BUDGET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes September 16, 2009
(Accepted at the Meeting of 10/21/09)

Members Present:  Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Ken Collins, Marcus Wilson, Chrystal Van Beynen, Sharon Kelly, Tyler Speer, Vincent Velasquez

Absent: Cyndi Grein

Meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

Meeting Notes from 9/2/09 were accepted.

Follow-Up: Adam indicated that Dr. Hodge did approve $200,000 additional money to provide access to students out of a total possible allocation of $690,000 that BDC recommended from carryover funds to be used in support of 66 additional courses in the spring. Marcus asked Dan Willoughby if he thought the deans felt that the additional dollars were allocated appropriately. Assume that it will put us well over the 17,500 FTES target. Dan indicated that the deans worked with Larry Buckley to determine the distribution of the $200,000 and that they feel that it is appropriate. The intent was to offer high demand classes with this allotment. A member asked if it would be appropriate to get a list of the classes being added back. Extreme sensitivity on the classes being offered in P.E.—certain classes to be cut by the state.

Tyler asked what happens to the difference between the $200,000 that Dr. Hodge approved and the $690,000 that BDC recommended? Don’t want to distribute all of the funds in case we have mid-year cuts. We could use the money next year for teaching additional classes. Dan Willoughby explained to the students how we have grown over the last 4 or 5 years and that the classes did not necessarily fill. We are serving the same number of students has we did last fall—fewer classes with a higher fill rate. Dr Hodge is concerned about misleading students by offering so many classes in the spring and in the fall cutting everything. This is the first time we have utilized additional campus money over and above our extended day allocation in order to increase the number of classes. Vincent added that My Gateway is at capacity and the server is not able to keep up—very frustrating for students. Banner steering is spreading out the appointments more so that students can register.

Question came up at DPC on Monday—when you look at the district budget and compare expenditures. Historically we spend a similar amount of money in the 40000s, 50000s and 60000s, yet the budgets seem to be much larger than the actuals in comparison. Adam clarified that this is not just a district office thing. Fullerton College, for example, does not budget any amounts in a 70000 category (contingency)
because we would spend out of the 40000s, 50000s and 60000s. All of the budget officers do this in order to reduce the number of budget transfers. Any time you are transferring from a contingency account it requires board approval. Therefore, our unallocated carryover is allocated into 40000, 50000 and 60000 accounts so they are available for expenditure if we make allocations to spend. Otherwise they will carryover again and therefore the actuals will be less than budget.

**Categorical Programs**—Adam informed the committee that we did get clarification from the state regarding the amount of federal backfill we will be receiving. Originally it appeared to be 28% but the actual percentage is 11% of the total cuts. The district put aside $1 million and is now adding another $1 million to have about $2 million for categorical programs for the 09/10 year. The categoricals that will need the backfill are CalWorks, EOPS, DSPS, CARE and Matriculation. No backfill for Instructional Equipment, Basic Skills and other programs.

Statewide about $37 million backfill allocated in federal dollars. This comes to the district in unrestricted general fund monies—not specific to categoricals but calculated on categoricals. District is recommending that the actual backfill to the programs comes out of board discretionary money. There will be no backfill after this year and Adam is in contact with Toni DuBois regarding this. They might be relaxing some of the state regulations during these times.

Dan Willoughby clarified that there was not a technology plan from Nilo presented to the deans. The committee that PAC is in the process of setting up is not the same. They are attempting to set up a Technology Implementation Committee or Technology Advisory Committee neither of which are being formed in response to the request from BDC.

Adam informed the committee that the Administrative Assistant II position in Humanities was approved by the BDC and has moved forward.

Nilo and Adam have been in discussion regarding a Technology Plan, both instructional and infrastructural. We endorsed the concept but nothing has been done to date. Once a group is established, we can then work with that group. Adam does not see this happening quickly.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.