CUESTA COLLEGE  
PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
May 03, 2011  
Planning & Budget Meeting  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm Room 5402  

| X L. Alderman | X C. Greiner | X P. Peachey | X M. Stengel | Guests: |
| X B. Anderson | X M. Korisheli | X N. Piña | X G. Stork | K. Botenbal |
| X S. Brazell | X S. Leone | X S. Pointer | X J. Sullivan | J. House |
| X B. Clark | X A. Merzon | X P. Rose | X D. Wulff | S. McLaughlin |
| X L. Fontanilla | J. Morgan | X T. Sommer | X M. Zarycka | Recorder: M. Foppiano |

### AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report from Co-Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Rose passed out a new document entitled “Planning and Budget Agenda Item Request.” She explained that if an item needed to be added to the agenda, this form would be completed and submitted 7 days prior to the next scheduled meeting. This would facilitate gathering the data to support the agenda item being presented. The committee would begin utilizing this new form beginning with the first meeting of the fall semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P&B Agenda Item Request**

## STANDING ITEMS P&B CALENDAR

- **Immediate Path Report**  
  - No Immediate Path Report presented.

- **Enrollment Management Report**  
  - No Enrollment Management Report presented.

## CURRENT ITEMS

- **Template for Long-Term Facilities Planning (Sandee McLaughlin)**  
  - S. McLaughlin presented a template for Long-Term Facilities Planning entitled “Integrated Planning Template.” The expectation is that the template would be completed for any new facility and then posted on the P&B website. The timing for this would be the point of discussion for a facility that would be showing up on the Five-Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan for the first time. This template would be completed for all projects already on the Five-Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan and then for any new projects added to that plan. By completing this form, planning would be done well in advance of anything coming on line in terms of anticipating staffing costs and clarifying the funding streams. By adopting this, we would have a more formal process for bringing together the planning processes related to facilities.  
  - Suggested revisions to this template were adding anticipated expenditures for the following year, adding technology, and linking the template to the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, and Strategic Plan. S. McLaughlin agreed to those revisions.  
  - Upon a motion by D. Wulff/M. Stengel, it was unanimously approved to adopt the Integrated Planning Template with stated revisions.
T. Sommer suggested adding a Standing Agenda Item for the Capital Outlay Plan. Project templates can be reviewed, discussed and updated at that time. This would also be added to the calendar.

Upon a motion by D. Wulff/M. Stengel, it was unanimously approved to adopt the Integrated Planning Template with stated revisions.

**2011-2012 Draft Budget Assumptions and Budget Criteria**

T. Sommer presented the draft Budget Assumptions and Criteria. She explained that these would be incorporated into the 2011-2012 Tentative Budget which will be presented for approval at the June 2011 Board of Trustees meeting. The committee went through the draft documents and made suggestions and revisions.

Upon a motion by S. Leone/S. Pointer, the 2011-2012 Draft Budget Assumptions and Budget Criteria was adopted with the stated revisions. This motion was unanimously approved.

Please access the link below for the final document.

2011-2013 Planning & Budget Assumptions & Criteria

**Technology Committee T-Tab Prioritization (Janice House and Debra Stakes)**

J. House and D. Stakes presented the results of the Technology Committee’s T-Tab prioritization.

This is the first year that the Technology Committee prioritized all technology requests listed on the T-tab in the IPPR. They provided a matrix pie chart highlighting the T-Tab Prioritization Results as well as a document which prioritized the needs, cost, description, and whether it was infrastructure, license, replacement, etc. The Technology Committee recommended that our committee consider items prioritized as 1 and 2 in the matrix when Planning & Budget completes the Cluster Prioritization process.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Upon a motion by C. Greiner/T. Sommer, meeting adjourned at 4:30p.m.
CUESTA COLLEGE  
PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
May 19, 2011  
Planning & Budget Meeting  
1:00 pm – 2:30 pm Room 5402

| L. Alderman | X | C. Greiner | X | P. Peachey | X | M. Stengel | Guests: |
| B. Anderson | X | M. Korisheli | X | N. Piña | X | G. Stork | K. Botenbal |
| S. Brazell | X | S. Leone | S. Pointer | X | J. Sullivan | R. Cartnal | T. Reece |
| B. Clark | X | A. Merzon | X | P. Rose | X | D. Wulf | J. Cascamo |
| L. Fontanilla | X | J. Morgan | X | T. Sommer | M. Zarycka | Recorder: M. Foppiano |

| AGENDA ITEM | DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION | RECOMMENDATION/ACTION |
| Approval of April 5 and April 12, 2011 minutes | | Upon a motion by M. Stengel/P. Rose, the minutes of April 5 and April 12, 2011 were approved. |

Report from Co-Chairs

STANDING ITEMS P&B CALENDAR

Immediate Path Report

Dr. Stork reported that the job description was approved for the new Director of Student Support Services, which is a merger of DSPS and EOPS. The next two positions were student site support assistants. These positions came about by a negotiated settlement with the classified union. Next, a full-time position for a caseworker is a categorical replacement in Workforce & Economic Development. The next 3 are replacements for promotions or resignations. Division Assistant for Business Education, Kasey Kerckhoff was promoted to Administrative Assistant to Vice President of Academic Affairs. ESL Division Assistant, resignation. This position was restructured to be .50 FTE, 11 months. Clerical assistant II, .50 FTE in Academic Affairs, replacement position.

CURRENT ITEMS

Prioritization of Resource Allocation

A handout was provided which detailed the ranked cluster priorities. T. Sommer commented that the prioritization process had 100% committee membership participation. D. Wulf inquired whether any of these priorities would be funded from the General Fund. T. Sommer stated that more than likely lottery funds would be used. D. Wulf made a motion proposing that if ongoing personnel were to be funded, ongoing personnel must be eliminated in another area in order to balance the budget for the upcoming academic year. S. Leone added a friendly
Dr. Stork commented that he had been investigating how to identify and generate new funds that could be earmarked for technology. Previously Dr. Fontanilla spoke about the MAA Program (Medi-Cal Administrative Activities Program) and that many departments were participating by distributing information to students regarding medical assistance through Medi-Cal, etc. During this trial year, the participating departments will keep the resources that are generated. Starting in 2011-12, the money that the District receives will be split. There is an overhead processing fee of 10%. The remaining monies, 45% will go towards the programs and Dr. Stork has designated that the other 45% be applied towards technology. This program has the potential to be very lucrative and a significant contribution to the college problem of funding technology.

Discussion took place regarding funding decisions not based on the prioritization list. Dr. Stork explained there would always be exceptions and that communication needs to take place in Planning & Budget regarding the rationale behind the decision and the funding source to determine whether or not it impacts the prioritization list.

A suggestion was made for the prioritization process next year that the top 3 cluster priorities include only new general fund items.

D. Wulff made a motion proposing that if ongoing personnel were to be funded, ongoing personnel must be eliminated in another area in order to balance the budget for the upcoming academic year.

S. Leone added a friendly amendment to the motion to state that if an unbudgeted item were to be funded then we must identify where to reduce in order to accommodate the new position so that new expenses are not added onto what was budgeted for the year. This motion failed to pass.

2 affirmatives
T. Sommer felt this should include all expenditures not just personnel decisions.

The committee felt that this discussion was beneficial in emphasizing that during times when the District was not receiving Cola, growth or new monies, every expenditure coming before this committee must have a matching funding source.

The following resolution was suggested: “Stay within our budget until new monies are forthcoming.”

T. Sommer stated it was important to identify inflationary costs. She suggested re-visiting this discussion at the beginning of next semester in order to define the process.

Please access the link below to view the document:
Prioritization of Resource Allocation

Prioritization of Resource Allocation

Committee Self-Assessment Survey
This survey will be analyzed in the fall. Please access the link below to view the document:
P&B Self-Assessment Survey

P&B Self-Assessment Survey

State Budget Update
T. Sommer passed out a PowerPoint outlining the 2011-2012 May Revise. In summary, the current status of the Governor’s 2011-2012 Proposed Budget is:
• $400 million cut to California Community Colleges
• Student Enrollment fees have been increased by $10 per unit
• The increased enrollment fees will be used to reduce cuts to the community colleges by $110,000
• No special election in June 2011

Currently, the Community College League of California projects the following cuts for the District:
• $4,350,000 (9.1%) cut if Proposition 98 is minimally funded
• $6,867,000 (14.3%) cut if Proposition is
Additionally, the District projects a $954,000 structural deficit.  
2011 May Revise PowerPoint

| Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan | T. Sommer explained that the Chancellor’s office had not released the due date for the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. Normally the deadline was July 1, 2011 but last year it was due September 1, 2011.  

She apologized for not providing the handouts which demonstrated that the 2001 Educational and Facilities Master Plan contained detailed descriptions of the projects which included planning for personnel, etc.  

T. Reece walked through the District’s Order of Priority for the Five-Year Capital Outlay Construction Plan. He stated it was highly unlikely that there would be any state funding released over the next few years for new construction projects. He recommended rolling the project proposals for the SLO Math Building, NCC Humanities Complex, and NCC Early Childhood Education Center since there were no changes to any of the projects listed and no state funding.  

T. Sommer explained the action to be voted on was support for the order of priority for the construction projects.  

A. Merzon felt this document showed only the list of projects in the queue and there was not enough backup information provided to make an informed decision.  

Dr. Stork explained that this list was submitted to the State yearly. There are currently no state dollars to support the projects on this list. It is not relevant to how this list currently lines up with the new Educational Master Plan but becomes extremely important as we finalize the Educational Master Plan and develop our Facilities Master Plan that when this cycle comes around again, it should reflect what we have identified as our top priorities. At that time we... | J. Sullivan made a motion to accept the Order of Priority for the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan which was approved with the exception of two nayes. |
will reaffirm this list or adjust it accordingly.

J. Sullivan made a motion to accept the Order of Priority for the Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. This motion was unanimously passed with the exception of two nayes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon a motion by C. Greiner/M. Stengel, the meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>