

# Budget Committee

## *Meeting Minutes*

February 16, 2017, 2:00 pm, PDC 104



## Attendance

**Members Present** – Jose Torres, Scott Stark, Wei Zhou, Jim Holbrook, Denise Allen-Hoyt, Yendis Battle, Larry Strong, Girija Raghavan, Mike Strong, Celia Huston, Jeremy Sims, Rosemarie Hansen

**Members Absent** – Achala Chatterjee, Ginger Sutphin, Angela Davis, Sheri Lillard, Steve Sutorus, Diana Rodriguez, Richard Galope, Steve Sarres, Jajuan Dotson

**Guests Present** – Tenille Alexander, Glen Kuck

## Welcome & Introductions

Jose welcomed everyone.

## Approval of Minutes

Jim Holbrook made a motion, which Scott Stark seconded, to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2017 meeting. The motion was unanimously approved by the members present.

## Status of District Services Planning & Program Review

Glen Kuck presented a handout and addressed the committee on District Office program review. While the process has improved over the past year, further progress is expected next year including better integration with college planning, documentation, and communication. DBC members reviewed both ongoing and one-time program review needs. Chancellor's Cabinet will determine which items get funded. Jose reiterated the DBC's decision last year not to reprioritize or "redo" the work of the DSP&PR committee. DBC members will also receive program review needs from the campuses.

Jim suggested that one question which should be addressed during this process is, "How does this help a student?" Glen advised that there is a list of questions that assists in the development of needs and he promised to forward it to committee members. Denise Allen-Hoyt mentioned that it would help to have another column addressing how each need serves the colleges and students. Celia Huston suggested cross referencing each item with the college plans. Jose expressed appreciation for this feedback and Glen advised these ideas would be considered for next year. Glen also added that KVCR needs are not funded by the district, rather they are included to provide a comprehensive picture.

## District Office 2017-18 Budget & Assessment

Larry Strong reviewed the handout which had previously been forwarded to committee members. He commented that this information had been compiled even earlier than last year to give the campuses more time to evaluate the assessment while in budget development.

Denise asked about the Distance Education program budget charges on page 9. Jeremy Sims explained that SBCCD is migrating to Canvas and saving \$274,000 currently spent on the outsourcing of the Blackboard helpdesk. Committee members compared the positions listed in program review with the budget. Although two positions were not part of the ongoing needs list, Denise recalled discussing these positions at length during the process. It was determined that their omission from the list was an oversight.

Jim pointed out that although he had questions about the budget, it is significant that this information is being shared. Denise commented on the necessity for taking cost saving measures in order to reduce the assessment on the colleges. Jose spoke about some of the changes that have occurred in this process in recent years like taking a zero-based budgeting approach and requiring explanations for any increases. He advised that the district office will continue on this path. Questica allows Fiscal Services to look at every single expenditure for possible savings.

Celia referenced the Human Resources budget on page 17 and asked about the significant increase in costs related to job fairs and diversity efforts. Were the job fairs successful? Are the expenses justified? Can this be trimmed? Jose advised that he will pass these questions along.

Larry asked Jim if Fiscal Services could further address his concerns about the district office budget. Jim provided a list questions and Larry promised to review and answer any that he could. Jose mentioned that the district office developmental budget assumes a 9% increase in benefits, however, recent conversations indicate this may only be 6% which may lower the assessment.

### DEMC Recommendation 2017-03 on FTES Projections

Scott spoke about DEMC Recommendation 2017-03 confirming a growth target of 1.5% for 2017-18. He reported the DEMC determination that the colleges are having a difficult time achieving this year's growth goal and the belief that attempting to achieve additional FTES next year could be very challenging. Therefore, the commitment was to stick with 1.5%, at least until after the P2 results are known. Jose added that this is a reaffirmation of the target previously established. Scott commented that this goal would not preclude the campuses from striving for 2.25%, if possible.

Jim responded that we need to communicate that SBCCD is not chasing FTES, rather, it is chasing quality programs. Mike said that based on data received, there is an unmet need in our community that we are striving to meet. Increasing FTES is a result of meeting that need.

### Adjournment & Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to occur on March 16, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. in PDC 104.