PLANNING & BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes March 2, 2011
(Accepted at the meeting of 3/16/11)

Members Present:  Adam O’Connor, Dan Willoughby, Sharon Kelly, Marcus Wilson, Sean Chamberlin, Brittany Kane

Resource Members:  Toni DuBois, Ken Meehan

Absent:  Unnamed Student Rep #2, Chrystal Van Beynen, Greg Ryan

Meeting commenced at 2:05 p.m.

The meeting notes from 2/16/11 were accepted with one minor change.

Follow-Up—None

2011/2012 State, District and College Budget Update—Adam informed the committee that there is no meeting of the DPC budget subcommittee until next week but has two handouts from DPC.  Summary of Board Priorities for 2011-12 (green handout)—these priorities focus on student success.  We could utilize these to meet our needs if we choose to and justify those needs based on this list.  FTES Summary (buff handout)—Adam noted that NOCCCD is the third largest in unfunded FTES.  Most districts are trying to get down to their cap.  Sean stated that the district estimates 2,500 of the 3,392.45 unfunded FTES are derived from instructors taking more students than the seat count.  Ken Meehan indicated that there are some issues with this report.  Sean asked if this document is to be used in order to reduce the number of classes offered.  Adam explained how cutting back on the number of sections doesn’t necessarily mean we will be cutting FTES.

There was a decision on faculty hiring—there will be two positions moving forward at FC and one at CC.  The other positions have been cancelled and the applicants are being notified.  Two of the three positions were created for retreat rights.

Adam is hopeful that by our next meeting we will know if the tax bill will make it on the ballot.

Marcus asked if it is the understanding of this committee to cut summer school by 50% or is that just a proposal—did we make a decision on this?  Brittany thought it was just sports that would be cut by 50%—that is not accurate.  Toni DuBois indicated that the subcommittee is scheduled to meet next Tuesday and will be making a recommendation to DPC.  Toni also added that the model reduces summer school by
$700,000 leaving $800,000. The cuts are not across the board—deeper in recreation but no decision has been made.

Sean asked what the precedence is as to the district dictating to the colleges what or how many sections to offer. He thought it was the colleges choice—he feels that the district is overstepping their role by asking us to cut by 50%. Dan added that we have always gotten a target from the district. The model indicates that CC will be cutting $300,000 and FC $700,000 from summer school. The model will be discussed at the meeting next week. This was to be discussed last Monday at DPC but it was delayed for 2 weeks.

Would it be appropriate for us to use the model for cutting 50%? The college should be allowed to decide on our cuts. If we cut by 50% this summer there will be labs open with no students. Is it a wise decision to make cuts as proposed as we will have a fully staffed college? If we don’t take the cuts in summer we will need to take them during the fall and spring. The 50% cut would reduce the certificated staff by 3/4 but the entire classified staff would be kept. We have a lot of carry over funds that could be used—the district also has carryover that could also be used. If we extend the cuts and spread them over fall and spring we could improve our ability to offer services to students.

Sharon added that she sees the summer classes as “extra”—the complaints that she receives is that students are not able to get classes in the fall or spring, not summer.

Dan asked about the idea of keeping these cuts in summer school given that even with the best case scenario we would be cutting more than the $700,000. Getting rid of the $700,000 problem right away we would still have to cut fall and spring on top of the $700,000. If we don’t do it in summer it will be worse in fall and spring. Marcus feels that increasing the ending balance during these cutting times is not right. If we have to continue to cut we can—maybe next year we can cut summer. We can’t change the classified schedules for this summer.

Ken Meehan spoke to increasing rates or increasing the base on which we apply the rate. We would have more students coming in. This would be a better way to go instead of transfer rates.

Dan made an argument to keep classes—the more time you put in a students pathway the more opportunity not to succeed. The more you eliminate opportunity by decreasing staff you are reducing opportunities for students to complete their sequence.

If we were to save $300,000 this summer we still have to come up with $400,000 off the extended day budget. If we cut $400,000 somewhere else, couldn’t we spend it somewhere else? Right now we have the money, the district has the money and we still have to cut classes. CC could make one decision and FC could make another. The district could ultimately tell us what to do ultimately.

**Review of Planning Calendar**—Adam reviewed the hand outs that he and Ken Meehan had revised. He indicated that they tried to take into consideration Dan’s comments of getting things into faculty hands earlier and moving into a 2-year cycle.

Program Review--there was much discussion:

Doing half instructional program reviews and half student services—would still be doing them every two years
If divisions did them together they might come up with some strengths that are similar
In different economic situations it could change the focus of program review—not comparable
Dan thinks that there could be some advantages to having all the departments in the same division doing program review in the same year, but which divisions are undergoing program review could still be staggered. Others, though, thought that maybe having all divisions do program review in the same year might be a good idea for some of the same reasons (e.g., comparable conditions/external factors under which all the program reviews are written).

If program review was focused on one of the major goals it might create a process that is sustainable. This could all change next year but we have to start somewhere.

As far as our timeline goes, there may be a time we won’t meet and there could be some times that we would need to meet more regularly.

**Budget**

The idea for this new calendar is to receive the college goals in May, PBSC would begin developing the budget for ongoing and dynamic funds in the fall using these goals and after knowing the state budget. If mentality could change it might be a good thing. Use a calendar year instead of a fiscal year budget. One time funds from January to June and then ongoing starting in July—might work.

The first time we go through the calendar we will have more time to work through the plan. We probably won’t have any new funds for this year anyway.

Need to focus more on program review and the goals portion.

Tying student success to budget—Dynamic Fund would accomplish this.

**Foundation Funding**—no major changes

**Planning**—Ken Meehan

This process needs to be talked about at PAC.

Times correspond to timeline when they finish their work.

Structuring program review to a theme each year—shorten the focus.

After all of this discussion and feedback, Adam indicated that he and Ken would be reworking the calendar based on our discussion and then bringing it to PAC.

**Technology Replacement Plan**—the “draft” document is going to the faculty senate on Thursday to be officially endorsed and then moved to PAC—possibly endorsed with later modifications. Larry Mercadante, Adam, Co Ho and Bob Morison met several times to understand our inventory, needs, and cost out the plan. Instruction will be severely compromised if old computers are not replaced.

Adam indicated that we might want to focus on ’06 and older and the Obsolete columns. He added that the “draft” and the Initial Replacement Plan were never put together. Virtualization vs. desk top—the costs are similar—purchasing 100 virtualization set ups means 100 less desk tops. Business & CIS is piloting a virtualization plan—we will wait to move toward virtualization campus wide, until we learn more about how it works in this division.

We still have wireless to be set up at the 1700 and 1400 buildings. After this is completed we will map the wireless access on campus to determine coverage. The plan would be to eventually become 100% wireless on campus. We need to work on infrastructure before we look at anything else. Adam had originally set aside $550,000 in carry over for the Tech Plan and the remainder for capital outlay projects. He proposed adding more to this plan—would like to see at least $1 million put towards this plan. With that amount we could make some good progression and take care of a lot of the ’06 and older and obsolete.
columns. We could agree to fund fully #1 and #2 at $1.6 million. Adam will discuss this with the president. The committee supported this approach.

Adjourned at 3:56 p.m.