**PRESIDENTS’ COUNCIL**

Minutes

October 6, 2020

Meeting held via Zoom

# MEMBERS PRESENT:

President Tim Cook Vice President David Plotkin

Vice President Alissa Mahar CHRO Melissa Richardson

ASG President Lanie Sticka FTF President Jay Leuck

PTF President Leslie Ormandy & Jennifer Nickell Classified Co-President Kelly Lawrence

Admin/Conf Co-President Shelly Tracy & Amy Cannata College Council Representative Cynthia Risan

Executive Director Marketing Lori Hall Recorder Denice Bailey

Guest: Jeff Shaffer, Vicki Hedges

Tim reviewed the purpose of Presidents’ Council (PC) and the guiding principles (listed at the top of every agenda). He would like PC to be very involved in the budget process this year.

**INTERIM SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS**

Tim said the college is working to reaffirm our shared governance process, but in the meantime, we need to continue to use our existing process. He heard frustration last spring about shared governance, and realizes the existing processes are not enough. We have to find other ways to engage and inform the college community. The virus has just exacerbated the situation.

This year, he plans to overcommunicate. Budget will be a prime example of that. Will get information out in a number of different ways. He has formed a group called Presidents’ Leadership Team (PLT). Many of the people on PC are also on PLT. It is intended as an oversight group, to have shared conversation about issues at the college, not a decision-making body. He could also use the word advisory instead of oversight. The group is still norming, but the goal is to improve communication between administration and the associations. Trying to get to less “us vs. them” at the college. PLT is an informal way to communicate better. It came up because there was a lot of confusion about information communicated last spring. This caused mistrust. PLT has met three times and are working on goals and meeting norms. It is not a public group or meeting. Most of the conversations held there will also happen here in PC. Tim gave a brief explanation of shared governance for those in the meeting who were not familiar with the term.

Tim invited conversation on what we can do this year, in a virtual environment, to improve our shared governance. Lanie suggested scheduling a lunch with one person from each department.

Kat Long expressed concern about the information listed on the PC agenda. She couldn’t tell from the agenda if this information was new or different, which made it hard to decide if she should come to the meeting. Tim said what PC is talking about is often redundant to College Council (CC). The two items on our agenda today were presented at CC last week. No decisions were made there, but there was an opportunity to provide feedback. PC provides another opportunity for feedback.

Leslie reported one problem with what she hears at CC is the lack of documents that make things real for her. She needs to read something to understand it. It is hard for her to know what questions to ask or provide feedback without the documents.

Tim said this is all good feedback. We may need to implement some protocols for both CC and PC. We can come back to this topic later if needed. The goal is to get communicate so much that people get tired of talking about the same things again.

**POLICY REVISIONS**

Vicki Hedges shared a summary page for the policies presented for discussion today. Most of the revisions are due to various new legislative changes and changes in the law around Title IX. The student handbook will also be updated to incorporate the new requirements. Vicki responded to questions.

**BUDGET UPDATE**

Jeff Shaffer provided a quick budget update for PC, rather than the full presentation. He has finished the year-end audit, so we have a firm number for the ending fund balance and where we landed with Covid impacts. We also received the state economic forecast, so we can build that into the college’s financial forecast. He has come up with some scenarios for funding for the next biennium. We will hear what our state funding will be in March or April, but we will hear the governors proposed budget earlier than that.

He shared and reviewed four different scenarios with different state funding levels and different tuition levels. He reviewed the same scenarios with an estimated drop in enrollment, which increases the budget gap significantly.

Tim asked if this makes sense to PC members, or if they need more information. His goal is to make sure everyone understands the information presented.

Leslie asked if a drop in enrollment means a drop in courses, and if that can be indicated somehow. Jeff responded it is a combination between some courses being up and some are down. There is a whole set of CTE courses are not even being offered. Also, Advanced College Credit (ACC) courses are a part of this. He will try to come up with some data.

Cynthia suggested it would be good to keep both tabs in Jeff’s spreadsheet. If we get a different number from the state, we can show that we ran certain scenarios and now need to run a scenario with a new, different number from the state. Tim added a suggestion to date each one so we can track when they were developed. Jeff liked those ideas.

Amy asked why don’t we have a scenario that shows a balanced budget. Jeff responded the HECC scenario is close to balancing, but when we incorporate the anticipated enrollment drop, it goes out of balance. Creating a balanced budget may not be realistic; for example, we know the Board would not approve a $20 tuition increase in order to have it balance.

**ACADEMIC REDUCTION & ELIMINATION PROCESS**

David said this is going to be very similar to what he presented at CC last week. He doesn’t have a document to share but will provide documents later. This conversation is to remind everyone that we are engaged in this process, but it is not meant as a comprehensive review.

Many people do not understand what this process is meant to achieve. It is intended to manage revenue, cost, and numbers in our academic programs. Originally, it was intended as an ongoing, systematic yearly process, first imagined three years ago. It was about support and investment along with reduction and elimination, however, it seemed disingenuous to talk about investment when there were no funds to invest.

The process was put on hold last spring, and we didn’t do anything with it over the summer. He is now reintroducing the process, with CC and PC being the first steps to re-engage. The workgroup that met last spring on the criteria will be brought back together to discuss the next steps.

The process will be a series of steps, moving from a large number of programs we can potentially considering analyzing to a much smaller subset. Decisions around what to do with that small subset will be a focused and intense dialog. No decision will be made on purely a financial analysis or purely on criteria. The criteria will be used to get the number of programs to consider down to a manageable number. Ultimately, analysis on the smaller subset will be shared publicly. There will be robust conversation on how we got to that point, then considering these conversations, Executive Team (ET) will decide on reducing or eliminating any programs. Those recommendations would then be shared for public discussion/conversation.

We may come to a point where there are no recommendations or multiple recommendations. He knows the college community will want to be involved before any changes are implemented. Those conversations may also uncover other things for ET to think about, such as a reallocation of funds to change a program’s financial situation.

Kat Long ask if this means the college might decide to invest in some programs. David responded yes, but honestly, he doesn’t know yet what the analysis will yield. He also doesn’t know where we would currently have money to invest in a program that is struggling.

Jennifer said this is a delicate issue. People are protective of their programs. CCC is not the first community college to do this, so there must be some data out there to use. It would be beneficial to do a data driven approach. It is harder to hurt feelings if data is guiding the process. David agreed. We will be using the financial analysis first, then an analysis based on criteria, some of which are quantitative. That will help us focus on specific programs. He has consulted with other community colleges in Oregon about this, and part of the process is based on their feedback and part is based on CCC’s input last fall. It is a delicate process, but when you come down to decisions, some information cannot be captured in quantitative data. It will require conversation. Tim agreed it is an emotional process. We want it to be clean and quantitative, but qualitative data must be included.

Amy ask what we mean by program improvement. David said in this context, things that would allow a program to continue and be viable in terms of what it will do for students.

Tim said we will have plenty of opportunity to discuss this further this fall.

# ASSOCIATION REPORTS

ASG – Lanie reported:

* ASG received more than 100 applications for grants. They are getting the award letters sent out.
* Food boxes are available every Wednesday.
* The multicultural center is having museum tour for Hispanic American Month.

ACE - Kelly had no report.

PTF – Jennifer reported:

* They are working on communication within the association.
* They are looking forward to meeting with David on the fall MOU.
* PTF are planning an October 22 all-association meeting to review the contract.

FTF – Jay reported:

* FTF continue to make progress on the MOU. They have reached tentative agreement and Senate is now reviewing.

Admin/Confidential – Amy reported:

* The goal for this year is focusing on communication.
* The group is thinking about professional development activities and connection activities

College Council - Cynthia reported:

Oct 2 meeting topics included

* Academic reduction/elimination
* Colleague strategic alignment process
* Security presentation
* Policy revisions
* Association reports

Adjourn 5:00