PLANNING & BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes November 17, 2010
(Accepted at the meeting of 12/1/10)

Members Present: Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Sharon Kelly, Marcus Wilson, Garima Aggarwal; Rocky Spinelli, Sean Chamberlin

Absent: Greg Ryan, Chrystal Van Beynen

Guests: Andrea Hanstein, Bob Jensen

Meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

The meeting notes from 10/20/10 were accepted.

Centennial Budget Presentation and Request for Funding Support (Jensen/Hanstein)—Bob and Andrea presented a proposal for budget related to the Centennial. Andrea gave a quick overview of the budget breakdown totaling $453,000 that will be spread over 4 years. The amount is $264,750 from district/campus funds and $184,500 from off-campus funds. The marketing costs of $43,000 will be paid from the PIO budget and is not being requested. They informed the committee that the Centennial committee consists of faculty, staff and students and that they have supported the proposal. Bob and Andrea have given power point presentations to all constituent groups around campus and indicated that people are on board. One member asked what the district is going to contribute towards this event. The district has indicated they are willing to fund some of the costs. Marcus Wilson thinks that we should ask that 2/3 of the cost be funded by the district.

Sean suggested that we tie this in with the student equity plan—affective domain, communication with the community and could justify the cost in that sense.

There was some discussion about the fundraising and the foundations role. It was stated that they could assist in raising funds but would not just be giving us money. The issue of what would happen if we did not get the off campus funding that is in the proposal was raised—what happens to those projects? The committee could make a recommendation as to how the money is to be spent if something doesn’t happen as proposed. Much discussion ensued. It was suggested that if changes were made it would have to go through the Centennial committee with a recommendation to the president—it would not need to come back to PBSC. Sean suggested that if there are any major revisions possibly up to a certain percentage that it should come back here. We could do an annual review for accountability purposes. Not sure if the PBSC needs to look at programmatic changes.
Garima asked what would actually be happening on the actual day. Bob indicated that they make sure it coincides with the vision and there will be events throughout the entire year. They will determine a special day to start and all of the other events will fall into place. He then added that it will also be our 100th commencement.

Marcus moved to approve funding the $221,750 over a 4-year period giving the committee flexibility if needed. The committee will also provide each year a report for accountability purposes showing how the money was actually spent. He also suggested that the president approach the district for funding support. All members present were in agreement.

**Follow-Up—FTES Calculation.** Adam stated that the League sheet includes all funds in their calculation—for our purposes FTES is apportionment only.

Marcus then asked how we are $750,000 off on our calculation for extended day. Adam stated that the number is actually estimated at $688,000 according to the last run they did. Shouldn’t we figure out how we were so far over before just going ahead and cut $350,000 more? We just got hit for around $30,000 for 08/09 summer school charges. Adam indicated that it is very difficult and time consuming to determine exactly why. He is not sure if part of the difference relates to the buying and selling of full time faculty, and how each division accounts for this.

Sean asked if there was any thought given to try to standardize the process for our planning purpose. Rajen, Scott and Adam are working together on this and it is just taking a lot of time. Are we reducing $350,000 or 350 units? If it were units, wouldn’t it be more equitable in addition to being easier? It is potentially inequitable if some rely on FT as opposed to PT.

There was much discussion about fill rates and how cuts were made—it was not an across the board cut. They were given a dollar amount not necessarily the number of units. Based on extended day or total budget? It was suggested that we do it in a way that people could understand and it could be tracked. Someone mentioned that there will be huge cuts to P.E. this summer that would affect next year’s budget.

**Beautification**—Adam brought to the meeting the Campus Image Plan from 2000. In this plan there was a plan to renovate the quad. There was a concept of cleaning up and beautifying the campus. Once we received the bond money, this plan has needed to change and new plans will be incorporated in the new comprehensive master plan.

**2010/2011 State, District and College Budget Update**—The LAO had just put out an analysis and it looks very likely that we will be having some mid-year cuts or potentially an 18 month budget that includes reductions. The categorical deficits of $974,000 will be reduced by $103,000 due to EOPS getting some funding but this could all change again.

Instructional Equipment—Rajen has asked the for a list of all instructional equipment purchased over the past 3 years out of all funds not just instructional equipment allocations. To date the allocation of funds is still on hold. One member said the ACT did put out a chart on items purchased by them for different divisions but the division attributions are not 100% accurate. As of this time Adam has not seen the report.

**Foundation Fundraising Priorities Final Review**—Adam indicated that he needs to take this to the next meeting of PAC. He added the college centennial under programmatic support and switched the order per our previous agreement. The committee approved the document as submitted.
PAC Update Classified Hiring Procedures (blue handout)—PBSC has been charged with coming up with a hiring procedure for classified positions. Adam then reviewed a draft handout. Marcus does not agree with informing PAC after the fact. As long as we are in a budget crisis, this committee should still look at replacement positions. Adam stated that Rajen would like a formalized process in place for hiring classified positions. Replacing vacant positions and hiring for newly established positions are totally different.

All positions are currently going to Chancellor’s Staff—one member commented that they should be coming here for review first. We should be drafting a procedure that we will be using for the next 3 or 4 years during the budget crisis. Our original procedure was written for the 2009/10 year but we intended for it to be through the entire budget crisis timeline.

Dan thinks that for new positions we need something a little more meaningful. Continue the process and come up with something different for newly created positions.

This committee continues to review all classified openings but we need to come up with a plan on how the college will fill new positions when we are not in a budget crisis. Sharon added that she felt it important to continue with justifications for all positions.

Adam reviewed the current process—a justification goes to the VP, if they sign off on it in support, then it comes to us for review and recommendation to the president.

It was decided that the draft document needs some additional work, especially the portion related to new positions. Adam will bring this back to another meeting. Adam added that at some point we will have some college goals and we will need to determine how to fund those goals—we might determine that we need certain positions, not just funding allocations. In other words, positions should flow through the same planning process. In looking at procedures for new positions, it would then be up to us to make a recommendation on positions as well as increases in percentages employed. If it cost money it would be considered “new” along with newly created positions.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.