SLT Budget Reduction Process Committee

Friday, August 26, 2011

CSC 125-127

10:30 a.m. to 12:30 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

Present:  Cindy Martin, Fatima Nieves, Fiona Hert, Laurie Chesley, Lisa Freiburger, MaryBeth Beighley, Pam DeGryse

1. Welcome – no new attendees.
2. Minutes from the August 15 meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. Next, group members shared information that they had gathered on potential budget reduction templates from other schools. Pam shared information from a K-12 district and is going to send Lisa the website. Fiona shared information from SUNY – Fredonia. Lisa reported on progress made in calling the colleges we had already researched. While several colleges returned calls and were willing to talk, none of the colleges had specific templates they were using. Lisa was able to get a detailed budget reduction process model from Central Michigan University that gave her and Laurie very preliminary brainstorming ideas about what elements a template might include.
4. Next, the group discussed what information should be required from every program or service being evaluated as part of the budget process (e.g. what information would be common to all templates, whether for non-academic or academic programs and services). The group decided on the following:
   • How is the program or service aligned to the College’s Mission, Vision, Values, and Ends?
     i. How is the work of the program or service aligned to the College’s Strategic Plan?
   • What is the direct or indirect impact of the program or service on student success? On student recruiting? Is the impact low, medium, or high?
   • What are the ramifications of reducing/eliminating the program or service?
   • What is the availability of the program or service within the area?
   • The team agreed that these questions would be answered by the program or service in narrative form.
   • The team also agreed that the program or service would be asked to suggest where budget reductions might be made in their areas, with the understanding that the recommendations would not be binding.
5. Next, the group considered what College-level data would need to be considered as we create templates for all programs and services. It was agreed that the following information would be supplied to all programs and services undergoing our budget process:
   - Total staff FTE
     i. Full-time
     ii. Part-time
     iii. Student employees
   - Student count
     i. FTE
     ii. Headcount
     iii. Billing units
   - Total campus square footage
   - Total College budget

6. The group next considered what department-level (program- and service-level) data would need to be considered as we develop templates. The following types of information were discussed, although no final decisions were made, as the specific type of department data will depend on the specific department undergoing review.
   - Number of staff
   - Total cost
   - Total cost per student served
   - Number of students served
     i. Billing units
     ii. Waiting lists
   - Future labor demand
   - Transferability
   - Revenue generated
     i. Tuition
     ii. Grants/donations
     iii. Other

7. We next focused our attention on populating a template for non-academic (another term suggested was “operational”) programs and services. We thought the following elements would be relevant for all programs/services but still flexible enough to be adapted to the unique circumstances of programs/services.
   - Section on People (establish ratios – staff to customers served - based on benchmarks)
     i. Number of staff / number of work hours – benchmark against standards / like organizations
     ii. Number of customers served – benchmark against like organizations
     iii. Consider whether work/services offered are duplicated elsewhere in the organization or in area
   - Section on Cost Analysis
     i. Revenue sources
1. Current (tuition, grants, donations, fees, etc.)
2. Potential (grants, donations, fees, etc.)
   ii. Cost-revenue analysis if applicable

8. Because faculty committee members had an unexpected conflict between our meeting and the Faculty Association meeting, we delayed discussing templates for academic programs until our next meeting.

9. One major issue yet to be determined is what our unit of analysis will be for the budget process – will it be by department, will it be by service within a department, will it be by activity, will it differ from area to area (obviously, yes). One suggestion made was to make the unit of analysis the budgets assigned to each BCO.

10. As a final topic, based on the information Fatima shared from Virginia Tech related to budget reductions, we revisited and added to list of characteristics that GRCC’s budget process should possess. The items were added were:
    - The College should be open to the elimination of some programs rather than the reduction of all programs.
    - The College should be open to the idea that some money may need to be spent in the short-term in order to achieve long-term budget savings.
    - We should avoid one-time savings only.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00. The team’s homework for the next meeting is to review again the information we received from other colleges from Donna and to see if it contains elements we might incorporate into our templates. Based on all of the team’s discussions to date, Laurie and Lisa will create draft templates and a draft process flowchart (the five phases) for the team to review at the next meeting. They also will create an updated version of our budget process characteristics.

12. The team felt it had made good progress in its discussions at this meeting.