



Thursday, May 28, 2009
Griffin Gate
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Present: Fred Allen, Alba Orr, Steve Baker, Jerry Buckley, Janet Castanos, Zoe Close, John Colson, Sunny Cooke, Jim Fenningham, Tim Flood, Rick Griffin, Kats Gustafson, Chris Hill, Oralee Holder, Anita Martinez, Danny Martinez, Pat Murray, Jane Nolan, Alba Orr, Shirley Pereira, Tina Pitt, Mary Rider, Adelle Schmitt, William Snead, Jim Spillers, Brad Tiffany, Jim Wilsterman

Guest: Pam Amor

Absent: Sunny Cooke

Recorder: Patty Sparks

Meeting Convened: 3:00 p.m.

I. Approval of Planning & Budget Meeting Notes, April 23, 2009

Shirley requested that if anyone has changes or edits to the April Meeting Summary, please send them via email to Patty Sparks.

Shirley announced that Pam Amor will speak to the Accreditation Follow-up Report.

II. Budget Update

Tim Flood reported that our first task is to move forward with a Tentative Budget (TB). Based on a survey that was taken throughout the California Community Colleges the average reduction to statewide budgets is 4%. He explained that a 4% reduction could be achieved by both colleges without going into what would be considered district wide solutions. The TB will move forward as we must have a budget by June to operate in July.

Tim reported that currently the TB is balanced at \$60,549,473. This budget is built with the 4.19% growth factor included. He provided a two page handout, *2009-2010 Income Allocation Formula - Tentative Budget*, for the Council to review. He explained in detail the make-up and reported that this TB will move forward to the Governing Board. Shirley inquired about the Governing Board's staffing commitment and why it continues to be a line item. Tim responded that staffing is an on-going commitment and will stay as a line item until a new formula is provided.

Tim explained that page two of the handout details the dedicated income. There was an increase in income from last year, however all income was reduced by 4% as indicated on the handout. He reported that our college stated that last year we received approximately \$40,000 for cell tower transmissions. We will have another cell tower on campus and he is working with DSA to have a portable tower installed until a permanent tower can be placed.

Tim stated that the TB as presented today is not reality as it is based on a 4% reduction. Unfortunately the college is looking at 58% reductions to categorical programs and realistically the general fund reduction percentage is closer to 9% - 11% which equates to an additional reduction of 7%. Suggestions regarding cost savings have been discussed at the college level and at the district. Those suggestions are surfacing with early retirement incentives and other cost savings. Further he stated that decisions are being made at a rapid pace at the State level and we will know soon what our working number will be.

Tim reported that there is some good news in that the ending balance is larger than initially thought. We are anticipating the ending balance to be approximately \$2.3 million.

William Snead inquired about tapping into the Governing Board Reserves. Tim responded that this has been discussed but clarified this would be a one-time solution. We are required to set aside 5% of the last year's expenditures. There were times when the Board's reserve was lowered, however we must determine when the best time is to utilize those funds. Further, he explained that this year's budget is worse than expected, however 2010-2011 will be worse.

Shirley inquired about tuition fees going up. Tim responded that there have been discussions, but no direction or decisions have been made.

Shirley inquired about growth funds. Tim responded that growth funds are now at approximately 1% - 2%. Tim provided a handout, *FTES Calculator*, for the Council to review. Right now the District is at 18,800 FTES, however the FTES Actual are at 13,501. We are currently 465 over what we are receiving funding for, based on our percentages. He referred the Council to the Growth Rate and Section Cost Analysis portion of the handout. If we calculate the growth funds at 4.19% then we would need to grow by 81 FTES. Realistically, if we receive 1% growth funds and we stayed flat we would be 335 FTES over, which would equate to 167 sections. These numbers are based on a 20 students per class scenario. As for section costs, \$3,700 was utilized which represents a mid-grade adjunct salary.

Further we should know by June what, if any, the growth dollars will be. Right now we are building on a flat schedule and there is a 36 section reduction to take into an account which is what we would gain back from ROP. At the same time, we have set our classroom cap for fall at 18 students per section; however, expect to see some reductions there.

Tina stated we could reduce sections by setting the cap at 20 if needed. Further, she reminded the Council that in the fall of 2008, we cut 174 sections. Those cuts incurred because of the colleges focus on effectiveness. She commented that cutting exercise science classes will severely affect us section wise, if the State budget includes those reductions. The Council discussed looking at large class bonus and room distribution to better meet the needs of students for efficiency. Tina reminded the Council that the goal is to run necessary classes most efficiently. Further she clarified that the student cap is not always the deciding factor whether a class runs or not. There is room to run the classes efficiently and she is working diligently with the deans and chairs and coordinators to do that.

Jim Wilsterman stated that the sooner departments know they need to consolidate sections the better. Tina responded that if departments can consolidate sections for efficiencies, please do so now. The Council discussed classroom availability and the ability to hold larger classes to meet the section consolidations. Tina stated she is working closely with Instructional Operations. Tim stated

that the people who know classrooms best is Instructional Operations and we will utilize their knowledge in locating classrooms appropriate to meet the needs of faculty and students.

Tim provided a handout, *Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Template for Budget Reduction Analysis FY09-10*, for the Council to review. Tim explained that there are additional expenses to consider, they are:

- Step & column
- Other payroll Increases (new hires, re-class)
- POCOs from 07/08 included in the 08/09 Adopted Budget
- Benefits Holding Increase
- ROP Transition - Second phase

These increases total \$1,613,159 which are our needs beyond the TB beginning balance. Further we are short by \$200,000 of being able to fund adjunct salaries needed for the ROP Transition. Tim stated we can do this because currently we have more than the needed \$1.44 million worth of carry over. In addition, Tim provided a handout that clearly represents the positions that are frozen. If there are any questions regarding the frozen positions please contact Tim.

Kats asked about when hours will be reduced in the Library/Tech Mall. Tim responded that by Monday, June 1, he will be able to provide that information. He informed that Council that on-going discussions and recommendations are brought to the District for input at the district.

III. Institutional Review Committee (IRC) Recommendations

Chris provided a handout, *IRC Activity Scoring Sheet, 2009-10 Planning Cycle*, for the Council to review. The handout lists criteria used in scoring the activities. On the back side of the handout lists the IRC Task Force members and those participating as resource members.

Chris stated that we can look at the processes college wide and know that we have done a great job, however we all know there is no money to allocate. She provided a handout, *2009-10 Activity Priority Funding List Possible Funding Sources*, for the Council to Review. She reminded the Council that this new planning process started in June and is ending now, when in reality it would have normally started in October. This committee was charged with reviewing the proposals, listening to presentations and scoring the proposals. There are two lists, each with the same proposals. She explained that we are switching from a culture of wish lists to what we actually need to get activities done for the next year. She reminded the Council that this process was not used for line item increases to budgets or for on-going costs. This process is use for activities for the next year only.

Chris referred the Council to page three of the handout. These proposals are a part of the existing facilities plan and pulled from the process. Chris worked with Tim Flood to go through the proposals and identify other funding resources, if any. Shirley stated that some of the areas are marked for ETC Funding Tim stated that if the ETC funds are available they could be applied; however, reminded the Council that there are cuts to this year's budget and portions of those cuts include ETC funds. We have spent some ETC funds - allocating it to Kats, but set aside the remainder of the funds.

Chris is asking for guidance on whether all the unfunded proposals should be send to the Resource Development Committee. She stated that the proposals are voluminous, and she expects that more will be submitted for the next year's planning process. Shirley was under the impression that the Resource Development Committee had people on it that could address these issues and research

additional resource alternatives. Tina recommended that for this first time around, we send the list to the Resource Development Committee. The Committee could utilize their talents in “looking outside the box” for funding resources. Kats wanted to clarify that ETC Funds is not the appropriate funding source. The Council discussed that the funds would be called Library, Instructional, Materials and Equipment (LIME) funds.

Action taken: All proposals not funded will be sent to the Resource Development Committee.

IV. Drop for Non-Pay Status

Jim Fenningham stated that there was a meeting with the Accounts Receivable Committee today. This group oversees the drop for non-pay issue. Students will be dropped for non-payment on Saturday, May 30.

Brad Tiffany stated if we dropped students for non-pay today we would have dropped 2,019 seats, and 2078 units. This equates to approximately 17% - 20%. There are 78 international students who have not responded to emails and that represent about \$69,000 in fees. Student veterans are down 36, but he believes these students should not be dropped as they are waiting for funding. John Colson explained that emails will be sent on May 30; however, there is link that allows the student to re-register again for a course(s) with the understanding that they must pay for their course then.

Shirley stated that approximately 10% of her class does not receive emails when she uses Web advisor to send emails. Tim reported that Patti Andrasko, College Cashier, has personally called every student in jeopardy of being dropped. Tina further stated that faculty informed students in classes. John stated that this is a pilot program and a good time for the program as enrollment is up. In addition we are looking at developing a process to track recover stats on students that were dropped. Brad Tiffany further stated that he is working with IS to develop a system that has students pay for their classes at the time of registration. Jim Spillers inquired about the ratios with this test population and extrapolate that out to fall enrollment, it could be a massive number. Tina stated that this is a good time for this trial and ultimately could help with changing student behavior and compliance when registering.

V. Committee Reports

Faculty Staffing Committee

Jim Fenningham stated that at this time staffing requests are in and now is the time to rank and score the positions. He inquired whether they should freeze their duties due to the economic climate we are facing. The Council discussed this issue at length including its history, past practices, and whether maintaining lists for more than two years is beneficial as faculty needs may change. The Council decided to suspend the staffing committee’s work and reevaluate again next year. The Council agrees and understands the importance of the Faculty Staffing Committee and to revive it when funding becomes available.

The Council discussed retirements and emergency replacements. Tim stated that there has to be a mechanism to address emergencies replacements. Because of the early retirement incentives we may lose faculty members and we need to address that issue as it arises. Right now as we move forward all issues are being scrutinized at the college and district levels.

William Snead objects to the recommendation of freezing the Faculty Staffing Committee duties.

Action taken: The Council recommends that the Faculty Staffing Committee suspend their duties and to reevaluate again next year.

VI. Other

Accreditation Follow-up Report

Pam provided a handout that provides the on-line link for the Accreditation Follow-up Report. She encourages the Council to review the report and stated that comments and/or edits can be submitted in the text boxes provided. When making your comments, please indicate which standard, and line items referenced, then hit submit.

The accreditation team will take the input provided, prepare a final draft, submit the final draft to the Governing Board and then send the report sometime in September. Pam thanked the Council.

Meeting Adjourned: 5 p.m.