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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Guerra</td>
<td>Chair, Vice President of College Administrative Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni Abbott</td>
<td>Director Grants &amp; Resource Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Alavezos</td>
<td>Academic Senate appointee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Carroll</td>
<td>Academic Senate appointee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cripe</td>
<td>Academic Senate appointee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayne Cooley</td>
<td>Student Senate Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanne Faughn</td>
<td>CSEA appointee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kincade</td>
<td>Vice President of Instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose LaMont</td>
<td>YFA Budget Analyst</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice McKinnon</td>
<td>Instructional Dean</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Robles</td>
<td>Student Services Administrator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sharif</td>
<td>Student Senate Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Sill</td>
<td>YFA appointee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Stearns</td>
<td>MJC President</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Thames</td>
<td>Vice President of Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Van Kuren</td>
<td>CSEA appointee</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Zamora</td>
<td>Academic Senate President</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant position</td>
<td>Classified Staff Advisory Council Class (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business**

1. **Review of Minutes**

Iris Carroll amended Nancy Sill’s comment as follows: Nancy Sill stated that the whole access becomes mixed with success the focus is shifting from access to success.

Kevin Alavezos moved to approve the minutes of October 19, 2012 as amended. Rosanne Faughn seconded.

The minutes of October 19, 2012 were approved as amended by aye vote.
Rosanne Faughn moved to approve the minutes of September 7, 2012 and October 5, 2012. Kevin Alavezos seconded.

The minutes of September 7, 2012 and October 5, 2012 were approved by aye vote.

2. Review of Agenda

Michael Guerra reviewed the agenda with members, adding Proof of Concept and Agenda Development.

3. Enrollment Update (standing item)

Michael Guerra informed members that the college appears to be on target at 16,249.2 FTEs. He will continue to keep an eye on enrollment and move forward.

In response to Kevin Alavezos’ questions, Martha Robles will generate a list of information on lab hours and positive attendance for clarification for the committee.


   Additional Suggestions for Principles

   Michael Guerra acknowledged that a lot of good work has already been done regarding the guiding principles. Paul Cripe added that he likes what the members have done.

   Maurice McKinnon commented that first and foremost, communication is central, and effective planning and ensuring trust among stake holders, both external and internal need to be included.

   Michael Guerra cautioned that he does not want to lose the objectives. The group is going to need to communicate this information to all constituents and report back accurately. Nancy Sill pointed out that items will not be numbered in the final document. Michael assured that the numbering will be left off the final document as agreed at a previous meeting.

   Maurice McKinnon stated that she would add financial stability and institutional effectiveness. Michael Guerra responded that these were addressed in item 3, allocate resources.

   Iris Carroll commented that she loves the chart that Jenni Abbott generated from the principles, adding that it really makes it clear.

   Jenni Abbott suggested adding projections to the last bullet in #2. Iris Carroll suggested deleting two year as it is redundant when proceeding multi-year regarding activity #3.

   John Zamora pointed out that enrollment is the charge of the Instructional Council, not RAC. Jenni Abbott responded that RAC wants enrollment management information not that RAC is going to do it. Iris Carroll further clarified that RAC is going to recommend that enrollment management is done – an analysis.

   Jill Stearns suggested program completeness, not fundamentals of enrollment management for activity #3.
Rose LaMont suggested adding *and cost effectiveness*. Nancy Sill stated that she does not want to imply that expensive programs are at risk.

Jill Stearns stated that it still needs to be flushed out a bit what this group’s responsibility is. This group’s responsibility is that resources are allocated in such a way to garner the best benefit to the college. Jill added that there are many factors involved and many we cannot change as much as we would like to.

Members were ok with guiding principle #4.

Guiding principle #5: Maurice McKinnon suggested adding definition and understanding of so we are all speaking the same language – *add well defined*.

Guiding principle #6: Jenni Abbott suggested using *in all fiscal climates* instead of *regardless of*.

Members were ok with guiding principle #7.

Guiding principle #8: Adding *refine and communicate* was suggested.

Jill Stearns suggested a commitment to or understanding the role of both expansion and contraction of programs. There needs to be something about planning for growth and for reduction.

Susan Kincade said taking a “students first” approach would be the only thing she could suggest.

Jill Stearns responded that maximizing opportunities for students should be somewhere. Rose LaMont suggested inserting this in the first paragraph. Susan Kincade suggested *assist students in reaching educational goals*.

**Action Item**

Paul Cripe moved to accept suggestions to the RAC guiding principles document. Rose LaMont seconded.

Motion passed with aye vote.

The following is the **approved** RAC Guiding Principles document:

**Resource Allocation Council Guiding Principles**
**Modesto Junior College**

The Resource Allocation Council is committed to clearly communicating our processes and recommendations. As part of the resource allocation process, we will ask the questions:

- Does it help students reach their educational goals?
- Is it reasonable?
- Is it allowable?
• Is it essential?
• Is it sustainable?

The direction of the Resource Allocation Council is based on the following established guiding principles:

- We value stewardship and integrity in recognizing our fiduciary responsibilities to ensure financial stability.
- We take an institutional approach to decision-making. Resource allocation recommendations are based on the following:
  a. Alignment to the college mission and goals
  b. Scholarship of teaching and learning
  c. Value to the community
  d. Budget assumptions, projections, and scenarios
- We strategically allocate resources to strengthen learning and support services that improve student success.
- We are responsive to articulated college needs through defined and documented processes.
- We use relevant, well-defined, agreed-upon data in a consistent manner for decision-making.
- We are proactive in leveraging current resources in all fiscal climates.
- We operate under the established timelines.
- We regularly assess, refine, and communicate resource allocation processes.

Michael Guerra thanked members for their persistence and good work in creating the guiding principles that were flushed out over the last several meetings.

5. Recommendation for requests outside Program Review

Michael Guerra presented two documents from his former institution that does a 5-year cycle of program review. These forms were used if they came into a budget year where they were told we must hold money unless absolutely necessary and then they would use this personnel justification form.

Iris Carroll asked didn’t this body talk about this process? She added that it seems like so many of the personnel positions that have been sent in emails, pop up outside of the process. Her concern is what is our process for handling these type of personnel items and what criteria makes those necessary to be outside of the process? She would like to be able to have an answer for these positions.
Rosanne Faughn responded that the college has approval forms in place already and are we going to have these forms as a pre-approval form?

Maurice McKinnon suggested that maybe it is executive discretion as executives have to make decisions sometimes outside of the process.

Iris Carroll suggested that maybe a monthly overview of these positions can be provided so RAC can speak intelligently about them.

Jill Stearns stated that she would like the form to be called *Budget Allocation Request* in the case that it is not personnel.

Jenni Abbott suggested looking at this as a tool; it is not a process. Jenni felt we could put words to the process even if it doesn’t come to RAC.

Jill Stearns reminded members that this form is to be used for when you are not undergoing program review or are outside that process.

Michael Guerra stated that the Action Plan has been successful at his previous institution.

Jill Stearns informed members that the program review process is just starting for MJC. Michael Guerra added that the process is just being cleaned up right now. Michael briefly went over the items, stating that he just wanted to present this and put forward as something to think about. He reminded members that RAC is a recommending body and asked what vehicles are we going to use? He added that we are going to design these forms if it is something members think is important to talk about. He asked what parameters are we going to put out there?

Jill Stearns asked if program review is making us better at what we do, adding that it is really about taking care of needs. Iris Carroll responded that if we are not doing program review at the time, something else needs to drive our allocations.

### 6. Name change to Resource Allocation *Council* instead of Committee

A motion was made at the previous meeting regarding the name change but could not be voted on due to lack of a quorum.

**Action Item**

Rose LaMont moved to change Resource Allocation Committee to Resource Allocation Council. Kevin Alavezos seconded.

Motion passed by aye vote.

### 7. RAC Representative on College Council

Paul Cripe agreed to be the Resource Allocation Council representative on College Council.

There was general consensus to approve Paul Cripe as the College Council rep.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Michael Guerra gave members a homework assignment of reading the decision-making document. Michael will also send out links regarding information on other colleges.

Future Agenda

1. Proof of Concept (re Patterson site)
2. Agenda Development
3. Recommendation for requests outside Program Review documents

ADJOURNMENT