SHAREDCOMMITTEE MINUTES

**COMMITTEE:** Budget and Planning

**Date of Meeting:** 11-03-2011  **Location:** CC4  **Time:** 12:00-1:30

**Voting Members Present:**
Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Joe Ramirez, Hanh Tran, Cathy Brinkman, Yoon Yun, Steven Nerud, Mi Chong Park, Steven Ruys, Estela Miranda, Roman Juarez

**Voting Members Absent:**
Tobin Sparfeld, Joanne Grey, Marcelo Rodriguez

**Resource Members Present:**
Frances Nguyen, Rolf Schleicher

**Guests Present:**
Leslie Milke, Angela Aghajanian, Dr. Monte Perez

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

**Call to Order by:** Leslie called the meeting @ 12:10

**Items Discussed:**

1. **Review/Approve Minutes of October 2011 meeting**

   The committee reviewed and approved the minutes from the October 6, 2011 meeting with minor changes.

2. **College Financial Update**

   - Dr. Perez presented the latest budget information based on the monthly projection as of October 2011. For the fiscal year of 2012, the college is moving forward with the original budget of $26,551,191. However, the college made some revenue assumptions specifically $125,000 for the enrollment increase in international students. The revised projected revenue is $26,666,798. Considering all projected expenditures, the college is not significantly reducing the classes in the spring semester. The college will keep the spring as intact as possible similar to last 2011 spring. The projected ending balance for 2011-12 is a deficit of $36,330. The college needs to be careful in monitoring the projected revenue to have some ending balance to cushion it for the challenging year of 2013. The full time equivalent enrollment is going well and the targets are being met. The college will have an additional 200 FTES beyond the target. Still the hard issue is that the $26,666,798 projected revenue includes the 2010-11 ending balance of $1,413,900 to carry over and for this reason, the college needs to be careful not to end the year with $0 balance or any deficit. The college must have some ending balance to carry over to be part of the 2012-13 budget. Frances will continue to inform the committee with any updates.
• Dr. Perez also informed the committee about what has been discussed by the Bond Steering committee. There has been some discussion by the Bond Steering committee including chancellor, presidents, and other members for planning of maintenance and operation for next 5 years. Mission College is a new campus with new facilities, built out under the master plan. The square footage increase for the college is projected to be 46% compared to the 4% projected increase for Trade Tech, which replaced the old buildings with new buildings. Therefore, the maintenance and operation cost will go up for next 5 years due to the increase of the square footage. More facility personnel will need to be hired and utilities will go up. As a district, the preparation for the maintenance and operation cost increase is being considered and the preliminary forecast has been made on MO side, on square footage side, and on budget side. The further discussion will occur on November 16 at the Bond Steering committee meeting. Continual report on any updates will come to the Budget and Planning committee. The central energy plan of the college is not currently contracted, but it will probably be approved since it is the energy saving plan. Yet, any other big projects are on hold including the athletic complex. The committee needs to be aware of the situation and the college might need some relief from the district: possibly from COLA and growth money. For example, there was an incremental M&O cost due to the new culinary building: $918,000 last year to $1.2 million this year.

2. CSB Smart Classroom update from Hanh Tran

• Hanh raised the question on how to create a procedure for paying for emergency costs. This issue came up after she faced a projector problem in a CSB smart classroom two months ago. She also shared that there was not enough resources to pay for the software maintenance renewal and update. The technology needs to be working efficiently for the college at all times, especially for the accreditation. Hahn and Curtis discussed the need to create a procedure for obtaining emergency funds and how to determine whether the case is really an emergency or not. She felt that the technology committee and the IT department do not have a voice on linking the request for the fund and receiving the fund. Leslie mentioned that in the past through the program review, the units planned out these contingency funds. Hanh said often the emergency cost involving technology repair and update is very expensive and it is usually above the contingency funds. Hanh reported to the committee that the non-smart classrooms on campus are currently part of the project under the bond and she had already discussed with CPA, the bond representative, Chuck Johnson, whether the college can retrieve the fund from the bond to upgrade all non-smart classrooms.

• The committee continued to discuss about the procedure for paying for the emergency cost. Leslie emphasized that all funds including the contingency funds should be planned through the program review. Emergency items should all directly come to the B&P committee. The B&P committee with the help of Rolf and Frances will seek for available funds. Hanh asked whether a department representative should come to the B&P committee or contact her directly regarding the emergency request. Leslie answered that each department request after reviewed by the dean should go to Hanh. If Hanh does not have enough funds, then she will fill out the request form and send it to the B&P committee as soon as possible. Frances mentioned about the funding allocation possibly available for the emergency need. Alma asked who would make the decision for these funds to get allocated for repair after the program review process. The decision might be college-wide, and the B&P committee may or may not approve the request considering the appending deficit and available funds. Rolf stated that ideally each department
including the IT should have a budget for repairing equipment to avoid the situation that Hanh had to face.

- Hanh shared her concern on how the voice of the technology committee is involved in the approval process of the program review. She asked whether the technology committee should be invited during the ranking process. Alma answered that the requests of resources will go to the division VPs and they will review and prioritize the requests. Leslie answered that the approval process can go two ways. The first route for the approval process is: each department submits its request through the program review and then it gets sent to the VP, and the request may or may not put in on the list for ranking depending on the yearly priority. The second route for the approval process is: a specific unit such as the technology committee puts a proposal to College Council and the president may agree with the request and send the proposal to the B&P committee. In summary, the technology committee goes up through the shared governance process and then back to the B&P committee, whereas individual departments come up through the program reviews, division deans and then back to the B&P committee. Alma stated that the technology committee should not be involved or have the voice at prioritizing each division’s request since these requests have been made through the program review and the review process is at the VP level. When the need for consulting the technology committee arises, Hanh will be contacted by the VPs since she belongs to both the B&P and the technology committees.

3. Report from College Council regarding changing charter to accommodate unclassified staff

- Leslie addressed the issue from last meeting regarding Angela Aghajanian’s request to be on the B&P committee as a voting member. This issue was requested at College Council and the members of College Council realized the category of people not represented. College Council agreed to find out who falls in this category and how to fold this into the process, yet no decision has been made. The recommendation was made that Angela should stay on the B&P committee until the final process gets formalized.

4. Budget and Planning Operational Plan Timeline for 2011-12

- Leslie mentioned that the committee would like to have its task force meeting on Friday, November 18, at 10:00 a.m., if possible. Anyone from the B&R committee is encouraged to attend and during the task force meeting the committee will have the assessment of the dry run of the rubric.

- Per Joe’s suggestion, Leslie stated that the committee should have the first look at the rubric and see whether any changes need to be made before the committee gets the recommendations from divisions. Again, this year the committee will concentrate on two areas: sustainability and stability.

- Joe requested to explain how the B&P over base request prioritization rubric is used. Leslie explained how the rubric is used: first, partners are assigned and then the team of partners will go through the list and rank them after receiving the prioritized requests from each division. Leslie continued to explain how to score a specific request based on the priority category and the priority weight. Joe asked, for example, how to put the hiring prioritization committee ranking and the B&P ranking together for an available position. Alma answered that having the
faculty prioritization is contractual and it goes to the senate and to the college president. The second part is that on program review, the request might be for a department’s growth position. So even though the request was made as critical and ranked one on the prioritization list, the B&P committee might disagree and give a lower ranking. The president will consider the lists made by both committees and make the decision. Leslie stated that the B&P ranking is informational and the president can possibly use it as a reference, but it is his decision based solely on the list made by the senate what position to be hired.

- Steve asked about the Clerical personnel position under sustainability and stability: whether there is any difference in level of clerical personnel. Alma suggested that the committee should see the position as support staff. Leslie stated that there is some difference between sustainability and stability, and there might be some personnel absolutely for sustainability or for stability.

- Roman suggested that the committee should somehow embed the faculty hiring process as part of this prioritization process for complete planning. Leslie answered this is not possible since the B&P committee can only recommend the number of positions rather than whom should be hired. Alma mentioned that the bargain agreement for faculty requires the hiring prioritization, yet the hiring prioritization committee only recommends the prioritized list to the president.

- Roman said that the priority weight will change every year based on the priority category, and it will be shared at the college retreat. Leslie again emphasized that the B&P committee will only look at the requests under stability and sustainability for this year.

- The committee decided not to have the practice run on November 18 since the prioritized request from the division managers will be received on December 12. Instead, the committee will have the practice session on December 1st. Leslie suggested that the committee members should preview the rubrics prior to the practice run, and she will suggest Tobin to make up teams prior to the next meeting.

- The committee further discussed how to improve the ranking process. Leslie requested Frances to bring any practice materials for the practice run.

**Adjournment:** 1:25pm

**Minutes submitted by:** Yoon Yun