

College Council
23 July 2007

Members present: Jim Bailey, Siv Serene Barnum, Sheila Broderick, Sonya Christian, Andrea Newton, Jim Salt, Mary Spilde, Craig Taylor, Dan Timberlake

Unable to attend: Bob Baldwin, Dan Dawson

Budget Development

The Board of Education is planning a fall retreat which will include a review of the budget development process. College Council will provide an evaluation for Board review – what worked, what did not work, what should change for next year.

Discussion Points

- Division proposals are valuable but more strategic, college-wide proposals are needed

- The Budget Review Group was an improvement but needs more input from the department level

- Even if no reductions are required, the college must figure out how to more strategically allocate resources

- The process of developing proposals at the department level generates turmoil and polarization. A more institutional process - but with a communication link to keep people engaged in the discussion - will guide the college toward fiscal stability

- The size of the FY09 deficit will determine the best process. Balancing the F09 budget should be less problematic as we will have more information from the state legislature and a clearer understanding of the roles of the Budget Review Group, ET, governance, unit plans, and the Board.

- To increase efficiency, department heads should identify opportunities for collaboration between each other; for example, counseling and enrollment

- How do we objectively increase efficiency in a way that people will accept?

- It is important to continue to use the target model approach as a part of financial planning. It keeps the numbers visible. But we need a more effective system to sharpen fiscal planning.

- There are large inequities in department budgets. A level playing field would produce greater efficiency.

- Some classes are more labor intensive. Fiscal equality does not translate to work load equality.

- Last year's budget review group lacked mechanisms to drive strategies
- The projected deficit was nearly doubled by the administration midway through the process – from \$4.7M to \$8.8M

For various reasons, not all the FY07 reductions were executed – the \$6M cuts identified were not all produced. Labor costs did not decrease. \$3M in reserves was not restored. We could not curtail spending mid year and we could not allow deficit spending to continue.

By September, we will be able to compare what we expected to spend in FY07 with actual expenses. That information will help to build strategic capacity.

An audit of the tools used in budget development – unit plans, BRG, ET, union negotiations – will help to determine which tools were useful

The CC budget subcommittee will recommend a process and calendar for next year; and will define departmental and governance roles.

Assessment

The current governance structure has been in place for three years. The focus of today's conversation is the design, method, and timeframe for an assessment of the system.

Discussion Points (including comments shared via email)

Begin with council charters – the scope of work outlined by the 2003 task force

Assessment should answer: were we effective, were we efficient

Interim accreditation report due in two years – will use this assessment information

Some changes to the structure may be due, but assessment should come first

We can make improvements to fix obvious problems without a formal assessment process (e.g. finance council)

Wide-spread assessment has value but it is time to move on to the next phase

The college will move forward with a governance system – we should keep what we have and improve it

A more streamlined assessment from council representatives, resulting in a list of accomplishments and recommendations, may be more productive

What works from our perspective? Articulate the benefits – the success of unit planning and of instructional redesign, the contribution to accreditation standards, the forum for stakeholders to exercise leadership, and compliance with Board directives.

Council chairs and vice chairs should send a progress report to college council

College council should report to the campus community – to educate people about the work of the councils, the information available from the web pages, etc.

Four areas needing improvement: communication, meeting regularity,
rules of engagement, distribution of authority (too much, too little?)
Assessment should include a cost-benefit analysis of both direct and
indirect costs, a catalog of accomplishments and costs.
Emphasis on council accomplishments will show the return on the college
investment in governance.

Salt will distribute a governance assessment design proposal. College council
will meet again in late summer and will decide on an assessment process at that
time.

Meeting adjourned: 2:30 pm
Recorder: Mary Bolton