



## Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee

October 27, 2010

### Members present:

\_John Lau, VP for Business Services, Co-chair  
\_Dr. Victor Jaime, Administrative Representative  
\_Dr. Michael Heumann, College Council Chair  
\_Eric Jacobson, Faculty Representative  
\_Faculty Representative  
\_Carlos Fletes, Director of Fiscal Services  
\_Jesus Gallegos, ASG Representative

### Recorder: Mary Carter

\_Kevin White, Academic Senate President, Co-chair  
\_Bill Gay, CMCA representative  
\_Marilyn Boyle, CSEA Representative  
\_Yethel Alonso, CSEA Representative

### Non-Voting

\_Kathy Berry, Vice President for Academic Services

---

The regular meeting of the Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee was called to order at 1:36 p.m. Kevin White, committee co-chair.

### Approval of minutes

M/S/C Alonso/Jaime to approve the amended minutes of September 22, 2010. Eric Jacobson requested that the minutes reflect the \$250,000 five year cost of the Desert Museum MOU.

M/S/C Boyle/Alonso (no: Jacobson, abstain: Jaime) to approve the minutes of October 6, 2010 as presented.

### Proposition 25

M/S/C Jaime/Alonso to recommend the College support the passage of Proposition 25 (Passing the Budget on Time Act). The proposition would change the vote requirement in the legislature to pass a budget from two-thirds to a simple majority. If lawmakers do not pass a budget on time, they will be required to forfeit their pay until a budget is passed.

### Response to Budget Recommendation

Kevin White reported that the committee's budget recommendation was delivered to the President by co-chairs White and Lau, and the President responded with the memo attached. Dr. Gould indicated that the committee should send its recommendations to College Council and Academic Senate, not directly to the President. The committee discussed the contradictory reporting lines contained in its bylaws and the current committee reporting flow chart. It also noted conflicting information regarding the reporting structure within the flow chart. Co-chair White noted that the committee had protested the \$75,000 funding of the IT position, and that the position will now be partially grant funded.

M/S/C Alonso/Jacobson that the committee draft a response to the President's memo and request clarification of the committee reporting structure.

### Reassessing the mandate of the Committee

Co-chair White asked how the committee saw its role. Did it want to take a global view or to look at the budget by line item. Bill Gay suggested looking at the budget beyond next year and

to consider that state funding mechanism might change. Dr. Jaime suggested the committee review its Budget Guidelines annually. Dr. Jaime stated that the Educational Master Planning Committee may be more involved in budget priorities and doing the actual “pick and shovel” work of reviewing the budget as the Program Review process becomes more refined in its third year. Marilyn Boyle suggested looking at fixed costs for savings (i.e. new copier contracts).

Next meeting: Wednesday, November 3, 2010, 4:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

October 12, 2010

Memorandum

To: Academic Senate, College Council, and Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee  
From: Ed Gould, Superintendent/President  
RE: Draft Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee Resolution regarding support for the Vice President of Information Technology

I want to thank the Academic Senate and the Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee for the resolution pointing out that the process for budget allocation was not followed in the approval of the position of Administrative Secretary to the Vice President of Information Technology. You are correct in your observation that the position did not appear in the Program Review of 2009-10. Consequently the district will use categorical grant funding for the 2010 – 2011 academic year and adhere to the process in the 2011 – 2012 budget year.

The resolution assumes two items that deserve presidential response.

The first assumption is that the Administrative Assistant and the VP for Information Technology the reorganization are not cost neutral. That assumption is simply incorrect. The VP of Information Technology and the previous Dean of Information Technology salaries are very close. While the VP is making slightly more than the Dean (who was making more than two VP's) the difference does not negatively impact the cost neutrality. Because of two months savings in the VP's position and grant money awarded through Title V we will be able to fund the Administrative Secretary position without negatively impacting cost neutrality this year, and we believe into the future for at least five years. Furthermore, these positions were not part of the administrative reorganization. While the position changed from a Dean to a Vice President the organization did not change.

The second assumption is that the recommendations from the Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee guidelines and priorities guide the decisions of the president. As you know I have always stated that committees make recommendations to the Academic Senate and/or the College Council, depending on the approved governance committee. Only the President's Cabinet, College Council, and Academic Senate recommend directly to the president. While I concur that the guidelines are good practice and will be followed in normal circumstances I reserve the right to make budgetary changes determined to be business necessities. I have made some of those decisions already this year. In order to meet the demands of enrollment temporary full-time faculty were hired for the semester and academic year that did not follow the Budget and Planning Committee Guidelines. There were not grant funds or vacancies to offset those hires. These positions were an academic, enrollment, and business necessity. Other items that did not go through the Program Review process also showed up on the changed budget but did not receive attention in the resolution from the Budget and Planning Committee. I will point to one that is a business necessity and that is the Memorandum of Understanding with the Desert Museum. While this will cost the district approximately \$250,000 over five years and \$40,000 this budget year it is in the best interest of the District that we do not honor the original agreement with the Desert Museum Society that required us to operate and maintain the Desert Museum in Ocotillo as an IVC program.

I would like to remind the Budget and Planning Committee, College Council, and the Academic Senate that the recommendations of the Budget and Planning Committee no longer go directly to the

Superintendent/President, but now go to both the College Council and the Academic Senate. Board Policy states that processes for institutional planning and budget development should be created through mutual agreement with the Academic Senate. The development of the 2010 budget followed mutually agreed upon processes for the most part with the exception of some business necessities that have occurred since the budget was developed through the participatory governance process last spring.

Thank you for your interest, your continued excellent work, and the cooperative spirit in which the resolution was offered.