Document	Nome	COMMENT	DESDONSE
Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE
3	J Holbrook	Typo – fill rather than filled and position to position(s)	
5	J Holbrook	I am not sure why a previous year priority does not	
		matter. If for some reason there is no money to hire	
		a faculty member, even if this position was listed as	
		the first priority, to have to start the process over	
		again is a significant problem and waste of time in	
		process.	
		If our process is reliable and the position is important	
		given all of the vetting, the prioritized position should	
		remain valuable from cycle to cycle.	
8	J Holbrook	Along with the requisite resources – I have not seen	
		this section in the current documents. There are	
		planning items that have been prioritized with "no	
		resources" nor funding status or funding resources.	
		Given the current process this sentence does not	
		make complete sense to me? It is my understanding	
		that PPR creates a list of <i>their</i> understanding and position of needs.	
8-9	J Holbrook	By the time our planning process is complete we are	
	O I IOIDI OOK	already in a new environment. A dynamic process	
		needs to be identified somewhere in the process.	
10-12	J Holbrook	This section creates structure which is ok, but my	
		concern is the time line for all of these layers of	
		approval delay an already protracted and political	
		process. Is there a way that people (i.e. staff) are	
		prioritized in one place and rapidly forwarded to the	
		next level while things are prioritized in another time	
		line? I have concerns of heterogeneity within some	
13-15	J Holbrook	homogenous thinking process. Another layer of input. There is structure without	
10-10	3 I IOIDIOUK	definition as to failure. There is structure without	
		between action and cognition with the explanation	
		Total double and obganion with the explanation	

Document	Nome	COMMENT	DESPONSE
Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		required, but what happens if this group decides to reorder the previous group? Do the previous groups have recourse or does the bigger / higher group have the approval? There are issues between expertise and authority. The experts have already made a decision and now the authority does a different list. This creates tension between the authority and the experts.	
18	J Holbrook	Same questions on process.	
19	J Holbrook	FON needs to be spelled out. This policy does not indicate only academic employees. Do all employees impact the FON? The two variables of people and funding make this problematic and static. There is no mechanism for the dynamic issues that have been discussed in many meetings. This continues to create this very large level of	
04.00		structure.	
21-22	J Holbrook J Holbrook	Do each of these groups get to rearrange the order? I am not sure of the position Classified Senate President as necessary in this decision making loop. I appreciate the idea of sense making from the largest possible group. Has this process been forwarded to the Classified	
		Senate for comments? How will the Academic Senate incorporate those comments? I can support the idea of fixed budgets and known processes with positions. This known variable will help stabilize positions.	

Document	Nama	COMMENT	DEGRANGE
Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE
31	J Holbrook	I am not sure the Academic Senate President is necessary for this decision. The senate president should have a macro view and leave the specific functioning to the department.	
overall	J Holbrook	In my world someone has to see the trees and someone has to see the forest. There is no one with a vantage or ability to see both. We need to move toward reliance of the local expert and known procedures based on reliable and effective communications. Overall, I agree with the process to provide structure to a known problem. I have concerns about layers of bureaucracy and time lines. I have concerns that the best thinking of faculty needs is only valid for one year and expire after one year. Thanks for the efforts in creating the original draft.	

Document Line #	Name	COMMENT	RESPONSE