## Options for Reducing Expenditures #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reduce the number of sites where classes are offered | • Consolidate into fewer sites to reduce cost of rent, utilities, services and administration without the loss of state “foundation grants”.  
• Consolidate programs even when it causes the loss of a “foundation grant” if savings are greater than the loss of income | See Attachment for expenses related to locations where the college incurs expenses for rent/utilities and supervision. | 1) Decreased access for some students who are unable to travel further for classes, with possible decline in enrollment.  
2) Loss of visibility for CCSF in some neighborhoods.  
3) Could cause faculty/staff layoffs, although not necessarily. |
| Eliminate specific instructional and student services programs and reduce the size of programs in decline | • Revised mission statement shows where resources should be allocated  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end programs based on data that shows which programs are experiencing declining enrollment and declining productivity  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end programs where research office data shows that employment or transfer opportunities are not available for students during the next five years  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end classes that are similar in content  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end special programs created by the Board of Trustees and/or by senior management | Assuming changes impact FTers and in turn PTers lose assignments, or PTers directly, the savings per PT FTE are $60,000. This number can be used to calculate savings for ending or reducing a program. FT savings would require March 15th letters and updated FSA analyses. | 1) Decreased enrollment could result in decreased revenue unless enrollment management is successful  
2) Possible elimination of a viable program based on limited data.  
3) Would cause faculty/staff bumping and layoffs. |
| Reduction of non-instructional faculty assignments | • Reduce district-funded reassignments of faculty away from teaching classes | Assuming changes impact FTers and then PTers or PTers directly savings per PT FTE are $60,000 | 1) Increased workload for department chairs and administrators.  
2) Potential reduction of program and service quality.  
3) Would reduce part time faculty assignments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| * Restructure academic and student services administrative functions | • Consolidation of existing academic and student services departments, with a goal of reducing the number of department chair positions  
• Reorganize administrative functions including elimination of department chair positions, with department chair functions reassigned to new administrator positions. | See Attachment | 1) Increased workload for administrators and remaining chairs, and possible need for additional administrators.  
2) Loss of discipline/campus expertise and historical knowledge in some deptmts.  
3) Would cause faculty layoffs as chairs return to full teaching loads. |
| * Administrator, and classified staff layoffs and / or work calendar reductions | • Layoff of administrators and classified employees  
• Closure of all facilities on designated days. Employees would not be paid for these days.  
• Consolidate classified staff assigned to administrators, classified managers, department chairs into smaller shared pools  
• Reduce hours when libraries are open | Estimated savings per administrator avg $180K per FTE including all fringe benefits  
Estimated savings for classified vary by job class see attachment for relevant classifications | 1) Increased workload for remaining classified staff and/or administrators.  
2) Less access to student services on non-instructional days.  
3) Additional backlogs in understaffed units.  
4) Loss of institutional expertise  
5) Some services/functions could not continue |
| Reduce Lab Aide Assignments | • Hire fewer students for fewer hrs worked  
• Consolidate, reduce, or end off campus assignments | 10% Reduction = $140K | 1) Loss of income to students  
2) Loss of work hrs for deptmts, making it difficult for some depts. to operate.  
3) Decrease in student retention and loss of FTES |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| * Workload increases for faculty           | • Reduce or eliminate load factors for faculty that exceed “1.0”, thereby increasing faculty workload  
  • Increase work hours per week for counselors and librarians and other non-instructional faculty  
  • Increase productivity by increasing enrollment capacity per section and reducing the number of sections offered. Establish WSCH/FTEF goals | Changes in workload would ultimately generate savings in the form of fewer assignment for PTers and less overload for FTers | 1) Potential decrease in the quality of instruction  
  2) If workload is greater than other colleges, it may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for faculty positions.  
  3) Faculty may limit enrollment  
  4) Would cause layoffs.                                                                 |
| * Other Workload changes for faculty       | • Reduce or eliminate paid sabbatical leaves for faculty  
  • Increase the number of annual work days for faculty  
  • Limit banking related to overload assignments to reduce the potential unfunded liability for the college created by banked units.  
  • Reduce or eliminate extra pay for “other professional responsibilities” | Estimated cost of sabbaticals when backfilled for 2012-13 = $800K                                      | 1) Potential decrease in the quality of instruction  
  2) If workload is greater than other colleges, it may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for faculty positions.  
  3) Could impact curriculum development                                                                                       |
| * Workload increases for classified staff   | • Increase classified work hours to forty hours per week  
  • Increase number of work days for full year classified staff | Overtime pay is about $175k/yr                                                                  | 1) Potential increased stress for staff.  
  2) Potential loss of experienced staff.                                                                                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload increases for administrators</td>
<td>• Increase number of work days per year without a pay increase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Potential loss of experienced administrators. 2) It may become more difficult to attract and retain candidates for administrative positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Reduce the number of full-time faculty | • Reduce the number of full-time credit faculty with a goal of exceeding the “Full-time Faculty Obligation Number” (FON) issued by the State Chancellor’s Office by a small amount.  
• Reduce the number of full-time non-credit faculty. (FON obligation does not apply)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                 | 1) Decrease in overall faculty time/effort available to students 2) Increased workload for remaining full-time faculty. 3) Could cause faculty layoffs 4) Difficult to implement 5) May cause overreliance on part-time faculty |
| *Reduce the number of full year classified staff | • Reduce specific year-round classified positions to school term only                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                 | 1) Increase in workload for full-year employees, particularly during school breaks. 2) Possible backlogs in understaffed units. 3) Partial year layoffs, with consequent economic hardship.                                                                                     |
| *Changes to retiree benefits – New Hires | • Create 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier that eliminates retiree health benefits for anyone hired after a certain date.  
• Create 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier that reduces retiree health benefits for anyone hired after a certain date.                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                 | 1) Creation of a “second-class” status for new hires, may generate resentment. 2) Addresses long-term liability but has no effect on current budget                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Changes to retiree benefits – Current employees and Retirees | • Require current employees to contribute towards the retiree health care benefit while they are working.  
• Increase District contribution towards retiree health care long term liability by reducing other areas of spending (shift in cost no net savings)  
• Reduce the cost to the district for health benefits for current retirees, by increasing the cost for current retirees |                   | 1)Reduces “take home pay”  
2)Reduces resources for overall current resources  
3)Legally questionable unless entity becomes insolvent                  |
| *Salary & Wage Reductions and Changes            | • Across-the-board % cuts for all employees  
• Reduce wages/salaries by a greater % for employees who are paid more, by a lower % for employees who are paid less  
• Reduce wages/salaries by type of work activity (i.e. overload, non-teaching assignments, subs, etc)  
• Reduce or eliminate the DCC stipend.  
• Shift all employees to monthly payroll system  
• Change criteria for salary/column movement |                   | 1) Imposes economic hardship for all current employees.  
2) May increase difficulty in attracting and retaining high-quality candidates for job openings.  
3) Possible pay gap for all employees at startup of monthly payroll |
| Grants                                           | • Terminate employment funded by grants when grant expires  
• Set minimum acceptable indirect cost rate for grants  
• Only apply for grants that match mission statement priorities |                   | 1)Would result in layoffs after grant expires  
2)District might not apply for grants that could improve programs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| * Reduce Spending on Fringe Benefits for current employees | • Reduce district contributions for employee health plans, increase employee contributions  
• Change criteria for qualifying for health benefits  
• Elimination or reduce fringe benefits such as vision, dental or life insurance that employees do not contribute to  
• Requiring employees to pay for benefits that are currently district paid (dental care, etc.)  
• Switch to less expensive health care options (different plan, reduced benefits) if available  
• Two tier system for all benefits for all employees for all funds  
• Cafeteria style approach to fringes with reduced overall spending |                   | 1) Reduces take home pay for all affected employees.  
2) May increase difficulty in attracting and retaining high-quality candidates  
3) Likely to generate considerable resentment depending on how implemented |
| Reduce Collegiate Athletics                  | • Reduce the number of sports for which the College fields team                       |                   | 1) At risk students may leave school                                   |
| Reduce Costs for Testing and Assessment      | • Adopt practices of other districts                                                 |                   | 1) Buy-in from faculty is needed for success                           |
| **REVENUE ITEMS**                            |                                                                                   |                   |                                                                        |
| Lease District Owned Property                | • Not a cost reduction but would generate revenue for the district.                   |                   | 1) Significant amount of lead time needed for real estate matters      |
| Increase Non Resident Fees                   | • Shift practice to average of Bay Area districts instead of lowest of Bay Area districts |                   | 1) Increased fees generate student opposition                          |

# After fiscal analysis is completed, items that do not generate net savings will be dropped from this list

*This option involves issues that require bargaining. Action could not be taken without prior negotiations with one or more labor unions.