



## PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

**Present:** Robert Cabral (*co-chair*), Tom O'Neil, Alex Lynch, Ralph Smith, Diane Eberhardy, Elizabeth Rangel (ASG Student Rep), Ana Maria Valle, Alan Hayashi, Ishita Edwards, Carolyn Inouye, Jeanette Redding, Lisa Hopper, Karen Engelsen, Erika Endrijonas (*ex-officio*), Linda Robison, Jeff Hiben

**Absent:** John al-Amin, Leo Orange, Jim Merrill

**Guests:** Andrea Balazar, John Rees, Bill Marley, Cruz Robles, Leon Sanchez, Sergio Alcaraz, Arcelia Martinez, Jose Ortega, Ricardo Romero, Ramon Bravo, Juan Smith, Paul Olivares, Johnathon Portillo, Rev. Jim Gilmar, Carlos Gonzalez, Carmen Guerrero, Andres Orozco

---

Meeting Date: **11/02/11**      Minutes Approved: **10/19/11**      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 2:06pm  |
| II. Approval of Minutes                                  | I,AT | The council reviewed the meeting minutes of October 5, 2011. A. Lynch stated that in his comments regarding program discontinuance, he was referencing one specific program, Auto Body in relation to program discontinuance. R. Cabral stated that he received proxy from Leo Orange and Jim Merrill. A. Valle moved to approve the meeting minutes with refinements, T. O'Neil seconded and <i>the motion carried unanimously.</i> |
| Public Comment   | I    | Public comments regarding program discontinuance were made by Andrea Balazar, George Ortega, John Rees, Bill Marley, Sergio Alcaraz, Carlos Gonzalez, Andres Orozco, Paul Olivares, Juan Smith, Johnathon Portillo, and Rev. Jim Gilmar.   |
| III. Analysis & Follow-up of Program Discontinuance Data | I    | A. Valle stated that when she was looking at the data she went to the EMP to compare the numbers and noticed inconsistencies. She spoke about Fall 2007 – related to accounting and gender and said that the data didn't match the EMP. L. Hopper responded that the student data refers to is unduplicated students, but she will double-check on the sections because this could be due to cross-listings.                         |

- I A. Lynch referred to the Program Cost Summary and wanted to know where the “Other Funding” numbers were coming from. E. Endrijonas stated that J. al-Amin created the spreadsheet so she is unsure but that it may be coming from Perkins. C. Guerrero spoke that the numbers she was looking at were significantly different from what was on the spreadsheet.
- I R. Cabral stated that one of the goals for today’s meeting is to put together a list of questions and concerns regarding the data elements. Unfortunately, since J. al-Amin is not present, he is not able to answer the questions but the list will be given to him.
- I T. O’Neil asked about what was included in the total cost of the program and if it was General Fund only. R. Cabral stated that when the District is looking for reductions, it is General Fund only. He added that J. al-Amin spoke about Total Cost of Ownership but that he wasn’t sure if that was included in these numbers.
- I The issue of Perkins dollars included in the program cost came up and R. Cabral asked how it’s allocated in? E. Endrijonas stated that Perkins is utilized for improvement and any CTE programs have to present the project or what they are going to improve before it’s approved but that it’s not forever and needs to be backed out of the allocation. She stated that Perkins is based on the number of disadvantaged students we serve and it also depends on what happens at the end of the year. She also added that IELM money is unplanned and that we never know how much we have because the amount has gone down every year. She stated that we have utilized the funds every year rather than saving them and that these funds are usually utilized to cover supplies.
- I In regards to the Program Cost Summary form, A. Lynch recommended adding another column for “Non-General Fund funding”.
- I,AN J. Redding asked for an analysis on how the data is analyzed to come up with these decisions. She wants a narrative explanation to be written by the people who reviewed the data as to why a program is being eliminated.
- I R. Cabral asked about the \$150K amount for OCTV/Television and E. Endrijonas responded that as the PAB was being finished, the TV studio was not originally part of the plan and so in order for OCTV’s

space to be fully functional there was additional equipment that needed to be purchased which was not factored into the FFE. I. Edwards questioned whether the Television program could exist without OCTV, or if it was necessary for the two to be together because she feels this is pertinent to the cost of the television program/OCTV issue. E. Endrijonas responded that that OCTV is a separate entity and that the information should appear separately within the data. She added that although it was possible for the television program to exist without the practical applications of OCTV, the television program was more useful with a practical outlet such as OCTV.

- I,AN A. Hayashi stated that assuming the analysis is based upon data where these 8 programs that are at the top of the list, his concern then is if this is a zero sum game, somewhere along the way a decision was made after analysis on all programs where it showed that these should be at the top, but if our options are a zero sum game then he would like to see analysis from the decision makers that isn't just focused on these eight but provided for all programs because if our choice is to "take this keep this", we need the analysis on what is recommended to replace.
- I,AN I. Edwards requested an explanation as to why Oxnard College programs with the highest number of majors such as the Business programs (Accounting, Business Administration, Business Management, and Business-Genera), had been included in the list of programs for discontinuation.
- I,AN As a follow-up to A. Hayashi's comment and request, A. Lynch wants to know why 88% of the recommended cuts are coming from CTE. He would like an explanation and rationale.
- I,AN A. Valle stated that she would like to see an analysis on the gender and ethnicity impact these cuts will affect. Additionally, she would like to see what the impact on Financial Aid, EAC and EOPS students would be.
- I,AN T. O'neil asked what the District's proposed mandated cuts were and how much it will save.
- I I. Edwards questioned when the four criteria discontinuance was decided on, why it wasn't chosen from the list on the AP4021. E. Endrijonas responded that the AP4021 was not in this format at that time.

- I A. Hayashi expressed concern that the percentage of cuts based on FTES is inappropriate for Oxnard College. He provided an analogy of how one would provide food to three individuals of different sizes and stated that if there's a budget cut you can't decide who gets to eat and who doesn't because of how big or small they are. He added that at this point we need leadership and the fortitude to be able to turn to the Board and say that cuts in academic programs cannot come from Oxnard College. He spoke about OC's % going down vs. Ventura and Moorpark and that it's going from 614 CRN's to 555, losing 61 course offerings between Spring 2011 to Spring 2012 which is a 10% drop in CRN's. If our numbers that drop are not even close to the numbers that drop at other colleges, OC will lose money for the allocation distribution next year. He feels that the District needs to look at it differently because when looking at the cuts by MC and VC – they are the fluff cuts OC made five years ago. He stated that he's not saying the allocation model needs to change but that we need to work with it and at a certain point we need to say there just isn't room to make cuts.
- I R. Cabral asked A. Hayashi to go over the analysis he put together and passed out to the council. A. Hayashi reviewed his handout and stated that his analysis was within the limitations of the Program Cost Summary. He took the allocation as if we made these cuts this year vs. next year as we don't have the budget. After going through his analysis, his data showed that the real savings by cutting the recommended programs is \$400K. (See attached copy of analysis) R. Cabral responded that we need to run the allocation model with the eight programs recommended and make sure it gets close to the \$1.6 million.
- I A. Hayashi asked what happens if we cut a program that a student hasn't completed yet, do they get the opportunity to complete that program? E. Endrijonas responded that the information regarding this is being gathered.
- I,AN R. Cabral stated that as a result of the council members' concerns regarding the data, the following questions will be presented to J. al-Amin and the President for clarification:
1. A narrative analysis and explanation of how data was used to identify the 8 programs considered

for discontinuation among other programs initially considered. Please also include your rationale for using the 4 criteria points for discontinuation.

2. Provide the general fund dollar cost per FTES (GF\$/FTES) of all campus programs.
3. Identify all mandated district cuts that are currently being planned.
4. Clarify the Program Summary report; for example, Auto Body indicates an “other fund” category of approximately \$65,000. The committee heard from the CTE dean the actual amount is closer to \$1,000. What constitutes “other fund” dollars?
5. Provide a rationale on why CTE programs represent 88% of the proposed program discontinuations.
6. Explain what impact discontinuing the proposed CTE programs will have on Perkins funding over the future fiscal academic years.
7. The Program Summary sheet does not clearly delineate general fund dollars versus other non-general fund dollars. Please include a column that identifies non-general fund dollars.
8. The Program Summary does not accurately match the program dollars as reported in banner. Please provide accurate and consistent program information that aligns what is being provided to PBC versus what the division managers are managed by.
9. Provide a separate a row in the Program Summary for TV and for OCTV.
10. Provide a student gender and ethnicity summary impact on those programs identified for discontinuation.
11. Provide a summary report on the impact to EOPS, Financial Aid, and EAC students for those programs considered for discontinuation.
12. Provide a “what if” scenario by applying the district allocation model using the proposed programs considered for discontinuation. What is the actual net change to the general fund?

- The council requested that the answers/clarification for the above questions be completed by November 2<sup>nd</sup> as the PBC members need time to review accurate data before making a final decision on the President's recommendation to eliminate the eight programs so targeted.

I The team will be here on October 31<sup>st</sup>. R. Cabral added that there is also an upcoming Budget forum that everyone will receive invites for.

AT The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 2, 2011</li> <li>○ November 16, 2011</li> <li>○ December 7, 2011</li> <li>○ January 18, 2012</li> <li>○ February 1, 2012</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ February 15, 2012</li> <li>○ March 7, 2012</li> <li>○ March 21, 2012</li> <li>○ April 4, 2012</li> <li>○ April 18, 2012</li> <li>○ May 2, 2012</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

October 19, 2011

To whom it may concern:

P.B.C. Committee

The state mandated mission for all California community colleges requires Oxnard College to offer a verity of programs and services in seven areas. Two of these directly relate to the auto body program. The first is economic development "programs and services, designed to meet the specific needs of business and industry in developing a trained workforce that can enhance the economic vitality of the community." The second is "community education, educational, cultural, recreational, and occupational programs that enrich the lives of area residents and provide opportunities for lifelong learning." The auto body program fits perfectly the state mandated mission in these two areas of economic development and community education.

The Ventura county community college district strategic planning vision statement "Board goal one," focuses on degree or certificate completion and successful four year college transfer **or employment**. The auto body program meets the employment goal. "Board goal two," maintain instructional quality within budgetary limits; focuses on degree/certificate completion includes benchmarks/objectives. Oxnard auto body program clearly fulfills benchmark/objective A. "technical and vocational college courses and programs are aligned with employer needs." "Board goal three" prudent fiscal stewardship, The College has received six million dollars for science and math programs, over one million dollars per year. This funding could possibly support ten new faculty hires teaching possibly fifty or more classes. Fine, but student enrollment increase would take years to slowly build in the science courses, while you eliminate vocational programs like auto body that are now in full enrollment and are low cost. It doesn't make sense! Please retain this excellent auto body program.

John David Rees, student

To whom it may concern:  
Subject: Auto Body Program

19 October 2011

In preparing for today's meeting I did a goggle search for automotive training opportunities in Ventura County and further refining it to auto body repair training. There are many located through out the state, none close, but for Ventura County we have two:

Oxnard College  
ROP Ventura County

The Oxnard Adult School sponsors the ROP Ventura County Auto Body Class for adults. It is a two-semester class comprised of Auto Body/Collision Repair and Auto Paint/Refinishing. It is limited to 25 students including high school students who have priority and the classes have been full.

Without the Oxnard College Auto Body classes there will be little if no opportunity for local residents to train for this vocation. A journeyman Auto Body or Paint Technicians can earn up to \$80000 annually in the Southern California job market.

We have a state of the art facility for auto body repair and paint here at Oxnard College that would be extremely difficult to duplicate at another location.

The Mission Statement for Oxnard College states that it promotes high quality teaching and learning that meet the needs of a diverse student population. As a multicultural, comprehensive institution of higher learning, Oxnard College works to empower and inspire students to succeed in their personal and educational goals and aspirations.

By eliminating the Auto Body Program we will disenfranchise a segment of our populace that needs this type of vocational training that will be unavailable for them in Ventura County.

Please help us to retain this valuable program at Oxnard College.

Yours sincerely,

William J. Marley



Assuming the same distribution of FTE5 --  
which is grossly optomistic when compared to  
next year's allocation

	2011-2012		2011-2012 (adjusted with the suggested program deductions)		
FTEF (including the Adjustment)	148		148		
less Full-Time Positions (FTEF)	68	\$8,842,903	60	\$7,802,903	less 8 FT at \$130,000 each
= Hourly FTEF	80	\$3,449,829	88	\$3,794,813	Hourly FTEF at \$43122.87 each
Total Class Schedule Delivery Allocation		\$12,292,732		\$11,597,716	the Program Teaching Savings for 8 FT and 4.5 PT is \$539,035.88 but the loss of FTEF allocation is \$695,016.00
Base Allocation		\$5,594,177		\$5,594,177	
FTES		4709		4709	
Percentage of the District FTES		17.77%		17.77%	NB: If the FTES drops more at OC than the other two, the percentage and the allocation will also drop.
FTES Allocation		\$6,127,224		\$6,127,224	
Total 2011-2012 Allocation		\$24,014,133		\$23,319,117	\$695,016 is the decrease in revenue

This indicates that the full-time costs are deducted from the Full-Time Positions (FTEF) which reflects in an equivalent increase in the Hourly FTEF. Since the Full-Time Positions (FTEF) are included in the allocation, their elimination lowers the F-T Position number but increases the Hourly FTEF. If the programs are eliminated, then the Hourly FTEF savings for 8 FT and 4.5 (est.) PT is \$539,035.88, because the FT amount is not gained or lost. But the difference in the Total Class Schedule Allocation is adjusted, and we receive back only 17.77% or about \$123,522 for a total increase of \$662,558.

So, if the College eliminates these programs, does not shift the sections (FTEF) to other areas [i.e.eliminates those section-units from the schedule], eliminates all staffing associated with those programs as well as their cost [and once again those dollars do not shift to other areas], the savings using the Program Costs Summary sheet would be the faculty savings (\$662,558), the other personnel/staffing costs (1720020-8\*130000-4.5\*43123= \$485,967), and the operating cost (\$9,910) or totalling \$1,158,435.

But keep in mind, our allocations will also be adjusted negatively by \$695,036 for a net savings of \$463,419. [and this does not take into account the percentage loss of FTES]