_____
MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, A. Serban, T. Garey, G. Carroll, E. Frankel, P. Haslund, L. Rose, J. Jackson and L. Auchincloss

GUESTS: L. Griffin, S. Coffield, P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1   Approval of the minutes of the January 27, 2004, CPC meeting.

The minutes of the January 27th CPC meeting were approved.

2.0 Announcements

Jack reported that although the headcount for the spring 2004 semester was a bit lower than it was in the prior year, he is certain that the credit program will meet its growth and Basic Skills targets for the year. This is due to the fact that we have expanded the number of Dual Enrollment classes offered this spring and a large number of FTES that was generated from the Professional Development Studies classes offered through the Professional Development Center have not been entered into the system due to staff shortages. Once these data are entered into the system, along with the increase in FTES resulting from the earlier Census date for the spring semester, the college should exceed its enrollment targets for the year.

Full-time faculty positions will close on Thursday. Sue Ehrlich said that they had 1,700 people at the job fair who indicated interest and they handed out 300 applications. To date, they have received numerous applications. She applauded the Chancellor's Office for establishing its registry that enables colleges to query names and addresses of anyone who has registered and indicated an interest in the areas for which they are seeking applicants. It is becoming a sophisticated tool.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0   Discussion Items

4.1   Identification of goals and objectives in the College Plan for which additional resources are needed: Fiscal Support

Jack said that John Romo would come at a future meeting to discuss governance.

Leslie Griffin discussed Goal 17 and its Objectives 78, 79 and 80 of the fiscal support area of the College Plan. For each goal and objective she indicated that the college is "on target" for meeting those goals and objectives in the fiscal support area. She cited the technological tools available to assist the fiscal area in maintaining and managing data. Andreea said with the Oracle reporting tools, and the efforts of her office, a lot closer management of enrollments is possible. Gary Carroll indicated that the budget workshops have been excellent to open up the budget process and contributes to our being an exemplary college.

5.0   Other Items

5.1   Process to begin developing 2004-05 college budget

Joe Sullivan distributed the model of the 2-year comparison of the unrestricted General Fund on the enacted budget for 2003-04, which compares increases/decreases on the rough-cut projection for 2004-05 based on the Governor's January proposal. He stressed that this is a very rough projection. The assumptions, to date, do not reflect any salary increase assumption, but are status quo. It does include the step increases and the salaries for our full-time faculty obligation. The assumptions will also reflect that the sabbatical leaves presently on hold will be re-established and funded. The next step in this process is to look at the budget model with the various assumptions using the various scenarios. Leslie said that it is important to show the budget holds on positions as well as the impact of those vacancies.

Leslie Griffin acknowledged that people would like to see the budget holds for the positions that are frozen or not being funded to know what the impact is of those vacancies on college operations and on other staff. We need to revisit those positions that are still on hold to see if the impacts are what we expected and how are we dealing with them. If we are going to hold other positions we should do a like analysis on those. Jack said as we build next year's budget, we should look at the consequences of adding back a position and determining the trade-off of such an action. We need the context to have this discussion. For example, if we add back in a position, which becomes an expense, then how does it affect the bottom line? Do we give up something else or do we just absorb it? Leslie will look at the positions on hold and give us an idea of what we are saving in terms of dollars and we can revisit the impact.

The Council indicated that they would also like to see a rough cut of the equipment and construction funds and have some indication what the flexibility is for use of those funds other than their intended purposes.

Joe discussed with the Council his rough draft of the pending assumptions for 2004-05 which itemized COLA, budget holds for the salary model, credit adjunct expense, transfers to other funds, core program backfill, and one-time funding needs. These assumptions will be redefined and clarified and distributed at the next CPC meeting. Joe also distributed a budget timeline which chronicled the process for developing our budget.

Leslie said that we would come back at the April 6th meeting with a refined unrestricted general fund budget. Jack proposed that the Council meet on May 25th from 10:00 to noon to discuss the budget after the May revise.

5.2   Review of the *Master Calendar for Planning and Budgeting*

Jack said that he would like the Council to look forward on the Master Calendar for the balance of the year to determine whether there is any item on the list that can be eliminated and/or should be added. Bill Hamre moved the discussion of the technology update from March to April.

Joe Sullivan said that according to our timeline for February, we are charged with making the salary model current and doing a TLU analysis for the adjunct expenses to be as accurate as possible.

6.0   Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.