

LANEY COLLEGE

May 19, 2010

Room T-450 / 3-4 p.m.

MINUTES

Present:

Elnora Webb, Eileen White, George Kozitza, Dawna Williams, Brian Nelson, Becky Hsieh, Marco Menendez, Carol Dalessio, Karolyn van Putten, Donna Marie Ferro, Don Petrilli, Shirley Coaston, Indra Thadani, Eliza Chan, Ju Hong, Reginald James, Donald Moore, Inger Stark, Evelyn Lord, David Reed

Minutes:

Maisha Jameson

1. Welcome & Introductions

- Handouts: Budget 3% reduction scenarios and Budget Guiding Principles
- The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) met this morning and reviewed the handouts passed out this morning
- The District has asked for 3%, 5%, 10% reduction scenarios to be produced
- A questionnaire should be included on impact of each level of reductions
- At the 5% cut level, all discretionary monies are gone and we need to begin making cuts
- Tried to keep cuts as far away as possible from instructional programs and eliminating positions
- Dean Marco Menendez asked: Is there a finite goal or duration for addressing the budget structural deficit of \$8 mill (general fund related) + \$1.7 mill (increase in health benefits) + \$3mill (owed for OPED bonds)...Answer: The goal is to address all of this deficit going into the 2010-11 school year.
- Laney's portion of the reductions district-wide = \$692K
- There will be an elimination of 1351 budget

Position Eliminations

- 2 Locker room attendants will be eliminated. The Dean was very aggressive in his attempt to maintain these positions. These positions were not within the core mission of the college (CTE, Transfer, Foundation Skills) and so this decision had to be made.
- We will develop an action plan to address this loss in staff to ensure the lockers rooms are safe and taken care of. Current staff will be need to be leveraged to provide back-fill. {Question asked re: the issue b/w 10 vs. 12 month locker room attendants. How does this work? President Webb asked Dean Menendez to talk to David Betts in HR about this question. HR has to answer this question.}
- The Program Specialist position within Student Services has also been eliminated. This person was also providing weekend instruction and training for Safety Aides. Funds are trying to be identified in order to keep this staff member on for at least part-time.
- The Public Information Officer position within the President's Office has been eliminated. The PIO was not originally one of the positions to be eliminated, however.

- Merritt was going to eliminate their PIO and they would automatically have bumped COA's PIO – who would then be able to bump Laney's. This would not have been a good fit. We need our PIO and in fact need someone with marketing expertise.
- A transition plan will need to be identified to address this loss.
- Laney & Merritt experienced push back with regard to offering discretionary funds for reductions.
- President Webb indicated that an up-dated memo to the College Community needs to be crafted to go out Monday or Tuesday morning.
- These current 3% cuts are the latest round of District instructed cuts, but our actual cuts as a college are more like 10%. All Colleges have made more than a 3% cut.
- There are approximately \$5mill being spent on consultants at the District level. This can be one source of potential savings.
- There will be \$400K out of the office of Educational Services to restructure the office.
- Within the Department of General Services, \$600K+ is to be moved from General Fund to Measure A – another potential source of savings
- Every unit is making cuts.
- Once the Council weighs in on the budget cuts document that was shared, President Webb will send the results to the co-chairs of the District Planning & Budget Integrated Council (PBIC) to bring it forward at the next meeting set for Friday (9:30-12pm) at which each college president is to present their 3% reductions. This group will then deliberate on these proposed cuts. The PBIC will ultimately endorse or reject these proposed reductions. The PBIC is a recommending body to the Chancellor.
- The recommendation that was shared in the BAC meeting this morning was to keep the position in the budget, and take the dollars out so that we don't lose this position.
- Student body elect, Dawna Williams posed the question: Will the elimination of the Student Services Program Specialist position close the program all together?
Answer: The associated tasks and activities will be reduced remarkably.
- The Educational Master Plan (EMP) is what we are guided by and will lead what we have.
- Question posed: Will the counselors at the International Students Dept. be making cuts as well? Can we leverage some of those counselors here at the college? Answer: Unsure. There may, however, be an issue with regard to whether those counselors meet the standards/qualifications of our counselors.
- Need a District-wide matrix showing how all cuts will impact funding streams. For line items that are district-wide, how much each of the colleges are receiving vs. what the district is reducing should be indicated.
- Need an applied model for resource allocation within the District.
- BAC challenges were shared. Hard to have a budget planning/development process in an irregular budget year. Hard to plan for next year with less money but not really knowing how much less we will have.
- Need to address Program Impact when developing the District-wide Budget...ex. Peralta TV...How impactful is this for students?
- Also need to address the impact of our cuts on our marketing and develop a plan – i.e. how to allocate marketing resources at the District to the colleges to backfill the loss in our PIOs.
- The BAC is starting to look at how to gain input from the college community.

- Currently, the role of the Budget Committee is all about process. There is no decision making or setting of priorities. The question was posed, “Who does that? And “What is the role of CC in this process?”
- Our District and Colleges need to figure out how to operate and deal with the facts of the budget crisis and plan accordingly.
- The State may not fund the colleges at the normal due dates. May be a stall for several months. How does this affect our planning? President Webb suggested that this should be discussed as a part of the district-wide discussions at PBIC.
- One option - We can do a 90 day borrow from our Measures. We need to look at this. May need to leverage our Measure A funds. One of the problems that remain is that there are no reports.
- Evelyn Lord made a suggestion in regards to Unit plans – Need to revise the template of the Unit plans to incorporate the prioritization of our resources so that this information feeds up.
- Inger Stark offered to develop (in conjunction with President Webb and VPI Eileen White) a fiscal visual that make sense to people.
- President Webb asked for feedback from the Council and the general consensus of the group.
- Don Petrilli – asked if the 3% cuts are equitable across the sections. Answer = no. The Budget Principles that were passed out guided the prioritization and cuts. Total amount of cuts from Instruction, Student Services and Administration (divisions) was equal given their percentage of the overall budget
- Exploration process of justification. Question posed - How did the BAC and Administration come up with the recommendations? Answer: President Webb worked with each of the various division Deans and the library. Each proposed recommendation had to include a justification and impact assessment attached to it.
- Need to summarize the impact of the reductions at the bottom of the document.
- Student Body President elect, Dawna Williams questioned management cuts? President Webb answered: Management/Administrative cuts at Laney are only considered at the 10% level. Non-instructional employee furloughs is one way that the management can be included more equitably in the cuts – will need to negotiate this with the unions.
- FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT – MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ADOPT THE 3% CUTS THAT WERE PROPOSED
- DEAN LINDA SANFORD SECONDED THE MOVE.
- ALL VOTED AFFIRMATIVELY TO APPROVE THE BUDGET REDUCTIONS.

Budget principles

- The BAC developed budget development principles. It was asked that the principles be shared with the District once they left the college. Answer: This Friday President Webb will send forward the updated version of the principles to the facilitators and co-chairs of the PBIC proposing that they are brought forward to the meeting agenda. This will give the college our approved budget planning model which can be potentially used at the district level.
- The plan is that this lead to a district-wide matrix that enables comparison of budget making decisions.
- CLASSIFIED SENATE PRESIDENT, DAVID REED MADE THE MOVE TO APPROVE THE BUDGET PRINCIPLES.

- HEAD LIBRARIAN, SHIRLEY COASTON SECONDED THE MOVE FOR ACCEPTANCE.
- ALL VOTED TO APPROVE THE BUDGET PRINCIPLES.

2. Shared Governance – E. Webb

- There was concern expressed by the small working group that we had not fully implemented the shared governance process that is already documented in the Laney College Participatory Governance and Administrative Structures document. Would like to work towards true implementation of those guidelines while concurrently discussing proposed restructuring. More details will be discussed at the College Retreats and within these small working groups. The plan is to go into the new year with a schedule that can be trusted.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm