



## PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

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

**Guests:** Karen Engelsen, Chris Horrock, Will Deits, Gail Warner

---

Meeting Date: **05/04/11**      Minutes Approved: **04/20/11**      Recorded By: Darlene Inda

---

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

---

### **DISCUSSION/DECISIONS**

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| I. Called to Order           | AT    The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.  |
|                              | AT    J. al-Amin requested from the Council an additional meeting in May after the May revise. He suggested May 18, 2011 and added that faculty will be off contract and asked if they would be able to make it. R. Cabral talked about the planning over the summer and stated that it's critical for PBC to be able to count on faculty to be "on-call" for matters relating to budget issues.  |
|                              | An official motion for additional meeting of May 18, 2011 was approved by Andrew Cawelti, seconded by Jonas Crawford and opposed by Marie Butler.   |
| II. Approval of Minutes      | AT    The Council reviewed the meeting minutes of March 30, 2011. T. O'Neil moved to approve the meeting minutes, D. Eberhardy seconded, and <i>the motion carried unanimously.</i>   |
|                              | I,D    C. Horrock asked about the recent cuts and whether an accounting can be provided. J. al-Amin responded that the information is in the Board of Trustees minutes and that the information will also be provided at the next Budget Forum on April 27 <sup>th</sup> and 28 <sup>th</sup> . J. al-Amin also stated that the methodology that was used in identifying the affected areas was well within the guiding principles of PBC and what was proposed to the President. |
| III. Resource Request Review | I,D    J. al-Amin suggested that the Council discuss the parameters for reviewing the requests and recommended that Business Services and Student Services present their requests at the May 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting.   |

R. Cabral added that he liked the way Business Services prioritized their requests and M. Butler added that everyone should come up with a shorter version like Business Services did which provided the Resource Request form along with a narrative for justification.

I,D R. Cabral asked if PBC wants PEPC to bring all 137 requests or should he go back to PEPC and see if some can be weeded out. J. al-Amin responded that PEPC should look at their requests and try to pull out items that are obvious and may fall in the Facilities Plan or other items that may be supported by something else.

I,D J. al-Amin asked the Council how these requests should be ranked and stated that he feels Health & Safety should be ranked highest. He asked if the requests should be ranked for the greater good of the College or broken down by each group's needs. The general consensus among the Council was to do it for the greater good of the College.

AT,AN The Council decided on the following criteria for ranking the requests:

1. Mandates (State & Federal)
2. College Strategic Goals
3. Total Cost of Ownership

J. al-Amin asked that a copy of the College Strategic Goals be brought to the next meeting.

I,D A. Valle suggested that instructional requests should be taken off. J. al-Amin stated that there is not a state mandate to hire anyone right now and added that PBC will give the President a list of staffing ranked requests and a list of the other items, to separate it out.

#### IV. Budget Development Review and Finalization

I,D J. al-Amin reviewed the Budget Allocation Planning & Development Process:

- Page 3 - overview of process and timeline which shows the District is working on three different budgets this year, which need to be consistent with reductions or augmentations.
- Page 4 – outlines that the District General Fund comes from a formula which is based on District size. This will be updated annually.

J. Crawford asked about the model and said that as we grow in size, there is a need to be looked at and changed in the future. J. al-Amin talked about the model in 2006 and gave an example of a Roman cap. He

stated that the model was devised to use the model as a gauge for productivity, which came up with a formula that capped growth. He spoke about how we were funded from the model and added that the state level of funding for our size is close to 3%. The model takes 15% and divides 5% for each College and we get a level of based funding which is higher than what the state would fund us.

A. Valle asked about having more instruction to get more FTES. She's concerned whether we made the right decision on not having offerings in the summer because the students will go to Ventura and Moorpark. J. al-Amin stated that we are not trying to increase our FTES and gave a brief example of why we won't get more money. He stated that we are doing our job on what we have already so why would they give us more money?

E. Endrijonas added that the statewide mission for Community Colleges is in the process of being pruned and that the State is going to ask us to focus on transfer, CTE and basic skills.

- Page 5 – Trust & Agency Accounts
- Page 6 - College budgets which will be based on last year's budget. There was a change in the first paragraph. The second paragraph is in line with the current budget process. The last paragraph discussed CQI process.
- Page 7 – highlights the management, assessment and planning & development phases of the process.
- Page 8 – the Budget Cycle, which is a new process than what was done last year to stay ahead of the process.

J. al-Amin gave an outline and explanation of what will be done each month starting in July to June. Instruction starts in August and September. He added that this puts us in line with the State budget process. Student Services and Business Services are starting in July.

E. Endrijonas added that data for faculty will be worked on this summer and spoke about PEPC and the data provided when faculty returns in August. C. Horrock said that PEPC and the requests are not as essential as the core of the programs and fears that decisions will be made about the core without faculty here and expressed his concern about not wanting to increase FTES because he's worried that Oxnard College is going to be the one who's written off. E. Endrijonas assured C. Horrock that is not the plan. She added that we're given a budget

based on what the model gives us, the Deans look at it and figure out how we can get the most students served while maintaining efficiency.

J. al-Amin stated that Oxnard College is not being held up in any way and added that if we grow by 8%, the District is only funding us at what the State gives us and we are held to the same standard and are not penalized.

D. Eberhardy asked that other than the timelines, the model is basically the same, which J. al-Amin concurred. She added that we have no experience with this model and asked how the model is being modified to reflect the changing process with the crisis.

J. al-Amin stated that the reality is that if the State reduces, then the amount comes from the budgets to counter it. The reductions are in proportion to the model.

D. Eberhardy doesn't feel the model addresses the crisis. J. al-Amin stated that the Program Review is the catastrophic model and added that we have cut from staff at this point and next is programs. He spoke about the Mission and the new focus and said we need to support the programs that meet those drivers. The Board told the President that no more classified staff can be cut and that programs are next. He added that no program is off the table and that we have to sit down and review each one in order to find a program mix consistent with this.

A. Valle talked about considering addressing revenue because we are only talking about reductions. J. al-Amin spoke about how we make the revenue shortfall and stated that it has to be done because we don't have the revenue. He added that we haven't had a mid-year reduction in two years and said that we should put in a bullet point in the vent there is a mid-year reduction.

- Page 12 – Integration of the Budget Development Process.

C. Inouye recommended "Other Support Services" be added to make it more generic.

- Page 13 – Review of the Calendar process.  
September – October 2011, November –  
December 2011, January 13, 2012 – March 31,  
2012 and April 1, 2012 – May 15, 2012.

J. al-Amin stated that the third and final draft will be ready at the May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting to review and finalize. He added that this is an accreditation requirement that has to be completed by the end of the year.

V. Mission Review Process  
and Finalization

I

J. al-Amin reviewed the Proposed Mission Review Process 1 through 10.

1. The College will review the Mission Statement every five years.
2. The review will be no later than October and concluded no later than January of the same academic year.
3. This is consistent with what we did this year.
4. This is consistent with what we did this year.
5. Recommended that this Mission be addressed by the College President, which is consistent with what was done this year. The statement was amended to read (2) faculty members from Student Services and (1) classified member from Student Services. Another change was to read Academic Senate President or designee.
6. Consistent with what we did this year.
7. Do not want this extended out from January to April or May. Input is needed from the college community within a month. R. Cabral stated that the moment PBC initiates an approval to the President; the President has to schedule a meeting with Chancellor's Council so it can go on the agenda. An amendment to the first part of the paragraph was changed to "After the *preliminary* review..."
8. Consistent with what we did this year.
9. Consistent with what we did this year.
10. Consistent with what we did this year.

A motion to accept the Mission Review Process as presented with the given refinements was approved by A. Valle and seconded by A. Cawelti, and *the motion carried unanimously.*

VI. Informational Item:  
Accreditation

No Update

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

VIII. Future PBC Meetings

- May 4, 2011