Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
Brian called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Review of Agenda
None

Oral Communications
None

Management Dialog
None

What, When and How
Brian provided an update on the recent Board meeting including the planning parameters that were approved by the Board and the list of critical needs. Brian told CPC that the college is not moving forward with the new lease in Scotts Valley. He also informed CPC that the college is continuing discussions about a sublease in Scotts Valley with Monterey Coast Prep and a lease in Watsonville with Ceiba Prep. Paul said he appreciated the public comments at the Board meeting, stating it made it more transparent. Stephanie asked about the current lease at Whispering Pines. Brian said it is in place through 2012. The college’s goal is to keep a presence in Scotts Valley while reducing costs. Brian said these will be pilot projects, one year deals and if they are successful they will be extended but if it is not cost effective they will not be continued.

Victoria went through the planning parameters document and the projections. Part of the process is reviewing department funds that have been accumulating over the past couple of years. Stephanie asked what the mid case is based on and Victoria said suspension of Prop 98.
The current best guess is that the college is short $3m for 11-12, based on the mid case scenario. Brian said the chancellor’s office is saying plan for the worst case, because it seems likely. The chance of the worst case scenario is more than 50 percent.

The long term projection for the deficit is where the college starts to see the full impact of the budget reductions moving forward. The reserve levels will be very low after 11-12. For 12-13 the college has a bigger ongoing problem to address, so if the college doesn’t start making permanent reduction now we will have almost $10m to cut. For the operating increases some are projections and some are calculations. Step and column increases are based on current staffing levels, health benefits are based on a projected rate increase, as are retirement benefits and PERS. All the projections are conservative. Medical benefit costs are increasing the most rapidly. There is likely to be a double digit increase next year, anywhere between 10 and 18 percent. The projected operating increases are separate from what is going on in Sacramento.

Brian said it is important to the Board that the college look beyond 11-12. The college needs to develop operating reductions in the neighborhood of $3m by July 1, 2011. The college has some reserves that will allow the implementation of some of the cuts over time, but not all because then the college runs into payroll problems. Victoria said in mid-September the final budget goes to Board. At that point the college has to have the $3m in reductions in place.

Brian asked if there agreement to move forward with reducing our budget by $3m and there were no objections.

Michael Mangin asked about the likelihood of the worst case scenario. Brian said that the chancellor’s office is reporting that the problem for the Governing is it becomes an argument for tax increases after July 1. Dennis added that when he met with legislators last week he walked away feeling like there was little to no hope, that we should accept the worst case scenario. The legislators seem clueless on how to work together to figure this out.

Barbara asked about the increase in student fees and the planning for that revenue. Brian and Victoria said the college does not get all that money and may lose students. Brian said there is a long way between $36 and $66, but some of that road may be travelled. Brian is hearing that it is not likely the legislature will tell the college how to make the cuts.

Paul asked if any decisions have been made about positions that are currently filled and Victoria responded no. Stephanie then asked if the classified/confidential service reductions are part of the overall reductions. Victoria said they could be part of both service and program reductions.

Brian said the Board emphasized that this is not a regular year. The work will have to continue throughout the summer. The Board said there are no sacred cows.

Daniel Wooten asked if it costs money to have a vacant position, and Victoria responded that those positions are currently funded.
The target reduction Feb. 2012 is somewhere between $4m and $6m. Brian asked if everyone acknowledges that this is the timeline to get to the reductions and there were no objections. Brian added there is no way to reduce by $10m and keep all the programs and services the college has now. Brian asked what people think about those dates. Michael said it is jarring and real. CPC agreed the message to the college community should be blunt about the numbers and timeline, and also indicate the numbers are likely to change and probably for the worst.

Brian said this is not the place for negotiation, but collective bargaining units should recognize changes in their agreements will result in a lowering of the $3m.

Steve said the reality of the college’s situation is that there will be rounds of layoffs, versus getting it over with at once. It is going to be bad for campus moral because once the first round is made people know there will be future rounds. Stephanie added it is really going to push the process issue. It better be crystal clear, inclusive and well defined.

Brian acknowledged that it is very important to have a process. Dan said the good thing about a process is that not everyone involved in the process will lose their jobs. Steve added that given the amount of these cuts it would be very difficult to look at it and say instead of cutting X lets cut something else. At that point is too late. Steve said the way validate any decisions is if we can say the cuts match the established criteria. That is where people can contribute.

Paul said there should be a conversation about criteria. Renee said there is a criterion which has been provided to the Board and CPC which lists things that the college needs to preserve. Steve said there is a criteria but more detail is needed. Paul said the criteria are very general, there needs to be some specificity but not too much.

Brian said we have to be a different college. He doesn’t want to cut a finger at time. Up until now Renee and the Senate have painfully scrutinized how to cut course sections. Now we have to discuss how to prioritize services and programs. Renee said discontinuing programs would affect the classified staff in that program too, not just the faculty. Renee said we need to look at a whole function and determine how it can function differently. Dennis said Student Services started the discussion this morning about how they could look differently. They are going to look at every function within Student Services and decide what they can do and what they can’t. Dennis is going to go to department to department and have that conversation. Brian said they will have collaborative discussions about the priorities for each department.

Renee said that just because the college can’t get to the total by just cutting course sections that doesn’t mean course sections won’t be cut. Dennis said his discussion with the Student Services Council included that nothing is sacred. How the college does business today is not how it will do business next year.
Brian said the college will try pilot projects. Some will be successful and some will fail. The successes will be replicated and the college will learn from the failures.

Brian said the theme that is resonating is zero base budgeting. Start by looking at what Education Code mandates and what is needed for accreditation. Ray Kraupp added start with the minimum needed to have a transfer program, the minimum to have a CTE program and the minimum to have basic skills. Renee said the state doesn’t say the college has to have every transfer program, or every CTE program, so it is difficult to determine what the base is. Paul is not sure zero based budgeting is the mental bubble the college wants to have. Everyone will have to be anxious and justify themselves.

Brian said building from the ground up has to happen pretty quickly.

Stephanie provided background on the classified prioritization process. There was a need established for the process and CCEU is asking to restart something similar. There is a systematic way to gather information for classified prioritization and it is best done through the classified staff. It is very uneven unless there is a process built in. CCEU would like to gather and analyze data about classified needs. Stephanie said there needs to be an ongoing way to deal with our classified resources. CCEU has discussed setting up a process that could roll forward when we have new money but could also serve as a function in a reorganization process, a committee that could look at secondary issues including: workload, transitions, retraining and follows up on the ripple effects after the implementation. A model CCEU discussed a committee that meets on an ongoing basis to identify issues that might come as a result of reorganizations around classified resources in general. Information has been gathered through CPC and neighborhood meetings but those meetings are not focused around classified resources.

Paul said it sounds like a proposal for managers and classified to meet and discuss classified staffing issues. Brian asked if CCEU discussed what the makeup of the advisory committee to CPC and Stephanie said no.

Barbara read Katy’s statement from the Board meeting about working on the collaborative process the better. Barbara said she has heard Stephanie asking for this for a while, but it is like we are frozen in time. She heard a lot of support.

Graciano said he is not clear what the proposal is. Is this at the strategic level or is CCEU advocating for a more detailed operational level. A lengthy amount of time could be spent looking at details. Graciano added if it is looking at it at a strategic level he can understand some value. He asked Stephanie to elaborate and Stephanie said she could not. Stephanie said impetus was to get the committee established and then determine the most useful use of their time.

Jill said this is not about input, her vision is that the committee would do work. The committee would not get or solicit input but gather information and make recommendations in a very clear and structured way. CPC is an opportunity for broad dialog and not work. CCEU wants to be part of doing the work. Lena said it is also about identifying the process. There is no structure or process for how
this done. We need to identify the steps that go into reorganization, then gather staff and come up with a plan.

Victoria said Graciano’s points are important because it is not clear how this will work. The college already has a classified study committee and that committee could be a mechanism that deal with the reorganization piece. There is value of having classified involved in looking at impacts, but it is hard to understand what the mechanism looks like.

Stephanie said CCEU does not see this as a CPC subcommittee. It should be an advisory committee to the Cabinet built into the college’s budgetary timeline.

Paul cited confusion about the charge of the committee and said he heard three to four different ideas. The piece he is missing is how program review happens for classified. Brian said that the faculty prioritization process started because of a proposal that came from the faculty to the administration.

Brian said he and Katy talked about a great wariness to create another group when the current infrastructure is not adequate and asked if CPC feel the need to revisit the current infrastructure and fix it.

Paul said his thinking is that there is a micro tactical look, a CPC review and what is missing is the holistic look for classified as a whole. Renee said the Senate does not go in and work through all the data but rather looks at the bigger picture. The Senate does not have a working group.

Steve said he understands part of what is being asked for but he is confused by some of it. The staff prioritization process started because they were told it is needed for accreditation. It hasn’t been done in recent years because there is no money for new hires. He understands prioritizing classified positions. It has also been done before and could be reinstated when funds become available. He is not clear what is being proposed by CCEU. Steve said it almost sounds like two different committees are being proposed.

Stephanie said they are trying to separate the two issues and what they are looking at is front door and back door say. CCEU would like to provide input on proposed reductions and reorganization before and after they happen.

Kathy said everyone agrees classified should have an input but reorganization are unit specific and the input should come from within the unit. Jill countered that changes in one unit have effects on workload across the campus.

Kathy said there was reorganization in Allied Health and AR, where the two units worked together on transition issues and the effects on staff. Brian asked if it was a good model and Jill responded that it was. Brian asked it could be used as a model for the whole campus, as an outline for the process CCEU is suggesting. Stephanie responded that the classified prioritization process needs to be reinstated. CCEU wants a committee and CCEU wants the committee to define itself.
Victoria brought up confidentiality issues, and concern about a committee reviewing a plans that managers may not have shared with their staff. Victoria said managers have concerns about spreading fears among staff while they are still in the planning stages of reorganization. Even just looking at functions is difficult because people know which positions are attached to which functions.

Brian summarized CCEU is asking input at the front door, back door, to do work and have a say. There is a question about how to balancing confidentiality issues. Also, it needs to be determined if another committee is needed or is a model already exists. There is also a need to figure this out quickly.

Renee asked for a written proposal. Steve agreed that CPC should review something in writing. Paul said the discussion suggests this is not clarity at this point. CPC agreed to discuss the issue again next week, and requested a written proposal from CCEU.

CPC will meet again next week. Same time same place.

9.0  Adjournment
Next CPC meeting is scheduled for April 13. The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.