



MOORPARK COLLEGE

Fiscal Planning Committee

The Fiscal Planning Committee makes recommendation on college-wide fiscal processes. Responsible to plan, monitor and evaluate the college-wide fiscal operations: Ed Code 53200(c): - processes for budget development

MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2018

1:00 – 2:20 p.m.

Campus Center Conference Room

POSITION/DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND	DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND	DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND
Co-Chair: VP Business Services	Silvia Barajas	X	Athletics/HED/Kin	Vance Manakas	X	English/ESL	Kara Lybarger-Monson	X
				Remy McCarthy (Alt)		Business	Ruth Bennington	X
Co-Chair: Academic Senate President	Nenagh Brown	X	Physics/Astronomy/	Erik Reese	X	Library	Linda Kennedy	X
			Engineering			ACCESS	Silva Arzunyan	X
Co-Chair: Classified Senate President	Gilbert Downs		Student Health Services	Sharon Manakas	X	Health Sciences	Christina Lee	X
AFT Faculty Appointee (1)	Rex Edwards							
Associated Students Representative (1)	Jeanette Ralph	X	Chemistry/Earth Sciences	Vincent Crisostomo		Mathematics	Phil Abramoff	X
Classified Supervisors' Representative (1)	Michele Perry	X	Counseling	Traci Allen	X	Child Dev Center	Johanna Pimentel	X
				Wendy Berg (Alt)				
Classified Representatives (3)	VACANT		Social Sciences	Lee Ballesterio	X	EOP&S	Marnie Melendez	X
	Linda Sanders	X		Hugo Hernandez (Alt)		EATM	Brenda Woodhouse	
	Obalid Younan	X	Fine & Performing Arts	John Loprieno	X	Behavioral Sciences	Danielle Vieira	X
Dean Appointees (3)	Carol Higashida	X	World Languages	Perry Bennett		Life Sciences	Melia Tabbakhian	X
	Mary Rees	X	Child Development	Cindy Sheaks-McGowan	X	Media Arts/Comm Studies	Neal Stewart	X
	Karen Rothstein	X	Guest	Cynthia Osuna	X	Financial Aid	Kim Korinke	X
Director, Facilities, Maintenance & Ops	John Sinutko	X				Ex Officio:		
						Vice President Academic Affairs	Julius Sokenu	
						Vice President Student Support	Amanuel Gebru	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
1. WELCOME, COME TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS Nenagh welcomed members and asked if there were any new members present. No new members were present. Nenagh mentioned Gilbert was attending a meeting and would be arriving late.	Meeting called to order by Nenagh Brown at 1:03 pm.
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None	
3. MEETING NOTES	
3.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes August 28, 2018	Karen Rothstein motioned to approve minutes. Ruth Bennington seconded motion. Motion carried with Vance Manakas, Marnie Melendez, and Melia Tabbakhian abstaining.
4. REPORTS & DISCUSSIONS	
4.1 Campus Environment Committee – John Sinutko John shared that the committee met on September 18 th in the PCR. They did member introductions and welcomed new members. They approved minutes and discussed last year's goals and objectives. Working towards supporting future hydration stations, additional sidewalks, and other things. Due to time constraints, they were not able to discuss facility reports. He mentioned that a few students attended the meeting. Nenagh asked John for a copy of the committee's goals. John will email copy of the committee's goals to Silvia and she will distribute. Nenagh elaborated that this work group has also been identified as a place where the master education plan can be discussed.	
4.2 Co-Curricular Committee- Silvia Barajas Silvia reviewed report of approved proposals. She mentioned that the complete proposals are on the website for further viewing. The second co-curricular notification will be emailed shortly. She also noted that all proposals were approved. Nenagh acknowledged the Co-Curricular Committee members who are Allam, Vance, Silvia, Leanne, and Kristen. She is also part of the committee and was quite impressed with the committee. Members inquired about what happens to proposals that are not approved. Silvia mentioned that applicants are notified by email indicating reasons why proposal was not approved with a cc to their dean.	
4.3 FTES Report – Silvia Barajas Silvia reviewed the FTES report for 2017/18 actual. The first column is last year 2017/18 & third column is 2018/19. Silvia asked if last year's column does not make sense, she is happy to remove it. Members stated that they do not want the column to be removed. Members asked for clarification for 2017/18 actuals & third column. Front page is MC and the back page is the district. Members asked why we are down. Silvia mentioned that we have more students, but they are taking fewer classes. We do have late starts in October and November. Members asked if for the Spring semester we have built a schedule were we could hit the fill rate. Julius is targeting to complete fill rate. We went with a conservative number when we were building our target. The district budget is built on 26,662 FTES. The back side of the page shows how the other colleges are doing. Last meeting it was mentioned that we could reach this growth but it was highly unlikely. The rate we get for student has gone down and plus you need to factor in the new SCFF metrics (PELL, AB540, Promise Grant, completion, etc. Therefore, there are still those ramifications. The budgeted FTES includes 590 FTES due to the shift from Summer 2018/19 to 2017/18. The College's hold harmless allocation is based on an FTES of	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>26,669. A member mentioned that other colleges have CAPs of 35 and that contributes to not being able to increase FTES production. Member asked for clarification of the hold harmless model. Silvia reviewed the hold harmless model. Currently, the SCFF indicates that the district should receive 11.7 million than 2017/18 PC TCR. This is only for the next 3 years The District will be held harmless for 2018/19, 2019/20, and 2020/21. It's the fourth year 2021/22 where there will be no safety net and the district allocation will be made based on the factors of the SCFF.</p>	
<p>4.4 Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF)</p> <p>Nenagh mentioned that during the last meeting we looked at our allocation model. Please refer to the blue handout. Some members noticed immediate ramifications. Nenagh asked members if they had questions. Members expressed concerns. Concerned that AB705 will push students up into the transfer courses and create grade inflation because we are going to get instructors who will feel pressured. Nenagh mentioned that this concern is real because there is a dollar amount attached to students. Jeanette asked for further clarification regarding issue. Nenagh explained that we could not require students to take pre-requisite classes if they are not ready for transfer level classes. The model awards more points/dollars for them to take transfer level. Mary noted that the state model has strong data that supports this new approach in helping students accomplish their math goals with additional supports. It will be an interesting time. Nenagh mentioned that English also shares the same concerns. Nenagh mentioned that this is happening at all levels of education. It is predicted that a million more students need degrees by 2025. A member expressed concerns that it seems internally inconsistent. She also mentioned that we are incentivized by money to issue certificates and it is very divisive. Conversation is taking place at the district level. The money that we have through SCFF model has already been used up through COLA. We are anticipating receiving 7.6 million for the current year. Silvia mentioned that we are looking at the tentative budget of 7.6 million. Looking at the adopted budget looks like that amount will go down to 3.6 million. Nenagh shared that the budget is being disputed at the executive level. How much money do we have extra? How will this change our district allocation model? Nenagh said we do not understand all the pieces of the pie. The Chancellor's Office does not know how quite to explain it. Silvia stated that DCAS spent last year trying to find money. She would rather understand the model and find out what we need to be ready for in the next three years. Members asked why Silvia feels that there is less funds to allocate once the SCFF is allocated in February. Silvia explained that she noticed that the adoption budget already has an increased rate per FTES for the COLA adjustment. This would lower the amount that is available for allocation. We need to remain transparent. Silvia was also concerned that the adoption budget included funds for the 590 shift. The District has not done this in the past. In past years, we have budgeted based on actual FTES, which does not include FTES funds for shifted FTES. She will need to review it once more. Campuses used these funds to create the 2018/19 budget, which included PERS/STERS, health benefits, and COLA. For health care retiree costs district pays over 15 million and cost goes up every year. Silvia does not see how the additional 7.6 million is extra because MC personnel and benefits costs increase by about 3 million, VC was probably similar, and OC was probably 1.5 million. That totals 7.5 million in recurring costs every year. There is no extra from the 7.6. Silvia will be exploring this further through DCAS and will continue to report to the FPC.</p>	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>Nenagh mentioned that the district has scheduled and IEPI visit. District will use \$200,000 to hire consultants. We need to look at the organization and infrastructure of DAC. Nenagh and Silvia are on this committee. Silvia clarified that when we are talking about infrastructure we are not referring to a building. It was stated that Strong workforce and categorical models does not go through new funding model.</p> <p>Silvia will be meeting with Oleg to discuss the SCFF data so we can best determine how to proceed. It is our understanding that all IR Deans have the data except for the transfer and wage gains data. We have the same amount Pell grant students as Oxnard. It is important for us to get that data. Hopefully Oleg will help us obtain this data. Nenagh mentioned that all community colleges are all having the same discussions. We are ahead of the game and Silvia is prepared. Members are curious how this funding formula will be affected after the elections. If you have more questions regarding this topic, please reach out to Silvia or Nenagh for further clarification.</p>	
<p>4.5 DCAS - Nenagh Brown, Silvia Barajas, and Gilbert Downs Set Reserves, irrevocable trust and discussion of the FON. Received statement of the FON from Chancellor's Office. Received 1.87 million in funding. FON for 2017 is 407 and the actual was 440- fulltime faculty, so the district is over the FON rate by 33. This is a district-wide number not a campus number. Our district should be 407. We do not have it per college. The 75/25 last year we were 59.2%. According to the district if you meet your FON obligation then you are fine as working toward the 75/25 goal. This is the state requirement, but does not address our need. Silvia has asked them for the calculation for MC. Once Silvia receives figures, she will provide information. Are we going to spend the 1.1 million? Does it need to be spent on hiring a faculty? They said no because we met FON. Phil asked if anyone was at 75%. Silvia mentioned that Imperial Valley was at 70% and no one is at 75%. Silvia will be sending handout. They use the 77,063 to calculate faculty cost, yet benefits are not included. We have a heavy year upon us.</p>	
<p>4.6 Review Committee Evaluations from 2017/18 Nenagh asked members to review committee evaluations. Evaluations were distributed during the previous committee meeting. Nenagh asked members if they had any questions. It was mentioned that in regards to Question 10 most committee members did not know what this question meant. Nenagh encouraged members to continue to make recommendations. Although these committees are set up for informational purposes, they are still required. Silvia wants to ensure that the information she provides is what the committee needs. If there are areas that are lacking, please let her know. Nenagh asked members if they had any more questions before we move on to goals. Members did not have further questions.</p>	
<p>4.7 Discussion & Recommendation of Goals FY 2018/19 Nenagh and Silvia reviewed committee goals. As a reminder, members would like to keep the focus on student success. Silvia reiterated that we want to continue doing the good work we have been doing. The goals will be brought back for a final vote during the next meeting. If you have any questions, please contact Nenagh & Silvia.</p>	
<p>4.8 Classified Prioritization Meeting – January 29, 2018</p>	
<p>5. OTHER - Discussion & Recommendation related to Committee Goals</p>	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
6. ADJOURNMENT	Meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.

HANDOUTS	FPC 2018/19 MEETING CALENDAR, 4 th Tuesday at 1:00 p.m., CCCR
FPC Agenda 8/28/2018 – Website	2018 – 08/28 , 09/25, 10/23, 11/27
FPC Meeting Minutes 9/28/18 (DRAFT) – Website	2019 – 01/22, 01/29, 02/26, 04/23
2018/19 FTES Report – Website	
SCFF Documents – Website	
FPC Portion of Making Decisions Document – Website	
FPC Charge/Membership - Included on Agenda - Website	
Committee Evaluation – Website	

FISCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP
Fiscal Planning <u>Reports:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Campus Environment Co-Curricular 	Plans, monitors, and evaluates college-wide fiscal operations <i>The Fiscal Planning Committee makes recommendations on college-wide fiscal processes. Responsible to plan, monitor and evaluate the college-wide fiscal operations: Ed Code 53200(c): - processes for budget development</i> The specific tasks of this committee are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annually review the District Budget Allocation Model and make recommendations for changes as necessary Receives reports on the development of the college General Fund budget in alignment with District processes Review emergent budget needs and constraints, and Implement the annual Classified Hiring Prioritization process. 	Co-Chairs: Vice President, Business Services Academic Senate President Classified Senate President Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Appointed by AFT (1) Associated Students Representative (1) Classified Supervisors' Representative (1) Classified Representatives (3) Dean Appointees (3) Director of Facilities, Maintenance & Operations All Department Chairs and Coordinators or Designees Vice President (Ex-officio)

DRAFT - Goals 2018-19	Date of Action/Completion
1. Annually review the revised District Allocation Model and supporting documentation to determine the impact on College operations and the continued efficacy of the budget allocation process. (This goal is going to be tied in with #7.)	
2. Look for opportunities to strengthen the connections among planning, resource allocation, and assessment processes. (Silvia asked how we are meeting this goal. Erik asked if we want to have a planning committee. How does this fit into	

committee? Mary stated this is part of the integrated model. Nenagh mentioned this is in response to the IEP visit. Phil shared that we did #2 when we discussed the survey. This is an active piece of what we do. Karen asked what the assessment process means. (Members recommended keeping goal.)	
3. Through the Program Plan Review process, recommend ways the campus can better utilize the Classified Service to meet the College Mission; recommend prioritization for classified staff hiring.	
4. Provide information updates on fiscal and budget components to entire campus. (Silvia recommended to keep)	
5. Review Multi Year Budget Projections (Silvia recommended to keep goal)	
6. Review Infrastructure Model (Silvia clarified that this is for facilities and computer equipment)	
7. Student Center Funding Formula – Educate ourselves so that we can adequately advocate on behalf of MC students at District Level. (How do we track impact?)	