BUDGET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes February 18, 2009
(Approved at the Meeting of 3/4/09)

Members Present: Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Ken Collins, Cyndi Grein, Robin Kim, Neil Patel, Chrystal Van Beynen Sharon Kelly

Absent: Marcus Wilson

Meeting commenced at 2:10 p.m.

Meeting notes of February 4, 2009 were accepted.

Follow-Up—Child Care—The child care group consisting of Molly McClanahan, Manny Ontiveros, Adam O’Connor, Dan Tesar, Rhett Price, Diane Montano and a community member met. Different scenarios were presented, one board member was comfortable covering a deficit of $150,000, and another was comfortable with $100,000—if either of these are accepted the chancellor indicated the district would cover the ongoing amount. Dan Tesar and Adam have worked on three versions, two which meet the criteria one costing a little more. Rhett Price is also working on some scenarios. The next committee meeting is 2/20/09.

District Budget Review—Currently, position replacement is being reviewed by Chancellor’s Staff—in addition all travel requests will now be approved by the Chancellor’s Staff. Any requisitions over $25,000 will be sent through the Presidents/Provost for approval. Dan Willoughby reminded the committee that there is language in the faculty contract related to travel and faculty rights, which could make it problematic if the new procedure resulted in extended delays. Adam indicated that he would research this and get back to the committee. Adam then stated that he would pass our concerns on to Dr. Hodge to pass along. Sharon Kelly asked if we, as the budget committee, should be informing our constituencies of the new process. Dan was adamant that this information should be coming from the district, the campus or some area other than the division and it best be clarified in writing—details are the important thing.

BDC Budget Recommendations—Dr. Hodge has accepted our four Budget Development Principles with one change: ending #3 after the word “shortfalls”. The principles are as follows:

1. The BDC shall, in conjunction with the PAC, develop recommendations on campus budgetary priorities.
2. At its first meeting of the academic year and throughout the year as needed, the BDC will make recommendations regarding the allocation of all new ongoing funds, new one-time finds, and campus carryover funds (excluding restricted categorical funds).

3. The BDC shall also make recommendations regarding cuts as necessary to cover budget shortfalls.

4. To facilitate budgetary recommendations, the BDC shall be provided with detailed information regarding campus expenditures and income, including multi-year data regarding the sources of campus carryovers.

Dr. Hodge also accepted our revised recommendation regarding requests to fill replacement positions. One caveat, sometimes the paperwork will get to Human Resources ahead of our recommendation to fill.

**Title V Grant Discussion**—The BDC was asked to discuss the pros and cons of going forward with a new Title V grant application. Does it make sense to do this now? Hiring a consultant to write a grant—if so, how would we do that? The last Title V Grant that we received we paid the consultant 10% of the grant amount each year. We couldn’t pay the consultant out of the grant for their services it had to come out of general fund. Possibly commit over 5 years for 10%. Cypress College instead hired someone to write a grant for a set amount and then hired them back to fill out reporting forms etc. which can be paid from the grant. This is much less expensive.

Not sure of what types of things we could apply for. Worry about doing this now—coming up with new special programs that we can’t seem to ever institutionalize with general fund dollars. Maybe buy some things that would have some added value.

Dan Willoughby wondered if we are even asking the right question. What programs do we feel that we need to have that we don’t have—what are the funding sources. What do people see as an issue? These questions cannot be answered very easily within a few weeks. Need to spend some time on what we think we need and what we plan on institutionalizing after the grant is up. Maybe next year would be the appropriate time to apply. No matter what we do, it amounts to a lot of work. Only so many people can take on so much added responsibility. Don’t know what we can institutionalize. It needs to fit a need that we have—not just to get a grant.

Ken Collins suggested that maybe next year would be the best time to apply. Consult with a consultant to find out what the hot ticket items are. If one of the things is exactly what we need on this campus it might be worth doing this year—otherwise wait until next year.

For a 5 year grant, if you don’t apply now do you have to wait for 5 years? Once you have had a Title V grant you have to wait for a certain amount of time before you can apply for another. Is there a place to look to in order to determine what grants are out there—the ones that are available to obtain? It is not as easy as looking on a website—each are customized with a certain commonality. Possibly get some information from other colleges. Could we borrow their grant writer to pick the plan? Look and see exactly if there is a way to find out what they are funding. What is our opportunity if we don’t apply in the next year can we apply again in a year. Waiting may make sense, find out what our needs are, what programs are missing. If we use a consultant, pay a flat fee up front. Consider if we are serious about institutionalizing up front. If it enhanced a program already on campus it may be better. Bottom line—don’t just apply for a grant to get a grant.
**Dynamic Fund Discussion**—February 19 is when we solicited for Dynamic Fund proposals last year so the time is upon us for next year. We still don’t have a state budget. Should we let the campus know that we will not be having a Dynamic Fund next year? The committee confirmed its previous recommendation not to solicit for Dynamic Fund requests for 09/10.

Good for students to visit universities in order to transfer—the Cadena Transfer Center needs these funds for this purpose. Adam stated that he is uncomfortable cutting budgets and then offering a Dynamic Fund. Maybe don’t have a Dynamic Fund with new solicitation but look at some of these items and possibly fund those items. Otherwise we would shave the amount off everyone’s budget to cover the cost of continuing these items. It is possible that we will have some carryover funds we could use to fund the items that come back every year. Look at what they need to operate their program not just what they need for one year. One area indicated that they would like to carryover DF to the next year. Look at potentially funding the things that are really ongoing programs—do some kind of estimate of what will be left. Could fund reassigned time from the extended day budget instead of DF.

Adam indicated that he will get the information out to the campus that we will not be soliciting for DF proposals this year.

Meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.