

**Glendale Community College
Institutional Planning Coordination Committee**

MINUTES

June 27, 2011 - 12:15 p.m. in AD121

Present: Trudi Abram, Jill Lewis, Alice Mecom, Richard Kamei (for Isabelle Saber) Mary Mirch, Mike Scott

Absent: Saodat Aziskhanova, Karen Holden-Ferkich, Ed Karpp, Margaret Mansour, Ron Nakasone, Vicki Nicholson, Rick Perez, Alfred Ramirez, Monette Tiernan, Hoover Zariani, Student Representatives

Guests: Michael Ritterbrown

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Scott called the meeting to order at 12:24 p.m.

Due to the lack of a quorum, the minutes were not approved.

1. NEW BUSINESS

Michael Ritterbrown presented a new way for the college to look at all of the annual resource requests submitted through plans and program review. Academic Affairs was asked to prioritize all of requests concerning instructional programs. The list was large and organized by division. Michael decided that he could not make constructive decisions from this list. Along with Mike Dulay and Mike Scott, the list was reordered into like categories of what the request was for and not where the request originated. Michael explained the similarities to a household budget that might be divided into rent, maintenance, food, entertainment, etc. Michael focused on IT as an example, stating that the current IT budget of \$579k was 2% of the 01 budget. This amount is only for requests submitted by each division and does not include any of the infrastructure needs cited by the accreditation visit (Recommendations 6 & 8). Combining similar requests could help the college to identify areas that need attention and also possibly result in economies of scale.

Large expenditures such as emergency repairs and facilities improvements are not linked to historical data to help the college budget efficiently. Every year a percentage of some of the items that are needed could be funded. A system such as this should be more efficient and effective. Michael asked if we could push forward toward a totally "categorical" allocations for budgeting. Mary expressed concern over the issue of collective bargaining and potential serious concerns when the college has "backed into things" in the past. If we "categorize" or "decentralize", everything would be "put on the table". Michael felt that this system does that and that when and if the money comes back—we are going to have real problems. If we could come to agreement then a process/system that everyone knows could facilitate how any and all resources come back into the system. He further stated that a system of budgeting by division facilitates cannibalism. Our archaic system promotes inequity in dollars, FTEF and enrollment management and that we need effectiveness. How do we best serve the institution, employees and students? Mike Scott added that "we" don't decide what is best for the college or how much goes into wages and benefits.

Michael responded that we must be open to modifications. As an example, he cited that we need to budget for emergency repairs such as broken gas lines, as there will always be something major that needs replacement. Additionally, the accreditation team did not like our "rollover" budgeting process. He further stated that eliminating historical allocation can allow prioritization to take over and that the current system supports poor budgeting practice. Rollover budgeting presents problems with collective bargaining, whereas the new proposed system could support and not compete with

collective bargaining.

Trudi stated that the new system could help by saving time and providing flexibility. As an example, if IT doesn't need their allocation for the year it could be reallocated. There will always be fluctuations and the college can plan through program review, planning and budgeting etc. Decisions should be data based and the Budget Committee could make adjustments.

Michael stated that this might be a very good time to solicit "buy in" and to pilot a new process—when there is NO money, and so little risk. It was discussed that this would require planning and that we must ask and answer as many questions as possible first. Sarah McLemore had given Michael a proposal for planning and outcomes/data based budgeting. It was suggested that IT and Facilities incorporate (potential) large maintenance items into their budgets.

Administrative "outcomes" were discussed. Michael added that we should try to avoid "ranking" requests submitted via plans or program review. Budgets could be "validated" on the basis of reasonableness of the request. Outcomes could be that "faculty and staff have the equipment necessary to do their jobs" and these plans could be cascaded. This system could help the college look at the "big picture" and think globally not individually. There is a need to consider a system that will work with our new culture (ranking- "no" and prioritization- "yes"). Michael stated that Academic Affairs can't effectively rank, however, units can prioritize. Additionally, the responsibility should be in the hands of those who can make an informed decision.

Michael asked for a recommendation from the IPCC to take to Campus Executive and the Budget Committee. This will be addressed at the next meeting when we (hopefully) have a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.
The next meeting will be on July 11.

Future meeting dates for the summer include July 25, August 8 and 22.

Submitted by Jill Lewis