Budget Task Force Meeting
February 12, 2015, AB148D Conference Room

Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Thomas, Jr. – Co-Chair</td>
<td>Mike Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Osinski – Co-Chair</td>
<td>Emily Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Ramirez</td>
<td>Tim Casper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Laufenberg</td>
<td>Bryan Woodhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator: Kathleen Paris
Support: Jill Spilde

AGENDA

3:00 p.m.                Check In
How are you doing today?  
Any barriers to full participation?

Approve Agenda
Approve meeting notes from January 29, 2015 and February 5, 2015

3:15 p.m.                Announcements
Update on presentation to College Assembly
Laura and Mark
*Clarification on IBPS process communication guidelines from Eddie Genna
Kathleen

3:30 p.m.                Impact on our charge of the Classification Study results
Sylvia

3:45 p.m.                Review remaining data we have for options to close immediate budget gap
(Sylvia, Bonnie, Tim)
  • What could we save?
  • How do these options compare to our criteria?
Propose budget strategies for coming fiscal year

4:45 p.m.                Check timeline and build agenda for next week
Check out

5:00 p.m.                Adjourn
Criteria

A. Legal / Regulatory
B. Logistically / Operationally Feasible
C. Consistent with Board Policy
D. Promote Our Mission / Values / Ethics
   1. Minimize, avoid lay-offs
   2. Shared sacrifice – not one employee group to make all the sacrifices
   3. Value employees
E. Financially Responsible
F. Long-term Perspective
G. Promotes access to higher education and student success*
H. Budget must balance*
I. Supports our strategic priorities*
   *from Cabinet charge to us

*With the understanding that providing this advice without being there and seeing / feeling the room presents a challenge, Eddie recommends:

1. Taking an interest-based approach to resolving the question, “How can we help task force members feel comfortable with the knowledge base we have for making the budget decisions while staying true to IBPS principles and process?”

2. Assuming we feel we don’t have a good handle yet on the interests that are out there for budget cuts, collecting more interests from more groups might be viewed as correcting an error. (You are not saving time if at the end someone who feels s/he does not have a good enough understanding of the interests has to thumb down a decision that might otherwise be thumbed up with sufficient knowledge.)

3. If the group can thumb a solution to #1 above, it’s fine, IBPS-wise, since we can change process, rules, etc. by consensus of the group. It need not be a permanent process change. It could be a special dispensation.