



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes October 19, 2016

APPROVED November 2, 2016

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

The meeting commenced at 2:02 p.m.

I. Approval of Summary Meeting Notes: The October 5, 2016 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved with minor corrections.

II. Planning Update: Carlos reported that a PAC workgroup is currently being organized to review the mission statement for Fullerton College. PAC approved the composition to be as follows: 2 managers, 2 deans, 2 faculty, 2 classifieds, and 2 students. There has been a flood of interest from faculty who would like to serve on the workgroup.

Carlos may ask the PBSC to review the Program Review Planning Calendar in February 2017 in order make changes to align it with the timing of when funding becomes available. The committee may also want to discuss what does funding look like with prioritized lists? When money is received in the fall, prioritized lists and the planning cycle need to be considered. Pete asked that we add the "college goal" for delivery of service to better analyze the SAOs (service area outcome) for students in the planning process

III. Budget Update: Rod distributed the 2017-18 System Budget Request approved by the Board of Governors (BOG) on September 19, 2016. He presented it at the PAC meeting on October 12, 2016. The top funding requests include a \$125M for 2% access/growth in FTES, \$100M for estimated 1% COLA, \$200M for a base funding increase to cover general operating expenses, \$100M for full-time faculty hiring, \$25M for part-time faculty compensation and health insurance programs, \$25M for Veterans Resource Centers for a total of almost \$800M in ongoing spending. Pete asked why there is growth at the Federal level and not in California. Josh stated that the difference is that the federal government has a COLA for Social Security at the national level.

The District earmarked funding to prepare for the STRS schedule increase to 2021, which is up to 19% PERS' increase is a little higher at 20-21% 1% is a huge liability for the District. Rod

stated he would bring the Audit Report to the next meeting for those that would like to view the figures and to discuss how it could affect our liability.

With costs increasing to run community colleges, the system budget is also asking for \$50M in technology funding, \$50M for campus safety needs, and \$25M to increase colleges' capacity to address core mental health needs of students. This budget request is a first draft and the College will receive updates from the District.

As for the state's proposed \$100M for F/T faculty hiring, this past year the District allocated \$1M in order to stabilize the state funding. The state created a 5-tiered system and we are in the highest tier where our FON is higher in proportion to other districts of the same size. So, our full-time faculty number grows slower and the state is trying to fix it. The District is one of the biggest advocates in support of reviewing this tiered system, and Dr. Marshall supports the effort. One fault with this system is that when it was originally setup, the state took data from one year in time and that became the benchmark.

As for the \$25M proposed for part-time faculty compensation and health, funding for health benefits hasn't changed in the past 8 years. Our District provides compensation and office hours, and Rod hopes the state will begin to augment the budget in future years.

If one-time funding is available in the state's 17-18 budget, then the system budget requests prioritizes the following needs: \$15M for the CA College Promise Innovation Grant Program, \$15M for Innovation in Education and an undefined amount for Deferred Maintenance and Instructional Equipment. Having an undefined amount us a concern that we may get significantly less than last year.

Pete asked how the District will fund the premiums for the new Lincoln Life Insurance policy, and Rod replied the expenses will be paid from the ongoing funds and apportionments from property tax and Prop 30 sales tax revenues. The Board is listening to those who asked for life insurance for all employees and health care insurance for dependents. The actual amount set aside for the life insurance premium in the 2016-17 proposed budget is \$150,000.00 or about \$1,250 per employee.

IV. Allocation of FY 16-17 Instructional Equipment (IE) Funds: This year, the College was allocated \$1M in one-time IE funds. Rod reported that he has not received a spreadsheet containing the prioritized list of IE funding requests from the Office of VPI. He spoke with Co Ho and Bob Morison in regards to the money allocated to ACT last year, and it was determined that the amount is sufficient and there is no need for additional IE funds this year and monies have been set aside for instructional computers to address computer replacement cycles.

Rod reported that there was an urgent need to replace the ovens and burners for the food program under the Natural Sciences Division, so \$9,500 in IE funds have already been spent.

Rich reported that the deans were to submit their updated funding requests and goals to Dr. Nunez. November 1st is the campus-wide due date for the Program Review Annual Update Form. Rich hopes a recommendation will be made by the PBSC before spring so expenses can

be identified while we still have time. He also proposed that the Program Review Cycles be changed to accommodate needs as they are time sensitive. He expressed that the decision-making team should make a recommendation to allocate funding by the start of the fall semester so money can be spent during the FY. Our program review funding needs and cycles are not ideal, and we should evaluate the processes and make some changes. Faculty has invested a lot of time in program review and wants it evaluated properly and in a timely manner.

Rod stated IE monies can be carried over and will remain allocated to IE. \$3M in Districtwide Technology Workforce funding may become available so we may not request to spend all of the IE funds. Rich asked if Richard Storti had an amount for computer replacement and Rod replied he planned to allocate \$500K. Pete asked about lottery money and Rod replied that lottery funds are for instructional materials and not instructional equipment. Lottery funds are separate and different money from IE.

Cyndi asked about scheduled maintenance needs, but Rod stated that is a separate pot of money. Each year, FC submits an updated 5-year Construction Plan and this year's 2016-2021 plan included the estimated scheduled maintenance plans and costs. FC used to allocate \$2M from carryover funds to be used for scheduled maintenance.

Rich asked where discretionary funds would come from for the divisions to spend on initiatives for tutoring and undergraduate research that were stated in the Program Review Self Studies. Rod said funding would have to come from carryover. Bev reminded the committee that if a funding request is endorsed by the Program Review Committee that means that the request was justified by a need and backed up by goals, but it does not mean the funding request is going to be funded.

Rich stated we have an open policy to share and communicate information with the faculty regarding operations and we should follow the program review guidelines. Deans' Council is not open and shared with faculty, but Program Review is and we are doing the right thing being transparent. Bev stated that the public wants to see the process and Rod reminded us that program review is new and it takes time.

Rod will schedule a meeting with Dr. Nunez to discuss IE needs.

V. Campus-wide Shredding Service: Rod reported that last year Fullerton College spent between \$3,000-4,000 campus-wide on shredding services. If the college decides to pay for campus-wide shredding services, once a funding source is identified for the campus charges at year-end, Rod will backfill the department/division budgets. It was decided that Rod will bring the list of departments who purchased shredding services last year to the next meeting and Rich will provide a list at the next meeting that identifies those interested in obtaining shredding services in their area so a decision can be made on whether to institutionalize this service.

VI. Amendment to \$100K Budget Augmentation Recommendation: Rich reported that at the last Deans Council meeting some deans wanted the \$100K divided equally amongst the twelve

deans while others wanted it left up to the deans to decide how to split the money. The PBSC discussed what the original intent was and Rod presented an amendment to the original recommendation approved at the PBSC meeting on October 5, 2016. The amendment read to replace the word “departments” with “divisions”.

Gil reported he has serious concerns that although this recommendation predates him and was vetted, it is to allocate monies to division deans and he proposed that we consider budgeting for more classified positions due to fact that we have experienced increased enrollment and 55% of our students receive some sort of financial aid. In order to keep up with the pace, we must recognize that we need additional staff to help them be successful. Having this \$100,000 available for classified staff could go a long way, as well as considering institutionalizing the food bank. He stated that some student support services budgets were already decreased by monies being transferred out to fund the Dean of Student Support Services position. A recommendation was made by Pete Snyder to accept the amendment as written, seconded by Bev Pipkin, and it was unanimously approved to use one-time money.

VII. Non-Instructional Program Review Funding Requests: Rod reported that one-time funding for this allocation has not been identified as of yet. Since some items will be funded by other sources, Rod stated he needs to finish reviewing the list and tabled the item for the next meeting.

VIII: Other/General Discussion: None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Meeting Notes were taken and typed by Melisa Hunt

Next Meeting: November 2, 2016