



President's Cabinet

Action Notes

August 23, 2011

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

(Terri Hampton substituting for Annette Loria.)

1. Mike reported on his team meeting with potential vendors to provide networked printing and copying service for the college. [See the attached summary](#). Present were representatives of Xerox, Hewlett-Packard, and Ricoh-Ikon. This activity is called Managed Printing Services. All could incorporate our existing college-owned devices as the transition to leased equipment moves forward. We currently have more than 350 networked copiers and more than 100 multi-functional printer/copiers plus an unknown number of individual desktop printers. Through Managed Printing Services we would become more efficient as a campus in providing imaging capability. Some of the goals are:

- Provide direct faculty and staff printing to "greener" and lower cost per page devices.
- Enable centralized, "just-in-time" toner purchasing.
- Eliminate most desktop printers in favor of lower cost networked printers.
- Limit size of jobs allowed to be submitted to local networked printers (use cost basis as deciding factor).
- Simplify online job submission of large print jobs to Printing Services.
- Track and charge student printing preferably through an account managed by them online.
- Establish different cost per page depending on printing type BW, Color, Oversized, and Plotting, i.e., CAD.
- Enable students to print to a "local" printer regardless of where they are on campus.
- Standardize printer and multifunctional devices: small, medium, large, and production.

Next steps for Mike and his team involve evaluation of information provided by potential vendors, following up on references provided, establishing a college plan and criteria for this service, doing a second round of interviews with qualified potential vendors to refine technical requirements, and then on that basis, issuing a Request for Proposals.

2. We received notification from the state ([attached](#)) that, based on the cost factors identified in statute, community college Boards of Trustees are authorized to increase the student health fee to \$18 beginning Spring Semester. Cabinet decided to pursue this option and create a robust rationale based on expansion of health services. Audrey will draft this rationale and prepare the item for Board action in time for implementation for enrollment this Spring.
3. Cabinet reviewed a draft of the report entitled Course Reductions for Mt. SAC 2011-12 Year produced by Academic Services. The format and presentation of the report needs more work before being shared, and Ginny will take care of this. The report notes that we finished 2010-11 being 6% over the number of Full-Time Equivalent Students funded by the state.

Given the likelihood of mid-year budget cuts resulting from the state budget trigger criteria associated with our sluggish state economy, it was decided to move forward with Tier 2 section cuts previously identified by the instruction team. (Tier 1 cuts of 1609 FTES or 5.1% of overall enrollment have already been made. Tier 2 cuts would involve a reduction of up to 450 FTES.) Given that these cuts could not be initiated until Spring, some adjustment in the overall scope and of particular course section reductions may be needed. **Ginny will work with the deans and chairs to make necessary revisions to projected Tier 2 cuts.**

4. Cabinet reviewed the process for development or revision of Board Policies and Administrative Provisions as described in [Administrative Procedure 2410](#) and the related [form](#). The consensus was that the process took more time than was appropriate for the college to respond to changes in state directives and local needs. A proposed revision of the process will be prepared by Bill and then, after refinement in Cabinet, shared with the President's Advisory Committee for input. The basic flow of the work would follow this pattern:
 - Proposals for a new BP or AP or revision of an existing BP or AP would be directed to Cabinet, regardless of source, for an initial review. Cabinet would verify the need for such a change and edit and format the BP or AP appropriately.
 - The Cabinet-approved BP or AP would be forwarded to President's Advisory Committee (PAC) for First Reading. One of the purposes of the First Reading would be to identify potential academic and professional matters or matters involving hours, wages, or working conditions.
 - Potentially negotiable items would be directed to the bargaining process. Those with possible academic and professional matters would be directed to the Academic Mutual Agreement Council (AMAC). Other items would be shared by PAC members with their constituent groups.
 - Items resolved in AMAC or negotiations would come back to PAC as an information item only. Other items would come back to PAC as a Second Reading for Action. Cabinet would continue to monitor this process and track each proposed BP and AP through the approval stages.
 - Finalized BPs would be sent to the Board of Trustees for action. Finalized APs would be shared with the Board for information only.
5. Cabinet discussed the Immediate Needs budgeting process for allocating funds for essential, late emerging needs that had not been identified in the 2011-12 budget development process. **Cabinet will follow this procedure:**
 - Short written requests, with rationales, would be brought to the attention of the appropriate VP (or President for his direct reports) who would assure that each request is in line with the unit program review and is, indeed, an urgent, immediate, late-emerging need.
 - Cabinet would review these requests, modify as appropriate, and prioritize the list.
 - The prioritized requests and rationales would be reviewed by the Budget Committee.
 - This process would be concluded in time for a decision by the President at the September 27 Cabinet meeting.
6. A few institutional memberships had not been finalized. Two were cut for a savings of \$495 and two were renewed (at a cost of \$475). **Mike needs to follow up on the Mitel membership and Audrey on the Umoja membership.**

7. Cabinet reviewed the updated [Explanation of Positive Variance report](#). The report shows additional revenue of \$3,216,623 due almost entirely to growth funds (which, following district practice, are not booked until earned). Unspent budgeted expenditure savings totaled \$9,075,662. Main contributors were unexpended salary and benefits from vacant positions totaling \$2,919,653, unspent unit budgets—thanks to conservative managers!—of \$1,971,034, and unused budgeted backfill for Categorical Programs (EOPS, DSPS, Matriculation—again frugal management!) of \$720,258.

8. Items for future agendas:
 - a. [BP and AP 6625 on District Fundraising](#) (Mike, 9/20)
 - b. Centralized Printing and Copying (Mike, 9/27)
 - c. Student Travel (Guidelines: Ginny; Waivers: Mike, both 9/20)
 - d. Process for Developing and Approving Board Policies and Administrative Procedures—[see attached form](#) (Bill, 9/20)
 - e. 9/11 Recognition (All, 8/23)
 - f. [Accreditation Follow Up](#) (All, 9/1)
 - g. Review Health Fee increase rationale and Board item (Audrey, 9/1)
 - h. Review Tier 2 section reductions (Ginny, 9/13)