

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.