



## PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

### Summary Meeting Notes

March 5, 2014

Approved March 19, 2014

**Members Present:** Co-chairs: Richard Storti; **Management Reps:** Greg Ryan, Dan Tesar; **Faculty Reps:** Samuel Foster; **Classified Reps:** Bev Pipkin, and **Student Reps:** Jose Solano.

**Members Absent:** Jamail Carter, Rolando Sanabria, Alex Trigueros, and Chrystal Van Beynen.

**Resource Members Present:** Terry Cox, Toni DuBois, Cyndi Grein, and Melisa Hunt.

The meeting commenced at 2:07 pm.

**1. Approval of Meeting Notes:** The minutes from the February 19, 2014 meeting were approved.

**2. Program Review Resource Funding Allocation - Update:** The PBSC's 2012-13 Non-instructional Program Review Resource Funding – Second Distribution Recommendation to PAC totaling \$46,550 was approved by PAC on February 26, 2014.

**3. Planning and Budget:** Richard distributed a PowerPoint handout of the District's FY 2014-15 Preliminary Budget Assumptions dated February 25, 2014. He shared the news that last year we projected a \$4M deficit, however, the deficit was reduced by \$3.6M resulting in an increase in one-time funds in FY 2013-14. Also, since the District exceeded the FTES State Target, we were funded an additional 137.37 FTES.

**4. Budget Update:** Instructional Equipment – The preliminary 14/15 State budget includes a Block Grant for Instructional Equipment of \$87.5 million system-wide. Richard requested the committee to explore allocation ideas which would utilize future funding in a manner that addresses campus needs.

Discussion ensued with the following methods suggested by PBSC members:

1. Tiered method whereby ACT (Academic Computing Technology Dept.) has a flat dollar amount off the top and then remaining funds allocated based on discussions at Dean's Council where the Deans decide amongst themselves or by another second-level method.
2. Solicit requests based on IE needs and then prioritize them by critical needs and those needs that provide the most benefit to students.
3. Since the campus is placing importance on Planning and Program Review, distribute IE funds based on the IE needs listed in the College's Program Review Reports.
4. Formula-based method based on FTEF (Full-time Equivalent Faculty) other than FTES of a Division, however there would be a concern how to quantify high-cost equipment.
5. Three-tiered: ACT, Program Review, Dean's discussions.
6. If we take a percentage off the top, we can easily spend money on infrastructure. But if we allocate and ignore PR, then we may be missing some major needs.
7. Our technology is out-of-date and we need money to upgrade as technology changes. A suggestion was made that 10% of carryover go to technology infrastructure. Can the College make a commitment to use carryover for technology planning?

Concerns were raised in regards to basing IE allocation on PR, and the PBSC should be mindful and cautious:

1. We need to be cautious of the needs listed in Program Review because it is a wish list. These items were approved by the Program Review Committee.
2. Due to the PR cycles, the needs listed may be outdated, and a suggestion was made to have a portion of funds designated as supplemental or new needs.
3. Modify the PR Template to insert a line item for IE and include the definition.

It was suggested that whatever the method be to allocate IE funds, general guidelines should be developed that outline the definition of IE and what the funds can and cannot be used for. Members agreed to bring additional information / ideas to the meeting on March 19, 2014.

**5. Other/General Discussion:** What is the future of this committee as far as planning? Richard asked the committee to brainstorm and bring back ideas from other colleges and your own to our next meeting. Sam stated that he has spoken to a number of Faculty Senate Presidents who have responded that their college doesn't use PR. Toni suggested speaking with the RP Group as they are experts in Planning and hire one as a Prof. Expert to evaluate the College's processes. Dan stated that due to accreditation, planning and budget is tied together and this committee can't be responsible for college planning, so he suggested having bi-annual planning retreats resulting in a written report that is provided to the PBSC to help us in our work.

Meeting adjourned at 3:23 pm.

Meeting Notes taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: March 19, 2014.