

Staff Council Meeting

December 7, 2010

Members present: 11 members attending

Guests present: Chad Schonewill, Susan Ashley, Robert Moore

- Approve minutes and treasurer's report (5 minutes)
 - Move to approve, seconded. All in favor
 - Treasures report
 - Gave update- \$400 showing up. Bon Appetite was billed to Kimmy's budget. She'll do the fund transfer.
- Budget Committee – Dean Ashley (15 minutes)
 - A budget was drafted for the next fiscal year and 2 years out. This year's budget was balanced. As were the next two years. This is the first time we have had a full year to craft a budget. They (and others(FEC, CCSGA, various departments)) identified what the most important needs were for representatives budgets and what they recommended. They took the needs and tried to relate them to college priorities and budgets. The budget they had for this year was out of balance. They took actions to get this year's budget balanced. They put most attention and focus into changing and modifying the budget. The endowment payout has lost money due to economic changes. They are looking at two models for projections, a moderate and a conservative. They are estimating about a 5% decline in the payout for next year as well. They are also looking at what the cost of living is likely to be, and that is very hard to predict. Within this context, they addressed how they would deal with the principal elements of the budget. They are committed to 1975 for the next two years, and then returning to 1965. We are actually way above this number now. Since we're budgeting for 1975 (or 1965) this creates problems. They are trying to get to the bottom of why our targets are so out of sync with reality. The cost of attendance: keep tuition increase to 2.39%, and room and board will remain the same. Salaries (which are principal drive of budget) began by talking about 1.5%. They have moved to a 2% increase for staff and faculty. They are committed to keeping this the same for staff and faculty. Temp on-call and block visitor budget will likely remain the same. Financial Aid is the second biggest driver. Many divisions identified this as the principal college need. This year's incoming class was overspent by \$1million. They have tried to make a commitment to the budget to provide this for 4 years. Financial aid is the most dependent on endowment payout. We can either fill that gap from operating budget, or lose financial aid. They have recommended that they use the operating budget. They tried to get the base to \$7million. That didn't work, but they could get to \$6.5million base. This means some salaries could suffer, equipment budget is frozen, etc. This is what they are giving up for the commitment to financial aid. They feel good about the commitment to it, but there can't be any more mistakes to have to accommodate a large amount for financial aid. The operating budgets have been frozen. They have set aside \$200,000 for this area. The budget committee wants to take the "extra" money from higher enrollment and put it back into the endowment so we aren't building a budget on the higher enrollment since our goal is for the enrollment to be back down to 1965 (1975).

- Is the increase in students the reason for the financial aid going above?
 - About 400,000 of the overspent is due to the new incoming class being so large.
- This budget proposal is set on the board approving \$1.5million spent out of reserve.
 - What happens if they don't
 - Not positive—but likely that financial aid won't go to 6.5million. They would push for it not to be taken from staff and faculty salary increase.
- Remember all of these are recommendations, it doesn't mean everything will be approved.
- What are the mistakes/targets from Admissions?
 - Discussed the meltdown and how more students returned than we expected, etc.
 - It's not all first year freshmen, we're up across classes.
- As a college, we're in really good shape.
- The long-term goal is to decrease to 1965?
 - Yes, gradually.
- What is the confidence level that the board will approve this?
 - Their recommendations go to president, so it depends on what recommendations he takes to the BOT.
- Can the BOT decision impact the Worner construction?
 - It could, if the BOT says to stop, we will stop with it. It has approval from grounds and the exec committee so we're moving forward as of now.
- There is a double goal: plan the budget for the college, but also to create a sustainable budget for the future.
- Next semester, around the first of the year- they will give more information in a town hall meeting.
- Compensation Recommendation – Chad Schonewill (25 minutes)
 - When it's time to do salary recommendations the committee splits into two. Faculty write a recommendation to go to FEC, and Staff write one to go to HR and Robert. The last few years the staff recommendation has not been taken. (and has seemingly been ignored).
 - Would something from staff council help or hinder?
 - Chad thinks it would help, or certainly wouldn't hurt.
 - For the last 10 years it has come out as a flat recommendation. One year it came out with no numbers, just a list of priorities. This year they tried to do both, priorities and numbers.
 - They have recommended 2.2%,
 - First requested that it be the same for faculty and staff.
 - Second it would include a 1.48% CPI
 - .75 would be a flat amount added for Cost of Basic Goods and Services to everyone regardless of how much they make. (flat dollar amount- applied regardless of performance or anything else)
 - .73 would be a percentage added to everyone. (this would be contingent upon performance and would be a percentage)
 - Third would be a .5% in merit
 - The rest is a market gap

- Two philosophical changes:
 - Merit would not be added to base. (for a number of reasons)
 - Flat dollar amount.
- There could be concerns with “favoritism” with the merit amount. We have always had this merit options, it’s just been so little of a percentage that it hasn’t impacted people like this has.
- There are concerns with the idea of people at higher pay level coming in lower than the CPI- that doesn’t seem sustainable in the long term.
 - More in favor of the money coming to those who really need the CPI, but also want to keep a sustainable plan in mind.
- Who is “ignoring” the recommendation?
 - HR, Robert Moore, President Celeste
 - Ignoring seems like harsh language—we should just ask why their decisions were made versus assuming that things were ignored.
 - If they are willing to share the information, this would help the committee in the following years to make more sound recommendations that fit in with the college’s priorities.
 - Some of the information we just heard from Susan Ashley and Robert Moore was a huge step forward for CC in transparency and what numbers actually look like.
- Should we stop this conversation with our time commitments?
 - Let’s determine where to move forward and assist as staff council.
 - Comments:
 - Really like Merit base
 - Really like the flat dollar amount
 - Distinction between cost of living and cost of lifestyle is very different.
 - Move to get staff council’s recommendation on this. Seconded.
 - Would someone draft a letter to go with their report?
 - They aren’t meeting in block four. They are sending it forward in block 5.
 - All in favor, no opposition.
 - Nominations or volunteer to write a letter to support this recommendation.
 - The letter should include WHY we support it.
 - The co-chairs will get together, write it, and send it to the group.
 - Chad- please address whether merit should be added to the base salary versus as a bonus check in the letter that is written.
 - How will merit be determined? This is decided by supervisors—but currently it will stay the same way it has been in previous years.
- Strategic Plan for SC (20 minutes)
 - We discussed having a plan where we should all participate, and not necessarily break into committees. (document was sent out)
 - Capacity building: staff council increases our power, influence, and what we can do on campus
 - Campus community climate: improve staff moral and help people in their jobs
 - Staff Support: help individuals improve their job or job environment

- Compensation
 - Subgroups would be made for each of these areas and meet outside of our meeting and then bring back info for the larger council.
 - Capacity building ideas:
 - Hold regular (a few times a year) all staff meetings- that all staff can attend to vote for things that are larger.
 - It might be prudent to ask large staff for support with this idea.
 - Part of the idea behind this is that it's really hard to get something done in this meeting. It would provide us with more support to get things done and use the meeting to vote and discuss topics.
 - These topic areas give us a focus so we know what to spend our energy on as a council. Provides us with an outlined priority list.
 - This has already been approved during the side committee—because there was quorum.
 - We would like to vote again as a whole staff council.
 - Any further discussion?
 - Move to approve this document as a brief summary of what was discussed. Weston has volunteered to clean up the document and send to staff council listserve.
 - Seconded, all in favor, no opposition.
 - What is the next step now?
 - Determine one or two things from each category and who should work on each topic.
 - All of us will be assigned or volunteer for one of these three categories, and should determine one or two priorities to move forward with. It should be interest based, not assigned.
 - Let's clean up the document, and then have “coordinators” for each area to keep the group on track and focused.
 - Groups should be set by winter break, we'll do this via e-mail.
 - By the end of the week, e-mail Weston what group you want to work with and nominations for someone who wants to coordinate.
 - Roll compensation topics into Staff Support area.
- Staff Council Manual revisions - Mark Lee (20 minutes)
 - Copies were handed out by Mark with suggested revisions.
 - Minor changes were already approved and updated, this document shows that.
 - Current highlights show bigger changes to discuss.
 - Want to change it to 15 members instead of 14 members. Leaving one member flexible for nonexempt or exempt to support staff interest. We currently have 15 members.
 - Move to approve, seconded, all in favor, no oppositions.
 - “The entire college staff will vote for new staff council members”—this is how we do it, but the old manual says that only staff council will vote for this.
 - Further in the document it does address what happens if someone leaves the position.
 - Moved to approve, seconded, all in favor, no oppositions.

- Vacancies section: nothing was in the manual that addressed what the term should be for someone who is filling up a vacancy. This sentence addresses that contingency.
 - Does anywhere say we can only serve one three year term? Do we want it to say that? No, we don't want to discourage that.
 - No language that says we can't do that.
 - Move to approve, seconded, all in favor, no opposition.
- Co-chairs term
 - How do they stagger if they only serve for one year? It says minimum of one year.
 - What is the current thought of having three versus two co-chairs. Three is nice, but two would work. We think the background came when there was a problem on staff council and they decided to have three chairs. We always have the option of changing chairs if the council feels we should.
 - Should we have a chair electf
 - Moved to chair this topic to the next meeting, seconded, all in favor, no oppositions.
- Ex-officio member term
 - We don't need this, it's not different than any other person that wants to come to our meetings
 - Move to strike this section, seconded, 10 in favor, 1 opposed.
 - No further discussion requested.
- Co-Chairs serve as ex officio members of all subcommittees of the staff council.
 - What does subcommittees mean? All committees that we work with?
 - It says subcommittees of the staff council, but our committees are more for the college, not for staff council.
 - Moved to get rid of section, seconded, all in favor, no oppositions.
- Move to finish this task at the next meeting, seconded, all in favor, no opposition.
- Mark will edit the version on the website to include today's changes.
- Updates or review on:
 - none
- New Business
 - none