



Financial and Budget Planning Advisory Council (FABPAC)  
October 6, 2010 – 2:00 pm  
Board Room  
Unadopted Meeting Minutes

**FABPAC Members Present:**

|                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Philip Andreini          | Ed. Administrator                 |
| Rich Augustus            | Local 39                          |
| Peter Bostic             | Exec. Director, Inst. Advancement |
| Richard Crapuchettes     | Local 39                          |
| Corey Elliott            | ASSC                              |
| Tom Grube                | SCFA                              |
| Chris Guptill            | Classified Manager                |
| Mary Ann Haley           | Academic Senate                   |
| Les Hubbard              | SCFA                              |
| Betsy Julian             | Ed. Administrator                 |
| Jowel Laguerre           | Supt/President                    |
| Debbie Luttrell-Williams | CSEA                              |
| Deborah Mann             | Classified Manager                |
| Louis McDermott          | Academic Senate                   |
| Arturo Reyes             | EVP, Academic & Student Affairs   |
| Kheck Sengmany           | Minority Coalition                |
| Roy Stutzman             | Chair                             |
| Thomas Watkins           | Academic Senate                   |

**Visitors:**

Nora O' Neill, Accreditation Standard III-D  
Karen Ulrich, Director, Human Resources

**Absent:**

Mary Lexi Parmer  
Sheryl Scott

ASSC  
CSEA

**I. Approve October 6 Agenda:**

- Motion (Corey Elliott), second (Richard Crapuchettes) to approve the agenda, with the following amendment: Roy Stutzman indicated the members will discuss the accreditation self-study, as well as review the audit addendum. Motion passed unanimously.

**II. Approve September 15 Meeting Minutes:**

- Motion (Corey Elliott), second (Debbie Luttrell-Williams) to approve meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

**III. 2010-11 State and District Budget Update:**

- Roy Stutzman reported that a budget deal nears completion in Sacramento on the state budget. Growth dollars are built in; however, the District did not include in its adopted budget. The whole budget deal is not on solid ground—he doesn't recommend counting on it **if and until** it's actually allocated. The good news: the District should begin receiving its apportionment soon.

- The Solano County Treasurer and Auditor-Controller are supportive and understanding of the District's cash flow situation. Other local school districts are experiencing the same. They are drafting a resolution for its Board of Supervisors meeting on October 26 to invoke Article XVI of the California Constitution and allows the County to advance up to 85% of the District's total revenues (equates to about \$27 million) to meet cash flow needs only. There may be state deferrals to spring.
- Growth allocated at 2%, but the District's growth percentage will likely be less. Growth is calculated based on our individual growth rate and a variety of factors like adult population changes and high school graduation rates, etc. This money is distributed state-wide based upon specific criteria—and sometimes the dollar amount doesn't correlate to what we think it should. If fully funded and allocated, it could equate to \$800,000 (at \$4500 per FTES). This best-case scenario money would be applied to one-time budgeting items like the \$419,000 property and liability insurance premium and the \$459,000 deficit in 2010-11.
- EVP Reyes indicated our growth target is 2% for this year. We're aiming for 2% over the 8965 FTES as a result of 2009-10 workload adjustment.

#### **IV. Accreditation Self-Study and Audit Addendum to Follow-Up Report:**

- Les Hubbard asked for input on the Standard III-D worksheets. He went through the questions and received input and clarification on where to locate evidence to show that financial planning is integrated with and supports institutional planning. The IPP flow chart was looked at to help members see the linkages.
- All budget managers should have access now to their respective budgets.
- Program Reviews are critical documents that show the college's self-analysis and a starting point for planning and budgeting.
- The People and Things List evolved into a key planning document to show what the District plans to do, the "prospective"—now, we somehow must show how an item got on the list.
- Other useful documents include the Five-Year Capital Construction Plan, the Retiree Benefits Actuarial Study done every two years, the EdMAC Report from 2008, and financial audit reports.
- PERT is a group that reviews, on a broader institutional scale, the planning process and will begin to focus more on ensuring the financial and budgeting link ties in more clearly and effectively. FABPAC will be a key resource in those efforts. FABPAC's role has evolved now to where it's not only advisory in budget and finance issues, but has assumed a more active, participatory role in the planning process.
- Class schedule development should be part of planning because it is a financial resource issue, and most resources go to instruction.
- Peter Bostic made the observation that the issue on emergency preparedness is currently being discussed and addressed at all campus levels and groups and it has a fiscal link and impact. This type of planning isn't part of the IPP but still operates and goes through the planning, budgeting and implementation process.

#### **V. Process for Augmentations to Program Budgets:**

- Roy Stutzman explained that requested augmentation to programs previously approved through the strategic planning process should go through the same process for additional funding. Philip Andreini gave the example of the Umoja Program has factors of uncertainty attached to it, because it was approved, funded and started but it hasn't reached its full potential. There should be a mechanism to

help supplement it. Dr. Laguerre remarked that the Umoja team should first have the conversation about it, because he has not yet heard of concerns for more funding.

- Dialogue occurred on whether an existing program gets focus and priority ranking because the college has already made a commitment to it? What about a proposal that did not get funded—should it receive priority ranking the following year? Did the program achieve its goals? The program evaluation forms in the IPP should be used and followed as valuable instruments. There are several philosophical points to be ironed out. Whatever we do, it should be fair, consistent and keep in mind the strategic plan.
- Dr. Laguerre proposed forming a subcommittee to develop and bring a recommendation back to the group in about a month or two. Volunteers are: Philip Andreini, Peter Bostic, Chris Guptill.
- Discussion followed on how and if a program should get expanded or reduced, for example, the theater program, when the budgets are scaled back and sustaining financial support becomes more challenging. How does a program lessen in scope and funding—has the college really thought about the criteria.

**VI. 2011-12 Budget Planning:**

- Reviewed the latest People and Things List. Roy Stutzman commented that the same revenues and reductions are being planning for 2011-12.
- There was agreement reached with the Academic Senate relative to new faculty hiring. The District will hire five new faculty, keeping in mind the early retirement program savings and Faculty Obligation Number (FON). The divisions are prioritizing.
- Deborah Mann noted that Contract Education is still on the list as being analyzed. There are a few other items on the list that are still pending further review and analysis.

**VII. Items for the Next or Future Agenda:**

- Discussion on faculty hiring process, and linking it to the planning and budgeting process.

**VIII. Adjournment:**

- Meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Minutes taken by Judy Anderson