



PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL (PBC) MEETING MINUTES

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

Absent:

Guests: Marji Price, Gail Warner, Carmen Guerrero, Cynthia Herrera, Andres Orozco, Christina Tafoya, Linda Kamalia, Jose Ortega, Leon Sanchez, Edgar Vallejo, John Rees, Ronald Duran, Ramiro Avila, Carlos Chavez, Andrea Baltazar, Arturo Reyes, Gene Silva, Juan Smith, Armando Naja, George Ortega

Meeting Date: **12/07/11** Minutes Approved: **11/16/11** 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 2:10 p.m. |
| II. Public Comment | I | Public Comments regarding program discontinuance were made by Carlos Gonzalez, Ronnie Duran, Ramiro Avila, Andrea Baltazar, Arturo Reyes, Gene Silva, Juan Smith, Armando Naja, George Ortega, and Andres Orozco. |
| III. Approval of Meeting Minutes | I,AT | The meeting minutes of November 2, 2011 were reviewed by the council. J. Redding moved to approve the meeting minutes with refinements, T. O'Neil seconded and <i>the motion was accepted with one abstention.</i> |
| IV. Program Discontinuance Recommendations | I | R. Cabral began the meeting by thanking the members for their diligence and professionalism as they deal with their role as a PBC professional. He added that this has been a learning process for all of us because we have not had a practice run of going through a program discontinuance discussion. He stated that once we have concluded this process he would like to collectively come back as a campus and identify the areas that worked well and those that got away. T. O'Neil added to that by stating that we have to learn from this process and evaluate what we wished we had known and now feels |

he has a better idea of the type of data he wished he'd had to assist in this process. A. Lynch also made a statement by thanking all of the students and speakers who took the time out to share their thoughts and feelings about the importance of these programs.

- I J. al-Amin spoke about the time frame given today to come up with the recommendations and it was decided that we would try to conclude the meeting by 4:30 p.m.
- I J. al-Amin stated there was a lot of information provided by Sue Johnson, Dr. Duran and himself at the budget forum. He added that the numbers are not changing in a positive direction and are getting worse, and this is not the first time we will be having these discussions and will probably be doing this next year at the same time. He added that we may not like the task that is forced on us and we have to deliberate and work through it because we won't have very many revenue options. He stated that our enrollment target is 4600 FTES; we are at about 4867 so we have an FTES target reduction of roughly 250 FTES. He added that given the disciplines on the list and their # of FTES, we have the flexibility not to recommend all of the programs for discontinuance, but we do need to put them in some sort of order for the ones we do recommend and we may have a parameter which will allow us to keep a program but we still have to meet a dollar target amount though which will be a result of contractual obligations. J. al-Amin stated that we have to proceed with the \$2.3 million target of which about half of is proposed for instruction and the other is operating costs (i.e. athletics, service and staff reductions) to make up the difference and if at the end of the day we come up with other programs or options for reductions, we can then have that opportunity to make that recommendation and have the dialogue.
- I J. al-Amin stated that the sheet provided is the cost for all instructional programs which will give a basis for beginning the discussion and dialogue and how we wish to move forward. He addressed the other sheet handed out and stated it was a ranking sheet that he and R. Cabral put together to try and figure out how to best continue with this process. He recommended that rather than voting up and down, have a discussion on where to place the programs however the committee feels appropriate, go through the programs and rank them. He added that Music and Ceramics are not on the list because they are a discipline, not a program and that these are all certificate or degree programs.

- I A. Valle asked if PBC members need to agree on this ranking process first. J. al-Amin responded that yes, we need to get feedback from the committee on how we want to proceed because we've been given a charge to come up with the recommendations. He added that the reduction target should focus on what we can do here and if there are comments on reserves we can discuss, act upon or recommend. In terms of the whole campus, there are other reductions proposed to the college, but this is phase one and this will impact phase two.
- I R. Cabral wanted clarification from J. al-Amin and stated that the District is anticipating a possible reduction of \$11-13 million and regardless of a larger budget deficit our campus will be looking at 2.3 million as of the current data vs. the original \$2.5 million and because of FTES concern, we are looking at a possible lower program reduction and a larger portion going towards non program costs on campus? He added that when we first started in August we were looking at 2.3 million in cuts and now we are looking at 1.5 in program cuts which means less cutting programs and more cutting offerings? J. al-Amin responded that yes it could be a result but at this point everything is more proportional.
- I A. Valle made a motion to not follow the ranking process presented by the co-chairs, stating that she can't rank the programs recommended based on the insufficient data provided. R. Smith seconded her motion.
- I R. Cabral stated that the motion on the table is unclear. The proposed process is to create a ranking sheet to allow PBC members to identify their level of recommendation. J. Merrill responded that this is a recommendation made by the co-chairs, not by PBC members.
- I,AT R. Cabral clarified A. Valle's motion and restated that the motion is not to accept the program ranking sheet provided, motion was carried and was accepted.
- I A. Hayashi made a motion to accept "The PBC Recommendation Regarding Program Reductions & Discontinuance for 2012-2013" which provided 16 considering items and 3 recommendations which were:
 - 1. The Planning and Budget Council recommends that Athletics and Television Production/OCTV be considered as part of the instruction component of the college and as such be considered within the

academic program reductions and discontinuances; *and*

2. Since additional reductions to the instructional portion of the College would be disabling to the College, its funding allocation, its mission, and its service to its constituents and community, the Planning and Budget Council recommend all instructional section cuts, program reductions, and program discontinuances be removed from consideration; *and*
3. The Oxnard College position be that the instructional portion of the 2012-2013 budget deficit at Oxnard College would be covered by the remaining closing balance of the Unallocated-Committed Reserves in the 2011-12 Adopted Budget (projected to be about \$3,000,000). PBC reiterates that the amount of the Unallocated-Committed Reserves in the 2011-12 Adopted Budget used will be no more than the amount of the College cuts associated with the savings for the instructional-based programs.

I,AN There was some confusion amongst some of the members to the recommendations that A. Hayashi proposed, so R. Cabral stated how he and other members understood the 3 recommendations:

1. Recommend Athletics and OCTV for program discontinuance.
2. No additional instructional reductions to the campus.
3. Have PBC recommend to the President to have the District consider the unallocated committed reserves to cover the reduction amount for OC.

A. Hayashi responded that recommendation #1 was to be interpreted that OCTV and Athletics be considered as part of the instruction component. E. Endrijonas also provided some clarifications as to how she understands the 3 recommendations should read; (1) athletics and OCTV moved into an instructional category to “protect” them, (2) additional reductions meaning “beyond those already made in 2011-2012” come from non-instructional and district reserves rather than out of instruction.

I,AT Due to the need for more clarification and understanding of the motion for the 3 recommendations, the following amendments were made to the 3 recommendations for clarity:

- Amendment to Recommendation #1:
*remove “s” from reductions to read “reduction”.
*remove “s” from discontinuances to read “discontinuance”.
*add “process” after the word “discontinuance”.
- Amendment to Recommendation #2:
*add “beyond those made in 2011-2012” after the word “reductions”.

I D. Eberhardy, J. Redding and A. Valle expressed concern regarding the lack of data received in order to make the appropriate recommendation and A. Valle stated that as far as analysis and assessment of the process, at the beginning the committee struggled with it because we didn’t know what we wanted and decided as we moved along as far as the impact to student, FTES, etc.. and we also felt in the initial discussion that it was in the purview of PEPC to get the data. She also stated that hopefully when we do the assessment later and look at the AP4021, we can come up with something for the future but as of now, we are still missing the elements.

I K. Engelsen stated that the way she understands Recommendation #3 is that the unallocated reserves would cover instruction so the remainder of the cuts would come from non-instruction. J. al-Amin responded as he stated earlier, if there is no action on the instructional portion it will come to non-instruction, which could be the consequence of the motion.

I,AT D. Inda read the recommendations with amendments. A. Valle restated the motion with amendments and R. Cabral asked with the motion on the table for a show of hands all in favor with refinements and the motion carried 9 in favor, 6 against, and 1 abstention.

V. Informational Item:
Accreditation

I No update

Other: Open Discussion

I A. Valle commented since our role as PBC is related to planning and budgeting, she would like to discuss planning in terms of PEPC, board objectives, dealing with the cuts, start planning and not be reactive.

- I C. Inouye stated that this is a very difficult process and she appreciates the work that went into this but regarding the last motion she feels it was written in such a way that pitted sides. She added that we were focusing on program reductions and the way the motion came down in the end left a lot of “unknowns” that if this motion were to happen, Student Services would take the weight of it. She felt this motion made it really black and white and didn’t bring the committee to focus on what we are talking about. A. Valle responded to C. Inouye’s comment stating that we were told Student Services was off the table.
- I R. Cabral stated one of the difficulties is this committee was given marching orders there were a lot of issues that everyone had regarding the program discontinuance process. He added that the committee wanted a bigger sense of the full pie and that it was very difficult to place members to that type of decision making.
- I A. Valle stated we still have to do further evaluations and doesn’t want anyone to think she didn’t follow her responsibilities. She added that we need to look at the AP bulletin, PEPC process, and be proactive. She added that this is a valuable lesson to take back to PEPC. R. Cabral responded that one of the comments from PEPC regarding this process was that they felt it shouldn’t be in the hands of PBC and it should be in PEPC. He added that if we are in a cycle where we have to look at this process again, we have to make sure we agree on data elements and agree to use those and make some sort of decision criteria on how we are moving on campus.
- I T. O’Neil asked if the committee could have operated more effectively if they weren’t given a list up front and A. Valle responded that this committee has done that before where they were all in a room, came up with recommendations, and left with the decisions of who and the ultimate what.
- I T. O’Neil stated that we keep talking about program cuts but wanted to know if downsizing was an option because if a program leaves, it won’t come back. J. al-Amin responded that those were one of the options we could have considered and although the one offered was a recommendation, it is not a viable one. He added that we have not done what we needed to do and have now placed it in the hands of someone else to make the

decision.

- I J. Redding stated that we need a better understanding of the ramifications of cutting in terms of the allocation model and no one seems to be calculating the figures. She added that the reason we are going down is because of what we have done before and we need to play ball like the other two campuses.

I. Adjournment

- I The meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

I. Future PBC Meetings

- I R. Cabral stated that our next session on December 7th will be held here in CSSC-101.

- I
 - o December 7, 2011
 - o January 18, 2012
 - o February 1, 2012
 - o February 15, 2012
 - o March 7, 2012
 - o March 21, 2012
 - o April 4, 2012
 - o April 18, 2012
 - o May 2, 2012