SLT Budget Reduction Process Committee
Monday, August 1, 2011
CSC 125-127
1:00 to 2:00 p.m.

Team Members: Aleta Anderson, Cindy Martin, Fatima Nieves, Fiona Hert, Jim Peterson, Laurie Chesley (co-facilitator), Lisa Freiburger (co-facilitator), Marty DeVries, MaryBeth Beighley, Mike Light, Pam DeGryse, Wanda Acevedo-Ferrer

Attendees: Aleta Anderson, Fiona Hert, Jim Peterson, Laurie Chesley, Lisa Freiburger, MaryBeth Beighley, Mike Light, and Pam DeGryse

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Lisa and Laurie defined our team’s charge and goals. Our team is charged with creating a budget reduction process for GRCC. Our team is not charged with implementing the process we create. That will be done by another group yet to be determined. Our first scheduled report-out to the whole Strategic Leadership Team is on Friday, September 23.

3. Our first task was to brainstorm what our group considers to be the critical components of a budget process. We developed the following list. A budget process should:

   - Demonstrate an awareness of the changing environment and an understanding of how work done on the budget impacts other commitments, such as contracts (labor and other).
   - Assess the implications of budget on accreditation and other quality initiatives.
   - Be transparent.
   - Include input from stakeholders – all employee groups, students, and the external community.
   - Be flexible.
   - Have a long-range and short-term goals identified.
   - Have a clear timeline.
   - Have a clear communication strategy.
   - Be data-informed.
   - Demonstrate a commitment to maintaining academic integrity (e.g. to maintaining sound academic practices for students).
   - Be driven by the College’s Mission, Vision, Values, and Ends.
   - Be proactive, not reactive in nature (e.g. allow the College to plan 3-5 years ahead).
4. Our second task was to review the work performed by the SLT last semester. In small
groups, SLT members evaluated many different budget reduction models from other
institutions of higher learning. SLT members recorded strengths and weaknesses of those
models. We reviewed their notes.

5. After our review, we did not feel that any model was perfect for GRCC, but we did feel the
models from the following institutions had some good qualities that we wanted to maintain in
our model. Those schools are Buffalo State, University of Nebraska – Lincoln, Southern
Nevada, Algonquin, and Western Washington. The strengths and weaknesses of their
models are included as an attachment to these minutes. The schools that did not have models
we wanted to emulate are Lansing CC and Diablo Valley CC. Their strengths and
weaknesses are also appended to these minutes.

6. As a last task, we decided on our homework for the next meeting. Team members are to
review in greater detail the models we selected as having merit and come prepared to share
the specific aspects of those models that we should include in ours.

Next meeting: Monday, August 15, 2011 – 10:00 to 11:30 a.m. – CSC 125-127

Parking lot issues: need to better clarify and communicate the relationship of this process to
Academic Program Review (they are NOT the same thing), and we want to take a look at
Shoreline Community College’s model.