1. Mr. Oester called the meeting to order at 2:10pm. Minutes of the February 23, 2011, Budget Committee meeting were reviewed. Typo in item #2 was corrected. The minutes were approved by consensus.

2. **Review of District Budget Committee meeting and remarks:**
   a. Partial copies of a handout from the most recent District Budget Committee meeting were distributed.
   b. If the state implements an “all cuts” budget, the impact to the District will be a further reduction of $46 million in 2011-12 beyond the $25.7 million already assumed. District funded FTES will be reduced by an additional 10,350.
   c. Colleges have submitted budgets based on a 5.52% cut and were asked to create a contingency plan for 15.31% cuts.
   d. Chancellor La Vista has made several visits to Sacramento along with chancellors of the other higher education systems to meet with legislators for the purpose of emphasizing the impact that cuts will have on students and the education system in California.
   e. District has mandated that colleges continue to seek further cost saving measures and additional revenue generating ideas.
   f. The Chancellor has requested the VPs of Administrative Services to get together several times to look for district-wide cost saving measures and other sources of revenue. The VPAS group will research ideas and write a report for the Chancellor. Examples of ideas the VPAS group is researching include duplication of efforts and personnel between the District and the colleges and whether to de-centralize or centralize more services.

3. **Review of Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services:**
   The final version of the Principles for Prioritizing Programs and Services document approved by the College Council was reviewed. It was asked how each division will implement the Principles in making cuts for next fiscal year, when cuts will happen, and how they will be communicated to employees. Mr. Oester explained that he has met with the managers in his division to review all non-personnel line items. The two other VPs performed a similar process prior to the budget prep submission.

4. **Review of Joint Council Ideas from Breakout Groups:**
   Some examples were provided regarding how a few ideas on the list have been addressed; e.g. the “turn off the light campaign” would be ineffective because most rooms already use motion detectors to turn off the lights and because the college uses an energy management
system; the idea of saving on gasoline would require more work to be done manually, thereby increasing the risk of injury and making various tasks more time consuming; and adding more solar units to reduce electrical expenses would require us to use $2 million of scarce bond funds. However, many other items on the list are still under review by various individuals.

5. Discussion of Draft 10100 Budget Projection:
   a. We are currently projecting a current-year surplus of $1,015,225 which can be carried over into next year. Utilizing this carry-over and assuming a 5.52% revenue reduction, WLAC is projected to have a 2011-12 deficit of $244,982. At a 15.31% revenue reduction, WLAC currently projects a 2011-12 deficit of $1,879,202. The 5.52% deficit must be eliminated through further effort. The 15.31% deficit requires a combination of college and district work and ideas. The Chancellor is expecting a proposal to be developed by each college.
   b. A chart was added to the budget format reflecting section counts and workload measures (FTES). 2010-11 section count: Fall 715 sections, Spring 721 sections. Projected section count based on 5.52% reduction in 2011-12: Fall 637, Spring 643. Projected section count based on 15.31% reduction in 2011-12: Fall 559, Spring 565.
   c. One FON faculty hire (child development) is currently budgeted for 2011-12. Olga Shewfelt requested an update of the District-wide FON status for the next meeting.

6. A motion was proposed to recommend to the President to hire 4 faculty FPIP positions for 2011-12 to meet FON obligation in order to avoid risk of a fine from the state and to prevent further reduction of the faculty workforce. The motion failed to receive a second. During the discussion, Mr. Sprague said that the District is monitoring hiring activity and will not allow the District to be fined. Mr. Sprague also said that the Budget Committee should take into account hiring needs campus-wide so that any recommendation would reflect the needs of the workforce in total. Mr. Sprague asked for a report of classified FTE by department comparing FY07-08 with FY10-11.

7. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee is April 27 at 2:00 p.m. in Winlock.