

To College Council, February 23, 2016

College Council Notes, 2/16/2016

Submitted by Diane Boynton, College Council Co-Chair

College Council met on Tuesday, February 16, 2016 to discuss CBT's project specifics as outlined by Rocky, Pam, and Shirley on Tuesday, February 9, 2016. After much discussion, College Council members supported the plan with a few modifications.

1. **College policies, processes and procedures** (both decision-making/governance and integrated planning) discussions should include elements related to communication and evaluation.
The plan will be modified to include communication and evaluation in both process discussions.
2. **Strategic Enrollment Management:** In agreement
3. **Finance:** Within your total financial review, please address:
 - a. How reliable is the financial information?
Validating the reliability of financial information is the responsibility of the independent auditors as part of their annual audit. If the Council has concerns, they should speak directly to the auditors. This would certainly exceed the scope of our work. However, in our review, we will certainly comment if we saw information that seemed unreasonable to us.
 - b. What is the structural deficit?
The report will define the structural deficit and discuss it in terms of the current college circumstances. It is also our intent to help the college look at this issue over the next three years through the modeling tools we will provide to the college.
 - c. What expenses might be cut (such as legal and consulting fees)?
The team will look at large expenditures and districtwide expenditures but the college community needs to be the one to review line item budgets to make more specific program and area alterations.
4. **Managing funded FTES/strategies to maintain (and possibly increase?) FTES:** in agreement
5. **ERP:** College Council would like:
 - a. Evidence of the need for an ERP (to help the college community understand an ERP's importance)
The team will discuss the general importance of having a reliable ERP system and why it is so prevalent throughout the community college system. However, for a more technical dialog, the College Council would be better served by working with the other ERP related consulting firm that has already been engaged.
 - b. Recommendations on generating/setting aside resources to purchase
The team will work with the college to explore alternative solutions.
 - c. Information/guidance related to implementation.
ERP implementation is a consulting expertise that exceeds our scope and ability. It is our understanding that when the college is ready to

To College Council, February 23, 2016

implement a new ERP system, that expertise would be engaged by the college.

Additionally, we suggest a **staffing analysis** to help us see how staffing impacts FTES/finances/processes and procedures. Such an analysis may be part of the analysis of comparative colleges.

The challenge facing us in the comparative college analysis is that we cannot rely on published data, but instead must contact each college with a request for information. Colleges may fully comply, partially comply or ignore us. As a result we will try to obtain aggregate staffing data so that we can make generalized observations but we won't be able to acquire position level data. We also realize that we need to keep the request limited in length and focused on available data or we won't realize any cooperation.

Members of College Council also requested that:

1. CBT provide written updates prior to College Council meetings, so College Council has time to review and process information.

All materials that will be distributed at College Council meetings will be made available to Council members prior to the meeting.

2. One or more CBT representatives meet with members of the Budget Committee (including Jon Mikkelsen) to address some of the comments brought forward by the MPCTA.

Mike Hill will be glad to meet with Jon Mikkelsen and the Budget Committee but would appreciate receiving the MPCTA comments prior to the meeting.

3. For comparison purposes, CBT choose at least two small community colleges who appear to be fiscally healthy (no structural deficit and no reliance on contracts). We may also want to compare ourselves to our competitors (Cabrillo and Hartnell).

The four colleges we will be using in the comparison are Hartnell, Gavilan, Cuesta, and Imperial. Cabrillo was not included because it is significantly bigger at nearly 10,000 FTES and it would not be a comparable college. As to whether any of the colleges are fiscally healthy we will probably not know until they respond. If they are all unhealthy and they are the comparable colleges, that will be significant.

4. CBT's final report include a clear analysis of each item along with recommendations. **Yes.**