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1. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Vela called the meeting to order at 2:08 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 7, 2006
It was moved by Mr. Cameron that the minutes of December 7, 2006 be approved as presented. Mr. Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3. UPDATE ON FULL-TIME FACULTY POSITIONS
Mr. Farmer reported that the College is not anticipating hiring additional full-time faculty. It was explained that because of the College's enrollment decline, the need to hire additional full-time faculty has also declined. One caveat to the full-time faculty hiring would be in the separately accredited disciplines which require a specific ratio of teachers to students, i.e. dental hygiene and nursing.

Dr. Reece inquired if there was a plan to hire for the vacated Judicial Affairs position. Dr. Johnson replied that the job flyer is being completed and the position would be advertised as a faculty position.

4. PROPOSED 2007-08 BUDGET
Ms. Higdon presented to the committee an e-mail that provided a brief synopsis of the Governor's proposed 2007/08 budget. She reminded the committee that the Governor's proposed budget numbers are preliminary and these preliminary numbers will change between now and the May revise.
5. **ENROLLMENT REPORT**

Mr. Farmer reported that based on preliminary numbers the College is up slightly in FTES from last year. He reminded the committee that enrollment declined in 2005/06. The College is striving to restore its base of 2004/05. While some progress has been made to restore to this base, the College has not yet reached this goal.

Dr. Vela added that enrollment is very important to the College. It is important that we provide our students with the utmost in customer service. She acknowledged and publicly thanked the One-Stop Student Services areas for their wonderful customer service during the spring registration. She believes that by providing extended counseling/admission hours for the students the College benefited from this extra touch in customer service.

6. **2006-07 CAPITAL OUTLAY TIMELINE**

Ms. Higdon presented draft #1 of the Proposed Tentative Timeline for Capital Outlay. She indicated that the timeline is in draft form and has been reviewed by the Management Leadership Committee (MLC.) This timeline has been designed to provide more time in all phases of the process. Additionally, the process will be similar to the process of last year in terms of the capital outlay input, automation and ranking. The committee provided the following comments/suggestions:

- If managers need a refresher course on how to input the capital outlay forms, contact the Innovation Center.
- In order to have a record of the campus capital outlay needs and to preserve the transparency of the process, the 2005/06 capital outlay information has been saved.
- Individual divisions/departments are not to input individual computer requests. Any staff/employee computer requests must come directly from Information Technology.
- At this time the Planning and Resource Allocation Model from Dr. Durdella is separate from this form. The planning and resource allocation model will interweave with the current process so that the capital outlay process becomes part of the entire planning process.

Dr. Reece inquired if the Planning and Budget committee would be the committee that has final approval of the Capital Outlay Plan. Dr. Vela responded that the Planning and Budget Committee makes a recommendation to the President.

Ms. Prindle indicated that it appeared that 1) faculty are far removed from the end process of the capital outlay plan and 2) the concern that the capital outlay request list will be so diverse, prioritization could be difficult. Dr. Vela replied that it is important that the faculty and divisions work as a team. The reality is that the College has a tremendous amount of needs and not enough resources. The intent is to try and maximize the resources we have; to meet as many needs as possible and to have a record of expenditures and their connection to planning and the Strategic Plan. Mr. Farmer added that in Academic Affairs, it
is hoped that each division collaborates and comes to a consensus so that it may operate from group decisions that staff have agreed to all along the way.

Ms. Nolan concurred that the capital outlay timeline does not acknowledge the work that is being done at the unit level. This began a discussion in which committee members provided their input for modifications to the form. Because of time restraints it was agreed that Mr. Farmer, Dr. Johnson, Ms. Higdon and Ms. Nolan would collaborate to update the form to ensure that more detail for the inclusion process is outlined on the form. Once this has been completed, a second draft will be e-mailed to the committee.

Dr. Namala noted that he thought that the Program Review process would be on the agenda for this meeting. Dr. Vela replied that the committee will see that Program Review will be integrated into the Planning and Resource Allocation process.

Dr. Reece added, that based on the current capital outlay timelines, the Program Review report should be received by this committee ASAP. He asked if the Planning and Budget committee would like to receive the report from program review every year, including this year. A lengthy committee discussion ensued regarding whether Planning and Budget was ready to accept this year’s Program Review report. The following were committee comments:

- The College is in the process of implementing a new Planning and Resource Allocation model. This model will not go into effect until 2007/08. This program review will be for all units, not just instructional.
- Discussion ensued about whether current programs undergoing review should submit capital outlay requests separately or through their units and divisions.
- It was again noted that the program review summary report needs to include common threads on campus that have budgetary implications, not just key requests from departments.
- The question remains: if the committee receives the Program Review report, then what? What does it mean to accept the report, and what is the expectation once the report is received? Also, would it privilege programs in academic affairs that have program review and disadvantage programs/areas that don’t have a program review process in place yet?

Dr. Reece also voiced his frustration that the Faculty Senate was not involved in the preparing of the draft planning and resource allocation model. Mr. Farmer recognized this and acknowledged that the Senate should have been more involved in this process. Dr. Vela indicated that the planning and resource allocation model is a draft that will be brought to this committee that includes Senate representation for further discussion. He suggested that he, Dr. Durdella, and Dr. Reece meet to try and think about how we can proceed in the short term.

In conclusion, it was decided that Program Review would be on the February 15, 2007 agenda.
7. **ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

Mr. Cameron noted that at the last Fine Arts/Communications Division meeting, a discussion took place regarding the increase in minimum wage and how it impacts the Fine Arts/Communications Division. He was asked to share the following information with the Planning and Budget committee:

- For any division that is effected by the minimum wage increase, that they be immediately augmented so that divisions do not have to cut back on adult hourly hours.
- All hourly wages go up proportionately.
- Department budgets are increased automatically to accommodate minimum wage increases in the future budgets.

Ms. Higdon reiterated from the last Planning and Budget meeting that the campus-wide monetary effect of the minimum wage increase will not have a large impact on the budget. If this minimum wage increase does have a large impact on a division budget, contact her directly. She reminded the committee that hourly employees are on an as-needed basis and should only be called on as needs arise.

Dr. Vela added that it is very difficult at this time to respond in a positive and affirmative fashion. In order to make the modifications requested, the College would have to have additional resources coming in. As was stated earlier in the meeting, the College is in the process of trying to restore lost enrollment as well as gain enrollment.

Mr. Cameron also stated that the faculty in the Fine Arts and Communications Division feel very strongly that it is time to stop freezing department/division supply budgets year after year when costs keep going up. Faculty are having to personally pay for supplies, because the College can no longer buy enough supplies for what the faculty needs are. Dr. Vela replied that perhaps, for the 2006/07 capital outlay process, the divisions/departments may want to think about whether or not you want to augment the supply accounts with the portion of capital outlay funds that come from the general fund. Absent sources of revenue, this could be an option.

Ms. Nolan commented ACCME has had a conversation about division supply funds and that on behalf of ACCME, they would like to make part of the record that supply funds at the unit level have been repeatedly slashed, and units cannot function if supply dollars become an institution wide supply request process. She acknowledged that no one has said that supply funds will become centralized; however section V of the draft document linking planning and resource allocation references supplies as a future by request process. An institutional wide supply request process that impinges upon existing supply funds would bring functioning of the units to a stop.

Ms. Higdon added that the majority of divisions/departments are struggling with the lack of funds in their supply/adult hourly budgets. She asked that when the College looks at the COLA for 2007/08, one could suggest that our supply budgets should be augmented equally at the COLA rate. An issue is that the College has health benefits,
which tend to grow at a much higher rate than the COLA. Remember, the College may not get growth funds, and absent any additional revenue, if you augment one budget, another has to suffer.

8. **NEXT MEETING - FEBRUARY 15, 2007**
The next meeting will be February 15, 2007

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.