



## PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

**Present:** Dr. John al-Amin (*co-chair*), Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Jonas Crawford, Diane Eberhardy, Erika Endrijonas (*Ex-Officio*), Carolyn Inouye, Andrew Cawelti, Lisa Hopper, Marie Butler, Linda Robison, Ralph Smith, Ana Maria Valle, Marie Butler, Tom O'Neil, Elizabeth Rangel (*ASG Rep*)

**Guests:** Dr. Duran, Dr. Herrera

---

Meeting Date: **03/30/11**      Minutes Approved: **02/16/11**      Recorded By: Darlene Inda

---

**AN = Action Needed    AT = Action Taken    D = Discussion    I = Information Only**

---

### **DISCUSSION/DECISIONS**

- |   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| I.    Called to Order                                     | I  | The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.   |
| II.   Approval of Minutes                                 | AT | The Council reviewed the minutes from the January 19, 2011 meeting. J. al-Amin stated that Karen Engelsen and Chris Horrock should be moved from Attendees to Guests.  |
|   | AT | R. Smith moved to approve the minutes from January 19, 2011 with the noted changes above. A. Cawelti seconded, and <i>the motion carried unanimously.</i>  |
| III.   Informational Item:<br>Resource Allocation<br>Form | I  | R. Cabral stated that the form has now been finalized with both PEPC and PBC's changes. He stated that this is a tool to help with the prioritization of resource requests. Questions came up regarding the process and J. al-Amin stated that instructions will accompany the form and also noted the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One form needs to be completed per each request.</li><li>• In the Priority field, there can only be <u>one</u> #1, #2, #3, etc...</li><li>• Once the form is filled out, it will go to PEPC for the ranking process before it is brought to PBC.</li></ul> |
|   | AT | R. Cabral stated that the document needs to be formalized by a vote and offered up a motion to accept the institutional document which will be used for resource requests for PEPC. The motion was approved by <i>common consensus.</i>  |

I E. Endrijonas stated that this form will be used to communicate through the PEPRs. She also stated that the purpose of this form was to be a document that could stand on its own. Questions arose regarding how the form will be communicated and R. Cabral stated that the form will go back to PEPC, the Deans will take it to the Department Chair meetings, and it will also be an informational item at the Academic Senate.

AN E. Endrijonas stated that the forms need to be submitted to PEPC before the March 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting so that they can be reviewed and ranked before submitting to PBC which will review them during the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### IV. College Budget Update

I J. al-Amin stated that the College has been asked to put together 3 plans based on the Governor's budget:

- 3% - \$778,000 reduction
- 5% - \$1.3 million reduction
- 7% - \$1.8 million reduction

He stated that one of the good things from last year's budget was that there was a difference between the tentative budget and the adopted budget and it allowed us to do a number of things with "one-time" costs such as putting money towards equipment and supplies. That "one-time" money will come out which will assist us with the 3% plan. It also helps substantially with the 5% plan because the figure we received for one-time funds will help make up the majority of this. He stated that departments are going to be looking for other cost efficiencies of which the managers are working on now. At the 5% we really are going to skate by with some changes which will allow us to meet the reduction. The 7% is where our issues lie because it will result in some significant operational changes and we will really have to reevaluate how a number of things are done.

I J. al-Amin stated that the timing of this is very important because in January when the original information was released, there was nothing for PBC to discuss because we just had a general picture of what the state was going to require us to do. It wasn't until afterwards that detailed analysis was done and real figures began to materialize. He added that a week or so ago, we received real concrete numbers that we began looking at and are in the process of doing. The reality is that given the March 15<sup>th</sup> deadline, if there are any personnel changes that need to go into effect, individuals need to give March 15<sup>th</sup> notification or they need to be notified per the SEIU

contract at least 45 days. For anything to go into effect July 1, it needs to be on the April Board agenda. He stated that we haven't been given a lot of time to work through these particular plans if any that we have to formulate, but wanted to put the information out there because these are the timeframes given which are rapidly changing. We need to make sure that accurate information is being disseminated to our constituents to eliminate any moral issues, false allegations and any false concerns. That's why these deadlines and timeframes are so important.

AN J. al-Amin stated that we have set forth Budget Development Guidelines with certain parameters where departments were to review or consider reductions and they need to be reviewed today.

I J. al-Amin stated that the target's that are trying to be met are for the overall College, not one specific department and each area has been asked to come up with whatever possible reductions that they can materialize in order to meet our target.

AN D. Eberhardy requested that a detailed spreadsheet with the data be provided before making such decisions so that they can see it on paper. J. al-Amin reiterated that the percentages and numbers provided earlier are the numbers she's inquiring about and that this information she's requesting was already provided at the last meeting. D. Eberhardy stated that it would just be helpful when discussing these guidelines. J. al-Amin stated that he understands the concern of not having the specific numbers, and will provide a breakdown of the College budget as related to the proposed target and what an estimated reduction will be. He also stated that these guidelines have been approved in prior years without the information that is being requested.

I A. Valle asked about the guidelines in respect to the Program Review aspect and E. Endrijonas responded that the overall strategic planning and effectiveness with the CQI assumes that program review has been taken into consideration.

I J. al-Amin stated that the guidelines that are presented are for what was done last year and are not ranked in any particular order. The only thing that has changed is that the reduction target is worse.

- I Dr. Duran added that by law we have to meet the FTO number. These guidelines are still valid because this is an administrative process. The timing has already occurred and doesn't mean it's less valid. He stated that these guidelines are necessary because they provide at the unit levels – some principles blended with what's happening district-wide. He also stated that this is why we're going through the process now because J. al-Amin needs to submit them to the Sue Johnson at the District to review.
- AN In reviewing the guidelines provided, J. al-Amin recommended adding Total Cost of Ownership principles to the resource allocation process.
- AT R. Cabral requested that the Council recap the guidelines, review them and vet them. In reviewing the guidelines, the following decisions were made:
1. Vacant General Fund positions will not be filled unless they are critical to the college. (e.g., ~~FTO~~ FON obligation).  
**Decision: Change “FTO” to “FON”**
  2. The college will reduce hourly classified staffing, unless this staffing is critical to ensure that programs are compliant with State or Federal mandates.  
**Decision: Leave as is**
  3. The college will reduce the class schedule to meet the funding limit provided by the State. Courses offered will be based upon the definition of core courses, as determined by the college.  
**Decision: Leave as is**
  4. Purchases of non-critical equipment, computers, or other program service needs such as consultants, will be delayed.  
**Decision: Leave as is**
  5. ~~The college Publications and Marketing budgets will be reduced, in addition to reducing the number of class schedules and catalogs.~~  
**Decision: Remove guideline**
  6. The college will reduce full/part time positions as needed to reach the 5% and 7% reduction level, but only as a last resort.  
**Decision: Add “and 7%” to the reduction level**

7. All Divisions are to participate in college budget reductions.

**Decision: Leave as is**

8. Total Cost of Ownership principles need to be included in the resource allocation model.

**Decision: "New" guideline**

A. Valle moved to approve the Proposed FY2011-12 Budget Development Guidelines as refined. R. Smith seconded, and *the motion carried unanimously*.

AN J. al-Amin asked each department to review their targets, and come back with recommendations to meet these totals. He stated that each department doesn't have to take 3, 5 or 7% of their program because they may not have it - it will be based on fixed and variable costs.

AN R. Cabral recommended discussing this subject in the future during December and January as Dr. Duran suggested earlier. He also suggested from this point forward, accommodating the non-financial inclined faculty members by providing pie charts/spreadsheets with the budget so they can see the bigger picture.

I Upcoming Budget Forums:

- February 23, 2011 – 2:00-4:00pm in CSSC-101
- February 24, 2011 – 9:00-11:00 in JCC-3B

V. Discussion Item: Budget Planning, Development & Management Process; Review, Refinement, CQI

I J. al-Amin stated that our current budget process is not consistent with the State's budget process. He gave a brief description of their process by stating that in September, budget proposals are submitted, they are reviewed in January, with a May revision and then the state formerly presents a plan for adoption in July.

AN J. al-Amin stated that we are doing resource requests, review and allocation in the Spring. His recommendation for the next fiscal cycle is to begin the process in the Fall during September and October for review by PEPC in November and December; so that in January, PBC will get the requests and have the discussion. In December before the break, come up with principles that we can adopt in January after the Jan 10 budget to be consistent and put us ahead of the process. In the Spring, we use this as an opportunity to go over and be proactive and then reactive with any changes that come out of Sacramento which we will know about in January and subsequently in May.

- I J. al-Amin stated that the problem with the May revision is that faculty will be gone. He stated that is why the May meeting has been moved up so that if any changes, we can accommodate faculty and make the changes prior to anyone leaving for the summer. There has been a discussion in the past regarding a summer meeting, however, it would be unpaid for the faculty. This is an alternative in order to deal with any last minute changes. Another option would be to leave for the summer with the recommendations and allow the Officer's of the College to make any additional changes as necessary in order to comply with the District and State.
- AN J. al-Amin stated that we need to discuss and come up with a timeframe and process for the review of the Mission Statement. We need to come up with a recommendation to the President as to the process that will be utilized. This needs to be done by May. If a change is made after the recommendation, an addendum will be issued to the PGM.
- I Dr. Herrera gave a brief presentation on Continuous Quality Improvement for the Planning and Budget Council. She talked about what we did really well, what needs to be improved on. She stated that the challenge is getting in sync. She stated that we have the parts in place and need to put them together. We are in transition, communicating and creating systems and as we create more, our awareness will improve. She stated that we need to really understand how to make it a functional aspect of the organization.
- VI. Discussion Item: PBC Committee Evaluation AN R. Cabral stated the reasoning behind an evaluation is to self correct and move forward. He stated that last year, two reviews were received and that everything rolls up to PBC, however, we can't seem to get enough input from the constituent members. He asked the Council if it would be helpful to do a mid-year evaluation. This could be done during a meeting as more of a discussion and then have a more anonymous follow-up. He stated that maybe managers could encourage faculty to provide feedback. It was also recommended to have an outside body facilitate the process.
- VIII. Adjournment I The meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.
- IX. Future PBC Meetings I
  - o March 30, 2011
  - o April 20, 2011
  - o May 4, 2011