BUDGET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes September 15, 2010
(Accepted at the Meeting of 10/6/10)

Members Present: Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Greg Ryan, Sharon Kelly, Sean Chamberlin, Marcus Wilson, Chrystal Van Beynen, Garima Aggarwal

Absent: None

Guest: Rocky Spinelli

Meeting commenced at 2:08 p.m.

There was some discussion of the meeting notes from 9/1/10 and with a minor change relating to categoricals they were approved.

The committee then reviewed the categoricals and the amount we are backfilling this year. There was additional discussion of the ranking of new faculty positions—Marcus Wilson thinks that a counselor position was ranked 5th on the list and was inquiring if we could move a categorical counselor into that position. This could affect the $947,000 backfill amount.

One member asked if we know what the minimum level of service is in the categorical programs. Adam indicated that Toni DuBois is working with the categorical managers and Cypress College and will report on this soon.

Follow-up: Bond Projects—Adam reported that the campus bond oversight committee was being reconstituted. He was not clear on what information he was to bring back to the committee on this item discussed last meeting. After some discussion it was determined that the committee was inquiring as to the amount of non-bond monies the college transferred in being used to finish the science building and other campus projects so far. Adam will bring this information back to the committee.

Foundation Funding (buff handout)—Adam reminded the committee that these forms are posted on the J drive. He then reviewed the handout with the committee. There are three different ways to request funds from the foundation twice a year. Recommended that this year there will only be one opportunity because the first deadline of September 15 has now passed. The first opportunity would be February 15, 2011. The request would be filled out, submitted to the dean and then to the area VP. Sean asked if there are criteria that the awarding will be based on? In the second paragraph on the first page it states: Those funding requests that are determined to best meet college goals will be forwarded to the Fullerton College Foundation for funding consideration. These would be the 2010/11 college goals.
In relation to the annual campaign, the foundation has already been contacted regarding One Book One College. We need to discuss fundraising priorities early in the year for 2011/12. Adam will add this to the next BDC agenda to start the discussion.

**Personnel Update**—Adam reported that he has not heard anything back from M&O on the positions so he has no update. Another request to fill an Admin. Assist II in the Business & CIS division was e-mailed two days earlier. Marcus Wilson then gave an overview of the classified staff in the division and their duties. There was then some discussion on lateral transfers and flying “in house”. The committee recommended to move this position forward.

**2010/11 District budget Update (green handout)**—this is the power point handout that was presented at last night’s board meeting. This handout shows the district general fund bottom line in deficit by $2.3 million. Since the deficit will be covered by the board discretionary funds, it was pointed out at the board meeting that there really won’t be a deficit.

Adam indicated that if any committee member had any question on anything in the detailed district budget book he would be more than willing to explain it. The committee then asked how money is moved—would it have to be board approved? Adam explained that any budget transfers greater than $10,000 that are moved between major account codes, and all transfers from contingency accounts would require board approval.

The committee discussed plusses and minuses of being overcap. An argument could be made to not be to far overcap in FTES—the state may make the argument that we can teach all these students without more money. There was also discussion about increasing ending fund balances by $7 million, and then cancelling $4.7 million of classes.

**Continued Discussion of Use of Carryovers**—Adam asked about the $500,000 being included to cover overages in extended day. It was suggested that any of the $500,000 of carryover that is not needed this year would be automatically put towards extended day up front for next year—augment the extended day budget next year by the remaining amount. Marcus indicated that even though we did not lay off anyone, some extended day instructors were just not hired back and students are not getting classes. Anything we can do to hold on to the money would be good.

Scott McKenzie has been putting some information together and the numbers seem to come in around $500,000. These are preliminary—using average rate of pay. Some divisions had not provided the information requested so some estimates were made. Scott is also working on the number of sections offered from year to year and we should have that data soon.

Dan Willoughby indicated that he would not like to vote on this today. It was brought up that if we wait until the end of the year we won’t have the money in time to plan for summer, fall or spring next year. From summer 09 to 10 there was a 13.69% cut. We are really trying to move in the direction of living within the amount of the extended day budget. Currently we are not doing that.

There was some discussion of how we get backfilled for phase in retirements—we do get backfill. Would that go back to the divisions? Part of contract for sabbaticals—the district pays for that.

**Extended Day**—sounds like we are in support of setting aside the funds for this year—the committee agreed.
Tech. Replacement—there is no reason to take action since we are not sure of the amount. Adam and Merc were given the charge of meeting with both the ITC and TIPC committees at the same time to get this process expedited.

Categorical programs consideration—The committee supports the allocation of $947,399.

Staff Development—Dr. Vurdien would like to allocate some funds as the campus has not had much money in staff development recently. There would be some kind of split between Faculty, Classified and Managers. There are some stipulations as to how to apply for these funds. If we allocate funds on campus for staff development activities we would then be more eligible for district staff development funds than if we did not have any allocation for staff development. District Innovative Funds and Staff Development at the district are not the same pot of money. The committee supported the $100,000 allocation.

Transfer to capital outlay—We don’t need to take action now, we should wait for the state budget to be approved.

Adam will move forward the recommendation to allocate for Extended Day, Categoricals and Staff Development.

Adam also received requests totaling $7,210 for critical needs on campus—1 from Math, 1 from Business and 2 from Humanities. The committee agreed to recommend funding for these immediately. Old items (not broken) should be addressed in the tech replacement plan.

Lastly it was suggested we add a line item for instructional equipment—Adam brought to the committee that last two years of instructional equipment allocations. The last two years that we received an instructional equipment allocation were 07/08 and 08/09. Each of these years we receive approximately $275,000. In addition to that amount there was carryover from the previous year (areas did not spend there entire allocations). Marcus then suggested that we set aside $500,000 for instructional equipment this year.

The process for determining the distribution of instructional equipment dollars take a long time. Have the process in place—based on no disaster with the state budget—we could then go ahead with the purchases already decided upon. The statement was made that our carryover budget is substantial and since we didn’t get any state instructional equipment last year this should be considered. The question was asked if we are to exclude items that would be included in the tech replacement plan? Augment was is already being done—if urgent they should be able to do that. It was brought to the attention of the committee that sometimes ACT didn’t order the equipment as requested thus the reason for unspent instructional equipment funds. Adam explained that each year the unspent instructional equipment dollars roll back into the pot for redistribution. If we allocate from campus carryover however, the unspent dollars would roll back into the college carryover. The committee supported this allocation recommendation.

New Budget and Planning Committee and Affects on BDC—Adam indicated that the composition and purpose needs more discussion. This committee would take the place of BDC but Adam is not sure of the charge of the committee.

Some discussion ensued:
Not sure if the BDC would be augmented or start over from scratch.
It could possibly reduce or increase the charge of the committee, include budget and planning.
There could be a recommendation that the BDC be moved to the new committee. Is there enough time for the committee to get the work done? Planning in the Fall/Budget in the Spring? Accreditation has a lot to do with the changes being proposed, not just a new president.

This will continue to be discussed in PAC.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00