



Thursday, December 13, 2012
Griffin Gate
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Chair	Sunita Cooke	√	AFT Rep	Michael Golden √ Jim Mahler	
Co-Chair, Faculty Rep	Michael Barendse	√	Chairs & Coordinators Rep	Joel Castellaw	√
VPAA – Accreditation Liaison Officer	Barbara Blanchard		Library Rep	Pat Morrison	√
VPAS – Dir. of Facilities & Operations	Tim Flood	√	Academic Senate Reps	Adelle Schmitt √ Jim Wilsterman Jane Nolan √ Craig Milgrim √	√
VPSS	Jeff Baker		Supervisory Rep	Alba Orr, TBD	
Arts, Humanities, Lang/Comm	Steve Baker	√	Classified Senate Rep	Janet Carter √ Irene Bauza	
CTE/Workforce	Sheridan DeWolf, Int.	√	CSEA Rep	Will Pines	
Counseling and Enrollment Services	Howard Irvin, Int.	√	ASGC President or Designee	Vacant Esau Cortez	
English, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Agustin Albarran, Int.	√	TTLIC Committee Chair or Designee	Angela Feres	
MNSESW	Mike Reese	√	Guests:	Denise Schulmeyer	
LTR	Kerry Kilber	√			
Allied Health	Debbie Yadow	√			
Assoc. Dean, Athletics	Jim Spillers	√			
Academic Senate President	Sue Gonda	√	Recorder	Patty Sparks	√

Meeting Convened: 3:00 p.m.

I. Education – Administrative Services Program Review (Part 2)

Tim provided a PowerPoint presentation utilizing the overhead screens to report on the following departments’ program review:

- Facilities
- Custodial
- Business Communication Services

Facilities

Staffing

Staffing has significantly decreased in this area (There are six positions and four are vacant).

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Sustainability Practices

As a whole, facility costs have decreased in all of the following areas water; electricity, natural gas and waste disposal have all decreased in costs.

Faculty & Staff Satisfaction Survey results

Faculty & Staff provided their rankings as follows:

Communication of facility projects and issues – 79.9% were satisfied, 14.6% were neutral and 5.5% were dissatisfied.

Comfort of classroom furnishings – 67% were satisfied, 19.8% were neutral and 13.2% were dissatisfied.

Response to ADA needs – 75.7% were satisfied, 18.4% were neutral and 6% were dissatisfied

Adequate campus parking – 63.5% were satisfied, 13.3% were neutral and 23.2% were dissatisfied.

Tim stated that the Facilities Committee is looking into additional staff parking and will bring recommendations to Planning & Resources Council soon.

Student Satisfaction Survey results

Students provided their rankings as follows:

Promptness with which safety hazards are removed – for fall 2011 and 2010 96.5% were satisfied.

The ability of the new buildings and labs to meet student educational needs – fall 2011 95.1% and fall 2010 95.5%.

Condition of classroom furnishings – fall 2011 88.5% were satisfied and fall 2010 88.6% were satisfied

Comfort of classroom furnishings – fall 2011 83.4.5 % were satisfied and 2010 84.6% were satisfied.

Facilities KPI's

Project funds:

Scheduled maintenance

Funds expended in 2011/12, \$462,658 and funds expended in 2010/11, \$91,504

Capital Outlay fund 41 in 2011/12, \$3.8 million and funds expended in 2010/11, \$1.9 million

Prop R Funds (Fund 42) in 2011/12, \$18 million and funds expended in 2010/11, \$14.9 million

Revenue generated from Facilities use and leases in 2011/12 \$88,365 and funds expended in 2010/11, \$84,879 million.

Equipment Needs

Program review identified a need for a Man lift and this need was met through the Activity Proposals process. Prior to its purchase, we had no way to service equipment and lights in the new multi-story buildings.

Goals based on Program Review Analysis

- To identify and incorporate water saving technologies to campus water towers to conserve resources and reduce costs

- Update the Grounds and Maintenance websites to include contact information to improve communication
- Pursue appropriate staffing levels that will allow for proper maintenance of college facilities

Custodial

Staffing

There are 23 custodial positions, three are vacant.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Buildings maintained per Custodian

2009/10, 20,307

2010/11, 23,155

2011/12, 23,155

Building Area to be Maintained

2009/10, 84,614

2010/11, 96,447.83

2011/12, 96,447.83

Classroom Efficiency

2009/10, 95.10%

2010/11, 97.74%

2011/12, 99.53%

Student Satisfaction Survey Results

Courteousness of Staff

Fall 2011 97.8% of students surveyed were satisfied

Fall 2010 it was 97.3%

Cleanliness of Classrooms and Labs

94.1% of students surveyed were satisfied

Fall 2010 it was 93.8%

Overall Condition of Classrooms

95% of students surveyed were satisfied, Fall 2010 it was 94.6%

Level of Supplies in Restrooms

80.6% of students surveyed were satisfied

Fall 2010 it was at 82.0%

Faculty & Staff Survey Results

Overall Faculty and staff that were surveyed related:

Courteousness of Staff - 92% were satisfied

Assistance with Special Set Ups and Events – 85% were satisfied

Timeliness of Staff to Respond to Requests for Service – 80.9% were satisfied

Cleanliness of Classrooms and Labs – 68.6% were satisfied

Cleanliness of classrooms and labs – 68.6% were satisfied

Cleanliness of restrooms – 58.3% were satisfied

Improvements (Outcomes)

Provided single point of contact for special event set up preparations, achieved an 85% satisfaction rate; reallocated area assignments to cover vacancies within the custodial ranks. We increased

student satisfaction rate with less staff. Further, the Custodial Department implemented green cleaning chemical use to assist college in achieving LEEDS certification for buildings 60 and 10.

Custodial Needs Identified

Program review identified a need for:

- Man lift to improve the efficiency of staff and safely reach second floor equipment.
- Fill three vacant custodial positions
- Replace two of the four computers shared by staff
- Improve efficiency by replacing the custodial meeting area, lockers, and storage areas.

Goals based on Program Review Analysis

- Improve classroom and lab cleanliness by filling vacant positions as funding becomes available
- Improve restroom cleanliness by changing cleaning schedules and assignments
- Improve area inspection process including new digital format
- Continue to expand green cleaning strategies
- Provide training to staff on new equipment operation and maintenance procedures.

Business Communication Services (BSC)

For Program Review we combined Business Communication Services, Budget Analyst, College Cashier and the Student Services Activities Window.

Staffing

Currently there are 11 positions with 3 of those vacant within BCS, two in the College Cashier's Office. The College Cashier's office is extremely low on personnel.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The BCS logs and processes college and district forms and for the years 2009/10 through 2011/12 the BCS serviced:

Expenditures – Restricted and unrestricted.

- 2009/10, \$66,322,042
- 2010/11 \$67,044,304
- 2011/12, \$63,415,475.

General Fund Expenditures per FTES

- 2009/10, \$3,887.52
- 2010/11, \$4,314.82
- 2011/12, \$4395.29

Number of requisitions processed.

- 2009/10, 1,368
- 2010/11, 1,514
- 2011/12, 1,584

Travel Expenses

- 2009/10, \$96,334
- 2010/11, \$132,249
- 2011/12, \$142,799

Audit Exceptions

There have been no audit exceptions for the last three years. Tim complimented stellar employees.

Facility Use Requests processed

- 2009/10, \$955
- 2010/11, \$1,536
- 2011/12, \$1,753

Tim reminded the Council the College's budget has decreased over the last three years, however as noted above, the BCS has maintained district and college wide processes efficiently and effectively. He also noted that we had moved the BCS offices twice during this time with no interruption of service.

Faculty and Staff Survey results

Faculty and staff that were surveyed indicated:

- 89.4% were satisfied with the courteousness of staff
- 88.3% were satisfied with professionalism in dealing with customer concerns
- 85.4% were satisfied with the timeliness in processing forms
- 88.2% were satisfied with the helpfulness in processing forms
- 88.7% were satisfied with BCS in processing transactions accurately

Student Survey results

Students surveyed indicated:

For fall 2011 students were 96.3% satisfied with the courteousness of staff
For fall 2010 students were 96% satisfied with the courteousness of staff

For fall 2011 students were 96% satisfied in the efficiency in processing transactions accurately
For fall 2010 students were 96.2% satisfied in the efficiency in processing transactions accurately

For fall 2011 students were 96.1% satisfied with the Cashier's knowledge about services and policies
For fall 2010 students were 96.2% satisfied with the Cashier's knowledge about services and policies

For fall 2011 students were 95.4% satisfied with the helpfulness of switchboard operators
For fall 2010 students were 96.1% satisfied with the helpfulness of switchboard operators

BCS Contributions to Institutional Improvements (Outcomes)

- Ensured mailroom and switchboard stayed operational during building 10 moves. Completed mailbox reassignment.
- Worked with deans and department managers to identify \$2.26 million in 2011/12 budget reductions
- Increased facility use, and expanded community use of campus facilities

BCS Program Needs identified by Program Review

- Replacement of antiquated computer and printing equipment
- Fill vacant positions as funding becomes available
- Facility changes such as better accessibility to mail room, equipment and security to the Business Office.

BCS Goals based on Program Review Analysis

- Improve communication with students regarding services offered
- Provide professional development and cross-training opportunities for staff
- Work to develop processing, and distribution to better serve students, faculty and staff
- Increase BCS participation in shared governance committees and councils where appropriate.

II. Faculty Staffing

Jim Spillers stated that approximately two weeks ago, the Faculty Staffing Committee heard 23 Faculty Request presentations in a four hour period. The Committee members had 10 days to review, rank and score the positions. The Committee will meet again on December 14, 2012, to score and rank the positions as a committee. Jim expressed the Committee's renewed excitement over the process and looking forward to reporting back to this Council with their prioritized list.

Sunny expressed concern that normally the Faculty Staffing Committee's recommendations are heard at Planning & Resources Council meeting in time to be advertised over the winter break. The Faculty Staffing Committee is scheduled to forward their recommendations to this Council in January. She will then have to take the recommendations through DSP&BC and DEC in January. The Governing Board will not be able to move positions forward until February and if all goes accordingly positions can be posted on the web in February. The Council agreed to an ad-hoc meeting before the winter break to review the Faculty Staffing Committee's recommendations and to move the recommendations to the January DSP&BC meeting.

Craig Milgrim expressed concern that the rubric used to rank and score faculty positions does not take into account sub areas of departments. For example, his area is looking to hire a Bio 120 coordinator however the data requested on the form does not allow justification for that specific need. Jim responded that when this process takes place in the spring we will take a fresh look at the process, the rubric, and what our college needs are. As a note, there are representatives on the Committee from each division. He further stated that any recommendations and/or suggestions be forwarded to him and can be discussed by the Faculty Staffing Committee. Sunny suggested inviting Shirley Pereira as a resource as she has worked diligently with the Committee to make the Faculty Request Form be more data driven.

Michael Golden asked if there is a specific dollar amount allocated to new faculty positions. Sunny stated that with Prop 30 we gained only \$700,000 as a district over 2011/12 funding, so not a lot of new money for Grossmont College. The council was reminded that we lost 26 faculty positions through this year's ERI and that number does not include the previous ERI. In addition, district wide we are only 2 faculty positions over the States Faculty Obligation Number (FON). Our district has always met the FON obligation however if we lose two full-time faculty members we will have issues to deal with. We certainly want to be compliant with the law and we will commit funding to faculty positions, however there is staffing needs for classified and administrative positions. Any new funds that may come into the district in the future would need to be considered for new positions as well as compensation increases for those already employed at GCCCD.

III. Budget Allocation Task Force (BAT)

Sunny explained that beginning in the fall we have been looking at the Budget Allocation Formula between the two colleges and the district. We started with a consultant, Rocky Young, who met with both colleges and the district. He then made recommendations and a Budget Allocation Task Force (BAT) was deployed. BAT is represented by the President, VP of Administrative Services and Academic Senate Reps from each college. The district has three representatives as well. BAT was tasked with going over Rocky Young's recommendations one by one. There is vast majority of

concepts that were agreed upon and are working through a couple other concepts. BAT has the choice to modify, agree, or disagree on the concepts. BAT continues to work on developing an easier formula to understand, one that models the State allocation of funds to colleges. BAT met earlier this week and considered simulations of the current allocation formula and the proposed allocation formula. The discussion now involves how to treat growth dollars that come into the district. We are in agreement as a task force to base enrollment projections on the best data available. Data such as demographic, communities served, labor market, K-12 pipeline data, feeder high schools, etc.

Tim stated that the district total cost to operate are being discussed ensuring that one college does not pay more than the other. Other discussions include what constitutes growth versus restoration. Do we get to restoration and go from there? Our highest FTES was 2008/09 and that would be a good year to restore to. We would best serve the college to evaluate the needs of the community and what employment trends are. We need to do an entire set of data driven enrollment projections that we don't have currently to determine growth.

Enrollment discussion:

Summer

DSP&BC and FTES Task Force discussed summer FTES numbers and the best we could do at this time for the long term projection is to say - we can plan next year based on the FTES Cap we had for this year. Because Prop 30 passed, for schedule planning purposes, roll the summer 2011 schedule as summer 2013 and modifications can be made as needed.

Several people reported confusion regarding plans for summer 2013. Additionally, confusion due to the spring 2013 Prop 30 "add" backs and some sections added to summer also added to the confusion.

It was decided that the deans should make it clear (via email or phone calls) to Chairs and Coordinators that FTES for summer should be somewhere between 2011 and 2012 summer FTES numbers, and departments, divisions, and the entire college will strive to balance fall, spring and summer. The semesters have been sporadically cut and augmented this year due to FTES caps during the reduced/post Prop 30 budgets.

IV. **FMP Phase II**

Tim stated that the FMP Task force met yesterday. The meeting went well and was well attended. He reminded the Council that we are not "designing" buildings at this point, but asking departments to provide what kind of building/space would be most appropriate. He reported that the cluster groups dispersed to discuss and consider what is most important to their areas. The groups were asked to create their wants and needs based on classroom space, lab space, ancillary space, meeting spaces, social spaces, as well as who their areas/departments need or want to be by (The groups created their plans utilizing craft construction paper and scissors). Each area had a lead person to help with the process. Tim reported he worked with departments in the modular and trailers to see where they may fit within the plan. There are some areas that need to provide their input. Once their task was completed each cluster group reported verbally back to the Taskforce. The architects will take the information and the department "plans" created and bring back a draft plan for review. These decisions are being approached based on needs rather than a specific dollar or percentage split.

Craig Milgrim asked about the allocation of Prop V funds. Sunny stated that the actual allocation has not been determined to date. These needs will be prioritized based upon projects in the bond language, specific timing of the series of bonds, the projected date of State School Bonds and also construction sequencing determined by secondary effects, etc.

Unfortunately the District wide FMP has an estimated \$600 million fix all price tax – Prop V is likely to fund \$398 million. The reality is not all our needs will be addressed. We have two projects in the State match queue, the 500s and the 200s. We have five major areas and we may be able to get to three to four.

Committee Reports

IRC – Verbal (Flood)

Tim reminded this Council that the prioritized Activity Proposals are due to IRC the second Friday of January.

Facilities Committee

No report.

Other: Next meeting scheduled for January 24, 2012, 3 – 5 p.m., Griffin Gate.

Meeting Commenced 5 p.m.