PRESENT: Charlotte Achen, Dennis Bailey-Fougner, Jill Gallo, Diane Goody, Paul Harvell, Steve Hodges, Renée Kilmer, Brian King, Victoria Lewis, Michael Mangin, Dan Rothwell, Barbara Schultz Perez, Stephanie Stainback, and Kathie Welch

ABSENT: Graciano Mendoza

VISITORS: Lori Amato, Tama Bolton, Michael Booth, Nancy Brown, Margitta Dietrick-Welsh, Sesario Escoto, Kristin Fabos, Rick Fillman, Wanda Garner, Jefferson Hancock, Ray Kaupp, Michael Kelley, Joe Nugent, Jana Marcus, Rachel Mayo, Rock Pfotenhauer, George Romero, Topsey Smalley, Tootie Tzimbil, Serena Muindi, Loree McCawley, Marcy Wieland, Jim Weckler, Daniel Wooten

1.0 Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
Brian called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. No substitutes.

2.0 Review of Agenda
None

3.0 Oral Communications
None

4.0 Management Dialog
None

5.0 CIP Rankings
Renee discussed the CIP rankings. The purpose of the rankings is to better integrate budget and planning.

6.0 Round I and Round II Budget Reduction Plans
SPRAC Chair Jeff Hancock reported that SPRAC is almost finished reviewing Round I plans. Dennis asked about the SPRAC process, and said he is unclear why he has been asked to submit a revised plan for the financial aid position. Jeff said SPRAC wants more specific information in order to provide input. Dennis said the financial aid plan is a pilot program so he will not know the outcome for some time. Marcy said SPRAC saw the financial aid plan as different from other plans because it could be a temporary cost savings while all the other reductions seem permanent. Dennis commented that it feels like SPRAC has moved beyond an advisory committee. A SPRAC member said SPRAC is an advisory committee that is charged to provide advice to Cabinet and CPC, so the committee needs clear information.

Stephanie said she is looking for an in-depth study of if these plans are realistic. From her perspective this is part of the shared governance process. This should drive CPC
discussion on whether or not this is realistic. Victoria said there are some clear contract
issues and SPRAC has to be careful to not to blur the line. Some of the feedback
seems muddy. Stephanie asked for specifics. Victoria said she is talking about the
bookstore benefits discussion, and how to make the bookstore employees whole is a
contract issue. Dan said he doesn't see the point of ignoring major concerns because it
happens in another house. Dennis pointed out that a SPRAC member advocating
finding another place for a displaced employee is stepping into contract issues. Dan
said mentioning concerns and issues is not advocacy.

Ray commented that he remembers this SPRAC being presented as an advisory
committee who could illustrate effects of the administration’s recommendations. There
was no accountability in the original intent of SPRAC that people have to answer every
issue that the committee raises. The committee’s charge does not say a response is
required.

Dan said that SPRAC cannot look at people individually they need to look the plans
globally and programmatically. Dan asked that in Round III the administration send a
list of what it wants SPRAC to look at specifically. Stephanie disagreed and said she
believes is a serious issue and anything involving classified reductions should be
brought to SPRAC. Steve said he understands that there are good reasons that not all
the information (on the expected outcomes) is available. It is a complex situation but
SPRAC needs to move forward and do the best with the information that was provided.

CPC went back to discussing the financial aid plan and Jill pointed out that SPRAC
requested that the additional review be completed six months from now, not every
week. Barbara said she would rather see it sooner. Six months is a long time for
something with moving parts that involves three positions. Three months might be a
really good check point for this. After some discussion on the issue CPC determined
December is a good time to review the plans.

CPC then went back to discussing the process. Ray commented that SPRAC’s charge
says the manager has the opportunity to respond to concerns, and then the SPRAC
chair will prepare a final summary. The charge does not say anything about a
manager’s written response, accountability or revised reports. Barbara said there is a
difference between budget reductions and reorganization decisions. The
reorganizations need review. Kathie said that does happen in the area where the
change is taking place. There is also a process for workload reduction. That should not
have to come to CPC continually.

Stephanie said the fact that CCEU came up with SPRAC was because there were no
feedback groups for the shared governance process. Stephanie added SPRAC was
formulated in complete acknowledgment that there were no feedback groups.
Stephanie wants vigorous discussion and vote if necessary and said this feels like a real
desire to minimize the opportunity for shared governance.

Next Jeff discussed Round II which SPRAC is still reviewing. The ACE and bookstore
reviews are complete. Brian asked if documents SPRAC provided to CPC are a final
summary on Round I. Marcy asked if CPC envisioned a narrative or written summary.
Renee thought the written documents were the summary and Steve agreed. Brian
asked if CPC wants to vote to accept the summaries. Marcy said SPRAC is still
wondering about the last two Round I positions. CPC agreed to note SPRACs reservations on the last two Round I positions but accept them and move forward.

Georg commented on the recommendations for interim reports and it seems like it would be a good idea to address those specific parts. It would be good to decide where the reports go to. Brian asked if it would be good for the VP’s to make a commitment to come back in six months with a report/global update. Stephanie would like to see the reports go back to SPRAC. CPC agreed the reports will go back to SPRAC.

Dan suggested SPRAC put “undetermined” next to the final two positions in Round I and move forward to Round II. CPC agreed to accept the Round I report. Also the ACE and bookstore reductions (Round II) can move forward to the Board in June.

SPRAC agreed to send CPC their reports as soon as they are complete, so CPC members have move time for review prior to CPC meetings.

7.0 Leases
The Ceiba Charter School and Santa Cruz County Office of Education leases are going to the Board in June for approval. Brian is continuing to work with other groups on potential leases.

8.0 Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.