

BUDGET COMMITTEE 2/2/2011

PRESENT: Greg Chamberlain, Corny Rodriguez, Rachel Vickrey, Stephen Eaton, Meg Stidham, Lynn Krausse, Kris Toler

Weekly Budget Update

Every Wednesday morning at 8 a.m., there is a weekly budget update hosted by Scott Lay, occasionally including Jack Scott (state chancellor), and Eric Skinner (Legislative Analyst's Office). Greg reported on this week's update, and invited any members of the committee to join him for the weekly broadcasts.

The current hot topic is opposition by the Community Colleges to the proposed census date change. There is also considerable discussion on workload reduction. If the tax increases proposed by the Governor don't get on the special June ballot or don't pass, the proposed budget cuts go from \$400 million to \$800 million. There has also been some discussion about increasing fees beyond \$36/unit.

Glossary

The first draft of the glossary was distributed. Suggestions for additional terms can be forwarded to the President's Office. WSCH, DSCH, FTES, BOG and COLA will be added immediately. This will be forwarded electronically so that additions and/or corrections can be made.

CRITERIA

There is general agreement that decisions on budget cuts should be made as far from the student as possible. However, this needs further explanation. It was proposed that this statement be modified to: Budget cut decisions should be farthest from the student success indicators - transfer, CTE, and basic skills. Conversely, in considering budget increases, these should be closest to the student success indicators. Student success indicators: course completion, degree, certificate.

Criteria for Budget decisions:

Program sustainability including support items such as web access, financial aid access

Community impact

Data-informed/explainable

Barriers to success - are we erecting or removing barriers?
Can the problem be fixed, or must the program be eliminated?

There was discussion on whether a shift in focus to CTE courses from basic skills would improve the success rate.

Less funding should mean lower FTES, not fewer dollars per student.

**Underlined items need further clarification.

Summary

The focus of this committee will be on identifying specific criteria for budget decisions, including:

1. Support student success. Budget changes that impact success.
2. Remember core mission.
3. Consider program sustainability/support service sustainability
4. Consider community impact and needs
5. Data informed and explainable

All committee members are encouraged to circulate this initial list and begin to solicit feedback.

Watch Outlook for the next committee meeting; the goal is to schedule a meeting during the week of February 14.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MARCH 2, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Kate Pluta, Rachel Vickrey, LaMont Schiers, Kris Toler, Jennifer Marden, Corny Rodriguez, Stephen Eaton, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Lynn Krausse, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

2010-11 BUDGET

Mid-year cuts are not anticipated.

➤ **Action item:** For the next meeting, LaMont will bring the year-to-date budget detail.

2011-12 BUDGET

The next 7 days are essential for advocacy. The push is on to get approval from the legislature to put the tax measures on the June ballot.

➤ **Action item:** Greg will be sending out some documentation regarding some opportunities for advocacy.

It is requested that everyone set aside time on Friday to make calls to the legislators, as they are typically in their home offices on Fridays. We are currently advocating with legislators that we move forward with the initiatives. However, if the items become ballot initiatives, there will be additional restrictions on what can be communicated and with whom.

The current feeling is that community colleges will be facing \$400 million in budget cuts, workload reduction, and tuition fee increase. Even if the initiatives pass, we are facing workload reduction.

Do fees generated by a fee increase stay with the campus? Any fees generated stay with the district, and as with any other income, distribution would be determined by the BAM.

MEMBERSHIP/CALENDAR

A committee membership list and a list of meetings calendared were shared. Forward any changes to the President's Office. The list of currently calendared meetings with times & locations was distributed. Additional meetings may be needed as we move through the budget

development process. The preliminary budget is scheduled to be presented to the board in June. Therefore, the bulk of the development work must be done by early in May.

BAM

➤ **Action item:** Before Friday's College Council meeting, Greg will make copies available of the Consultation Council minutes to discuss at College Council, and provide copies of comments from Porterville and Cerro Coso.

ACCREDITATION

Kate asked to discuss Accreditation and how the Budget Committee fits into the Accreditation work. This committee's charge is a match to #3d – Financial Resources. LaMont is the Co-chair. Faculty committee members are Moya Arthur and Mike Ivey, but neither has consented to be co-chair. Previous co-chair was Janet Fulks.

➤ **Action item:** Corny will speak to Mike Ivey about the co-chair position of the Financial Resources committee.

Kris Toler also agreed to join the committee. This body should review the Budget Allocation Model.

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

LaMont shared the Budget Development packet that has been sent to budget managers. This is primarily for non-labor (4000, 5000, 6000) expenditures. The spreadsheet allows for linkages to CCC Core Mission, College Mission, Strategic Initiatives, and Unit Plans to be identified. In Excel, a conditional format can be set so that if a cell is left blank, it is highlighted in color.

A discussion needs to take place about how instructional supplies are distributed, as it is apparent that there is no consistency campus-wide.

CRITERIA

Nan, Corny, and Jennifer worked on the list that was distributed. The proposal is that this statement would be the cover sheet to a document outlining processes. The question is whether the committee is comfortable enough with the document as presented to share with College Council on Friday. It was suggested that "communities" be changed to "service areas",

and provide examples to illustrate. Stephen noted that “Student Success Indicators” was more about measurement than criteria. It was noted that this was not just to add to a good program or take away from a mediocre one, but changing the indicators.

How are the budget criteria different from the core mission? These are the things that need to be considered when making decisions about budget allocations.

Jennifer, Nan, and Corny will work on the criteria statement to incorporate the suggestions made and add illustrations. Nan suggested that a sheet of FAQs also be included, which may help explain the criteria further. How does this link to the core mission?

What level of detail are we looking for from budget managers?

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MARCH 18, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Kate Pluta, Rachel Vickrey, Kris Toler, Jennifer Marden, Corny Rodriguez, Stephen Eaton, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Lynn Krausse, Joyce Ester, Nick Strobel, Meg Stidham, LaMont Schiers, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

Minutes

Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed. A request was made to include the name of the committee in the Subject line when forwarding minutes.

Budget advocacy remains an important topic.

BAM

BAM has been discussing the recommendations to the committee; both PC and CC have expressed concerns regarding the recommendations. Greg and Corny have developed a statement that will be presented at Consultation Council in support of the recommendations.

↳ **Action item:** It was requested that the CC & PC minutes be re-sent.

There was an action item from the last minutes, stating that Corny would speak to Mike Ivey about serving as faculty co-chair on the finance committee for accreditation. Corny has not had an opportunity to do this yet.

Nan shared a document showing CTE, transfer, and basic skills data for each California community college.

↳ **Action item:** Nan will send the report electronically to Nick, to be posted on the budget page.

Remember that these numbers are sections, not individual students, and this report is from 2009-10. Basic Skills is defined as pre-collegiate, e.g. English 50, Math A, and ESL.

Year-to-Date Budget Report

LaMont distributed a year-to-date budget report, current through the end of business in Feb. This shows that 66% of the year is complete. This gives a reference point for comparison to focus on any numbers are radically divergent.

↳ **Action item:** LaMont will bring a report to the next meeting that shows what how the reserves are being spent.

While there is a true reserve established, the term carry-over is more appropriate. Tom has a report showing exactly where the reserves are district-wide. A recommendation from BAM is to not have them separate any more, but combined.

Student Success

In terms of student success measurements, the Board of Trustees' goals state that student success will improve exponentially. DIRT (District Institutional Research Team) has been tasked with identifying which criteria we should be using as a district to measure student success. The problem with data from CLAS is that it is 6 years old.

Some districts have identified students who have only one or two courses remaining for degree completion. These students are contacted and encouraged to complete and transfer. Would this be a counseling function? What would this mean regarding staffing levels? Four thousand letters were sent out from A&R regarding probation and disqualification.

Budget Decision Criteria

Regarding the Budget Decision Criteria list developed by the subgroup, more examples are needed. Are these criteria to evaluate the proposal, or to evaluate budget decisions? These are the criteria that become incorporated in how we do things. Please send any feedback to Jennifer for inclusion in the document. Feedback should be forwarded by March 23.

Next meeting – April 6, 2011.

DRAFT
BUDGET COMMITTEE
APRIL 6, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Kate Pluta, Rachel Vickrey, Kris Toler, Jennifer Marden, Corny Rodriguez, Stephen Eaton, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Meg Stidham, LaMont Schiers, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

Minutes/Action Items

Minutes of the last meeting and action items were reviewed.

Carry Over Funds

LaMont shared data regarding carry over funds from 2010. BC used \$3.2 million to balance the budget; \$2.3 million remained. Items affecting this were:

1. Health insurance increased. This year, dental and life insurance are scheduled to increase.
2. Solar field payments were not budgeted, and have begun.

↳ **Action item:** LaMont will forward this report to Nick for posting, and will share with College Council.

Advocacy

Greg shared information regarding his most recent trip to Sacramento as part of a team advocating for higher education. Each team was comprised of a representative from UC, CSU, and CC, and had appointments with various legislators. The message from the State Capitol is not at all encouraging; higher education will be preparing for what has been labeled the “Doomsday Scenario” or worst case scenario. A May budget revision is expected from the Governor.

FON

The Faculty Obligation Number does not include one year temporary positions or contingent-on-funding positions. This may mean 3 additional hires for this year. One hire from the 2nd tier is currently being considered.

↳ **Action item:** Greg will publish the hiring priority list that was prepared by FCDC.

CRITERIA

There was discussion regarding units that transfer only as electives. It was suggested that a bullet be added under Transfer regarding Model Curriculum development. In further criteria discussion, it was suggested that the ratio might need to become something that was part of the annual review if it becomes apparent that the ratio may be a factor in making budget decisions. The cost benefit is also one of the criteria listed in the Senate Program document. Providing the cost benefit analysis helps clarify the reason for considering the ratio as part of the criteria. Course sequencing is paramount to moving students through the system in a timely fashion.

Document Effectiveness

How will this document be used to make a decision? This document will ultimately influence the annual review and how final decisions are made.

Committee Structure

Kate introduced the PRP. ASC (Accreditation Steering Committee) has done quite a bit of work to align program review and unit plans. The scope of IEC's (Institutional Effectiveness Committee) responsibilities is moving them back to the old model for Budget and Program Review (B&PR) that was previously split apart because the job was more work than could be handled by one committee. College Council doesn't now provide any feedback or response on program reviews. The budget committee's job is to close the loop.

Committee annual reporting will be a topic at the next budget committee meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 15. Two of the agenda items will be continued discussion of the Criteria, and the Program Review process.

D R A F T
BUDGET COMMITTEE
MAY 4, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Kate Pluta, Rachel Vickrey, Jennifer Marden, Stephen Eaton, Meg Stidham, Lynn Krausse, Corny Rodriguez, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

The purpose of today's meeting is to work toward finalization of the budget criteria. We also want to find a time everyone can meet in the fall for regular meetings.

Program Review Changes

The latest draft document regarding proposed changes to Program Review (revision #12) was distributed. Kate stated that this has been to College Council, FCDC, and Program Review for feedback. The criteria document needs to be finalized for full implementation. The Annual Program Review will reference college goals. The Program Review committee (PRC, previously IEC) will respond in writing, and will forward their response to College Council. This committee will be the one to review and consider changes in priority and structure. Integrated program review will launch in 2012-13. This version of the proposed changes goes to the Senate for a vote today (5/4) and the College Council on Friday (5/6).

Budget Criteria Document

The latest document was distributed. Also distributed was a definition of sustainability at Porterville College. It is unclear what "Ideals" means in this context.

In the criteria document, the areas were further identified and developed. An index of "Best Practices" will be compiled and included. PRC is going to use a Rubric to continue to solicit feedback. Jennifer stated it was her understanding that these would be used at the program level. What recommendations might come back from the program level? Rachel answered that the PRC would take a look at whether the review is complete. Using a rubric should make this a more meaningful process.

In terms of membership, there will be two co-chairs. The current structure isn't going to work because membership is based on volunteers. The committee needs a representative from FCDC. The people that develop the Rubric should know how it will be used, and make it more of a checklist.

The criteria is designed to be used by all budget administrators. Kris asked how this compares to accreditation standard #4. This is a subcommittee of the Steering committee. They are charged with providing direction to the President. Any objections should be thoroughly

discussed throughout the process. Was CSEA consulted about what classified membership should be? At what point does CSEA give input before approval? We don't have a clearly defined process of who should be involved and at what step.

Committees are reading program reviews and giving feedback. This is the same process as was used previously. In the spirit of the process of communication, feedback should be sent to the constituents. But the key really is an understanding of what they are developing is a 'straw man', a place to start. The document can be called a working draft to allow for a starting point, and allow it to be circulated.

Where do we go next? How are you feeling about the process? We're anxious to get this done for accreditation. We are on draft #12; the process has been well-circulated and well-discussed. The current PRC is well represented; it is difficult to tell who from this group will continue to be a part of the committee in the fall. Faculty cannot be required to participate in activities over the summer without compensation.

↳ **Action item:** Get the budget criteria 'working draft' document out within the next few days.

College Council meets on Friday (5/6). The goals should be referenced, as should accreditation standards. Under Health & Safety, i.e. should be changed to e.g. LaMont also wanted to include something on hazardous materials. Should the questions be reworded as statements? It was suggested that rather than try to reword the questions, a statement be included explaining that the questions listed are to inspire thought. It was suggested that rather than have the document be circulated in draft form, more work be done during the summer so that it is complete.

A work session was scheduled for the afternoon to work on the Criteria document.

DRAFT
BUDGET COMMITTEE
MAY 20, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, LaMont Schiers, Kate Pluta, Stephen Eaton, Meg Stidham, Lynn Krausse, Corny Rodriguez, June Charles, Nick Strobel, Kris Toler, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

Lynn presented the Budget Decision-Making Document as revised at the work session. The items were discussed as presented, and wording suggestions were discussed. See attached document draft highlighting changes.

Changes to this document as agreed upon at this meeting will be ready by early next week. Corny will be taking this document to the Academic Senate Executive Board on Thursday. Once it has been reviewed for content, it will be circulated to College Council.

Budget Update

The Governor's May Budget Revision was revealed. The CC League website has more information; watch for updates. BC will be using our carry over funds for 2011-12, which means that the potential for budget reductions in 2012-13 is greater. The "All Cuts" budget scenario is still a possibility; raising fees is also a possibility. However, if fees are raised, it won't be until spring semester at the earliest.

Next Meetings

There is a meeting on the calendar for July 15 at 10:30 a.m. The meeting currently scheduled for June 17 is cancelled. Watch e-mail for announcements of summer meetings that may be necessary regarding various budgeting issues. Regular meetings for the fall are being considered for the 2nd & 4th Mondays from 4 to 5:30 p.m. Watch Outlook for meeting requests.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

September 12, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Jennifer Marden, Meg Stidham, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Kris Toler, Stephen Eaton, Nick Strobel, Kate Pluta, Lynn Krause, Joyce Ester, Corny Rodriguez

Attached is the latest version of the Budget Committee Charge, showing the revisions discussed at this meeting. To avoid confusion in the future, versions will be numbered and dated. The revised committee charge will be forwarded to College Council.

The Budget Decision Criteria document dated May 31, 2011 is the final version of this document.

⇒ **Action item:** The budget decision criteria document will be presented at the College council meeting on Friday, Sept. 16.

Greg introduced the College-wide Committee report that was discussed by the committee co-chairs. Each committee has been asked to provide a report three times during the year on progress toward fulfilling the committee charge, and contributing to the College goals. The first report is due on Sept 30, and will be sent to College council, the Academic Senate, and posted on the website for campus-wide perusal. The co-chairs are responsible for the development of the reports.

⇒ **Action item:** Greg and Corny will develop a draft of the committee report, ready for review at the next meeting on Sept. 26.

[insert budget discussion here]

Based on the adopted budget, we are okay on the 50% law. The FTFO is applied district-wide. The reserves are pulled from the compliance test. Is the vacation accrual part of the 50% law or part of a liability against the reserves?

⇒ **Action item:** Greg will talk to Tom about banked load and vacation accrual and the 80% target. Does it count in the reserves?

One goal is to have 100% of the banked load and vacation funded within 5 years, at 20% per year.

The reserve referred to is the carry-over from the previous year. Part of this year's reserve was used to fund adjunct overload. The targets are based on summer, fall, and spring. To drop below the "floor" means a loss in funding. Any courses under 25 students require a rationale to continue.

LaMont shared copies of the revenue and expenditures from the budget, which explains the difference between last year and this year.

 **Action item:** At the next meeting, LaMont will provide a year to date report showing how much has been spent from the carry-over from 2010.

In 2010, a management position was eliminated from Maintenance & Operations. Greg is now taking steps to restore that position to provide assistance to the current M&O manager, as it is apparent the job is too big to be handled by one person. This will appear as a budget line item that is not currently in the adopted budget. We do not currently have a line item for minor constructions projects; LaMont will be creating a line item of \$250,000 for this. We also anticipate hiring an interim dean to replace Dr. Flores, who resigned in August.

College Council asked to add an FAQ regarding Cap and target to the budget criteria document.

 **Action item:** Nick will sent out the document reflecting the request from college council.

 **Action item:** Nan will draft a statement explaining ____.

The next meeting of this committee is scheduled for September 26 at 4 p.m. Nan and Corny will co-chair.

BUDGET COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 10, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Joyce Ester, Meg Stidham, Kris Toler, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Stephen Eaton, Mike Stepanovich, Kate Pluta, Jennifer Marden, Corny Rodriguez, Lynn Krause, LaMont Schiers, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

Review Agenda

Add integrated planning to the agenda. What are next steps in terms of what this committee should be working on?

Review Committee Charge

In reviewing **committee goal #1** is to identify and acquire the necessary training to function effectively as committee members. The committee needs to identify the type of training needed and move forward with setting it up.

Regarding **committee goal #3** – Develop criteria for budget decisions, College Council didn't formally approve the budget criteria document.

☞ ***Action item: Greg will put formal approval on the next College Council agenda so that the minutes reflect the action taken.***

Regarding **committee goal #5** – Annual review and modify the criteria – Is spring 2012 appropriate for the annual review? Nick answered that it depends on where in the APR's the programs are, to determine who/what is impacted.

Regarding goal #6 – Establish clearly articulated processes for reviewing budget requests – This fall, the committee needs to develop a communication plan on budget impact information.

Goal #10 – Meet at least once a month - Completed and on-going.

Goal #8 – Review the budget input and development process and documents completed by department chairs and managers to improve processes and forms. The committee should consider an annual assessment process in the spring

Goal #12 – Advocate for timely budget projections - complete for this year; but this should continue to be monitored.

The question was asked about what happens after APRs are submitted with regards to budget requests. Plans, processing, and implementation guidelines should be part of the criteria document.

Timeline

☞ **Action item: A review of the timeline will be on the agenda for the next meeting.**

A request for faculty positions currently follows this path for approval: Dept – Dean – VP – Pres – Board – Chancellor.

Committee Report

The budget criteria document needs to provide a delineation between various decision types such as regular on-going expenses vs. special circumstances.

Next Steps

Greg stated he was hoping to end today's meeting with prioritized next steps. Numbers 2, 6, & 7 are linked; these items can be discussed together this fall. Another fall item would be #9, as a communication plan is an essential building block to each area, and should be developed right away. Working on these should be enough to move the committee forward.

☞ **Action item: Nan will forward information to this committee and college council regarding what is happening at the state level.**

Writing down what we already do is an excellent place to start. Kate asked if any other college has a communication plan that can be used as a model. We could bring amber in to work with us when we get ready. Corny state we have to identify what we think we are doing. Greg forwarded a link to the AACC report on student success to this group, College Council and Admin Council. This report shows an increase in awards; the report also shows that we are making inroads into the Latino and black populations. E mail norms could be part of a communication plan.

☞ **Action item: At the next meeting, be prepared to brainstorm as a group the types of things expected to be communicated; Amber will be invited to join the meeting for this discussion.**

The next committee progress report is due Dec 1, 2011 to College Council and Academic Senate.

Budget Updates

Nick asked if the charge document was finalized; how do we go about? Any suggestions for changes to the DMD regarding the Committee Charge, structure, or duties of the Budget Committee should be forwarded to College Council for consideration.

Recent Legislation

The governor signed SBX. Any fee increase won't happen until summer 2012.

☞ **Action item: Greg will forward the legislation report to budget group.**

AB 743 deals with a centralized assessment system; outside funding was secured to finance this. The colleges will bear the cost of the on-going assessment; the full financial impact remains unknown. There are a number of schools that do not use outside vendors and write their own assessments.

SB 774 authorizes an increase in parking fees to a maximum of \$50 per semester. BC currently charges \$30 per semester. The fees currently collected are not enough to cover the full cost of maintaining the parking lots. Raising fees and/or charging staff for parking are options that need to be considered. The daily rate at BC is \$1/day. CSUB just raised their daily rate from \$2 to \$5. The legislation doesn't address daily rates.

New Faculty

Three retirements have been submitted for 2012 from BC. The Chancellor is considering the number of recruitments at around 25 new faculty positions district wide. This discussion will take place at Chancellors Cabinet, and each college will be given a number of positions to be filled. Filling retirements will be over and above replacements.

The district will get our Faculty Obligation Number (FON) later this month. There is some speculation that the Board of Governors will suspend the FON again; it has been suspended for the previous three years. All colleges are to have our initial recommendations to the chancellor by the first week of November. FCDC will vote on those recommendations. The criteria from the chancellor went out to FCDC.

☞ **Action item: Nan will check with Kellie on faculty selection criteria.**

We will not be adding sections based on new faculty.

It was suggested that a discussion for the FAQ be included on the following topics: goal, cap, target.

Integrated Planning

ASC want to make sure that everyone understands what integrated college wide planning is. To raise awareness and assess the current level of understanding, ASC developed four questions:

- 1) **What is "integrated collegewide planning"?**
- 2) **What data/reports inform this process?**
- 3) **What role do you have in this process?**
- 4) **Is your role accurately represented in the Decision Making Document?**

An example of integrated planning is the process of developing the new APR, which links into budget proposals, which links into faculty proposals, which link into budget.

The next date – 10/24 must be changed. There is a grant meeting with the consortium that meets at West Hills Community College; Kim Van Horne and Cindy Collier will be invited. Lamont will be out of the district also. Watch for a request on outlook to move the meeting to 10/31.

👉 ***Action item: Lamont will share and explain the report listing of items that have been paid out of carryover funds.***

BUDGET COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 31, 2011

Present: Greg Chamberlain, Corny Rodriguez, Stephen Eaton, Nick Strobel, Kris Toler, Meg Stidham, Kate Pluta, Amber Chiang, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, LaMont Schiers, Debbie Spohn (recorder)

COMMUNICATION PLAN

Previous minutes stated that Amber would be invited to join the meeting to discuss communication. Prior to the meeting, Amber spent some time researching various community college and university websites. A page on the website devoted to the budget is popular, and could this format be useful for accreditation, as this would allow community access to the information. Another tactic is brownbag lunches or President's forums, especially if employees are able to drop in during a broad time block. E-mail should not be relied upon as the primary source of communication.

The budget committee has a page on the website. Suggestions were made as to various documents that could be posted on the website to increase its value to the college community:

1. Communications from the chancellor and the president
2. Communications from Scott Lay describing the affects of various budget proposals

Amber also suggested some narrative on what these mean to BC. E.g., the district and the state are facing 'trigger points'; what does that mean to this institution? An information page such as this would serve double duty, providing information for the students and background for the media. It should be moved to a more prominent position on the webpage. A page can be created from old information, and updated as new information becomes available.

Greg reminded the committee that one of the committee's goals is to develop a communication plan to keep the college apprised regarding budget decisions. Moving from where we are to where we want to be requires an action plan, and implementation. Gathering the documents for posting on the website is a simple process; Amber is also working on a list of talking points. A budget chart was discussed.

↪ **Action item: Nick will work on putting the initial messages on the webpage.**

↪ **Action item: Greg will draft the first of what will begin a series of monthly communications to the college community regarding budget issues. Greg will add a list of take-away messages to the communication.**

↪ **Action item: Amber will work on an editorial calendar to identify those topics which will be time-based and occur regularly.**

BUDGET UPDATE

Greg reported that the projections for next year were discussed last week at the ACBO Conference. Analysts are predicting a \$3-10 billion state budget deficit. The actual number depends on the

resolution of the lawsuits now pending. All predictions are pointing to the economic triggers will be pulled. The question was asked if discussion continued regarding colleges that would have to be absorbed due to insolvency. Greg answered that there was no new information on this.

CARRYOVER

LaMont shared carryover activities. Fifty percent of Mike Stepanovich's salary is from the General Fund. The rest of the Foundation employees are funded fully by the Foundation; their salaries are paid through BC and the Foundation is billed. LaMont will add a running total column to the spreadsheet, and will share an update in January.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

From where are staff development funds derived? Greg explained that previously they were generated from campus recycling; this was determined to be inadequate. Therefore starting this year, SDCC was put into the regular general fund budget for \$10,000.

↳ **Action item: Greg suggested that SDCC research staff development funding methods and amounts at other institutions for comparison.**

FACULTY OBLIGATION NUMBER

Greg distributed and discussed the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) document. The number has been frozen for the past three+ years; the recommendation has been made to the Board of Governors from the State Chancellor to continue the freeze. If the freeze remains in place, KCCD will possibly be adding five new positions district-wide in addition to filling the vacancies created by retirement. However, to make sure that the FON is reached and to guard against a failed search, the district would likely authorize a search for more than five positions.

CAP & TARGET

These should be defined in the FAQs. Lisa Fitzgerald sent out an e-mail with a one-page discussion on targets and ranges, and what these terms mean.

Basically, CAP is state-funded FTES. TARGET is set by the district.

There are penalties for falling below CAP. The question was asked how the state determines CAP.

↳ **Action item: Greg will ask Tom to define how the state determines the CAP.**

↳ **Action item: Budget committee charge will be placed on the next agenda.**

↳ **Action item: Greg will develop a clear, easily understandable definition of TARGET.**

The next meeting of the Budget committee is Monday, November 14, at 2:30 p.m. in A-5. (Note: the agenda incorrectly identified the date & time of this meeting.)