

Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes

September 30, 2010

Present

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS-faculty)
Dr. Irving Berkowitz (Dean of Instruction)
Sandy Beckwith (Div Chair –faculty)
Tina Bishop (Lead Counselor - faculty)
David Burris (Exec Director-HR)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair –faculty)
Kayleigh Carabajal (Exec Director-IR)
Dave Clausen (Exec Director –Fiscal Services)

Toni Gomez (ASB)
Phil Horner (classified)
Dr. Doug Houston (President)
Jeff Lang (classified)
Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison –faculty)
Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)
Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)

Absent

Terry Bartley (management)
Shelly Baxter (management)
Monica Cochran (Public Relations)

Logan Merchant (Chair/IT Planning)
Carol Montgomery (classified)
Brian Wolf (Div Chair –faculty)

Guest

Shawn Hubbard (ASB)

Matt Levine (management)

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 2:51 pm.

Consultation Council:

1. Review of October 12, 2010 Governing Board Agenda (Information)

Dr. Houston identified that two annual contracts related to Child Development Services previously placed under administration had been moved to the consent agenda. The only item under administration is the approval of the final budget for 2010-11. The final college budget is normally approved in September, but has been delayed due to the lack of a state budget. In the absence of a state budget, the board is being asked to approve the final budget built on the assumption of a 5% reduction in revenues. A revised budget will be presented following adoption of the state budget. The personnel consent agenda item identifying the short term hiring of an assistant dorm manager and dorm mentor raised questions on sources of funding and process for hiring short term and substitute staff. Questions on the financial status and physical condition of the dorm were also posed. Dr. Houston clarified that the intent for auxiliary services is to break even not make money. The funding for the short-term dorm employees is provided by revenue from the dorm. Currently, budget managers have the latitude shift funds within their existing budget. The budget development process adopted by the Academic Senate and Consultation Council addresses budget enhancement requests and budget reduction proposals, but does not address implementation of priorities within the existing budget. **Consultation Council agreed to bring back for a future discussion “Consideration to establish a process, which would consider evaluation of existing budgets in the prioritization of budget allocations.” Consultation Council agreed that operational concerns (such as the physical condition of the dorm) should be taken to the responsible individual and up the organizational structure (next supervisor) if resolution of the issue did not result.**

2. Evaluation of Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Orientation (Consultation)

Kayleigh Carabajal provided evaluation instruments to all individuals in attendance. The results of the completed surveys will be presented at the next Consultation Council meeting.

3. Personnel Update (Information)

David Burris advised the group that the screening committee for the Library Director position is being finalized and will begin meeting soon. The interviews for the Distance Education Coordinator are scheduled for October 1 and 4, 2010.

Strategic Planning:

1. Status of Budget Reduction Initiatives from Spring 2010 (Information)

Dave Clausen informed the group that adjustments to the budget are being made in preparation for approval by the Governing Board. Further information will be available soon. A issue with the budget for the “Cougar Works” has arisen.

2. Budget Impact of Cougar Works Program (Consultation)

Dave Clausen informed the group that the budget includes \$30,000.00 for Cougar Works. The expenditures for the program have exceeded \$31,000.00 for the last pay period. The expected expenditures for the fall semester may exceed \$90,000.00 if no action is taken. Cary Templeton clarified that Cougar Works used district funds to pay for student workers. This year in order to improve the process of providing student workers jobs and campus employers workers student workers were funded through Cougar Works while awaiting their financial aid awards. Students can not received payment prior to the financial aid awards, which may take several months to process. As students receive their financial aid awards they are being removed from Cougar Works and transferred to federal financial aid. The financial aid office has received about a 15% increase in applications for financial aid this year over last year. The office is currently ahead of were their were last year at this time. Diann Jackson was credited with much of the success in timely processing of applications.

Individuals expressed concern that \$60,000 was a lot of money to be provided to an overspent budget. In an environment of staffing reductions and increased cost to staff for health benefits providing enough money to fund one or more positions was hard to accept. In response to where the money would come from, Dr. Houston responded that the one-time money would come from under spent areas such as unfilled positions. Others identified that no one wanted to not support students, but it appeared that overspending your budget meant that the district would provided additional money, the wrong message to be sending to account managers, particularly in times of tight budgets. Others identified that extra money spent now would not be available to fund needed expenditures later in the year. Dr. Houston emphasized that the decision has not yet been made, but he was reluctant to impose additional hardships onto students who are planning on receiving work-study money to support their pursuit of education. Sandy Beckwith identified that the program used to be funded much higher as high as \$150,000/year. In response to request for budget reduction last year, the budget was reduced to \$30,000. Sandy also identified that the implementation of the college work-study program this year had proceed much smoother than in previous years. It was also identified that the money needed for spring would be much reduced because the majority of students would already be receiving federal financial aid. The discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Consultation Council:

1. Campus Landscaping (Consultation)

Sue Mouck identified that the Executive Summary from the Maintenance and Operations NIPR had been provided with the agenda included recommendations supporting less resource intense landscaping. Eric Rulofson advised the group that the maintenance department had been working towards the incremental modification of the landscaping as the opportunities presented for the last fifteen years. Kayleigh Carabajal provided a handout delineating how the discussion from September 2, 2010 fit the ORID (Objective, Reflective, Interpretive, and Declarative) framework. The handout provided a Know/Don't Know table as a next step. [Handout attached] Kayleigh asked the group to identify what was still not known that was needed for a decision. For each unknown a Talent (responsible individual) and Time (due date) was identified. The cost and location of the Demonstration Plot discussed last time were identified as unknowns. It was identified that the geography and geology of the site of the college was not given sufficient consideration in the development of the current landscaping. The college sits atop a lava flow. Holes were blasted into the lava and filled with dirt to provide sites for trees. Many trees have expanded to the capacity of their holes and maintenance staff can only watch as they die. In response to a question, Eric Rulofson responded that there is a site plan with identification of problem areas. Much of the information is provided in the M & O NIPR. The NIPR will be distributed with the next agenda. It was suggested that the landscaping of the college might be utilized as a project by a four-year school with a horticulture program. Dr. Houston will make an inquiry at UNR when he visits next Monday. The discussion will continue at a future meeting.

Reminder: Update on Progress on Annual Action Plans 2010-2011 due to Consultation Council by Planning Committee Chairs next week

Other:

None

The meeting adjourned at 4:04 pm

Future Agendas:

1. **Update on Progress on Annual Action Plans 2010-2011 (Consultation) – October 7, 2010 - Kayleigh Carabajal**
2. **Announcement of NIPRs due May 2011 (Information) – October 7, 2010 – Kayleigh Carabajal**
3. **Distance Education NIPR (Information) – October 7, 2010 – Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
4. **Auxiliary Services (Food Services) NIPR (Information) – October 7, 2010 – Cary Templeton**
5. **Community Services NIPR (Information) - October 21, 2010 – Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
6. **Human Resource NIPR (Information) – October 21, 2010 – David Burris**
7. **Marketing/Community Relations NIPR (Information) – October 21, 2010 – Monica Cochran**
8. **Acceptance of draft 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan (Consultation) –October 21, 2010 – Dr. Berkowitz**
9. **Physical Education/Athletics IPR (Information) – October 21, 2010 - Cheryl Aschenbach/PE Faculty**
10. **Administration of Justice/Correctional Science IPR (Information) – October 21, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach/ Nancy Bengoa-Beterbide & Mark Nareau**
11. **Agriculture IPR (Information) - October 28, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach/ Brian Wolf**
12. **Business IPR (Information) - October 21, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach/ Garrett Taylor & Kam Vento**
13. **Child Development IPR (Information) – October 21, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach/ Betsy Elam**
14. **Announcement of IPRs due May 2011(Information) – October 21, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach**
15. **Campus Security (Consultation) – October 21, 2010 – Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal/Eric Rulofson**
16. **Nursing IPR (Information) – October 28, 2010 – Cheryl Aschenbach/Monna Walters & Liona Baker**
17. **Fiscal Operations NIPR (Information) - October 28, 2010 - Dave Clausen**
18. **Auxiliary Services (Bookstore) NIPR (Information) – October 28, 2010 – Dave Clausen**
19. **Civility – Students and Staff (Consultation) – October 28, 2010 – Dr. Houston**
20. **Automotive Technology (Information) - October 2010**
21. **Human Services IPR (Information) – October 2010**

Landscape Discussion – September 2, 2010

I. First step for this process – ORID Framework

“Dr. Houston informed the group that the Governing Board is interested in reducing the resource intensity of the existing lawns (water, human resources, equipment). The group agreed that reduction in lawns would serve to reduce resource utilization in addition to providing a good role model for the community. However, it was also agreed that the appearance of the campus is extremely important in how the community and visitors view the campus. The attractive well-kept campus provides the perception of a well-run campus. The desirability of keeping large expanses of green lawn particularly in front of the dorm where students engage in activities was also identified. Representatives from maintenance identified that the equipment used for mowing the lawns is also used for clearing the sidewalks of snow. Reducing the lawns would not eliminate the need for the equipment. They also identified that the equipment is way past the expected replacement cycle. There is no money in the budget for replacements or even major repairs. Maintaining the existing lawns is less expensive than replacement with different landscaping. Eric Rulfoson identified that the maintenance budget has been reduced to point where there is very little money for supplies and replacement parts. Currently, maintenance is rapidly depleting the stock of supplies that had been built up over a number of years, by spring there will be very little left for maintenance staff to use to keep the campus operational. It was suggested that Susan Vacher, who teaches Principles of Landscaping Design for us, be contact to suggest using a portion of campus as a class project. It was also suggested that small incremental steps to modify the existing landscaping be considered, perhaps beginning the planting of a stand of trees in a drainage problem area in the front of the campus. The discussion included where to go from here. Dr. Carabajal stated that the group had engaged in a rich discussion with examples of reflective, objective and integrative. **She would compile a list of examples to report back at the next meeting. Dr. Houston volunteered to contact Susan Vacher about possible participation. The Facilities Master Committee was identified as the likely place to forward suggestions and /or recommendations concerning future direction in campus landscaping.**” (CC Minutes- Sue Mouck)

II. Next step – Know/Don’t Know Table

| 1. Discussion Component (How we got the data in column 2) | 2. Data (What we currently Know) | 3. Task: (What we currently Don’t Know) | 4. Talent: (Two parts 1. who has the additional data we need 2. to whom did we delegate this task?) | 5. Time: (Two parts 1. when do we need this “don’t know” information 2. when do we need to make the decision?) |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Objective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important component of aesthetics/architecture with consequent impact on community perception of the college • Data are available with regard to budget impact • Complex issue – machinery has to be kept in order due to cross-seasonal impact (“mowers and blowers”) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Current “cross-seasonal” equipment is old with no replacement plan in place ○ College risk increases with snow accumulation • Students use lawns/ recreational value in lawns • Landscape architect on staff • Lawns function as excellent fire barriers • Drainage issues are ongoing (lawns are part of the solution to those issues) • Upfront costs of changing must be built into any decision-making process | | | |

| 1. Discussion Component (How we got the data in column 2) | 2. Data (What we currently Know) | 3. Task: (What we currently Don't Know) | 4. Talent: (Two parts 1. who has the additional data we need and 2. to whom did we delegate this task?) | 5. Time: two parts 1. when do we need this "don't know" information and 2. by when do we need to make the decision? |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Reflective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students complain grass is too wet to use • Aesthetic value of lawns in attracting students (parents) to LCC (ROI?) • Will this "shifting gears" cause more tasks for staff already impacted by maintaining current tasks? | | | |
| Interpretive | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xeriscaping options may decrease machinery wear, lower the impact on staff, and decrease fuel costs (remembering 7% budget reduction in supplies) • Facilities' supply budget (and extra inventory) is depleting rapidly and is likely insufficient to maintain current state by Spring 2011 • Options considered (with emphasis on incremental implementation): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement a formal pilot project with class and students ○ Create a design project aimed at a "Community Showpiece" ○ Partially remove grass (but which areas?) ○ Possibility of different usages and combinations ○ Implement a "Fundraiser" for trees ○ Explore "permits" to obtain trees ○ Explore use of LCC greenhouse in growing our own trees | | | |
| Declarative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where do we go from here? What part of campus do we develop?</i> • Delegation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cost analysis ○ Gauge interest of Susan Vacher in participating ○ Academic Planning impact ○ Facilities impact ○ Resource development possibilities | | | |