OS Meeting
January 16, 2013

A. Fran started the meeting by announcing that Nikki Nunes will be the speaker elect.

Also there are 2 committee openings : 1. Bylaws 2. Planning  Please let Fran know if you are interested in joining one of them

B. There 2 new OS members

Jennifer Lique
Erich Heron

C. Faculty Report:

At the last faculty meeting, they discussed unionizing:

**Pros:**

1. Adjunct already unionizeded
2. They need a unified voice with admin

**Cons:**

1. Could ruin relationship – right now, it is congenial

Parking Committee:

OS needs to vote on the parking committee’s proposal - whether OS is in favor of a fee for parking.

Fran and Mary reviewed 2 proposals that have already been approved by the cabinet and will be implemented in 2013.

1. Employees who drive to campus will need to register their car every year and new parking permits are reissued annually.
2. Employees with two or more cars pay for the additional parking passes at a rate of $50 per car. This additional parking pass is for employee use only and not for any other family member or relative

Many people were unhappy with the changes – particularly the extra $50 per car fee for additional cars. The suggestion was made to have one permit with all cars on the permit so that if you used multiple cars to drive to work, the permit would be valid for whichever car you used – but only one car could park on campus at a time.
There were 2 additional recommendations. These recommendations have not yet been adopted – however, OS will not have the opportunity to vote on them. OS’s views have already been represented through Mary.

1. Any parking violation committed by faculty or staff are either paid or appeal in the same process a student is expected to appeal a parking violation.

2. The second recommendation is raising the rates of parking permits for students to $100 for remote parking and $130 for premium parking (close to residence halls).

The intent behind the proposals is to:

1. Raise money – there is a shortfall in the shuttle budget and to help fund police administration of parking. The parking store is going away and the parking permits will now be administered by campus police.

2. Get rid of old permits from past employees and crack down on abuses. Ideally we would have a scanning system in place to determine if a permit was valid, but it’s not possible right now. So the parking committee is trying to develop a process to weed out old permits by having annual registration.

Again, lots of discussion – still voicing frustration that OS were not included in the process. Unfortunately, frustrations were inappropriately directed towards Mary. As was highlighted several times, OS and Mary are only one vote or voice on the committee.

The role of OS was restated – to vote on whether OS is in favor of a parking fee (proposed amount of $10). There will be paper ballots (at physical plant) and electronic ballots.

AS a follow-up, a subsequent meeting was held with Jim Hundreiser, Mary Petz, Michele Escobar and Fran Bean. They sent out a survey to collect more information about parking permit preferences.
Strategic Budget Request Process – Talking Points

- All FY14 budget requests were submitted electronically.
- Received 92 strategic budget requests totaling nearly $5 million.
  - One-time budget requests – 35 requests totaling $1.3 million
  - Base funding requests – 57 requests totaling $3.6 million
  - NOTE: There were also approx. 90 operating budget requests submitted that go directly to the Principal Administrators not the PBLG. The amount of the 90 operating budget requests is NOT included in the nearly $5 million figure.
- Eight PBLG members volunteered to serve on the budget sub-group to review requests.
- Volunteers included faculty, staff, and one student.
- The budget sub-group created a strategic request prioritization matrix.
  - Selected 9 criteria on which to rank the strategic budget requests.
  - Criteria were selected based upon PSU’s current strategic plan, SWOT results, PBLG forum discussions, strategic themes presented by Pres. Steen at a Fall 2012 PBLG meeting, etc.
  - Total possible points = 81 (each criteria was ranked 0 – 9)
  - Using the matrix, volunteers individually ranked each request (average hours per volunteer = 13 to 15 hours).
  - Volunteers held 3 group meetings in order to review ratings and reach agreement (meeting time = 8.5 hours).
- Prioritization Criteria included:
  - Link to PSU’s strategic plan
  - Impact on student life (holistic approach)
  - Full disclosure of costs
  - Impact on enrollment – recruitment & retention
  - Campus momentum to move the initiative forward
  - Diversity cultivation
  - Support of University’s “green initiative”
  - Increasing the leveraging of resources in support of teaching & learning
- Evaluation of Process to date
  - Dedicated volunteers that did their homework & stayed engaged in the process
  - Excellent group dynamics
  - Use of prioritization matrix helped review to be more consistent & focused
  - Outlying individual ratings were discussed by group and occasionally changed or omitted from average rating once consensus was reached
  - Subjectivity will always be involved to some degree in this process
  - College Deans met with sub-group at last group meeting
    - Gave sub-group the opportunity to ask some clarifying questions
    - Allowed sub-group to share insights discovered during review process
- Next Steps
  - Send all strategic budget requests to President & Cabinet along with a narrative and the prioritization matrix for their review & consideration during the multi-faceted budget decision-making process.
  - Communicate status of request process to campus periodically
  - Close loop once requests are approved/not approved