Planning & Budget Council (PBC) Notes for Meeting on October 1, 2010


Excused: Frank Palacat, Lui Hokoana, Jan Lubin, Kevin Ishida, James McCumber, Fac. Senate Liaison tba.

Guests: Mark Hamasaki, Jean Shibuya, Emi Troeger, Kalawaia Moore.

Doug Dykstra convened the meeting shortly after 2 p.m. expressing appreciation to members for attending on this busy Ho’olaule’a Friday. He proceeded to provide a narrative description of the outcome of the Program Change Requests (PCR) that had been identified and prioritized during the course of the Spring 2010 semester in the PBC’s inaugural year.

PBC identified four PCR’s and prioritized them during Spring 2010 as follows:

1. Library/Learning Commons Completion and Support ($2,134,000 ask);
2. Improving Developmental Education ($228,000 ask);
3. Associate of Arts Degree/Transfer Program Support ($570,000 ask);
4. Public Service Support ($283,500 ask) for a total of $3,215,500 of requests.

The Budget Policy Paper was completed by the UH System and presented to the Board of Regents in May 2010 well after the final meeting of the PBC on April 17. When the guidelines from the Budget Policy Paper were presented to the campuses during the first week of June the campuses learned the CC System would cap its PCR requests at $2,674,854 for year one of the biennium (2011-12) and an additional $2,674,854 for a total in year two (2012-13) of $5,349,708. PCR categories were issued by the system for the first time since the issuance of the budget policy paper and Windward CC had a short turnaround time to categorize and submit its proposed PCR’s in accord with the following categories:

PCR Categories (not in priority order)

**PCR #1 – Improve quality of existing CTE programs**

Faculty professional development, equipment replacement, costs associated with obtaining program accreditation or similar external certifications.

**PCR #2 – Emerging technical fields**

New faculty, new equipment, other costs associated with developing and offering instruction in new fields such as green jobs, medical informatics, new media arts, MELE, biotechnology, etc.
**PCR #3 – Education**

Additional faculty, other costs associated with developing or expanding education related programs, particularly to meet the needs of DOE or early childhood education.

**PCR #4 – Pre-baccalaureate workforce programs**

Additional faculty, curriculum development, equipment, other expenses to increase the number of students moving into high demand baccalaureate programs, particularly in STEM fields. Could include pre-engineering, engineering technology, STEM majors.

**PCR #5 – Nursing**

Additional faculty (or replacement costs for existing extramurally funded faculty) to meet nursing shortage. To be done in conjunction with the School of Nursing Center for Nursing Education.

The college administration faced a challenge to try to fit as many of the four PCR’s (and/or portions of the PCR’s) into the categories provided by the system. Among the categories identified, examples given internally as part of the category descriptions provided broad hints as to the types of PCR’s that would be considered fundable. For instance, Category #1 “Improve quality of existing CTE programs specifically mentioned costs associated with obtaining program accreditation…and this seemed to invite a PCR to build up the Veterinary Tech certificate program to degree level and seek national accreditation for it; Category #2 “Emerging technical fields” mentioned biotechnology by name and this seemed to invite a PCR to establish certificate programs in biotechnology, and ethno-pharmacognosy; Category #3 “Education” was a vague category that appeared to provide the best prospects for presenting the campus PCR on remedial/developmental education; Category #4 “Pre-baccalaureate workforce programs” specifically mentioned pre-engineering and engineering technology programs practically inviting a PCR that would be drawn from the AA Degree/Transfer program PCR at least in part. The college’s top ranked PCR for support and positions for the new Library/Learning Commons did not fit in any of the initial categories issued by the system, however the college administration proceeded with this PCR hoping to present it as a request that would be supportive of all four of the categorized priorities the college was pursuing. However, later the system replaced a category for “Nursing” with a category for “Infrastructure Support” and this seemed to fit the Library PCR perfectly.

The college administration thought better of sending forward its original requests in light of the budget ceilings that had been identified. Consequently requested amounts were pared down for its five PCR’s to a reduced total of $1,386,048. However, one can notice that the PBC approved requests had been supplemented by two new PCR’s (Biotechnology & Veterinary Tech Assisting) which could have been pursued earlier had the PBC known what system priorities were early enough to respond before the end of the spring semester. So the scorecard shows that one PCR (Public Services Support) had to be dropped altogether because it fit into none of the categories, two of the PCR’s (Library Support & Remedial/Developmental Education) were sent forward with cuts in the budget request, one PCR was sent forward (AA Transfer Program Support) with major cuts in its budget to transmogrify it into a pre-baccalaureate pre-engineering program request, and two PCR’s were developed belatedly.
(biotechnology & Vet Tech Assisting) and ironically these were the only two PCR’s that survived the review process at the level of the President’s Budget Committee to be included in the budget request recently approved (8/30/10) by the Board of Regents.

Pre Request forms and Form A applications were completed and submitted for all five PCR’s to the President’s Budget Committee. Not only did that system committee cull out three of the WinCC PCR’s but it also approved the two remaining PCR’s for substantially less than originally asked….from a $493,930 request down to $218,500 that was approved. At this point the Governor will finally determine how much of the UH budget to support in her budget proposal to the Legislature before she leaves office. Chances are good for the remaining two PCR’s to survive without further reduction by the Governor, however.

Additionally the CC System intends to ask the legislature for an amount double the size of the funds requested for PCR’s for Performance Based Funding increments based upon the achievement by the college in attaining its Strategic Plan targets. Doug noted that Windward CC has met all of the required targets with the exception of the target for graduation of Native Hawaiian students and the college is within 5 or fewer of achieving that target. Assuming all targets are attained in this coming year the college will be in line for an added supplement to its budget of up to approximately $400,000 a year if the Legislature approves this concept in the upcoming biennium budget deliberations beginning in January 2011. Doug noted that such a large supplement to the budget should be brought to the PBC to determine its use most likely for supplies and equipment needs since the precariousness of such funding might not be appropriately applied to positions unless they were understood to be temporary positions.

PBC members working with colleagues at WinCC and across the system may wish to keep the issue of timely system guidelines at the top of the hopper if the campuses are to be able to effectively participate in the budget making process based upon systematic consideration of program reviews.

Next meeting needs: Follow up on Ke Kumu Pali participation; Proxy Attendees/Voters; Add rep from Phi Theta Kappa; Electronic Distribution of Forms; Operational Budget report for 2010-11 & Briefing on Biennium/Supplemental Budget Timing & Process; re-issue glossary of terms for categorizing budget request items.

**Corral Issues called for following considerations and applicable motions approved after discussion:**

**Motion #1:** A space for divisional priorities will be added to the PBC Summary Sheet to be completed by the responsible Unit Administrator (Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, or Director) and to be informed by a separate Departmental prioritization into tiers 1, 2 or 3 with 1 being the highest priority.

Motion made by: Richard Fulton  
Seconded by: Mike Tom  
Approved: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained

**Motion #2:** Testimony will be provided to the PBC by the requestors of budget items before PBC completes its rating of the item and the unit administrator will determine who is to present the testimony.
Motion made by: Richard Fulton  Seconded by: Nancy Heu

Approved: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained

**Motion #3:** PBC Summary sheet will be reduced to one rating based on merit to include a narrative summary with a description and rationale explaining how it is linked to SLO/Process Outcome analysis as well as Program Review analysis along with an itemized list of positions, supplies and equipment to be rated by each PBC member on a 0 to 5 point scale.

Motion made by: Bernadette Howard  Seconded by: Alan Ragains

Approved: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstained

**Motion #4:** A title of request line to be completed by the requestor shall be added to the PBC Summary Sheet.

Motion made by: Cliff Togo  Seconded by: Bernadette Howard

Approved: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained

Ke Kumu Pali makes request to have its budget request considered by PBC...deferred.