



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. DO Conference Room/RC PCR/WI AC2-149B

Notes from Meeting of October 10, 2012

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynnna Billings, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Melanie Highfill, Lorrie Hopper, Erica Johnson, Helena Kennedy, Alicia Rios, Wil Schofield

Guest: Tabitha Villalba

The meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

II. Purpose and charge of the task force

The Grant Process Task Force was not created via any formal process. The group was formed in response to: 1) Questions from the Chancellor's Cabinet and Communication Council; 2) Program review goal to regularly evaluate the Grant Department process in order to improve application work-flow.

Initial meeting to form the Task Force was held with the finance and administration team. Vice Chancellor, Ed Eng, recommended that a group be formed to explore this issue. The campus presidents were asked to select three members to represent each of their campuses, with a mix of financial and grant-end-users being suggested. Overall grant application process to be reviewed with final recommendations to be submitted to the Chancellor's Cabinet.

Initial timeline for Grant Process Task Force completion to be updated in order to include incoming Vice Chancellor, Ed Services; Dr. George Railey (start date, November, 2012) with a project end date in Spring, 2013 (March, 2013).

III. Progress to date

Suggestions from the campus presidents were received; candidates were contacted; meeting date/time/location arranged; initial meeting materials distributed.

IV. Development of an ongoing schedule

It was proposed and agreed that the Grant Process Task Force will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of each month from 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM. *The meeting locations have been arranged, and are as follows: DO Conference Room /WI AC2 – 149B / RC CCI-208.*

V. Review of existing district and campus grant processes

A. FCC

Process begins with initiator speaking to Dean > proposal is forwarded to Vice President for review/approval > budget (but not narrative) is forwarded to campus business office for review/approval > campus business office forwards budget to DO accounting department for review/approval > once DO accounting signs off, routing-slip form initiated by grant seeker > routing slip and grant materials (budget/narrative) sent to campus offices that must review > campus offices sign off and return to campus business office > signed copy of routing slip sent electronically to grant department

B. RC(& NC)

Process begins with initiator speaking to Dean and/or Vice President for review/approval > project proposal is discussed with campus business office and project budget is developed > campus business office forwards budget to DO accounting department for review/approval > once DO accounting signs off, routing-slip form initiated by grant seeker > routing slip and grant materials (budget/narrative) sent to campus offices that must review > campus offices sign off and return to campus business office > signed copy of routing slip sent electronically to grant department

C. WI

Process begins with initiator speaking to Dean and/or Vice President for review/approval > work on the narrative and budget for the project begins > budget forwarded to campus business office for review/approval > campus business office forwards budget to DO accounting department for review/approval > once DO accounting signs off, initiator speaks with WI president to receive approval for final submittal of the grant > NOI form is submitted > routing-slip form initiated by grant seeker > routing slip and grant materials (budget/narrative) sent to campus offices that must review > signed copy of routing slip sent electronically to grant department

*Notes: Review of the potential grant to ensure that it is in alignment with the Strategic Plan is not always documented. The size of the campuses involved has an effect on the workflow and perhaps leads to different processes at each location. Timing of the NOI submittal may negatively impact this documents communication function for DO and campus

D. Districtwide Processes

Materials provided as part of meeting packet include AR 3280 and the formal 'district level' process for grant submittal.

For all locations, the NOI form is submitted via the district's intranet site. The NOI serves three functions: 1) To facilitate potential collaboration both on and between campuses on grant projects; 2) To inform DO and campuses of the maximum funding amount, deadline, match, space and personnel needs of the project; 3) To offer an opportunity for campuses to have input on grant application decision. The campus president approves or declines the NOI form. If the NOI form is not approved, the initiator receives a notice informing him or her to contact the campus president for additional instructions.

Proposal Development:

The grant department 1) distributes timeline and grant process information to initiator and campus business office; 2) distributes template documents based on funding agency RFA to initiator and campus business office; and 3) sends periodic reminders sent to campus regarding timeline. The initiator prepares the narrative and budget; the grants department provides edit/development services and research as needed.

Proposal Approval and Submittal:

The grants department completes/reviews final application forms and enters approved budget into the correct format. The campus initiator routes the draft proposal to campus department/business offices as needed for approval. The signed approval form is sent to the grant department; it is attached to the approved budget, narrative documents, and application forms and forwarded to Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration offices for final review/approval/signature. Once the routing slip is completed at DO, the grant department submits the proposal to the funding agency (electronic or hardcopy submittal), tracks submittal to ensure its timely arrival, and distributes copies of submitted grant documents to DO accounting, initiator, and campus business office.

*Notes: How can we make the NOI process work better? Are the current timelines developed in response to AR 3280 workable? Do these timelines allow for enough review at the campus presidents and Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration offices?

VI. Next Steps

The next meeting will include a review of the NOI process with input gathered from campus constituencies by Grant Process Task Force members from those locations. How can this practice be improved to better serve the grant application process?

There will also be a discussion of how to ensure that grants are aligned with strategic/educational master plans.

Meeting adjourned at 12:06 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. NOI Process
2. Final Approval Timelines
 - a. Timing of Routing Slip via Campus Presidents & VC Finance and Administration
3. Summary sheet of narrative grant information/project for faster review

Next meeting October 24th, 2012
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B

Notes from Meeting of October 24, 2012

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Erica Johnson, Helena Kennedy, Peggy Marks, Frank Nunez, George Railey

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today.

II. Discussion of NOI Process

S. Conner discussed the current NOI form and its origins in a joint DO/campus group that met several years ago. She went on to describe the current steps in the NOI process at this time:

- 1) NOI completed by grant applicant;
- 2) NOI reviewed by campus president;
- 3) Approved > NOI automatically forwarded to R. Kim for distribution via districtwide mail-all (email) at least every seven days.
- 4) Denied > Notification emailed to original NOI submitter, letting them know to contact their campus president for further information.

S. Conner then asked for feedback from the group on the following aspects of the NOI process as it stands today:

Purpose: The NOI was originally intended as a districtwide communication tool; has it lived up to this? The current deadline of the NOI is 16 business days prior to the grant application deadline. M. Byrd pointed out that this is not enough time to provide the information to campuses if one is seek collaboration. J. Chin noted that 16 days is a minimum but that an NOI can be forwarded at any time and therefore more time could be allowed if an applicant wanted to use the form to seek greater collaboration

on a project. S. Conner noted that campuses could choose to seek internal deadlines for NOI's that extended beyond the 16 days for their own purposes.

L. Hopper noted that she uses the NOI as a communication tool as it allows her to plan her time for reviewing campus budgets. C. Crill-Hornsby noted that C. Chang has stated the same thing for district level accounting review.

Function: S. Conner discussed the current NOI form as it is today. The form had been sent to task force members for their use in prepping for today's meeting. It was noted that an important function of the communication of this document was in determining the fit of the funds for that campuses needs, potentially via Strategic Planning goals.

III. Recommendations for Revisions:

Specifically noted changes that could be made included the following (by form heading):

- 1) (**KEY IDENTIFIER**) "Department": This could be more detailed, with division/instructional unit information captured and later used along with headers such as 'grant source' and 'grant award range' to allow recipients of mail-all's to determine if they would like more information on a grant application.
- 2) "Campus": G. Railey noted that instead of only the applicant president receiving a notice of the NOI, perhaps all presidents should receive this document, with only the applicant president able to 'Approve/Deny' the NOI application.
- 3) (**KEY IDENTIFIER**) "Grant Source": Unchanged, but identified by the group as a key piece of data in determining if mail-all recipients would be interested in having additional information about this NOI.
- 4) (**KEY IDENTIFIER**) "Grant Award Range": Unchanged, but identified by the group as a key piece of data in determining if mail-all recipients would be interested in having additional information about this NOI.
- 5) "Match Required": C. Chang suggested that it would be helpful for this section to capture the type/amount of the match in a general way (ie. "1-to-1", or "50% match", etc.).
- 6) (**NEW**) "Indirect Rate Allowed": C. Chang also suggested that a Yes/No question on indirect rate be added to the NOI form.
- 7) "Need Addressed/Campus Focus Area": S. Conner suggested that this portion of the NOI be updated to include greater detail on how the funding would forward the campus' strategic plan or the district's strategic plan. C. Crill-Hornsby suggested that a website version of the NOI would allow for greater flexibility in information gathering, with specific campuses NOI's having the details (strategic plan) for that location. She went on to state that there was potential for backing up this information to a database that would allow the campuses/district to see what sorts of grant funds were being sought, in pursuit of which strategic planning objectives. G. Railey pointed out that this was the sort of data that accreditation teams would like to see us collecting.

The distribution of these materials was also discussed, with campuses stating that the KEY IDENTIFIERS noted above could help those reading a shortened mail-all document to determine if they were interested in additional information on an application opportunity. G. Railey noted that any communication needed to avoid an excess of layers between the audience and the details they were looking for.

M. Byrd noted that a key step is building greater awareness of what the NOI is used for. G. Railey suggested that a general statement regarding the purpose of NOI's be drafted to be included in the standard mail-all template. E. Johnson mentioned the possibility of additional basic grants training for staff at campuses, which S. Conner concurred with.

IV. Next Steps

S. Conner noted that the next meeting will include a review HR and how hiring and positions in grants are approached in the application process with input gathered by Grant Process Task Force members from their campus locations. How can this practice be improved to better serve the grant application process? Diane Clerou, Interim Associate VC of Human Resources and Elba Garcia, Director of Classified Personnel have been invited to attend to provide their input.

Future meetings will include similar guest and input on Information Systems and Institutional Research.

There was also a brief discussion of polling created for use in assisting campuses in securing input from their sites regarding upcoming topics for these meetings. S. Conner and C. Crill-Hornsby to distribute examples via email shortly.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. H.R. and grant applications process
2. I.S. and grant application process
3. I.R. and grant application process

Next meeting November 14th, 2012
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Review Group Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B

Notes from Meeting of November 14, 2012

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Melanie Highfill, Lorrie Hopper, Diana Tapia-Wright, George Railey

Guests: Diane Clerou, Frances Garza, Elba Gomez

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today and the intention of the Grant Process Review Group.

II. Discussion of Human Resources/Personnel Commission and Grant Applications – E. Gomez & F. Garza

E. Gomez began by noting that there are concerns in the Human Resources/Personnel Commission (HR/PC) departments with current grant application practice of including positions in grant applications that do not match current position descriptions used at SCCCD. She stated that it was important that grant positions be written using the current SCCCD position descriptions. She then asked what method is used currently to determine positions in grant applications. M. Highfill noted the following practices at Reedley College:

- 1) In renewals, positions are used that are the same as those historically names in prior versions of the grant application;
- 2) In new grants that are of the same type as prior grant applications, positions are used that are based on prior (existing) grant templates;
- 3) In the case of new or first-time grant applications, campuses forgo classified positions in favor of hiring adjunct and/or full-time temporary certificated positions. This is done in order to avoid future ‘ownership’ of classified positions in the district (i.e. the requirement to provide continuing employment to classified staff as compared to the ability to release adjunct and full-time categorically funded certificated personnel when funding ends. *S. Ahrens noted later that this is also the common practice at FCC.*

E. Gomez clarified that the Personnel Commission (PC) has internal guidelines that will not allow for a certificated personnel to be hired to fill in for classified work assignments. However, she noted that 'limited term' positions are an option for filling classified positions with personnel who will not have long-term rights to their position. These positions must be re-approved by the Board of Trustees every 6 months, and do not have any benefits (health, vacation, etc.) but otherwise are very similar to regular classified staff and can be held by the same person on an ongoing basis.

F. Garza noted that if a campus is aware that a classified 'limited term' personnel position will actually be a long-term position, the job should be hired as a regular classified job in the first place and not put on 'limited term'.

S. Conner pointed out that the issue with hiring 'limited term' is twofold:

- 1) Some grants are designed to include institutionalized (long-term) personnel;
- 2) There is a potential cycle of instability in hiring non-permanent staff into a long-term project;

D. Tapia-Wright noted that in some cases, grant-funded staff members 'bump' into other jobs and that this can spread work-related issues. E. Gomez noted that the practice of offering seniority benefits and bumping rights to personnel who are hired into grant-funded jobs is regulated by law and not optional for SCCCD. F. Garza noted that XX0 funded and categorically funded jobs can bump each other – there is no delineation by funding type. She also noted that there are conflicting viewpoints on if PT staff can bump FT staff in the same position; this is a matter that will need to go before general council for review if it comes up (layoffs). S. Ahrens noted that this would also mean that PT could lateral into FT jobs.

E. Garcia also noted that it would be possible to write a position that was specific to a grant so that the individual filling the position would not be eligible to "bump" into a non-grant position once the grant funding ends. The timeline for writing a position from scratch would be lengthy; however, the writing of a modified position (one based on a current SCCCD personnel job description, but different enough to warrant a separate classification) could proceed once a title was agreed upon between a grant writer and HR/PC with final development of the position description/salary negotiation to take place if the grant funded, and temporary staffing to be provided via provisional personnel to cover until position was completed and ready to fill.

F. Garza also noted that if a new position is listed in a grant and the grant has been approved by the Board of Trustees, then the new position does not need to go to the SCCCD Board of Trustees again.

S. Ahrens noted that, in addition to certificated staff doing classified work, there are managers at the campuses who hire student aides and then assign them classified duties. This is not permissible.

G. Railey asked if the faculty contract details what the 67% employment time entails/includes as included activities. D. Clerou stated that only instructional duties are included at this time; however, there is an administrative regulation (AR) that states that one cannot work more than 60% in any capacity as a PT faculty member. S. Ahrens noted that it is possible to hire PT faculty members on as 'trainers' per the Training Institute model. F. Garza noted that trainers are exempt per the Ed Code. Currently, only FCC Training Institute hires Trainers. F. Garza also noted that there is nothing that states that only the Training Institute can hire trainers.

S. Conner discussed the issue of stipends for certificated staff. She noted that in grants funded projects, it is common to compensate faculty for additional grant-related work, but no 'standard' exists for faculty compensation, such as stipends or release time, for additional duties. G. Railey and D. Clerou both noted that this is an issue that falls under negotiations and compensation and could be seen as an unfair labor practice.

D. Tapia-Wright asked if the culmination of these review discussions would be an updated Grant Process Handbook. G. Railey assured her that it would and stated he would like to meet with S. Conner regarding the current written grant documentation.

III. Recommendations for Revisions:

Specifically noted changes that could be made included the following:

- 1) Campus grant writer to email HR/PC (E. Gomez and Samerah Campbell the following information regarding any grant that will support personnel);
 - a. The e-mail will have the position title, duties, length of the grant, and salary range information.
- 2) HR/PC will respond within three weeks to email message with their approval and/or recommendations and will include the campus grant writer and the campus business office in their reply;
- 3) Once campus business office receives this email they can use it as the basis for budget formulation and include the email as documentation of HR approval in the final grant application packet for routing/sign-off;
- 4) Timeline to be determined - currently suggested HR/PC receiving initial email from campus grant writer three weeks prior to application deadline.

IV. Next Steps

C. Crill-Hornsby to send D. Clerou and E. Gomez current grant application timeline with suggested location of HR/PC notification inserted (for review and discussion).

D. Clerou to address issue of student aides performing classified work at the next District Managers Meeting.

S. Ahrens to send D. Clerou examples of current FCC cases where there is a need to hire trainers outside of the Training Institute.

D. Clerou to review need for 'stipend guidelines' and how this fits with current HR/PC policy and practice.

G. Railey and S. Conner to meet and discuss current Grant Process Handbook documentation and development of new materials.

Meeting adjourned at 12:12 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. I.S. and grant application process
2. I.R. and grant application process

Next meeting November 28th, 2012

NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of November 28, 2012

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Erica Johnson, Helena Kennedy, Peggy Marks, George Railey

Guest: John Bengtson

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today and the foundation of the Grant Process Review Group in the district ASUR process.

II. Coordination & Approval of Grants Involving Information Technology

S. Conner gave a summary statement regarding the nature of the overall concerns when information technology components (hardware, software, infrastructure) are included in grant applications by campuses. The current process for grant development includes little-to-no review by the campus and district Information Technology departments. This lack of input has led to various problems with the current equipment and systems.

G. Railey noted that in addition to these issues, there is a need to ensure that grant applications/new technology demonstrate clear linkages with campus and district strategic planning.

J. Bengtson noted that the following issues are of primary concern, and that they are not singularly related to grant funded projects:

- 1) Lifecycle costs;
- 2) Staffing issues for support and maintenance;
- 3) Maintenance contracts costs;
- 4) System integration issues (high cost in staffing hours in I.T. departments);

- 5) Single campus vs. districtwide application of technological solutions.
 - a. Campus specific configurations led to limitations when systems are later integrated on a districtwide scale.

III. Discussion:

S. Conner summarized the following grant-specific issues of technology integration:

- 1) Expectation that I.S. staff will find the time to complete the necessary work – without prior coordination – is potentially unreasonable;
- 2) How to ensure that ongoing costs associated with technology will be covered;
- 3) Localized vs. Districtwide introduction of technologies;
- 4) How to institute complete conversations regarding what technologies to pursue via grants, in order to avoid a piecemeal approach to new technologies.

G. Railey noted that the Districtwide Technology Taskforce (DTT) would have a role to play in answering the larger questions of technology prioritization. He also noted that it is important from a grant perspective to ensure that the process for reviewing technological applications needs to be as streamlined as possible. He asked J. Bengtson to note what the preferred strategy for technology review would be for the I.S. department(s).

J. Bengtson expressed concerns that any process that is instituted will lack the ability to achieve its aims unless the process includes a clearly defined authority to say “no”, vs. the current “money in hand = yes” default. . He also sees that the DTT is a likely mechanism for this process, but is unsure it will have the ability to effect meaningful change absent such authority, based on prior experience with the Technology Coordinating Committee.

S. Ahrens commented that the issue of prioritization of technology decisions is a campus-level issue. J. Bengtson noted that the findings of the CampusWorks group in reviewing the technology environment of the district suggested that many of these decisions should be overseen by a centralized figure (they recommended a C.I.O. or C.T.O.) and that a person in such a position would sometimes find it necessary to override campus level decisions in order to ensure a consistent level of services to students throughout the district, eliminate duplication, take advantage of economies of scale, etc. This may lead to campus departments moving forward with projects sooner than they expected, or being told to hold off on projects they intend to pursue so that overall integrated planning goals can be attained.

Discussion of various mechanisms of technology review in grant processes proceeded from here. E. Johnson suggested the development of an I.S. ‘consideration’ checklist for grant applicants to use in determining their need to seek additional I.S. input. S. Ahrens noted that it is important to not add excessive additional steps/time into an already busy and short grant application process/timeline. S. Conner reminded the group that many of the topics being discussed were issues that are larger than the

grant application process alone and that only a few grants focus particularly on technology, with most having technology components that are secondary to larger grant priorities. She noted that many of these discussion items are currently ongoing in other forums, and would continue to resolution independent of the grant application review process. She finished by summarizing the current grant application issue as being one of determining the level of technology involved in an application as either a) campus level (computer labs, etc.) or b) district level (integrated software, etc.).

IV. Next Steps

It was noted that the following items should be developed by J. Bengtson for use in the review of Information Technology elements in grant applications/proposals:

- 1) A list of technologies and their required approval levels which are subject only to local/campus decision making processes rather than global/districtwide review;
- 2) A checklist of IT-related questions to be answered by grant applicants with information technology incorporated in their proposals.

J. Bengtson noted that he would be meeting with the technology officers of each campus soon, and would review his draft proposals of the above items with them at that time. These items will then be forwarded to the Districtwide Technology Taskforce for review and input.

Meeting adjourned at 12:13 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. I.R. and grant application process

Next meeting December 12, 2012
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

FCC LI-142/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of December 12, 2012

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Melanie Highfill, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Erica Johnson, Helena Kennedy, Peggy Marks, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey, Diane Tapia-Wright

Guest: Michelle Johnson, Robin Torres, Lijuan Zhai

The meeting was called to order at 11:08 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today and the foundation of the Grant Process Review Group in the district ASUR process.

II. Coordination & Approval of Grants Involving Institutional Research

S. Conner opened the floor to general observations and input from the Institutional Research (I.R.) staff present as guests at the meeting.

R. Torres began the discussion by stating that there is a need for grant applicants to be familiar with the data available to them prior to determining what objectives are to be included in their applications. This allows for data both in application and future reporting by ensuring that the campus/district is currently recording the data needed in some manner.

M. Johnson suggested that by tracking the types of data commonly used by grant writers it may be possible to create a combined report that would satisfy multiple grant needs. R. Torres agreed that this might work well, especially if it was available online from all locations (general data repository), and that it may eliminate duplicative work by I.R. staff.

M. Johnson went on to state that she is aware that grant timelines are often very short, and that the earlier that I.R. is involved the better for ensuring availability/accuracy of data. She went on to say that this may be resolved by increasing research capacity (staffing) via grant funding. L. Zhai noted that many grants include an evaluation

component, and that this may be an area where funding could be used to support I.R. work.

III. Discussion

Ongoing support of a centralized 'grant funded' researcher would need to be coordinated at a district level. This is due to personnel commission hiring practice (classified vs. certificated hiring), the volume of funding needed (may be working for multiple campuses), supervisory questions (working for multiple campuses), and T&E tracking/accounting needs.

S. Conner noted that there has been some discussion between her and G. Railey about the potential of finding a way to continuously fund the C6 Researcher position (currently in the hiring process for a PT, districtwide grant position) so that this person could eventually work in the capacity being described.

E. Johnson added to the idea of a web-based reports menu that would allow for easier data retrieval on behalf of grants applicants. L. Zhai stated that she would discuss the possibility of such a project with Mr. John Bengtson, Director of Information Systems for the district at their meeting later today. R. Torres discussed the current district reports menu and the difference between static and regular reports; static reports are updated only four times a semester and therefore offer more constant data, unlike regular reports on the system which have their data updated every 15 minutes. S. Conner also noted that the program review site is very useful, as is the I.R. Fact Book.

S. Conner noted that persistence data is a common issue in grants. She also mentioned the current growth in a need for employment data on grant recipients and the various issues with securing this data from the EDD and Dept. of Labor. There was a discussion of the various means that might be used to secure these types of data and to provide it to an end user. This led to a conversation regarding the FAQ's of data from I.R. for grants applicants. It was determined that a list of frequent data requests would be helpful in establishing how best to make data more available through self-service reports and district publications.

IV. Conclusions

It was noted that the following items would better allow I.R. to assist in grant proposal writing:

- 1) Provision for a districtwide researcher position to help serve grants needs specifically;
- 2) Data reports set up specifically for regular grant application questions;
- 3) Method of ensuring I.R. input on best data for objectives/reporting for evaluation of grants;

V. **Next Steps**

It was noted that the following steps should be taken to ensure that I.R. is included in the grant application development process:

- 1) Grant Department and I.R. to develop an 'Objectives Outline' to be used by grant applicants in discussions with I.R. to determine if data types are available;
- 2) 'Objectives Outline' to be forwarded along with all other application packet materials by Grants Department during initial development of grant along with timelines/templates;
- 3) Campus I.R. personnel to be added to distribution list for above materials (templates/timelines) in order to ensure that they are aware that a grant application is currently in process at their location;
- 4) G. Railey to sign-off on approval of applications to indicate that objectives/reporting requirements have been reviewed with I.R. department(s).
- 5) 'Objectives Outline' to be tracked by Grant Department in order to develop a FAQ list for I.R./I.S. to use in development of online, self-serve data system.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Finance Department discussion.

Next meeting January 9, 2013

NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of January 9, 2013

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Melanie Highfill, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey, Diane Tapia-Wright, W. Schofield

Guest: Liz Brase

The meeting was called to order at 11:12 a.m. by S. Conner due to technical issues.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today.

II. Campus Application Signatures – Which are Required?

S. Conner opened the topic with a statement that the overall SCCCD Routing Form would be the topic of a later meeting, as the discussion of this topic was likely to take a similar amount of time as the prior NOI form discussion.

S. Conner asked the group who they felt should be required to sign-off on a grant application document. C. Sullivan noted that the current document was left without designated signature lines because the number of signatures varied at each campus, depending on who the grant initiator is (ie. Deans would need VP signatures; VP's would need President's signatures, etc.). It was generally noted by those present that all versions of the use of the current SCCCD Routing Form require the signatures of the following individuals at a minimum:

- 1) Vice President of Administrative Services (or equivalent);
- 2) President (or equivalent).

W. Schofield stated that the District Accounting Department simply wanted to know that there had been a high level of review of the application documents at the campuses.

It was agreed that the SCCCD Routing Form be amended to reflect these two titles (VP Admin Services, President) as required signatures, with campuses determining when/if additional signatures were needed in their own procedures.

III. Documents Required for Campus Business Office Budget Review

During the review of the proposed materials, the following documents were determined to be critical to campus business office review of application budget documents. If the application contains:

- 1) **Personnel New:** Benefit Calculator *and*:
 - a. Full-Time (Classified or Faculty): Position Title/Step-Range of Salary/Number of Duty Days.
 - b. Schedule C/Part-Time (Classified, Faculty, or Student): Step-Range of Salary/Number of Hours per Work Period (Week/Month/Semester).
- 2) **Personnel Existing:** Benefits Calculator (*for projected years*) & Budget Control Report from Campus Business Office.
- 3) **Travel Costs:** Detail as determined by grant, at a minimum this information must include: Trip Title, Location (if available), Cost Estimate/Person (flight/hotel/per diem), Number of People Traveling.
- 4) **Equipment Quotes:** Equipment quotes are required for all equipment with a total cost of \$5,000 or more. Total cost includes the cost of the item, sales tax, shipping cost, set-up fees and any peripherals required to make the item operational.
- 5) **Construction Quotes:** Requested from/provided by from SCCC Operations Department.

IV. Benefits Calculators, How to Properly Project for Future Years?

FCC's business office requested that the Finance and Administration Unit create a formula for projecting future increases in fringe benefits and that a standard rate of increase be given to the campuses at the start of the fiscal year. W. Schofield explained that there were a number of issues with creating a fixed projection of the cost of increase. He noted that if the salary was increased by X%, then the benefits calculator would also project a percentage of increase. Those present agreed that providing a standard rate used by all grant applicants will eliminate confusion over rate increases and should reduce the need to re-do benefit calculators. G. Billings and C. Sullivan agreed that the Accounting Group would address this issue at its meeting on 1/23/13. C. Crill-Hornsby will follow up with G. Billings after that meeting.

V. Evaluation of Competitiveness of Proposals

It was noted that the meeting had reached its designated end point, and that those who needed to move on to other events were free to leave. The discussion of this item continued after meeting close to 12:26 PM and will continue on to future agendas as well.

S. Conner started by noting that she understands that grants are a time consuming item for the campuses to produce. She stated that there are many factors that go into the decision to complete/submit an application and that these factors vary by funding source. S. Conner also noted that grants are sometimes submitted so that the applicant can receive funding source comments, allowing for a stronger application in the next round of funding.

C. Sullivan noted that administrator decision to allow applications to move forward can be influenced by the criticism they can receive later for disallowing an application to be completed.

Meeting officially adjourned at 12:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Dollar Value Threshold for Application Review
2. Evaluation of Competitiveness of Proposals (Ongoing)

Next meeting January 23, 2013
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of January 23, 2013

Present: Shanna Ahrens, John Bengtson, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Erica Johnson, Peggy Marks, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey, Diane Tapia-Wright, W. Schofield

The meeting was called to order at 11:04 a.m. by S. Conner due to technical issues.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today.

II. Procedures/Supporting Documentation

S. Conner began with a brief review of the current process for getting budgets to the DO Accounting department for their review. W. Schofield then began his comments by noting that the overall issue faced by the DO Accounting department in review of grant documents is one of timing; when there is not sufficient lead-time for the review of budgetary items it prevents all stages of the review process from doing their job properly. There followed a discussion of possible delay items, including legal review, which prompted the statement by S. Conner that that the overall process for potential legal review of application documents would be the topic of a later meeting.

It was recommended that the number of years to be evaluated during the budgetary review process would be determined by the number of years required in the application documents. *ie. If only one year of funding estimation is required, only one will be reviewed even if a grant has a period of longer than 12 months. If a funding agency required five years of budgetary estimates in their application, then all five will be reviewed and approved.* This was determined to be appropriate as any additional budgetary periods would already undergo campus and DO review during budget load, reporting, or any major change to the grant contract.

The following routing order for budgetary review was proposed, along with noted supporting documentation for each portion of the process:

- 1) Campus Grant Seeker completes NOI Form;

- 2) Campus Grant Seeker to email HR/PC (E. Gomez and Samerah Campbell the following information regarding any grant that will support personnel);
 - a. The e-mail will have the position title, duties, length of the grant, and salary range information.¹
- 3) HR/PC will respond within three weeks to email message with their approval and/or recommendations and will include the campus grant writer and the campus business office in their reply;²
- 4) Campus Grant Seeker to prep initial budget and submit to the Campus Business Office along with the following documentation:³
 - a. **Personnel New:** Benefit Calculator *and*:
 - i. Full-Time (Classified or Faculty): Position Title/Step-Range of Salary/Number of Duty Days.
 - ii. Schedule C/Part-Time (Classified, Faculty, or Student): Step-Range of Salary/Number of Hours per Work Period (Week/Month/Semester).
 - b. **Personnel Existing:** Benefits Calculator (*for projected years*) & Budget Control Report from Campus Business Office.
 - c. **Travel Costs:** Detail as determined by grant, at a minimum this information must include: Trip Title, Location (if available), Cost Estimate/Person (flight/hotel/per diem), Number of People Traveling.
 - d. **Equipment Quotes:** Equipment quotes are required for all equipment with a total cost of \$5,000 or more. Total cost includes the cost of the item, sales tax, shipping cost, set-up fees and any peripherals required to make the item operational.
 - e. **Construction Quotes:** Requested from/provided by from SCCCD Operations Department.
 - f. The following items were added to the above at the 1/23/13 meeting:
 - iii. **Draft Narrative**
 - iv. **Draft Timeline**
- 5) Campus Business Office will review and forward the approved budget to DO Accountant/ Auditor (C. Chang) for review along with all above documentation. In addition the following will be provided:
 - a. **Match:** Information on how the total match was calculated including T&E or salary schedule information as appropriate.
 - b. **Indirect Cost Information:** If allowed by funding agency, standard SCCCD indirect cost will be 8%.
- 6) DO Accountant/ Auditor (C. Chang) will notify Campus Business office, Campus Grant Seeker and Grants Department of approval of budget.
- 7) Campus Grant Seeker seeks campus-level signatures for SCCCD Routing Form and returns completed form to Grants Department. Signatures to include⁴:
 - a. Vice President of Administrative Services (or equivalent);
 - b. President (or equivalent)

¹ Grants Process Review Group - 11 14 12 - Summary

² Grants Process Review Group - 11 14 12 - Summary

³ Grants Process Task Force - 01 09 13 - Summary

⁴ Grants Process Task Force - 01 09 13 - Summary

- 8) Grants Department sends SCCCD Routing Form and a copy of the completed grant application packet to DO Accountant/ Auditor (C. Chang).
- 9) DO Accountant/ Auditor (C. Chang) to complete final approval of budgetary items and route packet to Secretary of the Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration for signature.
- 10) Secretary of the Vice Chancellor to notify Grants Department when Vice Chancellor has authorized submittal of the application.

It was noted that this process involves a large number of people completing reviews and signatures in a timely manner. S. Conner asked what procedure should be followed when signers are not available. It was decided that this matter would be discussed at the Chancellor's Cabinet level by G. Railey and members of that body.

There was additional discussion of whether or not the District Accounting department should review proposals for programmatic compliance, or whether it should be the responsibility of the campus grant writer and the Director of the Grants to assure that the required programmatic components are addressed. It was decided that a meeting would be held to include G. Railey, E. Eng, W. Schofield, S. Conner & C. Chang to discuss this item in greater detail.

Meeting officially adjourned at 12:05 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Legal Review of Grant Application Documents
2. Evaluation of Competitiveness of Proposals (Ongoing)

Next meeting February 13, 2013
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of February 13, 2013

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynnna Billings, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Melanie Highfil, Lorrie Hopper, Helena Kennedy, Peggy Marks, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey, Alicia Rios, Wil Schofield, Diane Tapia-Wright

The meeting was called to order at 11:07 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today.

II. Legal Review of Applications

S. Conner noted that Gregory Taylor, SCCCD Legal Counsel, had been invited to attend this meeting but was unable to do so. An invitation will be extended for him to join us at our meeting on February 27th. In the meantime, S. Conner asked the group to provide questions to help Mr. Taylor prepare for his time with the group. The following questions were noted at the meeting:

- 1) Is there a need for grant applications to be reviewed prior to be submitted?
- 2) What is the purpose of the legal review of applications (what are the main concerns)?
- 3) What would the timeline be for legal review to be accomplished?

S. Conner noted that the decision to include legal review in the application process may need to be determined at Chancellor's Cabinet.

III. Review of "Non-Grant" Applications

In Cases of Partnership with Outside Applicant Institution

S. Conner asked the group their opinion on when review of materials should occur in cases where SCCCD is not the applicant agency (if we are acting as a partner). S. Ahrens noted that any time specific budgets are attached to an application there is an expectation that those will be reviewed prior to their submittal to a funding agency.

However, in cases where no budgets are included [Letters of Intent (LOI), partnership statements, etc.] when does review happen?

After extensive discussion, including the process for the current signing of MOU's and sub-agreements and the difference in the nature of obligations for MOU's and LOI's, the following was outlined:

IF NO BUDGET IS REQUIRED IN SCCCD MATERIALS FOR APPLICATION:

No review by the budget office is necessary as there is no contractual obligation from either the applicant or SCCCD at this time.

IF A BUDGET IS REQUIRED IN SCCCD MATERIALS FOR APPLICATION:

There will be a mini-review of application materials by the campuses prior to them being submitted as part of the primary organizations application.

It was noted that a full review of all proposed budgets and contract/MOU/sub-agreement materials would be triggered once the primary application was funded and the awarded institution started formal contracting for services.

In Cases of Application for 'Alternative Funding' or 'Limited Funds'

S. Conner noted that there are a number of cases where SCCCD applicants are seeking small or specialized funding (gift cards, donations, etc.). She asked if there is currently a process for tracking or reviewing these applications on the campuses when the applicant does not seek the assistance of the Grants Department. C. Sullivan noted that no current process of this type exists on the campuses. S. Conner then stated that submitting these alternative/limited funds application to the full grant review process may show a poor return on invested time; the amounts being sought may not off-set the time/work intensive process that full grant applications receive. She asked if there was a means of creating a shorter review process for specific types of external funding. After discussion, the following outline was developed:

Projects of \$10,000 or less will be:

- 1) Reviewed by the campus business offices on a case-by-case basis. If the office determines that the application and use of funds does not rise to the level of a full grant review process, they will initiate a campus level sign-off on the standard routing slip (VP of Administrative Services, President only).
- 2) NOI's will not be required in these cases.
- 3) DO Accounting review will not be required in these cases.

The question was posed as to how many grants under \$10,000 were applied for in the past year, and how many of those were successful.

IV. Evaluations of the Competitiveness of Proposals

S. Conner posed the following questions:

- 1) What thresholds might be created to determine the competitiveness of grant applications?
- 2) What types of grants should SCCCD not be applying for?

S. Conner noted that there needs to be strategic focus of Grant Department energies in order to ensure that the district is meeting the external funding goals included in the strategic plan and approved by the Board of Trustees. However, she also noted that there are times when seemingly non-competitive applications are completed for purposes rather than immediate funding.

V. Review of Updated Grant Process Summary

S. Conner introduced the document, “Grant Process Summary – Draft” (also sent to the group as materials for this meeting). She requested that members of the group review the document and seek feedback from their campuses. This item will be discussed in detail at the next meeting of this body, February 27th.

Meeting officially adjourned at 11:59 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Legal Review of Grant Applications
2. Review of Updated Grant Process Summary

Next meeting February 27, 2013
NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of February 27, 2013

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Glynnia Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Cindy Chang, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Peggy Marks, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey

Guests: John Bengtson, Greg Taylor

The meeting was called to order at 11:11 a.m. by S. Conner. Due to changes in guest schedules the meeting agenda was altered into the following order.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

S. Conner provided a brief overview of the agenda for today and the review process to date.

II. Review of Updated Grant Process Summary

S. Conner provided copies of the draft grant process documents, including timeline, process flow and sample forms. She began the review with the timeline document, taking each step of the process in turn as below. It was noted during this process that the general instructions for this timeline need to indicate that the days included are only working days, not weekends and holidays:

- a. 16 days prior to deadline – Complete online NOI form
 - i. No comment from the group on this stage
- b. 15 days prior to deadline – Email sent to HR/PC (elba.garcia@sccd.edu and samerah.campbell@sccd.edu). Message to include the following personnel information regarding any persons to be funded by the grant; 1) Title, 2) Position, 3) Duties, 4) Term of Employment, 5) Intended Salary Range
 - i. There was general concern expressed at the length of time proposed for review by PC/HR as it would present significant delays in the timeline if the business offices had to wait for this departments final review before beginning to develop a budget
 - ii. S. Conner to follow up with PC/HR regarding their portion of the timeline and how it fits in with the remainder of the review process
- c. 15 days prior to deadline – Email sent to I.S. staff

- i. J. Bengtson stated that he and the other I.S. Directors had met and agreed to simplify their portion of the process; so long as there is some evidence of I.S. review/approval of the proposed project (email, signed routing slip, etc) attached to the application packet they are fine with it proceeding
 - ii. The campus I.S. departments will review campus proposals, and the district I.S. department will review district proposals
- d. 10 days prior to deadline – Draft narrative due to supervisor, manager or dean for review and input.
 - i. *Not reviewed in detail*
- e. 10 days prior to deadline – Draft Budget due to campus Business Office for review
 - i. *Not reviewed in detail*
- f. 7 days prior to deadline - Draft Narrative due to Grant Department
 - i. *Not reviewed in detail*
- g. 5 days prior to deadline – Budget due to DO Accounting (Cindy Chang) for review
 - i. *Not reviewed in detail*
- h. 3 days prior to deadline – Completed draft copy to VP, Administrative Services, Area VP and President for final approval (signed transmittal form.)
 - i. S. Conner noted that Ed Eng would like to receive a copy of the draft narrative at the same time that the campus routing process begins, allowing him more time to review the documents (i.e. routing at campuses and DO to proceed simultaneously – with DO signing after campus signature approved)
- i. 2 days prior to deadline - Forward signed transmittal form to the Director, Grants and External Funding
 - i. *Not reviewed in detail*

There was some discussion as to the process for ensuring that DO Ops could approve grant applications with construction components. S. Conner stated that she would contact Brian Speece’s office to establish a procedure for the proposal and would include it in an updated draft copy.

III. Legal Review of Applications

G. Taylor, SCCCD Legal Counsel, joined the meeting to discuss the options for grant review. He noted that he was unclear as to why there would be legal review of grant applications, but that there were concerns regarding the review of grant contracts. He noted a number of items that have come up in regards to contracts that have caused him concerns in the past, and stated that these needed to be reviewed even if the terms of the contract are non-negotiable.

S. Conner suggested and the group agreed that the group recommend that there not be a step for legal review of grant proposals. It was further agreed that a recommendation for *post-award* legal review be included in the draft revision of the Grant Process for the Chancellor’s Cabinet review. It was suggested that a list of

the normal contract language for both federal and state contracts could be reviewed on an annual basis as a 'pre-staging' activity for incoming contracts in that year.

Meeting officially adjourned at 12:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Updated Grant Process Draft

Next meeting Wednesday, April 3 from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

NOTE: Assignments are underlined



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Grant Process Task Force Meeting

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

DO Conference Room/RC CCI - 208/WI AC2-149B/MC AV1-101D

Notes from Meeting of April 3, 2013

Present: Shanna Ahrens, Diana Banuelos, Glynn Billings, Marie Byrd-Harris, Cindy Chang, Jim Chin, Shelly Conner, Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby, Lorrie Hopper, Helena Kennedy, Wil Schofield, Cheryl Sullivan, George Railey

The meeting was called to order at 10:16 a.m. by S. Conner.

I. Welcome and Introductions

See listed individuals above.

II. Review of Updated Grant Process Documents

S. Conner provided copies of the draft grant process documents, including timeline, process flow and sample forms. She began the review with the timeline document, which included a discussion of the timelines ultimate length vs. additional departmental timing needs. S. Conner notes that the DO Accounting department is the only district agency that has a required approval step in the process, and that all other district departments are included in the application process as advisory bodies only. There followed a lengthy discussion of the proposed forms and their contents. It was noted that while the NOI form is distributed throughout the district via mail-all once approved by the campus president/Vice Chancellor of Ed Services, the Initial Grant Proposal Outline document will only be distributed to necessary campus and DO groups concerned with the specific information it contains. Based on the groups input, C. Crill-Hornsby will prepare updated drafts of these documents and distributed to group members for final input.

There was additional discussion of the timeline of the application process, including the timing of the completion of the NOI form and the associated Initial Grant Proposal Outline. S. Conner pointed out that the NOI form may be completed prior to a campus president's notification of an intended grant proposal, and that thereby there may be cases in which the Initial Grant Proposal Outline may be sent before final approval for application is received at the campus level (via the NOI form). It was noted that in a majority of cases, the presidents and Vice Chancellor of Ed Services have chosen to approve the NOI forms and that based on this precedent and the

shortness of the overall application timeline, the group agrees that these items should be approached concurrently rather than consecutively.

At the end of the meeting G. Railey noted that he would be taking the edited proposal documents to Chancellor's Cabinet for review and approval as soon as the final electronic review of the documents was completed by this group. He asked that S. Conner act as a guest speaker at the Chancellor's Cabinet where he presents these materials, in case there were any questions; S. Conner agreed to attend. G. Railey stated that he would report the determination of the Chancellor's Cabinet back to the group. It was further noted that this group, the Grant Process Review Group, would not need to meet further unless the Chancellor's Cabinet asked for revisions to the proposed policy or documents.

S. Conner thanked the group for their time and service in this effort.

Meeting officially adjourned at 11:49 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

*Until otherwise indicated by Chancellor's Cabinet review,
this was the final meeting of this group.*

NOTE: Assignments are underlined