

Planning and Budget Committee Meeting

APPROVED MINUTES

Meeting date **Nov. 1, 2019** | Time **12:30PM** | Meeting location **District Office Board Room**

Meeting called by VC of Business Services
Type of meeting Planning & Budget
Tri-Chairs Doug Roberts, Rajeev Chopra & Cathy Gould
Note taker Dawn Neideffer
Timekeeper Doug Roberts

Attendees: Patricia Shannon, Matt Kritscher, Cathy Gould, Julia Dozier, Noell Adams, Rosalie Roque, Rajeev Chopra, David Rodriguez, Diane Brady, Michelle Diaz-Nava, Stacy Thompson, Theresa Fleischer Rowland, Roanna Bennie and Dawn Neideffer. *On the phone:* Miguel Colon, Tamica Ward and Paulette Lino

AGENDA TOPICS | MEETING COMMENCED AT 12:40

Time allotted | **2 min** | Agenda topic **1.0 Welcome and Quorum Check** | Presenter **Rajeev/Cathy**

Discussion Ten members present, six attendees. All welcomed.

Conclusion Quorum met. No guests.

Action items

Person Responsible Deadline

None noted

Time allotted | **2 min** | Agenda topic **2.0 Approve Agenda** | Presenter **Rajeev/Cathy**

Discussion The original agenda previously sent to members and published to the PBC webpage was tabled and a new agenda was created to address the evaluation of Student Centered Funding Formula Project Proposals (SCFF PP). An item was added to the agenda called *SCFF PP Timeline*.

Conclusion New agenda approved with the addition of second agenda item.

Action items

Person Responsible Deadline

1. New agenda approved

Time allotted | **3 min** | Agenda topic **3.0 Approve Minutes** | Presenter **Rajeev/Cathy**

Discussion The minutes from October 4th were reviewed.

Conclusion Moving forward, a recap of future agenda items will be read at the end of the meeting to avoid confusion over agenda content. It was noted that agendas and other meeting data is posted on the PBC webpage at least 72 hours advance of the scheduled meetings. Minutes approved.

Action items

Person Responsible Deadline

1. Minutes approved.

Time allotted | 110 min | Agenda topic 4.0 FFC Rubric Discussion | Presenter Rajeev/Cathy

Discussion Handouts given: [SCFF PP Evaluation Assumptions](#), PBC Rubric & Reserve [Policy Taskforce Philosophy Statement](#), [Breakout of District's UGE](#). This discussion is to clarify PBC's process in evaluating SCFF project proposals (PP's). The *Funding Formula Committee Proposal Subcommittee* (FFC PSC) is a nine-member committee that has developed a thorough evaluation process. Only PP's that have been vetted and cleared through this process will be forwarded. The question was asked about presentations of the PP's given in next PBC meeting. Per FFC PSC, with the number of proposals being evaluated, there is not enough time for presentations. The FFC PSC requested additional information from the applicants during the evaluation process, when needed. The SCFF PP Rubric was reviewed. Question asked about what will happen if FFC PSC approves a project that conflicts with projects at the other college. Another question asked about how college-wide or district-wide projects are being looked at and how similar projects can be grouped. There's a need for a mechanism to know how we are going to measure a project's success or lack thereof. How will PP's be evaluated to measure success? Discussion about PP's with semester-long durations was had. *FFC Subcommittee for Application and Rubric* (FFC SC) considered semester based projects and year round projects, but determined the duration is not a delimiter. Faculty and staff should be encouraged to continue to apply for spring 2020 and subsequent semesters. One member thought funds should be limited, e.g. this amount for fall and this amount for spring. The Budget Officer said budget development starts early and talk should be for FY and not by semester, and funding needs to be set aside per budget development calendar. Discussion ensued about timeline of PP and ongoing projects. A multi-year projection of SCFF revenues and expenditures will be drafted by VC of Business Services, as previously agendized. It was noted that earmarking money can be done in conjunction with approving PP's. Cash flow is an important factor when considering PP's sustainability; budgets will continue to change with labor and longevity costs; seeing financial statements for approved projects as they progress will be helpful. There was a question about which fiscal year SCFF funds will be taken from. It was noted that the assessment and evaluation of approved PP's is extremely important. Question asked: Can we agree that if a PP is funded in first year, it will continue to be funded in subsequent years. Question asked: if PP is not sustaining, how do we quash it?

Conclusion Answer on how to quash an unsustainable project: there is not a guarantee all PP will continue to be funded, as there is a finite amount of money. In regard to the discussion

about putting some of the rollback money into a reserve: it has not been decided how much of \$7M in rollback money will be allocated to PP's and how much will be held in reserve. A look at SCFF multi-year projections will help determine revenues and expenditures moving forward. It is in the District and College's interest to implement supplemental metrics. It's safe to presume funding will continue for approved projects but caution should be taken about spending the reserve. Added to the draft list of assumptions is recognition that multi-year projects may take longer to get off the ground; the evaluation of PP is to look at each PP achievability and ROI to determine if it's realistic. Long term projects will be more beneficial to the District and Colleges; need to think about short term PP and how we can improve them to have long term effects. Short term or long term is not on SCFF Rubric. How do we support projects that need help, do we use ESS or other peer groups to help connect projects, make them scalable, make them sustainable? There is a need for structure or support for PP outside of PBC. Per the VC of Ed Services, ESS is a good place for continued evaluation and support of SCFF PP's. The Assumptions list will be revised. It was suggested that the timeline for approving applications be shortened. Improving FTES is biggest contributor impacting the metrics to our benefit; improved FTES will cascade to other areas of the SCFF metrics. Important to retain students and not just recruit students. Persistence is needed to drive necessary changes to success metrics. There is a need to disentangle the effort put toward metrics from the measurement of approved PP's.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Evaluation of approved PP's will be housed in ESS	Theresa	TBD

Time allotted | **5 min** | Agenda topic **5.0 Future Agenda Items** | Presenter **All**

1. Timeline and Scope for New Budget Allocation Model
2. Multi-year Projected SCFF Expenditures & Revenues
3. SCFF Cliff and Rollback Reserve (Doug)
4. Summary of BAM History (to alleviate brainstorming during PBC meetings)
5. Assumptions for evaluating SCFF project proposals
6. Vote on whether or not to have a Special Meeting 1/24

Summary of Actions Items:

1. Agenda approved with revisions
2. Minutes approved
3. Evaluation of approved PP's will be housed in ESS

Meeting adjourned at 2:20