**President's Cabinet
Action Notes
February 28, 2012**
Bill Scroggins, President/CEO
Virginia Burley, VP of Instruction
Audrey Yamagata-Noji, VP of Student Services
Mike Gregoryk, VP of Administrative Services
Annette Loria, VP of Human Resources

1. Cabinet welcomed Associate Vice President Linda Baldwin. Linda presented sample documents for the upcoming revised Status Quo Budget Review. This is the annual process through which heads of units on campus can make adjustments to line items in their budgets by shifting funds as long as the total unit allocation remains the same or "status quo." Going forward, the Status Quo Budget Review will ask unit heads to identify line items which can be reduced or eliminated to assist with the college budget structural deficit. After reviews at the unit level, this same line item review will be done by the Budget Committee (to make recommended further changes) and ultimately by Cabinet to make final line item decisions. These expanded Status Quo Budget Reviews will be based on an expanded set of information that includes three years of budget data with each year's reports including Adopted Budget, Revised Budget, and Actual Expenditures. Cabinet reviewed drafts of three year budget data for the President's Office and also for the Facilities Planning Office. The format looked acceptable with a note that the three years data should consistently be reported in the order: 2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11. Also, the 2011/12 data for Adopted Budget and Revised Budget should be included. (Actuals, of course, are not available until the close of the fiscal year.) Cabinet noted the exceptional job of the Information Technology Unit in preparing and formatting this information. A budget template for the 2012/13 year was reviewed, using the President's Office Status Quo Budget and the Grants Office Status Quo Budgets as examples. Unit managers will fill this out to shift funds among line items—and to reduce budgets where possible. This document will be due on a timeline that allows Fiscal Services to prepare the 2012/13 Tentative Budget to be approved by the Board of Trustees in June. The Vice Presidents will monitor this process to assure that all unit managers submit the forms. Unit managers will fill out two additional forms: the Status Quo Budget Reductions Form will list and explain the proposed reductions, and the Positive Budget Balance Explanation Form will ask unit managers to list and explain why they would propose to retain line item budget levels shown by the three year analysis to regularly be underexpended, resulting in positive residual year end balances. The completed forms will be reviewed by the Budget Committee, perhaps in a special day-long meeting yet to be scheduled sometime this Spring Semester. Finally, the forms and the Budget Committee input will be reviewed by Cabinet early in the summer in time to produce the Adopted Budget for action by the Board of Trustees in September. Linda made a presentation to our management meeting that summarizes this process. Mike Gregoryk will go over this process with managers at the next Management Staff Meeting and with the Budget Committee at its next meeting.

2. Cabinet reviewed our previous discussion on fundraising processes and made a few minor changes (attached). Mike Gregoryk, Audrey Yamagata-Nogi, and Lisa Sugimoto will turn these notes into a revised Administrative Procedure.

3. Cabinet reviewed and approved the Academic Senate's draft resolution on establishing prerequisites. This will also result in a revised Board Policy 4260 and a plan to be adopted by the Board of Trustees.

4. Cabinet reviewed the current Vacancy List showing the status of open positions authorized for recruitment and hire. We moved the filling of the Associate Vice President for Fiscal Services up to #1, the Associate Dean of Counseling up to #2, and the Vice President for Human Resources up to #3.

5. Cabinet discussed the general outline of the Title V Hispanic Serving Institutions grant the application for which is due March 15. The proposal will be for mechanisms of offering programs that have the potential to increase persistence and completion.
    - One possibility is a cohort model in which students apply for admission to a program after meeting certain prerequisites and then are directly enrolled in the program's courses each semester as long as they remain in good standing. The Associate Degree Registered Nursing program uses this model which could be expanded to other programs such as the transfer Child Development program and the Aviation Science program.
    - Another model could be an accelerated cohort in which students again apply for admission after meeting prerequisites but then take two courses in the program each half-semester (many of which are hybrids to assist with time management) and then students rotate through the required courses which are offered once in each four semester cycle. If demand is high enough, new cohort cycles can be added each year or even each semester. And as students leave the cycle—either through dropping out or completion, new admits can be rotated in. Possibilities include Liberal Studies (for K-12 teacher preparation), and perhaps Business Management and General Business.
    - A model could also be created in which sections of generally offered courses could be identified for enrollment of students admitted to a cohort program. This might work well for majors in Social Science and Humanities.

    To increase faculty engagement and support for these cohort program models, faculty who teach in the discipline of the major could be relieved of office hour time to serve as faculty advisors. Ginny Burley will lead the team writing the Title V HSI grant application.

6. Mike Gregoryk and Bill Scroggins reported on a recent meeting on improving the college web site and other means of electronic communication. Particularly exciting are plans for a mobile application strategy for the college (attached). Using the software package Mobile Connection that the college already owns, we have the ability to design and deliver Smart Aps to devices such as iPhones, iPads, and Android-based devices for access to Course Schedules, News Feeds, a Mobile Web version of our web site, Grades, and more. The proposed schedule would have this up and running this June. We have a cross-unit team working on improving the web site. This team will meet again the week of March 14.

7. Cabinet discussed the issue of adding students in priority order from a wait list. Students are told on our web site in the FAQ section, answering the question, "What if the Class is Full?" that "Getting on a wait list does not enroll the student in a class but it does establish a priority

for adding the class." Faculty receive [instructions on wait list processes](#) that makes the same point. [AP 5075, Course Adds and Drops](#), is less specific, stating just "Students on wait lists will be added before walk-in students during the first class meeting only." We have received reports from a few students that instructors are adding students lower down on the wait list before those who may be #1 or #2. <mark>Audrey will explore the matter to be sure that information is clear and also bring back revised language on AP 5075.</mark>

8. Items for future agendas:
   a. [BP and AP 6625 on District Fundraising](#) (Mike, 3/27—with Lisa Sugimoto & Audrey Yamagata-Noji)
   b. Centralized Printing and Copying (Mike, 4/10)
   c. Facilities Use (Mike, **3/20**—with Bill Eastham plus revised [BP/AP 6700](#))
   d. Implementation of Degree Works (Audrey, **3/20**)
   e. Process for prioritizing and funding small renovation and scheduled maintenance projects (Mike, **3/20** with Gary Nellesen)
   f. Expansion of International Student Program (Audrey, **3/20**)