



**Thursday, February 24, 2011**  
**Griffin Gate**  
**3:00 to 5:00 p.m.**

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

**Present:** Fred Allen, Steve Baker, Michael Barendse, Jerry Buckley, Janet Castanos, John Colson, Sunny Cooke, Tim Flood, Chris Hill, Oralee Holder, Michael Golden, Sue Gonda, Patti Morrison, Jane Nolan, Alba Orr, Shirley Pereira, Cheryl-Anne Phillips, Will Pines, Adelle Schmitt, Jim Spillers, Wendy Stewart, Jim Wilsterman, Debbie Yaddow

**Absent:** Barbara Blanchard, Angela Feres, Kerry Kilber, Anita Martinez, Nick Montez, Lynette Wilson

**Guests:** Janet Carter, Beth Kelley, Pat Murray (Classified Senate) Jim Symington

**Recorder:** Patty Sparks

**Meeting Convened:** 3:00 p.m.

#### **I. Meeting Summary Discussion**

Shirley suggested that the meeting summary be disseminated two ways, a condensed version for easy reading and the regular more detailed version posted on the website. After discussion, it was recommended that the Council receive a condensed summary via email and the longer, more detailed summary will be posted on line at:

[www.grossmont.edu/adminservices/budget/meetingsAgendas](http://www.grossmont.edu/adminservices/budget/meetingsAgendas)

Shirley also welcomed Cheryl-Anne Phillips to the Council as the ASGC Representative as well as Pat Murray and guests, Beth Kelley, Jim Symington and Janet Carter.

*Action Taken: Two versions of the meetings summary will be made available as discussed above.*

#### **II. Budget Update**

Tim provided a handout, *GCCCD 2011/12 Budget Challenges*, for the Council to review. He explained our three budget scenarios are as follows:

- 1) If the June tax package is approved.  
This equals to a \$12.5 Billion Spending Cut  
\$12 Billion Tax Extension  
Leaving California Community College with a \$400 million cut  
GCCCD Reduction: \$6.4 million

Overall this is the best case scenario. Tim explained the reduction districtwide would be \$6.4 million. We would be able to keep the student enrollment fees difference (the difference from \$26 to \$36)

which would be approximately \$1.76 million to the district, however this scenario does not cover infrastructure increases, step & column, or benefit cost increases.

- 2) If the June tax package fails and Prop 98 funded at minimum  
Leaves California Community College with a \$620 million cut  
GCCCD Reduction: \$9.9 million

This scenario would hopefully include the student enrollment fee increases. However the reduction will be painful, and again the infrastructure increases, step & column, or benefit cost increases are not included in the overall reduction.

- 3) June tax package fails (or fails to get on the ballot) and Prop 98 is suspended  
Leaves California Community College with a \$1.085 billion cut (updated)  
GCCCD Reduction: \$17.3 million

This scenario is the worst case scenario. Tim reported that there is talk at the State level that they are considering increasing the student enrollment fees from \$26 to \$66, so we included that in this scenario. That would give us \$4.46 million in fees to the district if they are raised. In addition, the infrastructure increases, step & column, or benefit cost increases are not included in the reduction.

#### Legislative Analyst Office (LAO)

Tim reported that the LAO is proposing a 9 unit max reducing funds to Basic Skills to the non-credit area. They are also proposing that the educational level to teach Basic Skills range from a bachelors degree to a high school diploma and have even proposed vending it out to libraries. They are also looking at eliminating the subsidy for intercollegiate athletics and funding for repetition in the arts and physical education and eliminating entirely for non-credit. Sunny stated that it is hard pressed to believe that anyone of these proposals will help to save funding or ensure student success.

### **III. Enrollment 2010/11 and FTES 2011/12**

Tim stated that in 2009 at Adopted Budget, the district wide FTES goal was 18,052 and is the same number used for Tentative Budget for this year. We decided that our FTES goal was 5% over cap at 18,995. At P2, which is the second reporting period of our FTES (last year), they reduced us to 17,939. Just this month we received another reduction to last year's cap to 17,908.

Tim explained that we are always in a three year State run cycle as follows: 1) we have to think about what they are going to do to us regarding the previous year's FTES; 2) how do we manage the current year; and 3) how does the current year impact the next year. As we receive State updates we are required to react to them. This year's Tentative Budget FTES is 18,052, with our growth we are at 18,392 and revised as of February to 18,329 as a district (including growth). Grossmont College receives 69.34% of district wide FTES.

Tim further explained that with the different scenarios as explained above, for 2010/11 Grossmont College's projected FTES is 13,586.76 for this year. Keep in mind this number could go up or down. We need to reduce down from 13,586.76 FTES to 12,951 FTES if we are going to reach what this year's cap plus the 1.9% growth. We would have to reduce 600 FTES to meet cap plus growth for next year. If there is no growth next year we would have to reduce down to 12,710 FTES. To go down to a 5% reduction we would need to reduce to 12,074 FTES.

### Reductions Required to Meet

Tim explained with the budget scenarios as listed above, the FTES and section reductions would be approximately:

Scenario 1) 636 FTES, 165 sections.  
LED (FTEF) - 32.9 reduction

Scenario 2) 877 FTES, 227 sections  
LED (FTEF) - 45.5 reduction

This scenario is the most likely.

Scenario 3) 1513 FTES, 392 sections  
LED (FTEF) - 78.4 reduction

This is the worst case scenario reducing cap by 5%.

Tim reported that the budget situation continues to get worse and is still very fluid. There will be section reductions in all of the three budget scenarios. We need to manage sections and the number of students in courses.

Tim stated we are looking at each and every area on the campus for cost savings. Sunny stated that at DSP&BC, the three scenarios were discussed and 13 to 14 suggestions were forwarded for cost reduction consideration. Some suggestions were benefit reduction for employees, voluntary furloughs, and cutting summer school. Reducing and/or cancelling summer school is one area discussed but 86% of our summer school students are continuing students. Not many on the side of instruction are supporting this. We are poised to reduce by 50% maybe 25% summer sections. We need to get students through the system.

Sunny would like to curtail rumors concerning that some departments will not be cut. With the budget the way it is every department on campus will feel the cuts, some may be more than others, but the pain will be felt by all.

### Fall/Spring Semesters

Sunny reported that our fall and spring semesters have gotten out of balance. Normally fall is the bigger semester, however spring is much bigger. Logically we want a larger fall. We need to look at fall and spring and determine how we rebalance our organization to serve our students, not an organization desperate to generate FTES.

Chris asked that we always tend to look at schedules one semester at a time. Sunny stated the best thing for a student is to provide them with a yearly schedule, but how do we do this as we cannot provide guarantees. Sunny stated that this should be a goal for us when the funding becomes available however, we can start by taking small steps.

Tim stated that we need to be mindful of our class max numbers. This has a large effect - if we let more students in classes in the fall and we have a hard FTES cap, we would end up having to decimate an already decimated spring, not to mention the impacts to students and faculty.

### **IV. Large Class Equivalency**

This item was initially pulled, however Tim Flood discussed costs associated with Large Class Equivalency. He explained in 2007/08 we were chasing FTES, however in 2008/09, 2009/10, and this year we had to cut FTES, however we are incurring more costs year after year.

Sunny reported that in spring we constructed a message from this Council to faculty that at census date they should not be over course max. She explained that we plan a schedule to get to a certain FTES however going over course max exacerbates the problem of free students. If this piece is not balanced we will have to cut more sections in spring than we want. We are currently filling our sections at approximately 98% and we do not have the funding for faculty that have unauthorized or unplanned large classes.

Tim stated that he will run the numbers for cost of large classes per department and provide the information to the deans and department chairs. We are going to have to cut at the minimum 277 sections, maybe more, and we need to balance our large classes and not allow more students than authorized.

Steve stated that when departments were tasked with reducing sections, they started by cutting smaller classes however, that allowed for students to be moved into larger sections. There should be no blame as to why the costs have increased it may just be a side effect of being efficient. Tim reminded the Council that there is a difference between class max and course max. You may be in a room with a 50 class max however the course max may be 35. There are lots of good reasons both good and bad on why costs have increased but we need to get it under control. Course max was decided by faculty and should be adhered to no matter what the class max is. Shirley explained that if you taught a course max of 50 last year and again this year, we should see the approximate same dollar amounts.

*Action taken: Tim to provide a detailed large class equivalency costs separated by department.*

#### **V. Update - Educational Master Plan Process**

Chris reported that we are beginning the process of developing an Educational Master Plan (EMP) for our district. The EMP will have various parts to it and what the document will look like is still in process. DCEC is made up of the two Senate Presidents, the two Senate Vice Presidents, the Curriculum co-chair, and the Vice Presidents with the exception of Administrative Services.

Sue Gonda stated that the EMP Committee has developed a timeline that ends in December but having the document finished by then is slim and may extend to April. A consultant, Phyliss Sensenich was hired to help with the document. She is experienced and has assisted other educational institutions in California with their EMPs.

Phyliss will work closely with the scan teams (disciplines on campus) gathering data. She will use her resources as well as the data collected from the teams and break it down in a document. That document will work its way through the collegiate process ensuring accuracy. Once she gets feedback, she will rewrite the report and brings it forward as a draft for convocation.

Chris stated that the steering committee will review the draft proposed areas for taxonomy, they are: Society, technology, economy, environment, politics, and education. There are a lot of similarities to what we have done before. Sunny reminded the Council that this is a district wide document and is broad in nature as it looks at trends years ahead.

Chris stated that it would be beneficial to have the entire college as a whole participate in sending Phyliss relevant or related data as to trends coming down the pipeline.

## **VI. Update - IRC Update**

Tim reported that the IRC has been meeting and reviewing activity proposals. So far the Committee has reviewed proposals from Administrative Services, President's Office, Fred Allen and Janet Castanos' divisions. We will continue through the remaining department and divisional proposals through mid- March. Overall we are seeing exciting activity proposals and continuing to get better. We hope to report back to this Council either in March or April with a prioritized list.

The Council discussed how the Activity Proposals will be funding. Tim reported that as we balance our budget, salary and efficiency savings could be utilized to fund activity proposals. We may only be able to fund a few Activity Proposals, but he reminded the Council that these proposals are saved in the system and could be re-submitted again. Sunny reported that once the budget is determined and balanced we can look to see what can be funded, but we must be mindful to keep this college moving forward with technology, college wide needs, and accreditation requirements. We need to our processes in place so when funding becomes available we are prepared and ready move forward.

## **VII. Kingsborough CC Grant Update and Visit**

John reported that we recently had the Kingsborough Group visit our campus. He stated that throughout their visit they met with the president, each vice president, counselors, senate officers, and the Student Success Committee. When they came away from their meetings they had great understanding of what we do here at Grossmont Colleges.

John forwarded a set of questions via email from Kingsborough requesting responses in areas from administrative structures to professional development. Sue Jensen will coordinate and prepare the final document/responses. He explained that the questions will help us to take a critical look at our current policies and practices and evaluate, based on data, whether they promote or inhibit student success. Each college is responsible to provide their responses and are due mid-March.

Sunny stated that some of the questions had a lot to do with what kind of data we are collecting and suggested involving the Institutional Excellence Council for their input. Chris suggested that the draft version of the document be provided at the next Council meeting. Shirley stated that this is an exciting process and we can learn from Kingsborough as they have successfully improved their student success.

John stated that Grossmont College's group will meet with the other colleges in July to discuss developmental education (Basic Skills), professional development and organizational structure. Grossmont will have the opportunity to bring back ideas and better develop our own policies and procedures.

## **VIII. Participation of Classified Staff in PIE**

Sunny reported that the Classified Senate met with the Chancellor and Chancellor's Cabinet about integrating classified staff into the process of Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE). This is an opportunity to have staff involved in PIE and Program Review.

Pat Murray asked how do we get classified staff involved? As a classified leader we want classified staff to know they are important and need to be involved. Michael suggested changing the culture and that starts at the top with managers and department supervisors to invite classified staff for their input and suggestions. Shirley and Chris will again go to departments talking about PIE and at that time can bring attention to classified staff. Tim stated that being invited to meetings is one thing, but making classified staff welcome and offering them the opportunity to provide ideas is what needs to happen.

Pat Murray reported that at the macro level the Chancellor invited classified staff to DEC, EMP Taskforce, and the Institutional Excellence Committee, but we need to begin including classified staff at the micro level. Sunny stated that some governance committees, such as this Council, can be overwhelming and some training /or shadowing would be beneficial and suggested scheduling training moduals. Sunny suggested that Oralee place this issue on the agenda at the next Chairs and Coordinators meeting.

Councils and Committees for review are located at:

[http://www.grossmont.edu/org\\_gov\\_structures/committees.htm](http://www.grossmont.edu/org_gov_structures/committees.htm)

## **IX. Committee Updates**

### **Facilities**

Tim reported that the Facilities Committee is looking at available spaces on campus. There is discussion of possibly moving the deans to the campus proper. As far as the Student Center/Student Services we had a recent task force meeting wherein office plans were discussed and reviewed. With the reductions in staff there are some holes and managers were tasked to review their areas and report back. He further reported that steel will start going up and there will be noise associated, however the buildings will take shape at a fast pace.

The Facilities Committee is looking at some small projects such as the pool shade structure that was included with roofing portion. We were able to match the metal standing seam on the rest of the area. Currently, we had to add funding the kiln structure area which is moving forward. In the next couple of months we will be discussing moving back into the new structures.

### **Staffing Update**

Sunny reported that we have gone through the process of critical hires which is posted on the employee intranet site. Since then we have had unexpected vacancies. They are:

#### **Child Development Teaching Assistant**

This is a licensed position that is necessary to maintain student/teacher ratio requirements. This position is a grant funded position - not general fund.

#### **Health Services Nurse**

This is a nurse that works in the Health Services Department and is solely funded through Student Health fees. We need to provide adequate health services on the campus.

#### **Printing Technician**

Holly accepted the Printing Supervisor's position and Crystal Nguyen has been working out of class in Holly's old position for over 2 years. We anticipate being down one position within the Printing Department but this position is critical and needs to be permanent. We will have an internal search and this position is a general fund.

#### **Theater Lab Technician**

There are components to this position that are being worked on and is position still waiting to be approved to move forward. This is general fund position.

The restricted or grant funded positions make for easier decisions but the general fund positions are tougher to decide. Oralee asked if these positions bump the critical hires. Sunny responded they would move forward simultaneously.

## **X. Other**

Sunny reported that we recently had an accreditation site visit from John Nixon, a commissioner on the ACCJC Commission. He visited for a day looking at our ASO, SSO, and SLOs, planning and program review. He was impressed with our planning processes, what we were able to move forward with, as well as our consistency in planning. He will prepare a report indicating what we do well and make suggestions on areas we do not. We are going to have to teach people all over this campus about planning to ensure consistency in all departments. He offered helpful suggestions and in general we did well.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:00 p.m.