



**PLANNING & BUDGETING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, December 11, 2013**

**Building 2, Room 10 – 2:10 to 4:10 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Alaa Aisi, Gregory Anderson, Jennifer Castello, Ivan Evans, Patty Hall, Sarah Harmon, Doug Hirzel, Robert Hood, Chialin Hsieh, David Johnson, Debbie Joy, Ruth Miller, Paul Naas, Vickie Nunes, Karen Olesen, Martin Partlan, Loretta Davis Rascon, Robin Richards, Mike Tyler, Lezlee Ware,

**Ex-Officio:** Lawrence Buckley – College President

**Members Absent:** Lizette Bricker

**Guests:** Kathy Blackwood, Joseph Fullerton, John Hashizume, Kim Lopez, Susan Mahoney, Lina Mira, Kay O’Neill, Lorraine Barrales Ramirez, Anniqua Rana, Supinda Sirihkaphong, Soraya Sohrabi, Janet Stringer, Maggie Souza, Dave Vigo

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>	<u>PROCESS</u>
1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES	The minutes were approved as amended.	Doug Hirzel & Debbie Joy, PBC Co-Chairs
2) BUSINESS A. Solar Farm Project	<p>A presentation on the Cañada Solar Farm project was given by Joseph Fullerton, Energy Coordinator for our District.</p> <p><b>Why solar power and this project:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates our District’s commitment to Board of Trustees Goal #4 which states that our district “continue efforts to build energy efficient infrastructure and facilities; and adopt green/clean and sustainable practices; continue commitment to sustainability through LED certification of new construction and renovation projects, promotion of energy efficiency initiatives and green management practices; support college and districtwide sustainability committees; continue to explore opportunities to further incorporate sustainable practices and materials into procurement and operational processes.</li> <li>• proven and reliable technology</li> <li>• the leverage of State and Utility Funding</li> <li>• following the proper “load order”</li> </ul> <p><b>The cost of the Cañada Solar Farm</b> project will be \$5, 250,000 of which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$3,788,421 is from local funding (includes various energy efficiency rebate and incentive funds)</li> <li>• \$961,579 from California Solar Initiative fund - final incentive payment amount will be based upon actual system production</li> <li>• \$500,000 from Prop 39 funds - approximate (California green jobs act)</li> <li>• Noted that our District will front the cost and be reimbursed from funding listed above.</li> </ul> <p><b>The project scope will include:</b></p>	Jose Nunez, SMCCCD Vice Chancellor of Facilities Planning, Maintenance & Operations

<p>B. Resource Allocation Model</p> <p>C. Hiring Proposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to design and building project to build a 1.+ MW solar photovoltaic system at Cañada College, shifting 1/13 to one half of the campus electrical consumption off of the grid.</li> </ul> <p><b>The schedule for the project will include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selecting a vendor – scheduled for Winter 2013 – looking at proposals now</li> <li>Design completion – spring 2014</li> <li>Construction completion – fall 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kiosk or info resource area to flash solar data</li> <li>Project Layout will include 3 1/2 acres southwest of the soccer field situated well to PGE connected solar panels covering area fenced with security to keep track of infrastructure. Our district is working with a company that will advise in making the right selection of the material and process for this project.</li> <li>Drafting of RFP/release of RFP/selection process/contract award notice</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Cañada is taking the first renewable step in our District.</p> <p>Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood reviewed and discussed methods under consideration for our district’s revised resource allocation. This was presented and reviewed in a document showing four scenarios that included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scenario #1 which assumes FTES goals that are for the ultimate size of the college with FTES goals of 5000 for Cañada; 10,000 for CSM; 10,000 for Skyline.</li> <li>Scenario #2 uses current year budgeted FTES goals.</li> <li>Scenario #3 uses FTES goals modified to not exceed 15% increase</li> <li>Scenario #4 changing the LOAD goal</li> </ul> <p>The document presented was scanned and included with these minutes. Questions from discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“What about Student Success in other scenarios?”</li> <li>Would like to see minimum staffing at all three colleges together with positions and see what they have in common.</li> </ul> <p>Reported that the link for program presentations have been posted for campus viewing along with the link to the minutes listing the pros and cons developed at the Joint Meeting of APC, IPC, and SSPC on December 4th. In addition, new reports were generated by program proposers to correct any errors or answer questions and were handed out for review. The Academic Senate will be meeting tomorrow and recommend a prioritized list which will be sent to President Buckley.</p> <p>The process followed for hiring was discussed and asked what outcomes are we looking for? Suggested changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>begin earlier next fall</li> <li>add 30 minutes to the joint meeting for discussion on the pros and cons</li> <li>consider having discussion at PBC</li> </ul>	<p>Kathy Blackwood, SMCCCD Executive Vice Chancellor</p> <p>Doug Hirzel, Academic Senate President &amp; PBC Co-Chair</p>
---	---	---

<p>D. Professional Ethics Policy</p> <p>E. EMP Progress Report</p> <p>F. Annual Plan Resource Request</p> <p>G. Division/Committee Reports</p>	<p>A motion was made and seconded to allow the program presenters to respond to statement errors and facts to President Buckley by Monday, December 16. PBC will submit their list to President Buckley on Monday, December 16. A vote was taken and the motion failed.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded that we proceed with process as understood sending forward as originally proposed. All members present agreed.</p> <p>In regard to the next college hiring process, a motion was made and seconded to follow the process and add sufficient time for discussion at the joint APC, IPC, and SSPC meeting time. All members agreed.</p> <p>SMCCCD Board of Trustees Board Policy No. 2.21 on Professional Ethics and referring to Accreditation Standards III.A.1.d and IV.B.1.a, e, h and revised on 2/12 was reviewed. After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to endorse Policy 2.21 Policy on Professional Ethics.</p> <p>In the interest of time, it was proposed to move this agenda item to another PBC meeting.</p> <p>In the interest of time, it was proposed to move this agenda item to another PBC meeting.</p> <p>No updates given.</p>	<p>Larry Buckley, President</p> <p>Debbie Joy, PBC Co-Chair</p> <p>Doug Hirzel, PBC Co-Chair &amp; Chialin Hsieh, Dean of PRIE</p> <p>Division Committee Reps</p>
<p>3) NEXT STEPS</p>		<p>Doug Hirzel &amp; Debbie Joy, PBC Co-Chairs</p>
<p>4) MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Doug Hirzel &amp; Debbie Joy, PBC Co-Chairs</p>
<p>5) ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.</p>	<p>Doug Hirzel &amp; Debbie Joy, PBC Co-Chairs</p>

Assumptions for Instructional Staffing								
12/11/2013 13:05								
Part-Time Faculty								
Scenario #1								
2013/14 Budget	FTES Goal	Convert to WSCH	Load Goal	FTEF Needed	FT FTEF Available	PT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/PT FTEF	1310 Budget
Canada	5,000	75,000	550	136.36	54.32	82.04	\$ 58,393	\$ 4,790,767
CSM	10,000	150,000	550	272.73	98.75	173.98	\$ 57,895	\$ 10,072,461
Skyline	10,000	150,000	550	272.73	90.19	182.54	\$ 58,055	\$ 10,597,134
District	25,000	375,000	550	681.82	243.26	438.56	\$ 58,055	\$ 25,460,362
Full-Time Faculty								
2013/14	FT:PT Ratio	Ratio Goal	FT FTEF Goal	FT FTEF Available	FT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/FT FTEF	FT Allocation	Reduction to 1310 Budget
Canada	40%	40%	54.32	54.32	-	\$ 94,335	\$ -	\$ -
CSM	36%	40%	108.64	98.75	9.89	\$ 94,335	\$ 932,974	\$ (572,584)
Skyline	33%	40%	108.64	90.19	18.45	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,740,483	\$ (1,071,108)
District	36%	40%	271.60	243.26	28.34	\$ 94,335	\$ 2,673,457	\$ (1,643,692)
<p>This scenario assumes FTES goals that are for the ultimate size of the colleges.</p> <p>Average cost includes benefits.</p> <p>FT FTEF based on Fund 1 FOAPALs as of August, 2013.</p>								

Using current year budgeted FTES Goals																																															
Part-Time Faculty																																															
Scenario #2																																															
2013/14 Budget	FTES Goal	Convert to WSCH	Load Goal	FTEF Needed	FT FTEF Available	PT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/PT FTEF	1310 Budget																																							
Canada	4,494	67,410	550	122.56	54.32	68.24	\$ 58,393	\$ 3,984,945																																							
CSM	7,819	117,285	550	213.25	98.75	114.50	\$ 57,895	\$ 6,628,745																																							
Skyline	8,455	126,825	550	230.59	90.19	140.40	\$ 58,055	\$ 8,150,923																																							
District	20,768	311,520	550	566.40	243.26	323.14	\$ 58,070	\$ 18,764,613																																							
Full-Time Faculty																																															
2013/14	FT:PT Ratio	Ratio Goal	FT FTEF Goal	FT FTEF Available	FT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/FT FTEF	FT Allocation	Reduction to 1310 Budget																																							
Canada	44%	46%	56.76	54.32	2.44	\$ 94,335	\$ 229,889	\$ (142,300)																																							
CSM	46%	46%	98.75	98.75	-	\$ 94,335	\$ -	\$ -																																							
Skyline	39%	46%	106.78	90.19	16.59	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,565,242	\$ (963,263)																																							
District	43%	46%	262.29	243.26	19.03	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,795,131	\$ (1,105,563)																																							
<p><b>Scenario 1 minus Scenario 2</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>FTES Difference</th> <th>Canada</th> <th>CSM</th> <th>Skyline</th> <th>District</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FTES</td> <td>506</td> <td>2,181</td> <td>1,545</td> <td>4,232</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% difference</td> <td>11%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Using 5k, 10K, 10K affects each college differently, depending on how close the college is to its goal. CSM has the ability to grow the most; Canada the least.</p> <p><b>Funding differences Scenario 1 minus Scenario 2</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1310</th> <th>\$ 805,822</th> <th>\$ 3,443,716</th> <th>\$ 2,446,211</th> <th>\$ 6,695,749</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FT Faculty</td> <td>\$ (229,889)</td> <td>\$ 932,974</td> <td>\$ 175,241</td> <td>\$ 878,326</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reduction to 1310</td> <td>\$ 142,300</td> <td>\$ (572,584)</td> <td>\$ (107,845)</td> <td>\$ (538,129)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$ 718,233</td> <td>\$ 3,804,106</td> <td>\$ 2,513,607</td> <td>\$ 7,035,946</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>By setting these larger goals, the colleges each are allocated additional funds for FT faculty and for adjuncts. Selecting the ratios used impacts the colleges as well.</p>									FTES Difference	Canada	CSM	Skyline	District	FTES	506	2,181	1,545	4,232	% difference	11%	28%	18%	20%		1310	\$ 805,822	\$ 3,443,716	\$ 2,446,211	\$ 6,695,749	FT Faculty	\$ (229,889)	\$ 932,974	\$ 175,241	\$ 878,326		Reduction to 1310	\$ 142,300	\$ (572,584)	\$ (107,845)	\$ (538,129)			\$ 718,233	\$ 3,804,106	\$ 2,513,607	\$ 7,035,946	
FTES Difference	Canada	CSM	Skyline	District																																											
FTES	506	2,181	1,545	4,232																																											
% difference	11%	28%	18%	20%																																											
	1310	\$ 805,822	\$ 3,443,716	\$ 2,446,211	\$ 6,695,749																																										
FT Faculty	\$ (229,889)	\$ 932,974	\$ 175,241	\$ 878,326																																											
Reduction to 1310	\$ 142,300	\$ (572,584)	\$ (107,845)	\$ (538,129)																																											
	\$ 718,233	\$ 3,804,106	\$ 2,513,607	\$ 7,035,946																																											



Using FTES Goals Modified to Not Exceed 15% increase

Part-Time Faculty

Scenario #3

2013/14 Budget	FTES Goal	Convert to WSCH	Load Goal	FTEF Needed	FT FTEF Available	PT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/PT FTEF	1310 Budget
Canada	5,000	75,000	550	136.36	54.32	82.04	\$ 58,393	\$ 4,790,767
CSM	9,000	135,000	550	245.45	98.75	146.70	\$ 57,895	\$ 8,493,499
Skyline	9,700	145,500	550	264.55	90.19	174.36	\$ 58,055	\$ 10,122,141
District	23,700	355,500	550	646.36	243.26	403.10	\$ 58,065	\$ 23,406,408

Full-Time Faculty

2013/14	FT:PT Ratio	Ratio Goal	FT FTEF Goal	FT FTEF Available	FT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/FT FTEF	FT Allocation	Reduction to 1310 Budget
Canada	40%	40%	54.86	54.32	0.54	\$ 94,335	\$ 51,046	\$ (31,597)
CSM	40%	40%	98.75	98.75	-	\$ 94,335	\$ -	\$ -
Skyline	34%	40%	106.43	90.19	16.24	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,532,055	\$ (942,839)
District	38%	40%	260.04	243.26	16.78	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,583,101	\$ (974,437)

Scenario 3 minus Scenario 2

FTES Difference	Canada	CSM	Skyline	District
FTES	506	1,181	1,245	2,932
% difference	11%	13%	15%	14%

Limiting the increase over the 13/14 FTES Goal to no more than 15% (before rounding) moderates the differences between the colleges.

Funding differences Scenario 3 minus Scenario 2

1310	\$ 805,822	\$ 1,864,754	\$ 1,971,219	\$ 4,641,795
FT Faculty	\$ (178,843)	\$ -	\$ (33,187)	\$ (212,030)
Reduction to 1310	\$ 110,703	\$ -	\$ 20,424	\$ 131,127
	\$ 737,682	\$ 1,864,754	\$ 1,958,455	\$ 4,560,891

Changing the Load Goal

Part-Time Faculty

Scenario #4

2013/14 Budget	FTES Goal	Convert to WSCH	Load Goal	FTEF Needed	FT FTEF Available	PT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/PT FTEF	1310 Budget
Canada	5,000	75,000	525	142.86	54.32	88.54	\$ 58,393	\$ 5,169,942
CSM	9,000	135,000	525	257.14	98.75	158.39	\$ 57,895	\$ 9,170,197
Skyline	9,700	145,500	525	277.14	90.19	186.95	\$ 58,055	\$ 10,853,479
District	23,700	355,500	525	677.14	243.26	433.88	\$ 58,065	\$ 25,193,618

Full-Time Faculty

2013/14	FT:PT Ratio	Ratio Goal	FT FTEF Goal	FT FTEF Available	FT FTEF Needed	Average Cost/FT FTEF	FT Allocation	Reduction to 1310 Budget
Canada	38%	38%	54.86	54.32	0.54	\$ 94,335	\$ 51,046	\$ (31,597)
CSM	38%	38%	98.75	98.75	-	\$ 94,335	\$ -	\$ -
Skyline	33%	38%	106.43	90.19	16.24	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,532,055	\$ (942,839)
District	36%	38%	260.04	243.26	16.78	\$ 94,335	\$ 1,583,101	\$ (974,437)

Scenario 4 minus Scenario 2

FTES Difference	Canada	CSM	Skyline	District
FTES	506	1,181	1,245	2,932
% difference	11%	15%	15%	14%

Reducing the load goal increases the 1310 costs.

Funding differences Scenario 4 minus Scenario 2

1310	\$ 1,184,997	\$ 2,541,452	\$ 2,702,556	\$ 6,429,005
FT Faculty	\$ (178,843)	\$ -	\$ (33,187)	\$ (212,030)
Reduction to 1310	\$ 110,703	\$ -	\$ 20,424	\$ 131,127
	\$ 1,116,857	\$ 2,541,452	\$ 2,689,793	\$ 6,348,101