

**Modesto Junior College  
Planning & Budget Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2010**

**Present:**

Gaither Loewenstein, Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)  
Mike Adams, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)  
Kevin Alavezos, Academic Senate appointee  
Iris Carroll, Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee  
Paul Cripe, Academic Senate appointee  
Lori Dangerfield, CSEA appointee  
Rosanne Faughn, CSEA appointee  
Kenneth Hart, Director of Research and Planning (ex-officio)  
Rose LaMont, YFA Budget Analyst  
Karen Walters Dunlap, Vice President of Instruction  
David Ward, YFA appointee  
Gary Whitfield, Vice President of College Administrative Services

**Absent:**

Jane Chawinga, YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)  
Jim Clarke, Technology/Distance Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)  
Maurice McKinnon, Instructional Dean  
Bob Nadell, Vice President of Student Services  
Dale Pollard, Faculty Career Technical Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)  
Martha Robles, Student Services Administrator  
Robin Jones, ASMJC Student Rep

**Guest:**

Jenni Abbott  
Brian Sanders

**Business**

**1. Review of Minutes**

**Action Item**

Ken Hart requested that the minutes of December 3, 2010 reflect the following change at the top of page 3.

A little over 19% of ~~students qualify for financial aid.~~ MJC students qualify for BOG waivers based on financial need alone.

The minutes of October 15, 2010 and December 3, 2010 (as corrected) were approved.

## **2. Review of Agenda**

Mike Adams reviewed the agenda with members.

## **3. Recap of Annual Prioritization Process**

Gaither Loewenstein would like a survey sent out asking for feedback regarding the prioritization process that Planning & Budget just went through. Karen Walters Dunlap responded that the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee (AIE) can facilitate sending out a survey.

Mike Adams reported: There was some discussion in the Senate about the rubric used for prioritizing. He felt the process is a good one. We have never used this process before and now people are curious about it. They want more data which should have been considered. Think we all knew that going in for the first time.

Gary Whitfield responded that even our committee said there should be more training for people preparing the addendum. Also, positions should be broken out more as three positions on one line are not all going to be approved.

Gaither Loewenstein received feedback from counselors who were quite disturbed about the Basic Skills Counselor moving from #35 to #1. Gaither gave the counselors the example of getting a grant obligating the general fund to sustain a position in future years which automatically moves a position up. The college needs to look at grant funded positions and when they are going to move into the general fund after the grant is over.

Karen Walters Dunlap reported that there is similar concern from programs that don't have full time faculty. Gaither suggested that when addendum instructions are sent out, criteria for linking positions should be included which would give a better chance of receiving a position.

Brian Sanders stated that he struggles with positions being all in one pool and trying to pretend they are all on an equal playing field when they are not. Gaither responded that one list can tell you what the college needs are and that is why we need one list. The problem with having multiple lists is the lists all come to him and he doesn't have an overall sense from this group. Brian suggested a category for success rate, for instance. Gaither responded that this group and IAC could filter that out as long as you don't use that success rate as a straight line. Karen added that math and English is an easy one because of the need. Jenni Abbott added that it could maybe be part of the conversation that they are vocational, etc., just stated somewhere in the process. Paul Cripe suggested that you could watch out for smaller, vibrant programs. Gaither responded that departmental ranking might help.

Mike Adams added that he feels in the twelve years he has been here, that this was the most inclusive process the college has had.

Brian Sanders stated that coupled with the data, the IAC conversation really helped.

Gary Whitfield reminded members that as the college goes on into the future, its priorities are going to change so our lists will change depending on grants, separations, etc. He added that the college finally has a product after all this time.

Gaither heard that the deans were unhappy with his memo as they felt feelings were hurt with respect to his rationale for not filling management positions. In his memo, Gaither was trying to explain why we weren't going to fund management positions this year. He intended to talk to the deans about this and it wasn't intentional on his part to upset anyone. He is attempting to look at some benchmarks for what managers community colleges have and MJC appears to have more managers than a comparable group of colleges. The college has lost a few managers and some of those positions won't be filled and will give the college budget savings.

Gaither complimented PBC members for their attendance on this, the last meeting of the semester and all the hard work and respectful attitude that has been shown throughout the priority process over the last six months.

#### **4. Five Year Total Cost of Ownership Plan**

Gaither introduced the five year total cost of ownership (TCO) plan by stating that the college now has a nice prioritization process and puts PBC on a one year cycle. The plan lays out a possible scenario for college expenditures over the next five years. He added that PBC also now needs to start thinking forward particularly when we are building buildings and renovating space. How the college is going to staff and maintain buildings is what TCO is about. Total cost of ownership is also an accreditation standard for plans of new facilities. This plan would allow the college to take a look at how much new or reallocation of existing money it will need. In creating the plan he went to lists, where items were on the priority lists and where they were in relation to things on line like the observatory going up, i.e., an astronomy instructor will be needed. Gaither pointed out that the items came from priorities, and that he did not make anything up, particularly from classified lists. There are several media service and IT technicians because we are bringing in so much technology. The rubric will give the college a general, conservative idea of what will be needed. What the college is going to need and what it is going to cost is indicated in the plan.

Gary Whitfield informed members that Central Services is in the process of redoing their total cost of ownership plan.

Gaither cautioned members that the plan is an incomplete view of what the college will need because security, custodial, maintenance and grounds falls under the district.

Rose LaMont asked where it falls into account when people retire or separate from the college. Gaither responded that every time a position is vacated, a decision has to be made and replacement is not automatic with this process. If a replacement is made, it really has no effect because that position is already in the budget. If a position is not replaced, that is where it could be used elsewhere. A vacated position would be looked at in relation to overall college priorities.

Gaither stated that the college has to look at supplies and equipment. General fund dollars need to be set aside because other funding can go away without notice. The college has never had a library line item and currency has to be maintained in the library collection. Gary added that the library has been struggling to cover software needs. The college has had the Dell lease program for the past three years and what are we going to do with upgrading computers that are falling behind. Technology is trying to figure out how to upgrade. Gaither responded that the college will be backing out of the Dell lease in the next few years and buying a limited number of high end machines and other machines. The high end users would be on a three year cycle and low end users on a five year cycle as a possible example.

Gaither added that the college will not be able to offer the same range of services and programs as in the past if we do not look at the base. Paul Cripe responded that a Senate resolution stated that the Senate would be amenable to being flexible to changing to a new culture of discussing the base. However, the resolution got voted down as some people felt the resolution was vaguely worded. Paul added that he would like to see a conversation take place.

Karen Walters Dunlap felt that there was not enough framing of what the resolution was or who would lead the discussion. Kevin Alavezos felt Senate members were not opposed to discussing looking at the base, but rather direction was needed. Karen Walters Dunlap suggested a study session instead of emails and resolutions. Gaither responded that the essence of shared governance is members taking information back to their constituent groups. He added that it is too large a college for him to meet with the whole college on every issue. He needs members to take the message out and needs the communication links stronger and more effective to get the word out.

Gaither clarified that reallocation of the base is going to happen anyway as it is already coming from positions that have not been replaced. His preference would be to not do it in a crisis modality. He would rather have this conversation take place when the college is not in a crisis situation. He added that it is not a shared governance issue but rather, good managers get as much information as they can before making a decision.

Gary Whitfield pointed out that the Instructional side relies on lottery funds to cover instructional supplies and Student Services relies on categoricals, i.e., matriculation funds to purchase supplies. Karen clarified that when the supply budget was zeroed out, some money was given to the library from lottery funds. Gaither added that the day the state budget cuts are announced is the day decisions will need to be made and members need to talk to constituents now.

Gaither clarified that the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness is basically in the plan as a place holder. He is exploring options to see how we are going to get the work done at this point without adding a new position. This position is at most other colleges.

The 5% escalator in personnel for each year after 2010-2011 reflects estimates in COLA and step and column costs.

## Action Item

There was thumbs up approval of the Total Cost of Ownership rubric as a conceptual document, but not approving individual items contained in this plan. It is understood that the individual items will be subject to the allocation process. This will be noted in a footnote at the bottom of the spreadsheet. Equipment item monies in this document were determined arbitrarily and are more than we now have and less than what we need.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Karen Walters Dunlap announced that the substantive change proposal was accepted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges which means that the college can continue to offer online classes. Gary added that this is important for when the Accreditation Team comes to the college.

Meeting dates for the spring semester have been amended due to the president's participation in negotiations. The new schedule was distributed at the meeting and will be sent to members electronically. There were no objections to the necessity of altering the schedule.

## **FUTURE AGENDA**

## **ADJOURNMENT**