PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES
September 4, 2013

Approved September 18, 2013

Members Present: Claudette Dain, Jamail Carter, Greg Ryan, Dan Tesar, Samuel Foster, Rolando Sanabria, Bev Pipkin, Chrystal Van Beynen, and Alex Trigueros.

Members Absent: None.


The meeting commenced at 2:05 pm.

I. Welcome/Introductions: With this being the first meeting of the Fall 2013 semester and new members present, Claudette introduced herself and then asked those present to introduce themselves.

II. Review/Discussion of Committee Guidelines: Claudette introduced Jamail Carter, the new co-chair for the PBSC. Jamail was hired this summer as the new Director of Institutional Research and Planning. With Sandy March retiring in October 2013, it was also announced that Cyndi Grein, Bursar Manager, has been added to the PBSC as a resource member and Melisa Hunt will now be taking and typing the minutes effective today.

Claudette asked that members review the PBSC Mission, Purpose and Guidelines approved by the PAC on 3-13-13. No formal action is to be taken; however, if there are any items that the members would like to be discussed, please request those items to be added to next month’s agenda.

III. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the May 15, 2013 meeting were approved as read, by the original members present, including: Rolando, Sam, Greg, and Bev.

IV. Meeting Schedule: The 2013-14 Meeting Schedule was distributed and approved.

V. Budget and Planning Calendar: The Budget and Planning Calendar handout is an excerpt from the recently distributed Integrated Planning Manual. This calendar was discussed at the Planning Retreat. In some areas, we are where we should be, but in others we have fallen behind. Toni stated that we need to get on track or change the calendar.
Claudette stated that the calendar may need some revisions as the Program Review Cycle has changed. We are doing things differently, and we need to make updates accordingly. As for the budget column, we are on track for August and September.

Jamail said he is open to questions and comments from the members concerning the calendar. Items listed are elements in planning and should be considered. It was reported that Ken Meehan, former Director of Institutional Research and Planning (DIRP), originally created the calendar. One of the President’s Circle’s goals was to raise $30-50K per year for the Foundation. Since those funds never materialized, the college does not have to make decisions regarding the use of those funds, so this column should be removed from the calendar. As for the full-time faculty hiring piece, this follows a cyclical calendar and is more in line with what falls under PAC.

Historically, this calendar has been used through all processes, and the committee was waiting for the permanent DIRP to take office so that we could revisit the calendar and make adjustments as needed. Jamail thought some items related to planning and budget were not found on the calendar. He is in agreement that this item should be revisited as an agenda item and discussed at a future meeting. Dan Tesar agreed and said he would like to brainstorm on other items.

**VI. 2012-13 Year End Financial Information:** Claudette distributed the handout entitled “Analysis of Ending Fund Balances dated June 30, 2013. The Board is expected to approve this recap of FY 2012-2013, included as part of the 2013-14 Proposed Budget document, at the next board meeting on September 10, 2013, so this is still a draft at this time although no changes are expected. The District’s ending fund balance is $46,483,331.71. There are four budget centers listed: 1) District Service and IS, 2) Cypress College, 3) Fullerton College, and 4) SCE. Fullerton College’s ending fund balance, including restricted funds, is $10,992,180.11.

The next handout Claudette discussed is the narrative entitled “Fullerton College Campus Carryover”. It notes Fullerton College’s beginning balance of $8,082,780, with a remaining balance of $2,837,833, after known commitments at this time. Our carryover did increase from last year. Since we didn’t expect Proposition 30 to pass, the budget centers were preparing for large one-time and ongoing cuts, but since it did pass in November 2012, the cuts did not materialize to the extent that we had planned. The budget centers had to come up with a narrative to explain why the carryover increased and what the plan is to do with it. Claudette discussed the individual line items on the Carryover handout.

Carryover monies are tracked to ensure we don’t spend the same monies twice. Claudette pointed out that the remaining balance of $2,837,833, provides an opportunity this year for PBSC to make a recommendation to allocate one-time funds to address some of the needs that we have deferred over the last several years due to the budget crisis. Claudette discussed that this money can be used, for example, to allocate funds for safety purposes, as related to emergency preparedness and tying back to the analysis conducted after the active shooter drill. As the campus participates in safety drills, we continue to identify needs and priorities, and some require purchases we may want to invest in. It was also noted that this item specifically relates to our Accreditation Self-Study Planning Agenda Item #4.
VII. 2013-14 Budget Information: The FTES Targets – 2013-14 Proposed Budget Assumptions as of August 28, 2013 is a draft, pending board approval. The district began putting it together in the January/February timeframe and as we received more information from the state, May revise, etc., the items change to reflect the best information we have about the budget situation. After Board approval on Tuesday, September 10, any changes to the budget will be taken back to the Board as either budget transfers or budget augmentations.

On page 1, our 2013-14 FTES Target is 17,187.09. (There is no non-resident FTES included in this target.) The total district-wide target of 33,724.17 incorporates a 2% increase over the prior year target and estimates that 2.97% of total FTES will be unfunded.

In February 2014, we will know the 2012-13 funding, but on Page 7, this is our best guess for funding (see Section B – FTES Workload Measure Assumptions). For 2012-13, actual FTES is 32,542, and 32,225 is expected to be funded although we won’t know our final funding for 2012-13 until February 2014. This results in approximately 317 FTES; 0.98% unfunded.

On Page 7, Section C, the District’s 13/14 Apportionment Base is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grant (based on the size of the campuses)</td>
<td>$9,003,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One FTES=$4,565</td>
<td>122,592,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit FTES=$2,745</td>
<td>7,386,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCP @ $3,232</td>
<td>10,355,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13 Base Funding (excludes est. deficit)</td>
<td>149,338,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA of 1.57%</td>
<td>2,344,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Deficit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151,683,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The narrative on Page 7 (Appropriations and Expenditures) explains the ongoing expenditure assumptions for 13/14.

Full-Time Faculty Obligation (FON) - The District thinks they found an error in the State’s FON calculation. As of Fall 2013, the District believes our FON to be 486. However, the State Chancellor’s Office calculation reflects a FON of 491.8. Thus, we believe we are 6 positions over our obligation but the State’s calculation puts us at 6 positions under our calculation. The district will continue to work on this discrepancy with the State Chancellor’s Office.

Page 4 of the handout “Allocation Model for 2013-14 Proposed Budget Assumptions” reflects our Operating Allocation of $5,365,636, which includes our share of the district-wide $3.5 million in cuts ($1.4 million), and our Extended Day Allocation of $8,552,729. Related to the $1.4 million structural deficit, we anticipated these reductions and we already cut our internal cash allocations so we will not need to make additional reductions to make our $1.4 million cut.

VIII. PE Program Review: A question arose as a result of an approval to fund an instructional program review funding request from the PE department. The issue was that they used the term “software” in their program review when they intended to purchase “technology” because they wanted to purchase software and hardware. Since PBSC has stipulated that awarded funds are only to be used for the
specific resource request stated, PBSC is asked to consider this purchase to determine if the awarded funds may be used to purchase both hardware and software. Discussion ensued and then the members voted unanimously to allow the purchase of cameras, in addition to software, with PE's remaining awarded funds.

**IX. Institutional Self-Study:** Jamail presented the Institutional Research Committee Evaluation Form whereby the chair, Diana Kyle, is requesting the PBSC to take part in their survey, which is due in October 2013. In an effort to review the effectiveness of PBSC, we have been asked to conduct a self-study of the processes used by our group using the form provided. This was just a discussion item at this time. Jamail recommended that PBSC, as a group, go through the survey at a future meeting so that we will be prepared to respond by October.

**X. Other/General Discussion:** Jamail distributed an evaluation form that he is recommending the committee consider filling out at the conclusion of each PBSC meeting. The form will then be used to assess how the group is doing by collecting data that is not just anecdotal.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Minutes taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: September 18, 2013.