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Joint Meeting College Planning Council, Classified Staff Consultation Group, Academic Senate, Management, Instructors’Association

March 11, 2009 Room H111

Meeting Notes

Ignacio began by welcoming all the different groups that were present. We have been discussing Program reviews and resource requests. It is important to know where the funding comes and the nature of the different funding. Ignacio also announced that the Senate will convene at 4:35, when Kelly Lake would give the senate an update regarding Draft IV of the Accreditation self-study


President Serban said that the reason to have this joint meeting is to try to arrive to a common understanding of funding mechanisms. She said that she was aware of many different feelings spread on various sides of this issue. The new process is a new approach in some respects and relates to institution-wide activities. We tried to have this joint meeting and hopefully questions from some of the groups will be of benefit to other groups. We are all in the same kind of room trying to understand each other.

Linking Program Review to Planning and Budgeting: Why now and why me? I would have been happy to have found it all in place when I came back as president, but I was not that lucky. That being the case we have to deal with it.

President Serban said that this is not all about accreditation standard requirements. It is more about the need to develop a process for budgeting that truly informs the link to planning, understanding what we really need to operate across all facets of the organization. It’s about aligning our expenditures to our revenues. This is more important now than ever for all of us. Achieving a balanced budget is not a joke. This is something serious and it is also part of the accreditation standards. The primary driver for this is not accreditation standards although accreditation standards are part of why we are doing this. It is not the primary reason. The primary reason is the need to understand what we can spend, what we need to spend, where the money is coming from, and how much money we really have and how much money we have to spend versus what we spend and how we try to make it up from other sources, which has been a practice to some degree in certain areas. Going back to the rubric which some of you have seen and even though it has been passed around a few times we will do a group reading, although we are not in agreement with what the rubric says.

On Program Review, this is a rubric that wasn’t made up I didn’t make up. It is from the Accreditation Commission and the expectation is that regarding Program Review and Planning all colleges must be able to provide evidence that they are at the highest level, the sustainable continuous quality
improvement. We are not supposed to ignore the other three levels; it is all cumulative. We should be able to demonstrate that we are doing everything that is listed on the different levels of the rubric. Program Review at the Developmental phase addresses strategies that we were supposed to implement three years ago: development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation. Which translates into program reviews needing to be linked to planning; what to fund is identified through program reviews and linked to the planning of the college. This requirement was already up at the developmental stage. We should have been doing that for quite a while now. By now we should be using program reviews. And, this for all units, not just program review for instructional units. It’s only this year that we have implemented operational unit program reviews and it’s only this year that we have changed the program reviews that existed before to have a clear link to the college plan and objectives and a clear indication of needed resources. We can debate all we want, but this is the requirement. And on planning, again it’s the same thing: we are supposed to be at the sustainable continuous quality improvement and should have been working in that direction a long time ago.

Program Reviews inform Institutional Planning. This effectively incorporates results in all areas of educational services, including the financial side. These are the requirements and the teams are trained to look at the rubric and verify the institution evidence as to where the institution is based on these rubrics. Any less than Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement for Program Review and Planning in the mildest way puts you on probation if not on warning. For those of you who don’t know what probation or warning means from an accreditation perspective, when we put our students on probation we are very kind to them, we give them a lot of help and a lot of time. Right now the Department of Education has a two-year rule: If you are put on any sanction: probation, warning, with or without a visit, you have two years; not to make progress towards but to have fully implemented. You have endless reports that require a lot of work year after year. So it is really important that we actually do it; that we actually put it place a mechanism that funds these requests. It’s not just we have requests and then everybody goes their merry way and does what we’ve done before. It is really important that everybody understands that this is not an optional activity. However, the commission doesn’t tell anybody how to do it. As long as colleges find a way that is really satisfactory in this regard. There is no prescribed mode but we have to come up with one mode.

As you know, we have started working with the new Program Review templates – we know they’re not perfect. This will get better next year. For the first iteration it is what it is. The resources relate to people, equipment (not technology), technology, physical plant maintenance/construction, and other resources like marketing, research.

How are we going to fund these things? There was a quick review in terms of how we get funded (see page 4 PowerPoint slide). Ongoing funding, unrestricted, is very safe and becomes part of what is called base funding, meaning you cannot get any lower than that unless you drop in enrollment dramatically, or the state goes bankrupt. That’s part of what we can count on. Then there is funding that is sort of ongoing, not truly ongoing. These amounts are not at all guaranteed. They are ongoing in the sense that we have gotten this money for quite a while year after year, such as the lottery funding. The unrestricted lottery funding component that we get, you really don’t know how much money you are going to get every year. The revenue from the lottery profits that K-12 and us get has gone down. On the May 19 ballot there is an important item on the ballot: privatizing the lottery. If that happens it means that the first $5 billion of the profit from the lottery goes to the state to make up the anticipated $42 billion deficit. If anything is left then we supposedly will get it through the general fund
allocation. If anything is left we won’t get it directly anymore. Right now we have certain points in
time when we know we get this allocation no matter what the state does. The state has implemented
the deferral of payments which means that in the best case the January, February, March and April are
deferred to July and June is deferred to October. The fees from non-California residents and from the
non credit side fee based courses are all ongoing in a sense that we have them but we can’t count on
the amount being safe. We don’t even currently know if the non-credit fees are enough to cover the
cost of a course – we are going to look into that. The sort of Ongoing/Restricted Federal funding is
always tricky for financial aid and grants, etc. There is a part of the lottery funding destined to
instructional expenses. There is also state categorical funding that has been cut or reduced before, like
EOPS and matriculation. There is also Fundraising, which is always restricted. Finally, there is one-
time restricted variable funding: block grants. The amounts in these areas have varied a great deal. We
don’t count on this money as a source of ongoing funding. Our sources of revenue are not endless and
many of them have very clear restrictions.

The budget spreadsheet – Unrestricted General Fund: This fund is what we have discretion on how we
use it. The box called Total Salaries, Benefits & Fixed corresponds to ongoing costs that we have an
obligation to pay and we don’t have much leeway there. The 08-09 figure already includes the $4.2m
in expenditure reductions that we have put in place. Things would have looked worse had that $4.2m
been spent. Even with the $4.2m expenditure reduction we are at 90%; which means, that we have
10% of unrestricted general fund to buy the infamous toilet paper, travel, professional development,
and all other things that are not part of salaries, benefits and fixed costs. This is why when the
November 6 proposal came it would have meant a 5% reduction in our unrestricted general fund
revenue. We would have been at the point of needing to cut salaries, benefits and fixed costs. This is
why we engaged in the present conversation because we can’t take this college into a hole. It’s our
responsibility collectively to keep us afloat. Another interesting fact is how some fixed costs, like
bank fees have increased by almost 100%. This is due to the Banner online payment on credit cards.
We pay to the banks who are receiving credit card revenue. Dr. Serban explained what “elections fees”
are. Every so often our Board members have elections. The College has fees/costs involved in putting
them on the ballot, etc.

The three unrestricted general fund ending fund balances, include the 5% contingency (a part we
should never touch), equipment fund, construction fund. If there is a cash flow problem this is the part
of the money used to keep us afloat. We can talk about 08-09 separately. Starting in 08-09 budget year
by end of June, this three balances accumulated would have been around $14M. This used to be $30M.
What is the relevance of that? In 01-02 all fund balances as a percentage of the unrestricted salary and
benefits was 69% so we could have paid 70% of the whole year of salary and benefits from this
reserve if a severe cash flow problem arose. If we did nothing in June of 08 we could have paid 9%.
That’s a pretty significant change.

Every year how much have we set aside compared to the revenues we had in that year? As you can tell
in 01-02 it was about 54% of the revenue for the year where as of this June we’ve represented only 9%
of the revenue that year. What did we do? The next column in 08-09 is the adopted budget as of
September 08. What is happening there? Not much. We were still thinking about spending the same
way we were anticipating. We just put more money into the construction fund and a bit more in the
equipment fund. The next line represents the adjusted fund (not actual cash on hand, it’s accrued -on
paper- assuming that when we get the money in July and October if you count Equipment fund is
higher because that money that’s what it would be). As Leslie and Joe can explain in our accounting model to the state you have to show accrued, everything as real, it’s not quite real. We were going to spend some but didn’t. Construction fund – the deal with Measure V we got the following money: about $1.2 million from Measure V to cover costs for swing space for Drama/Music that was initially covered from our own budget. We got $92,000 reimbursement from Measure V once we sold the bonds. These are one time funds.

Moving forward there is a need to watch spending more closely, but there is also a need to allow for the institution to move forward. Even in bad budget times we can’t stop moving forward. This semester was a good example. We don’t want to continue like that. We want to still be able to continue to conduct business, be innovative, to not keep positions frozen for too long. As of now all positions have been unfrozen so we are going to proceed with opening all classified staff positions that had been frozen. The point is for new positions moving forward, there are only two sources of state money that become part of the base ongoing: growth and COLA. We also know that part of growth certain things need to come off the top. Funding for new FTF positions to meet the Full Time Faculty Obligation needs to come off the top and that is a non debatable expense, plus other things that become also ongoing. We should use the growth funding instead of fund money for that. Fixed costs like liability insurance, bank fees and other things, are not going away. They are ongoing expenses and we have to have them backed up by a safe source of money on an ongoing basis. Then some of the remaining amount we should set aside, and make an effort to put in place, to fund new classified, management and administrative positions. We had a study before called CPP in 04-05. We discussed then the concept that we need to set aside some money, really ongoing money, for new classified staff positions, new management and new administrative positions. At the end of the day, we discussed a lot and nothing happened. We did have money then. It was a collaborative planning effort. Every unit got to fill their template. It was actually a good process, except it was good only for discussion. When it came to allocate resources based on that, zero resources came about as a result. We cannot have a process like that. To have this whole thing in Program Reviews be a sort of shadow of CPP is just not acceptable. We are going to be dinged big time and it is just not acceptable and it is not fair. At some point in time we need to make a commitment to fund, if we fund new full time faculty positions and that’s a non debatable issue as we grow, there should be also as a result of getting COLA because growth is not only growth in faculty, it should be growth in staff and management. For example, if we add all the square footage of SOMA who is going to clean it? I’ve looked at other districts in terms of three things: if they have certain formulas which drive additional new classified staff. Some have a formula for every 20,000 additional square feet of useable space you add a new grounds person. I found several districts have put a CAP going back to the salaries fixed costs and revenues. And also from talking to a number of people, they have negotiated certain limits saying this percentage cannot go higher than 85% or 87% in order to maintain the viability of the institution. We need to create a fund for other needs identified through the Program Review. We need to create this.

The proposed model which would be better aligned to what we really need and money to pay for everything would be a committed fund. What is routinely needed shouldn’t be debatable it should be part of your budget. It’s a given. We shouldn’t debate when Biology needs microscopes. Those would be what we call routine needs, routine budget. Other things not routinely replaced every year: we should be able to develop an inventory of these pieces, when were they last replaced or when they were first bought or brought forth; what is the approximate value applied over time decreased; state when it needs to be replaced, replacement value and then budget for it. We don’t need to fight over it,
we just need to do it. We need to recognize that the only things that would need to be ranked are brand new stuff. Obviously we only have so much money coming in so the truth is not everybody can get what they want. We need to have some money set aside so that something new gets funded every year and we can do it if we are all careful how we spend our money. This was not a normal year. Only brand new technology needs to be ranked by CPC. For physical plant planning, thanks to Measure V, we now can look forward to many of the deferred maintenance projects and we don’t need to worry about those.

Things may need to be modified. Until we try we don’t even know if it is working or not. So, all I’m asking from you is to be open minded and willing to give it a try. We are not married to this thing, we are not stuck with this model. We need to give it a try and find the model that works for us at SBCC. Again, nobody tells us how to do stuff. It’s all about what works here. But let’s at least try. We must not be one of those colleges that are put on warning or probation. I cannot emphasize how merciless the accreditation process has become. We have a stellar accreditation record. We have never in the history of this college even gotten as much as a progress report. We shouldn’t spoil it now. I know some people are worried. We need to have a fair process for everybody where everybody’s needs are recognized and we make an effort to distribute the money we have in a fair way. When we have the money let’s all enjoy it and when we don’t have money spread the pain equally. We can’t just continue this way. It’s just not something that’s going to work. Again at the end of the day all I can do is to engage in this conversation but the actual doing it’s only you who can do it.

Dr. Serban mentioned that she saw some really angry faces in the audience.

Questions and Answers:

Kathy O’Connor asked what would happen if the initiatives in May don’t pass and we go back to the state of essentially having no budget? Dr. Serban said that in that case we would go through the same thing we did this year, waiting for a budget for months and months, without really knowing what the budget is. What we have going forward for next year is the base plus growth. If the election doesn’t go it’s not going to get better. If the propositions don’t pass this year we’ll get paid less for FTES than what we should. Property tax revenues and other revenue are coming in lower than estimated; the only wild card is the Federal stimulus package and what kind of beneficial effect will have on our budget.

Esther Frankel asked what will happen to the money that was cut from our budgets? Dr. Serban said that before anything new is funded we will put back what was cut. However, we really need to look at hourly people because we need to understand how we use hourly personnel.

Dr. Serban was asked what happens if we don’t have enough money to restore everything? Do you have any idea what the process is going to be? Is there going to be a ranking, is there going to be a justification that’s going to have to be made? She responded that we cannot keep on not replacing equipment. Continuing to do this can only hurt us. It’s not good practice to fall behind. If we have money we’ll restore.

Another question was: why do we bother going through the process of asking for new things when we really want the things back that we’ve lost over the year.
Dr. Serban said that some of the requests can be funded with funding sources that are restricted for particular purposes and don’t overlap with what was cut. It’s not necessarily one for one. Some of the funding sources cannot be used for hourly personnel or travel, but they can be used for equipment, for new software, for other new things that we need. Also if we keep growing, as the budget stands now, there is no funding for next year. Again, we have a choice to make about what is left from the growth funding. Do we put it all into restoring or maybe some things emerged to be more important than replacing all hourlies as they were. As an organization, just because we always did it like we cannot do it now. It’s an opportunity to look at some different ways in some areas. In some areas you may be better off consolidating hourlies and get a good full time person rather than outsourcing our services for plumbing and electrical. We need to look at how much we spend. How much does it cost us to call whomever, for them to come and charge $120 an hour. What would be the cost to have a full time person on campus. The point is that this analysis hasn’t occurred yet. When you have money you don’t worry about it. The point you ask is: why do we bother? You have to start somewhere. You have to at least get on with the concept. We may not be financially in a position to fully implement the concept this year or even next year. We have to at least start working on the concept and when we get out of this hole we will. We know we will sometime. We can’t just sit and say oh we can’t do anything. We are going to get dinged if we just say well you know it was a bad budget year, therefore, we can’t bother. Well it’s the standard we’ve been doing for about fifteen years now. We can’t do that.

An opinion was expressed saying that “I’m a big fan of streamlining and I found the process to be unnecessarily unwieldy so far. So far we haven’t even gone through it yet. That’s just my view.” Dr. Serban said that she had a different opinion, and that after all, this is a free country.

Dr. Serban was asked where SBCC’s contingency fund is in relationship to contingency funds at other community colleges in the state? She responded that the Chancellor’s Office requires 5%. If you fall below that, they put you on their watch list and they send the two remaining staff that they have. This goes back to what I was telling about my research of other districts. There is a difference between a state required level and what other districts, Boards of other districts, have developed over time as a minimum contingency fund reserve. As an example, Yuba has a policy. Right now they are at 6% and they have a plan to arrive at 10% in a few years. Many other districts have moved up and if you are actually hit by a bad situation the 5% doesn’t even cover you ½ a month. We pay between $10 and $11 million on the peak months for salary, benefits and fixed costs. This model is based on the concept that we’ll always get they money we are supposed to get.

Dr. Serban was asked if she could you give a figure about where SBCC is in relationship to other community colleges now? She said that of the 72 districts we are around the middle we have about 30 above us and 40 below us. It’s a little tricky how they come to this and about what is counted. This is public information. Contrary to popular myth, we are not at the top. Joe Sullivan said that we’ve had two rankings actually. The one ranking was for unrestricted general funding alone and we were 31st out of 72 and for unrestricted/restricted we were 39th out of 72.

Dr. Serban was asked what the percentage currently is. She said that if we don’t spend anything on equipment and we don’t spend anything on construction, and we put in the 5% that we shouldn’t touch it is the amount on the right hand column if you look at the revenues it is 25% of all unrestricted
general fund revenues for this year and it’s 29% of annual salaries, benefits and not including fixed costs. That’s where we are right now. But again, it includes the 5% you shouldn’t touch.

A follow-up on the question was: is the 5% corresponding to all fund balances? I don’t know what I’m comparing the 5%, to 16% or 5% to 25% or to 29%? Dr. Serban said that you should be comparing the 5% to 20%. This assumes we never spend any money.

Carlos Ramirez asked where Dr. Serban saw us. At what percentage area do you see the school having reserves in your mind right now? Dr. Serban said that she hadn’t decided yet. That’s not something I want to decide on my own. That’s part of the conversation I want to have with CPC and other groups. We need to understand why we need to commit to more and how much more is enough. I don’t have a set figure in my mind. All I know is that I would like us to have enough that when we are faced with what we are facing here so we don’t need to talk about salary reductions and furloughs.

A follow up: what would be the minimum that you have in mind? Dr. Serban responded: Some people never give up, and I don’t think I can give you a different answer.

Dr. Serban was asked what kind of carry over do you look at from year to year? She said that this varies. Ending balances varies. There are years when we have spent a lot from the construction fund, if you look at the trend in the construction fund. This year we have started with $2.3 million from about $12.5m in 01-02. These are the carryovers, the ending fund balances and again, it includes the 5% contingency. That’s really what we had from one year to the next. In some years we have spent more and some years we haven’t. The reason they didn’t go further down is that every year we do transfer funds. We take money and move it to these funds to keep them at certain levels. And primarily we have used ending balances as our one place to replenish this fund when we spend money. The ending balances have come down significantly. We are at the point where what’s available from ending balances to put into this thing has gone down so low that we have to find a better mechanism than ending balances because they are just not as high as they used to be.

Oscar Zavala asked about the role of CPC. It seems like everything ends up in CPC. I’ve never been to a CPC meeting. I don’t know if it is an advisory committee that advises you or do they make decisions? Dr. Serban said that CPC is our main shared governance group with representation from all constituencies: faculty, classified staff, students and administration. Yes, they are an advisory committee.

Oscar Zavala said that he wondered if when everything goes to CPC for ranking his voice was being heard. Dr. Serban said that faculty have five representatives on CPC. Hopefully they represent at CPC what is happening in the Senate. The CPC meetings are open; if you want to come and hear what’s being discussed. We also post all agendas and minutes on the Web. We also have a process. Nothing happens in just one meeting. We have a number of iterations to allow for discussion, to allow for input from all representatives at CPC including the Senate. Ignacio and Susan and the other folks should represent what you’ve all discussed at the Senate meetings; they shouldn’t come up with their own opinions. Oscar said that he realized that but kept thinking: so I’m a department, not on the Senate, and I have worked on my ranking of needs. Has that been discussed at the Senate? Am I assured that it’s going to voiced and listened to? I’m just thinking about the department that may not have a voice and I’m wanting to clarify whether or not the process is working or is there a way to review the voting
structure? Dr. Serban said that as she understood it, each division is represented in the Senate. Your division senator is to consult with all departments within the Division.

Oscar asked if P&R was part of the process? Andreea said that as a Senate committee, P&R was part of the process as well. Kathy O’Connor said that the CPP was a good example of how this actually worked. We’re sort of modeling after that process where our program review resource requests are going to Planning and Resources and then to the Senate. If your division is represented at P&R, that’s your voice. That’s why the Senate committees are so important. They are also represented by their deans. So you have your deans helping you, which from the faculty standpoint your division rep at P&R and your senator, being you, I mean you are the voice of the people you represent and then our senate reps go to CPC and represent the Senate. They don’t represent their own division at least I’ve never heard them do that. We’re only going to be as powerful as we want to be. If we want to abdicate our responsibility and not do this that’s our choice but then we need to take the consequences. So our Planning and Resources committee is important; our Senate is important and CPC represents all entities. It just depends on whether we want to do our job of being a good representative body.

Dean Nevins asked Dr. Serban why we were having this conversation exactly, and that he was not really clear about what she was looking for or what we’re trying to get out of this. Dr. Serban said she was I’m trying to get people to have a common conversation. Rather than hearing rumors, this is a venue to have a voice in a collective way. Attendance is not mandatory. It’s an effort to try to engage in a common conversation which I think is the right thing to do. To ask the questions that have been posed here.

A question was asked if, in terms of the faculty area, those will be reviewed and ranked first at P&R and then P&R will make recommendations to the Academic Senate and the Senate will look at them again? Is that correct? Dr. Serban said that this is the Senate’s process. So frankly whatever you decide to do. It’s your process. What we’ve asked each department to do is in their resource requests and to show priority 1 “gotta have it”, priority 2, 3 and so on, so the Senate gets it and if they want to delegate it to P&R that’s the Senate’s prerogative.

What about things that are important this year vs next year and five years? For now, what is being requested is for next year. In the fall we’ll go through the process of saying what is routine and what is non-routine (every couple of years) must haves. That’s the challenge of reapportioning money to allocate to know each year this is how much money we need to pay for critical routine operations to put in the department budget so they don’t have to go through this process and for non routine (major ticket items) when that budget year comes up you determine how much that’s going to be taken off the top to fund those things that have to be funded. The idea is that the ranking process going forward after next year won’t be as cumbersome as it is now because you will be only looking at what is new.

If you want an example: when we finally put the computers on the automatic refresh cycle it took away the emotions year after year and the debate about whose computer is going to be replaced. When the routine (annual) is taken care of it would allow, for example, the ranking of equipment needs and resources for new programs. Only the new stuff will need to be ranked. It would be the same concept as the computer replacement/refresh style cycle. This would require an initial effort to put an inventory together. But then again it is a lot easier to maintain and forecast what you may need.
Dr. Serban was asked what happens if there is not enough money? She said that it would be like this year. You make the decision not to replace computers. We had to decide: are we going to lay off people or replace computers? Save people first. We will have years unfortunately like this year, when we have to postpone equipment replacement. If we make it part of the budget it will make it easier. If we are committed to have certain things happen we have to be committed to the funding. It should make things simpler. It will take us a few years to work it through.

Dr. Serban was asked about the funds that were cut this year out of necessity, how they were going to be reinstated. And, if that money won’t necessarily go exactly where it was before it was cut. Will it be reexamined for other priorities like maintenance, how much do we want to fund hourlies and so on. Dr. Serban said that this was not the case. Most money will go where they were, except for looking at hourlies usage.

Dr. Serban was asked who would make the decision about hourlies? She said that each Vice President needs to look in their area. Some were not cut that badly. Some were backfilled and hopefully next year we’ll still have money. The point is you have to really look at those areas that are heavily dependent on hourlies. I think it’s the responsibility of those areas and they can make an argument that this is the only way we can operate. We can’t just automatically say okay, we’ll never look at anything. It behooves us to do it.

Dr. Serban was asked how you make a commitment to funding when you have no control? We have no control whether we get that funding or not. How do we make a commitment to that kind of funding? Dr. Serban said that it’s the same commitment we make to when we grow and funding for growth exists, and most years it does, then you have a source of incoming money. If you get COLA you have a source of money. If we don’t, then that’s a different conversation. The point is, you’ve been here long enough at the college, you know we’ve been through cycles. There will be two/three bad years, then we have five/six good years. In the five/six good years you can make a real commitment. Then we have money, actually to the tune of many millions of dollars, a very significant amount of money. So, in bad times like this year we have to constrain ourselves. For the most part there are more good years than bad years. In bad years unfortunately, this is why it is unfortunate timing for this conversation. In 06-07 and 07-08 there was money. Then we would have had a few years to see how it would work and in bad years all bets are off anyhow. I understand the point. The point Esther was trying to make sooner, why are we going through this, why do we bother with this arduous terrible process this year? Why? Because we have an accreditation visit coming in October; I didn’t choose the timing of this. It takes time even for the discussion to occur. Even if we had the money we still need to come up with the concept and that takes time. Right now we are accelerated by an incoming accreditation visit. If I had my wish we would have done this at a different time with a different budget situation where you can actually see it working. Right now we are more in the conceptual mode. We are not that far from making this happen. I can’t give you a guarantee right now when we don’t know what the May ballot is going to do. What I can guarantee is that if we think this process through correctly, when the money comes, we’ll get out of this hole. The commitments we have made in the past also through collective bargaining have actually materialized and this will materialize too.

A follow up question on the process. Dr. Serban was asked about the hourlies usage and other stuff that was pulled and to whether it will be expedient or financially wise to backfill these and how there
will be an analysis. What about departments that have huge amounts of hourlies because there is a shortage of classified staff. How does this work as a process? Will we analyze it, will CPC be the ones analyzing it? Will a Senate committee be doing it and once the analysis is done where does that go and who ultimately makes the decision? Dr. Serban said that we hadn’t thought this through and that any productive suggestions or processes are welcome. We haven’t thought about it, of course the immediate one might happen anyway, the VPs working with the different areas that somehow we can find a way to do this. This doesn’t mean that the shared governance structure doesn’t have a place. It should have a place because any big change of this kind should never be done outside the shared governance process and we’ll never do anything outside of shared governance process that is of big significance. We need to think it through. This is a new development. If we didn’t have to cut hourlies we probably would never have thought about it. I don’t know. We’ll have to think about it.

Dr. Serban was asked how the program reviews incorporate student input, and how this input can be considered in the ranking and shared governance? She said that we have student representation on CPC and at CPC the student is a voting member. Students may not always have a vote but they always have a voice in committees.