 – FabPAC, August 15, 2012; (Fiscal Updates; Energy Projects Update)
- #24 – FabPAC, September 9, 2012; (FY 2012-13 Adoption Budget; CCFS 311Q4; Open Positions, CalPERS Health Plan)
- #25 – FabPAC, October 3, 2012; (Solar Update; Enrollment Management Update)
- #26 – FabPAC, October 17, 2012; (Enrollment Management Update)

- #27 – FabPAC, December 5, 2012; (Learning Management System; Prop 30; CCFS 311 and 311Q)
- #28 – FabPAC, January 16, 2013; (Budget/Financial, including 13/14 State Budget, budget calendar, revenues and expenditures)
- #29 – FabPAC, February 6, 2013; (Budget/Financial; Higher One Payment Plans; Committee Operating Standards)
- #30 – SGC, March 13, 2013; (Strategic Proposal Rating, Task Force on Committees)
- #31 – SGC, March 27, 2013; (Strategic Proposal Feedback Process)
- #32 – SGC, April 10, 2013; (Integrated Energy Efficiency & Capital Improvement; 13/14 Strategic Proposals)
- #33 – SGC, May 8, 2013; (Budget Subcommittee; Human Resources Re-Organization; New Non-Faculty Prioritization)
- #34 – SGC, June 4, 2013; (Prioritization of New Non-Academic Positions for 2013/14)
- #35 – SGC, June 19, 2013; (Tentative 2013-14 Budget, May Revise; SGC Budget Task Force; HR Re-organization; Strategic Proposal Reconsiderations; Ranking of New Non-Academic Positions for 2013/14)
- #36 – SGC, August 14, 2013; (Budget Update, Enrollment Update, Strategic Proposals)
- #37 – SGC, September 11, 2013; (Bond/Fiscal positions; re-organizations)
- #38 – SGC, September 25, 2013; (Corporate College)
- #39 – SGC, October 9, 2013; (Corporate College, positions)
- #40 – SGC, December 11, 2013 (Fiscal re-organization; positions)
- #41 – SGC, January 15, 2014; (HR recruitment update; FY 2014-15 budget update; Affordable Care Act)
- #42 – SGC, January 22, 2014; (Budget; FabPAC reinstatement proposal)
- #43 – SGC, February 12, 2014 (HR recruitment update; strategic proposals; Academic Affairs re-organization; FaBPAC proposal)
- #44 – SGC, March 19, 2014; (Strategic proposals; Student Services re-organization)
- #45 – SGC, March 26, 2014 (Strategic proposals)
- #46 – SGC, April 9, 2014; (HR recruitment update; strategic proposals)
- #47 – SGC, April 23, 2014; (Budget)
- #48 – SGC, May 14, 2014; (Budget)
- #49 – SGC, May 28, 2014; (Budget)
- #50 – SGC, June 11, 2014; (HR recruitment update; Strategic proposals)
- #51 – SGC, June 25, 2014; (Budget)
- #52 – SGC, July 16, 2014; (Budget)
- #53 – BOT, September 18, 2013; (Board and CEO Goals 2013-14)
- #54 – BOT, October 3, 2012; (Strategic Goals)
- #55 – BOT, July 18, 2012; (Board and CEO Goals 2012-13)
- #56 – BOT, December 7, 2011; (Board and CEO Goals 2011-12)
- #57 – BOT, September 15, 2010; (Board and CEO Goals 2010-11)
- #58 – BOT, May 16, 2012; (CalPERS Health Plan; SCTA contract)

4. The College will use the IPP process and strategic goals and objectives to provide for physical and personnel resources to ensure safe and adequate custodial and groups [sic] grounds.

Standard III.B.1.b

The College followed the IPP (non faculty hiring process) to hire Custodial supervisor, Assistant Facilities Director, and new Facilities' hire, in progress (See Planning Agenda Item 2, Item 13).....**OR BETTER TO EXTRACT PORTIONS OF PA 2, ITEM 13 AND INCLUDE HERE. ITEMS ARE INTERRELATED. REREAD STANDARD III.B.1.a (ITEMS OVERLAP)**

5. The College will, prior to the passing of a bond, create a Business Plan that will ensure new bond facilities and grounds will have enough staff support for maintenance.

Standard III.A.2

Standard III.A.6

Standard IV.B.2

In the fall of 2011 the District received Board authorization to explore the prospect of pursuing a facilities bond in November 2012 [EVIDENCE HERE]. As part of that process the College engaged the services of a political consultant, a polling firm, underwriters as well as bond counsel [Evidence]. Additionally, the District also hired an Educational Master Planning and a Facilities Master Planning firms, with the latter's charge being to develop an institution facilities' build out (explain), that began with the campus plans for Vacaville and Vallejo Centers and the Fairfield Campus. [evidence for consultant] The planning strived to address total cost of ownership, that is it emphasized overall building and energy efficiencies to allow for ongoing maintenance costs, including staff support as necessary [evidence is part of FMP, will ask architects]. Planning will include Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) standards, developing design, materials as well as Furniture, Fixture & Equipment (FF&E) standards, as well as address the President Climate Action Commitment. Part of the savings of the energy efficiency initiatives funded a new Assistant Facilities Director position who is charged of the District's energy management [Evidence is JD. Hire date was August 1, 2014]

Evidence will include:

- FMP; varying stages of campus plans as presented to Board and FabPAC, eventually leading to FMP.
- RFQs/RFPs for political consultant, pollster, bond counsel, underwriters. On we under Administration/Purchasing
- Aug 2012 Board – green light on moving forward with bond election
 - o Also late 2011, Board approval to move fwd with exploring feasibility of bond

The Facilities Master Plan, as informed by the Educational Master Plan, is the primary support document for the bond spending plan.

What about reference to the Executive Bond Manager who manages the fund?

Is that beyond scope, i.e. “prior to passing a bond ...”? Bond management addressed elsewhere or here??.

How will Business Plan be assessed?

Community and College input to the Plan?

[Evidence here, various forums (first Ed Plan forums, next FMP forums, including open sessions,

Evidence:

- #58 – FabPAC, September 7, 2011 (RFPs/selection of Banker/Underwriters; Public Opinion Research Firms; Campaign Consultants; Bond Counsel. Also RFP for Facilities Master Planners)
- #59 – FabPAC, October 5, 2011 (Preliminary/draft bond project list; initial survey and polling timeline)
- #60 – FabPAC, October 19, 2011 (Facilities Master Plan (FMP) interface with Educational Master Plan)
- #61 – FabPAC, November 2, 2011 (Review of bond measure draft survey; review of updated project list)
- #62 – FabPAC, December 7, 2011 (Facilities Master Plan kick-off; Bond 2012 polling update)
- #63 – FabPAC, January 18, 2012 (Potential 2012 Facilities Bond)
- #64 – FabPAC, May 2, 2012 (Prospective Bond Planning)
- #65 – FabPAC, June 6, 2012 (Facilities Master Plan Update)
- #66 – FabPAC, July 17, 2012 (Update on Bond Process)
- #67 – FabPAC, August 15, 2012 (November Bond Update)
- #68 – FabPAC, September 19, 2012 (FMP Update)
- #69 – FabPAC, October 3, 2012 (FMP Update; Bond Update/Financial Advisor)
- #70 – FabPAC, November 7, 2012 (“What do the election results mean”, passage of Measure Q)
- #71 – FabPAC, December 5, 2012 (FMP Update, priority projects with probable costs)
- #72 – FabPAC, January 16, 2013 (Measure Q Update, Next Steps)
- #73 – SGC, March 13, 2013 (Measure Q Committee and Staffing)
- #74 – SGC, March 27, 2013 (Measure Q Executive Bonds Manager position)
- #75 – SGC, June 19, 2013 (FMP Update)
- #76 – SGC, May 8, 2013 (New Non-Faculty Prioritization)
- #77 – SGC, June 4, 2013 (Prioritization of New Non-Academic Positions for 2013/14)

- #78 – SGC, June 19, 2013 (Ranking of New Non-Academic Positions for 2013/14)
- #79 – Deans’ Meeting July 24, 2014; (Instructional Equipment funding rubric)
-

6. The College will create a staffing plan.

Standard III.A.2

Standard III.A.6

Standard IV.B.2

NARRATIVE AND EVIDENCE NEEDED

7. The College will work with the Board on goals to establish reserve levels funding available for IPPs, staff development, equipment replacement, etc.

Standard III.D

As part of several budget presentations to the Governing Board, varying levels of reserves were discussed (**ESTABLISH A TIMEFRAME HERE REMEMBER SINCE 2011**), including the consequences of falling below the minimum 5% level and the impact of maintaining lower reserve levels have on the District’s operations. [\[evidence\]](#) The Solano College Governing Board in its Policy 3010 – General Fund Contingency Reserve – outlines a minimum of five percent of the unrestricted budget which also corresponds to the minimum guideline recommended by the State Chancellor’s Office. [\[evidence policy here\]](#)

Consistent with both Board Policy and the Chancellor’s Office guidelines, The District has maintained reserve levels above the minimum 5%, reaching 9% in FY 2010-11, and 11% in FY 2013-14. [\[evidence\]](#) Besides compliance with the Board policy and CCCCO guidelines, reserve levels also impact 1) cash flows, 2) the District’s credit rating, and 3) accreditation:

Cash flow – as the District’s cash burn rate is approximately \$4million per month, a 5% reserve merely that represents about a half months of cash flow. As a result the District prudently puts in place borrowing arrangements and in the past has resorted to the annual Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRAN) through the Community College League of California as well as invoked via the Solano County Treasury a short-term temporary funds transfer arrangement, allowing cash balances to deficit, repaid upon receipt of State funds. [\[evidence needed\]](#)

District credit rating – as part of the bond issuance process in 2013 the District was rated by both Standard & Poor’s and Moody’s, where we received AA- and Aa3, respectively. While certainly solid ratings, such ratings were in part based on relatively strong reserves of approximately 11%, used as one of the predictors as to how the District manages it finances. Future lower reserves may negatively impact the District’s credit rating. And

of course credit ratings may impact the District's ability to borrow funds. **Updated information here?**

Accreditation – reserve levels often play a role in demonstrating to external organizations, including ACCJC, how a district handles not only day-to-day finances but also its long-term obligations. As such, a higher reserve does represent more stable finances and thus an improved ability to adequately support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness and to assure financial stability.

In discussions with the Superintendent-President as well as the Governing Board, reserve levels double the monthly cash flow were deemed a reasonable long-term goal [\[evidence here...ALSO WHAT ABOUT SGC?\]](#) Informal discussions only, mentioned in budget presentations to the Board. SGC this year recommended reserves between 6%-9%. **SEARCH FabPAC minutes to document the double the cash flow.**

Also determined in discussions with the Superintendent-President were dollar amounts to be set aside for Strategic Proposals – first introduced in 2011-12 at \$100,000 per year, the allotment grew to \$200,000 the following year, and are now at the \$300,000 per year levels. [\[evidence\]](#)

Additionally, during the FY 2010-11 the District stratified its reserves by the minimum required 5% as well the Designated Fund Balances, to include: Staff Development, Strategic Proposals (please note that Strategic Proposals are part of the IPP process, but in this context IPP truly represents Strategic Proposals), and Stability Funds for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. **?? [also evidence needed]**
REFERENCE Adoption Budget 2010-11 HERE??

CONCLUSION GOES HERE

Evidence:

- #80 – Board Policy 3010 (Reserve Level)
- #81 – FabPAC, September 7, 2011 (Reserve level requirements, set aside for staff/professional development and strategic initiatives)
- #82 – BOT, September 5, 2012 (Adoption of FY 2011-12 Budget)
- #83 – Adoption Budget – FY 2010-11; (Designated Fund Balances)

8. Through oversight of budget decisions and discussions in FABPAC, the College's financial planning will rely specifically on its mission and goals and will be fully integrated with all planning through the IPP, specifically program review and three-year plans.

Standard III.A.6

Standard III.D.I

Standard III.D.1.a

Standard III.D.1.d

SCC has made progress on developing a foundation for developing a plan for faculty and

non faculty staffing. **EXPLAIN WHY NO FaBPAC AND NEW PROCESS EVOLVING.**

There is a prioritization process for determining faculty hiring needs and non-faculty hiring needs, which promote evidence, based decision making tied to program review and available data. [[Evidence Senate Minutes for Faculty Prioritization and Non Faculty Minutes](#)]

Process Evaluation Committee (PEC) met (**explain committee function**) and identified a need for managers to submit an annual area staffing plan which included justification for current and new positions tied to program review. PEC will now contribute to design of actual staffing plan. [Evidence: [meeting minutes](#)]

IPG (President's Planning group?) strengthened this idea by requesting that training (**for??**) become an element [[evidence: meeting minutes](#)]

Need to carefully coordinate a more coordinated general strategic staffing plan. **Longitudinal Data can be collected that pertains to our human resources (staffing) comparative to students served.**

THIS SEGMENT IS IN THE PROCESS OF REVISION.

**9. The College will make program review and three-year plans more meaningful through training and a possible program review committee.
Standard III.D.1.d**

Significant changes have been made to SCC's Program Review since 2011 to make the process more meaningful and effective. A standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate called the Academic Program Review Committee was first established on May 7, 2012 [[E1: Academic Senate Minutes 5-07-12](#)]. During the summer of 2012, an Academic Senator was hired to rewrite the College's Academic Program Review process drawing from the State Academic Senate Program Review handbook and models from other California Community Colleges. A Solano College pilot program review process was outlined in a handbook and a template was created [[E2: Academic Program Review Handbook and Template Pilot 2013](#)] which was vetted in the Academic Senate, the Union, and by other constituent groups. It was also brought to the Solano College Board of Governors for review.

The handbook provides a description of the purpose of Program Review and instructions on how to complete what SCC refers to as the program review self-study. The goal was to make the program review process more robust to investigate topics such as student success, equity, student access, and programmatic needs. The new document also integrates an analysis of SLOs, PLOs, and distance education data. It calls on faculty to collectively analyze the data, but also to survey students to get their input on the program.

In Spring 2013, the Academic Program Review Committee began meeting (2nd and 4th Mondays of the month), and reporting back to the Academic Senate. The Committee assisted in both refining the new Program Review process (making decisions about rubrics, timelines, etc.), and providing feedback on the various program review self-studies. The Committee is made up of faculty representatives from each School (who also serve as a support team for their School during the reviews), members of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, and, when available, the Vice President of Academic Affairs. [\[E3: Academic Program Review Committee Agendas\]](#)

A faculty Program Review Coordinator was hired in Fall 2013 in a .20 reassigned time position to facilitate Academic Program Review committee meetings, to compile feedback to faculty undergoing Program Review, and to assist in the training of faculty [\[E4: Position Description for Program Review Faculty Coordinator\]](#). Trainings were held for faculty members during Spring Flex 2013, Summer 2013, and Spring Flex 2014 [\[E5: Flex Calendar Programs and Follow-up Emails\]](#). Open office hours were also held to support faculty undergoing Program Review. The Academic Program Review Coordinator also met with a number of faculty members individually to assist them in understanding the process and to help them to complete their program review self-studies. The Program Review Faculty Coordinator worked closely with the Dean of Institutional Research and Planning to ensure faculty had-easily accessible data they needed-to complete their reports.

In the second year of the Program Review cycle, additional support systems were put in place to assist faculty in completing their program review self-studies. Specifically, the handbook was expanded to include the rubrics that would be utilized by the Program Review Committee to evaluate the program review self-studies. Also, a detailed description of where to find the data for each section of the report was added to the handbook [\[E6: Program Review Self-Study and Handbook, 2014-2015\]](#). Further, the database for retrieving program review data was structured so that the title of the data (for example “Distinct Enrollments”) is listed with the number of the corresponding section of the template for which the data applies (for example 1.3). Completed Program Reviews self-studies were also placed on the College website so that faculty who were initiating Program Reviews could see samples. Finally, trainings will be held during Fall Flex 2014 to help faculty see how program review is connected with planning and resource allocation, and more importantly with student and program success [\[E7: Flex Calendar Fall 2014\]](#).

The new Program Review process will include a one-year, one-page follow up detailing the status of Program Review recommendations. This document will be developed Fall 2014 in the Academic Program Review Committee with the support of the Academic Senate and the Dean of Institutional Research and Planning. In the same time period, the Academic Program Review Committee will also conduct a self-evaluation so the committee can strengthen its process. In light of the creation of a one-year update, it was decided to not pursue 3 year plans as have been done in the past. Faculty now have to complete comprehensive Program Review self-studies, as well as yearly SLO assessments, yearly PLO assessments, and Educational Master Plan Updates. The

combined work of these planning processes provides ample opportunities to reflect on, analyze, and ascertain the needs of students and the various programs offered at Solano Community College.

**Item 10. The College will investigate the possibility of a 0-based budget model.
Standard III.D.1.d**

While 0 based budgeting was noted [\[evidence here\]](#), it was only briefly discussed and at the recommendation of the Vice President of Finance and Administration (VPFA) not pursued. The rationale being that with an overall budget that accounts for approximately 85% staffing and after taking into account mandatory and required expenditures such as utilities, licenses, leases, maintenance contracts, etc., it was established that there were little discretionary funds available. In 2014, **there was a recommendation from?** [\[evidence here\]](#) that the VPFA would work with and request that Academic Affairs develop a rubric for both Instructional Equipment and Supplies to address establishing a 0-based budget in these areas [\[#79 – Deans’ Meeting July 24, 2014; \(Instructional Equipment funding rubric\)\]](#).

Next steps? How will O based be evaluated? Future plans?

-