



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes April 5, 2017

APPROVED April 19, 2017

Members Present: Co-Chair: Rod Garcia, Carlos Ayon; **Management Reps:** Cyndi Grein, Rich Hartmann; **Faculty Reps:** Josh Ashenmiller, Pete Snyder; **Classified Reps:** Summer Marquardt, Bev Pipkin; **Resource Members:** Melisa Hunt, Catalina Olmedo; **Members Absent: Student Rep:** Niko Diehr.

The meeting commenced at 2:07 p.m.

I. Approval of Summary Meeting Notes: The March 1, 2017 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved.

II. Planning Update: Co-Chair Carlos Ayon distributed a first draft of the revised Mission Statement resulting from the combined efforts of the Mission Statement Workgroup. The first side of the two-sided handout identifies the proposed revisions to the Mission, Vision, and Values, and the second side lists the Mission Statement Timeline. The workgroup plans to host two campus open forums scheduled on Monday, May 8, 2017 from 5-7 pm in rooms 224/226 and Friday, May 12, 2017 from 10 am – 12 pm in rooms 224/226. The workgroup is asking for feedback by visiting the link: bit.ly/FCMissionFeedback. Carlos stated that the four components of ACCJC have been included in the revision. Once the mission statement has been approved by Faculty Senate and PAC, the new mission will be incorporated to update the goals in the strategic plan.

IEPI PRT Visit: The PRT team visited Fullerton College on Monday, April 3, 2017 and met with various groups to identify areas for improvement prior to the ACCJC visit scheduled in fall 2017. The team took notes on our institutional effectiveness, college-level planning, and structure. One important question asked was, “Does the self-evaluation reflect the new or old mission statement?” The team is scheduled to return to the college to present a menu of options for campus improvements on Friday, May 19, 2017.

III. Budget Update: Co-chair Rod Garcia reported there are no budget updates at this time, and there will not be any news from the Chancellor’s office until the May Revise. Rod stated we are approaching a crucial time with the P₂ report due April 15, 2017. The college was over 400 FTES below our target, and at census it fell an additional 200, resulting in over 600 FTES below our target. The campus is funded at P₂ and not at EOY (End of Year). We may go into “stability funding” and continue with the same level of funding as last year, which would also keep us at the same base with no growth funding for one year.

A new “Push-out Funding Model” will be discussed at the next District Council on Budget and Facilities meeting (CBF) that is based on Chancellor Marshall’s request to look at different ways to allocate the remaining budget to the campuses after the portion of salaries and benefits expenses have been paid. This model is not being proposed at this point in time, but discussions are taking place at various levels to analyze the results of allocating funding to the campuses that generate the revenue. Another component is that District Services will be charged back. Vice Chancellor Fred Williams may provide a draft outlining what it would look like if we implemented a modified version of this model. If a proposed model is ever approved, it would be implemented over a 4-5 year period because it will have a huge financial impact for Cypress College. With declining FTES and a \$5M deficit, Cypress College would be responsible for \$4M of the deficit. The District conducted research and found other college districts have incorporated similar forms of this model. These districts reported that district expenditures account for 10-13% while the proposed NOCCCD push-out model identified only 5-6% of total expenses at our District, which means our district is lean compared to other districts.

Rod reported that the Enrollment Management Committee is looking into funding options if enrollment continues to decline. For years, FC had been short-sighted with the prior extended day model. FC always overspent the budget with too much reassigned time as the model is based on a 32-seat count when realistically that is not the average class size. In the model, one seat converts to \$1M in funding. The “push-out” model hopes to bring more efficiency and accountability where ownership is on the campus. One big concern with this model is that union contract negotiations (such as salaries) cannot be made at the campus level where most other financial decisions would be made. Josh Ashenmiller stated that VC Williams said we currently do not know the cost/unit or cost/class, but this model disentangles costs so that we can make a determination and be efficient. Rod stated the District currently pays utilities and that may be another area of contention.

The updated prioritized list for Facilities Bond Projects is as follows:

1. Instructional Building (Referred to as Humanities Building)
2. 300/500 Building Renovation
3. Centennial Parking Structure
4. M&O Building

The new Instructional Building was moved to the top in order to provide necessary swing space for the 300/500 building displacements. Sherbeck Field has been removed from the current EIR Study and is now under its own separate study so that the bond projects may move forward. Since the City of Fullerton and Historical Society found the Chapman-Newell properties to have historical significance, the College is unable to demolish and rebuild, but the properties may be purchased and moved to another site.

The tentative budget assumed an on-schedule COLA that has remained intact thus far, but if it is not approved, the District is compensating each employee with \$1,250.

IV. Update on Non-IE Approved Funding (FY 16-17 to FY 18-19) for the Humanities and Natural Sciences Divisions: Rich Hartmann requested to table this item for the next meeting so that he can compile the progress reports on the outcomes of the programs who were awarded the first-year funding allocation. Humanities and Natural Sciences were approved for three years of program funding on the basis that each year they would provide a progress report to the Planning & Budget Steering Committee. Based on the PBSC's assessment of the findings, a vote would be taken in order to approve funding for the next year.

V. A.S. Resolution – Sherbeck Field: Niko was absent from the meeting; the item was tabled.

VI. Other/General Discussion: Rod reported that on March 28, 2017, PAC approved and President Schulz accepted the PBSC's recommendation to allocate FY 16-17 Instructional Equipment funding in the amount of \$506,336 for thirty-four (34) instructional equipment resource requests.

Meeting adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

Meeting Notes were taken and typed by Melisa Hunt

Next Meeting: April 19, 2017