



Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)

Minutes, Approved 10/16/2020

September 18, 2020 9:30 a.m.

Special Meeting

Minutes Prepared by: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Julia Dozier	Dr. Susan Sperling
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ron Gerhard (DO) non-voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (CC)	Angela Castellanos	Dr. Stacy L. Thompson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Gould (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Rosalie Roque	Christina Read
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pedro Ruiz de Castilla	Guisselle Nuñez	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Christine Herrera	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell (CC)	Dr. Matthew Kritscher	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dale Wagoner (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vacant (LPC)	Heather Hernandez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raischbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)	Kirti Reddy	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Chasity Whiteside	
<input type="checkbox"/> Vacant (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Diaz-Nava (LPC)	Lora Bongard	
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)	Nathanial Rice	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Terri Anderson	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Katherine Tollefsen	Arnold Paguio	
Academic Senate (4)	Billy delos Santos	Dr. Dyrell Foster	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Sui Song	Samantha Kessler	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Paulette Lino	Dave Fouquet	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Jennifer Lange	Dr. Cynthia Gordon da Cruz	
Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	Stephany Chavez	Bobby Nakamoto	

Meeting commenced 9:30 a.m.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1.	<p>Welcome Guests and Quorum Check <i>For information</i></p> <p>All welcomed. Quorum met with 16 voting members, excluding Ron.</p>	None
2.	<p>Approve Today's Agenda <i>For action</i></p> <p>Agenda reviewed, no discussion had. Ron asked for a motion to approve, Anette moved and Noell seconded; <u>agenda approved, unanimously.</u></p>	Sep. 18, 2020 agenda approved
3.	<p>Approve Previous Minutes from September 4, 2020 <i>For action</i></p> <p>Minutes tabled until the next regular PBC meeting.</p>	None
4.	<p>Review Scope of Special PBC Meetings and Revisit Ground Rules <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>A review of the scope and ground rules for PBC special meetings was had. Noell suggested adding action words to the bullets. Members agreed as it will not change the intent of the ground rules. Revised ground rules are on the PBC webpage.</p>	None
5.	<p>Continuation of Review of Existing BAM & Five Years of Budget Data <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Ron shared and reviewed a twelve-year history of position control analysis. This analysis includes the unrestricted general fund, and does not include grants, categoricals or other restricted funds. There was a ten percent reduction in staffing by FY12-13 due to the great recession; the District began to build itself up from reductions/layoffs in</p>	None

FY13-14. The current BAM was implemented in FY14-15 and the District saw a huge jump in FTE: 274 FTEs in FY13-14 to 325 FTEs in FY14-15. During that time, we received a big augmentation, formerly known as the matriculation to student success triple SP, and that trend of increasing staff levels continued from FY13-14 to FY19-20. The “unrestricted fund 10XXXX” is BAM driven. The unrestricted general fund is revenue received from the State and goes through the current BAM model. The “unrestricted general fund 1XXXXX” includes the unrestricted general fund revenue in addition to revenue received through auxiliary services, such as revenue received through facility rental. The presumption is that facility-use-funds are self-supporting, meaning facility rentals cover fees and related costs, plus the cost of personnel. For example, looking at the unrestricted general fund only, for FY19-20, Chabot had 281.26 FTEs supported through the state revenue/general operations; the broader general fund in the same fiscal year had 291 FTEs; meaning Chabot predominantly uses Classified Professionals to support the operations of the facility rental program. Not all of these Classified Professional positions are full time, some of them are .5FTE or .75FTE, depending on need. All to say, if the facility’s rental program is no longer a self-sustaining enterprise, then the general fund is used to subsidize these positions. The Strong Workforce program did not exist in 2008-2009, but the program has since grown and hundreds of millions of dollars came through the state system and consequently, some positions at our district are supported with those funds. Important to note for resource allocation is that most of the new money CLPCCD has gotten has been applied to restricted programs and services.

Ron reviewed M&O funds. Looking at all funds shows that in FY08-09 we were at 59 FTEs and by FY19-20 we are up to 70FTEs. The low watermark for FTEs (employees not students) was in FY12-13. The same pattern is consistent with previous discussions about actual FTEs and what we reported to the state over a period of time; this slightly deludes the impact of the rollback. Trish said some faculty salary increases were due to faculty forgoing the step and column increases in one year and then the subsequent contract addressing those deficiencies in a later year. David asked what are the basics needs to generate revenue. CLPCCD’s enrollment growth has been about five percent in this same window of time. Consistent with direct, instructional cost is that our staffing patterns outstripped and exceeded our growth across departments districtwide six-fold over enrollment growth. In regard to personnel expansion, Sarah said in 2000 it was difficult to hire employees and as such, part-time staff was heavily relied upon to support services; functionality became threatened in a lot of areas during that time. This exercise [of creating the new BAM] is to gain clarity and understanding to ascertain what works and what can be improved. Discussion ensued.

PBC members are to consider if the future allocation model should factor in periods of growth as well as periods of decline/reduction (the current allocation model does not do this). The current model allocates funds to areas and locations without a check and balance system. Noell said it’s important to look at and map the growth in services, as well as student outcomes that have been achieved, especially under the new SCFF because those [SCFF metrics] are going to be revenue generating buckets; and it’s important to ask if more students received education plans/placements, and were awarded degrees/certificates. Noell noted the State has put more demands on the

	<p>colleges to reach these goals with restricted funding sources over the years and as such, resources have been put behind these goals; but it is important to know if there has been actual growth in these specific areas to justify the growth in staffing. Ron concurred and said looking at how to increase the points in the new metrics that are driving the revenue, such as PELL/Promise grant recipients, completion of degrees and success measures, etc. is important to look at and ask how these factors collide with the future allocation model. Miguel said he would like to understand why these increases in personnel were made, and feels it's important to understand in order to move forward. Julia said she recalls a study done in FY16-17 that indicated there was understaffing in District departments like HR and Business services, which may account for some of the sharp growth. Dale added that in comparing our BAM allocations, you find staffing at LPC is under on all the metrics and staffing at Chabot is slightly over when looking at the unrestricted general fund and the District is over with categoricals. The faculty split between the two colleges is only different by one FTE.</p> <p>Ron moved to the operating ledger summary to show the dollars and cents perspective compared to the FTE perspective. Probing questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much of the cost of instruction was related to COLA/inflation? • What are basic needs to generate revenues? • Will new model incorporate districtwide staffing levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifying what is essential for fulfillment of mission; perhaps equitability is not in alignment with mission • Data showing comparisons of costs with Bay 10 • Compliance with statutory requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g.: 50% law of FON <p>Ron concurs with Trish and Rajeev that the allocation model is not only to allocate funding but also to support student success and our mission districtwide. David added how we build these structures is important because we need a clear buy-in for program review and program implementation. Ron completed his review of the operating ledger summary. The District and Colleges have been overly reliant on measure B/measure A funds, lottery money and instructional equipment block grant money to support fundamental and basic operation of classroom and student services.</p>	
6.	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue conversation above about current BAM review and analysis 	None

Meeting adjourned 11:35 a.m.