PLANNING & BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes March 16, 2011
(Accepted at the Meeting of 4-6-11)

Members Present:  Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Sharon Kelly, Sean Chamberlin, Brittany Kane, Chrystal Van Beynen

Resource Members:  Ken Meehan

Absent:  Unnamed Student Rep #2, Marcus Wilson, Greg Ryan

Guests:  5 Accreditation Team Members

Meeting commenced at 2:03 p.m.

The meeting notes from 3/2/11 were accepted with one minor change.

Follow-Up

Technology Replacement Plan—Adam informed the committee that PAC did endorse the Tech Plan at the past PAC meeting and the president has approved $1 million of expenditures. Sean inquired as to how the dollar amount was determined when we recommended $1.5 million. For the computer replacement and infrastructure the total is $1.6 million including all obsolete equipment and equipment older than ’06 and we originally had a placeholder of $550,000. Dr. Vurdien decided that given the fact that we are overdue in finalizing such a plan, but due to the state of the state budget, he felt comfortable with the $1 million figure as a compromise. Brittany asked where the money was coming from to fund the Tech Plan. Adam explained that it was coming from our carryovers.

Who will determine what will get done off the list? Adam explained that the first piece will be infrastructure items totaling about $600,000 which includes some funding for a consultant which was a recommendation of the tech committee. That would leave roughly $400,000 for desk top computer replacement. Adam added that Co Ho and Bob Morison will be going over the inventory and looking at the aging—the oldest will be replaced first. One member asked who would be overseeing the spending. Adam explained that all requisitions would go through Banner and that Co Ho and Adam are on the approval queue as well as Dr. Vurdien for all purchases over $5,000.

2011/2012 Budget Update (green handout)—Adam indicated that there was still no action taken on the state budget at this time. He then informed the committee that there was one recommendation that came
to the budget sub committee and that was a 5% workload reduction. Workload reduction in our FTES has been decided—our target FTES in the best case scenario will need to be reduced by 5%.

Adam then went over the green handout pointing out the difference between Scenarios 1 and 2 is the adjusted FTES growth. How to reduce the 5% FTES--they acknowledged that the target was increased but we received no money for it. The budget subcommittee still needs to work out the dollar figures that go with the reduction. Scenario #1 actually shows a 12.8% reduction. Scenario #2 takes into consideration current year growth funds prior to the reduction. This should amount to about a net 7.2% reduction. We get $1,268 on any new FTES when we grow. He added that the Vice Chancellor argued that he could do either one. The discussion will continue.

Nine teaching faculty that we are down would also be part of the 5% workload reduction.

What are we doing this summer? FC and CC are adding additional dollars to extended day in order to offer additional classes. The amount of reduction for FC is $700,000 and CC $400,000. Was it a directive from the district? It doesn’t matter what term we take it from as long as we meet the target. We will be reducing summer by $560,000 and the difference in the fall and spring in addition to the 5% workload reduction.

Karen Cant from Cypress was concerned that we weren’t taking the full summer cuts. Not sure why CC would be concerned about this. CC is taking a 50% reduction and we are reducing by $560,000 rather than the $700,000. Adam shared some figures of cuts FC vs. CC showing that they cut a smaller percentage than we have over the past 2 years.

Pink Handout—Adam reviewed with the committee this handout. With carryovers do we have enough money to get through the next year in any scenario? Yes we do. Dan asked about the SCE carryover and how it could be down to zero. Usually the bottom line cut is shared between all the entities. The 5% workload reduction is the same in each of the cuts—doesn’t mean that it will be the same. We would also have savings from not filling full time faculty positions—that would come off also. He explained that if we did nothing, this would be the effect from year to year.

What are our highest priorities? Important, from an accreditation standpoint, that we should be making reductions in alignment with our mission. One member added that there needs to be a philosophical conversation on campus and with the chancellor to determine what to cut.

Last year we agreed that some level of cuts we can do across the board—and we already cut 5% of general fund instructional allocations and 10% administrative. If we need to cut more we would need to look at programmatic types of issues.

In the DPC subcommittee the classified staff made a point that there isn’t greater participation by classified in talking about potential cuts on the subcommittee. If you had a different group of people in the room you might come up with different ideas for cuts. The classified staff at FC seems underrepresented—the only classified member on DPC is a union rep from CC. Adam then stated that he does try to represent the sense of the entire PBSC at the subcommittee meetings. It was suggested that we need to talk about different types of scenarios regarding lay offs, cutting overloads, load banking, etc. at the district level. This should have been discussed earlier instead of last minute when it is absolutely necessary. It is felt that that decision comes from the board.
Q & A with accreditation team members. Adam moved the Q & A up on the agenda, and PBSC members responded to various questions posed by the accreditation team.

Review of Planning Calendar (white handout)—Adam indicated that this actually went to the last PAC meeting and stated that he and Ken made a few more changes and proceeded to review them with the committee. Under the Budget column—Sept. and July—hope for a state budget to be approved; April update Tech Plan and format recommendations to PBSC along with funding requests related to the Tech Plan. Updating the plan would come from the ACT execution plan and should follow the strategic plan. Adam added that it might be beneficial if we could get the two committees to fold into one in the near future. It was also suggested that the order of the calendar headings be changed as to how they are listed on the page so that program review is listed first.

Ken Meehan then reviewed the planning column with the committee. He clarified that the objectives and goals are for a two year cycle as well as program review. Instructional programs could be done one year and non-instructional the next year rolling into the strategic plan. He stated that we have 52 instructional programs and could possibly break it up into 4 groups.

Adam will make the changes and Ken and Adam will review again at the next PAC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.