



Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes December 3, 2021 12:30 p.m. Regular Meeting

Minutes Recorded by: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Dr. Dyrell Foster	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonah Nicholas (DO) non-voting	Noell Adams (CC)	Dr. Matthew Kritscher	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (DO)x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Rosalie Roque	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson (LPC)x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chasity Whiteside (DO)	Na Liu	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Dave Fouquet	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell (CC)	Dr. Cynthia Gordan da Cruz	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dale Wagoner (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stephany Chavez (LPC)	Christine Herrera	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raichbart (LPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Gould (DO)x	Heike Gecox	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Walt Blevins	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nathaniel Rice (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Blakely (LPC)	Christina Herrera	
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)x	Dr. Kristina Whalen	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Jamal Cooks	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Craig Kutil	Angela Castellano	
Academic Senate (4)	Tamica Ward	Sui Song	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Daniela Ballif	Christina Read	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tina Inzerilla (LPC)	Bobby Nakamoto	Ron Gerhard	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Kirti Reddy	Dr. Susan Sperling	
Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Jennifer Lange		

Meeting commenced 12:30 p.m.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1.	<p>Welcome Guests and Quorum Check <i>For information</i></p> <p>No new guests, quorum met with 16 voting members, excluding VC Nicholas.</p>	None
2.	<p>Approve Today's Agenda <i>For action</i></p> <p>The agenda was reviewed and the following amendments were made: 1) After item 4, VC Nicholas added the Budget Status Reports through November 2021; 2) item 5. Success Allocation Info, was tabled; and 3) The title for item 6 was changed from SCFF Legislative Update to SCFF-Related Enrollment and Outcomes Data. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve today's agenda as amended. VC Theresa F. Rowland moved to approve and Dale Wagoner seconded the motion. <u>The agenda is approved with the additional item, the tabled item and the amended item title.</u></p>	November 5, 2021 Agenda Approved
3.	<p>Approve Previous Minutes <i>For action</i></p> <p>November's regular and special minutes were reviewed. The November 19th minutes from the special meeting were amended to show Cathy Gould in attendance and Noell Adams as a member of the subcommittee. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve both sets of minutes. Dale Wagoner moved to approve and Thomas Orf seconded the motion. <u>Both sets of minutes were unanimously approved with changes the changes above to the November 19th special minutes.</u></p>	November 5, 2021 and November 19, 2021 Minutes Approved
4.	<p>DEMC Recommendation <i>For information</i></p>	

	<p>At the recent DEMC meetings, discussion was had about a recommendation to the Chancellor to adjust FTES productivity and ratio targets. The voting members decided to reduce the FTES allocation by approximately 400 districtwide. The productivity ratio was left unchanged.</p> <p>The significant drop in enrollment from Fiscal Years 2020-21 to 2021-22 means the colleges will not meet their FTES targets again this year. This has no bearing on how the State will fund the District as the State funding will remain in the hold-harmless formula for the next couple of years. This does, however, lower the 3-year average of FTES that the State uses to calculate that 70% of the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). The lower that average goes, the greater the disparity of what CLPCCD would earn under the SCFF compared to what we are earning under hold-harmless. Discussion ensued.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Success Allocation Info <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Tabled</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>SCFF-Related Enrollment and Outcomes Data <i>For information</i></p> <p>Rajinder Samra presented data on 1) Review of SCFF Components, 2) Head Counts of Students at Both Colleges, 3) FTES Generated by Chabot Students at LPC, 4) FTES Generated by LPC Students at Chabot, 5) Percentage of Chabot Degree Recipients Who Took Course Work at LPC, a) All Associate Degrees, ADTs, 6) Percentage of LPC Degree Recipients Who Took Course Work at Chabot, a) All Associate Degrees, ADTs.</p> <p><u>Review of the SCFF Components (simplified):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES), 70% • Supplemental Allocation, 20% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promise Grants 65.4% CLPCCD ○ PELL Grants, 30.2% CLPCCD ○ AB 540, 4.4%, CLPCCD • Student Success Allocation, 10% <p><u>Head counts of students at both colleges, (on average 31,000 students are served districtwide):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2016-17, 2391, 7.6% of total students • FY 2017-18, 2299, 7.2% of total students • FY 2018-19, 2234, 7.1% of total students • FY 2019-20, 2159, 6.9% of total students 	<p>None</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2020-21, 3233, 11.4% of total students <p><u>FTES generated by Chabot students at LPC, (resident and non-resident):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2016-17, 332.24 • FY 2017-18, 331.31 • FY 2018-19, 279.97 • FY 2019-20, 262.39 • FY 2020-21, 374.21 <p><u>FTES generated by LPC students at Chabot, (resident and non-resident):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2016-17, 478.97 • FY 2017-18, 450.87 • FY 2018-19, 478.41 • FY 2019-20, 461.73 • FY 2020-21, 640.85 <p><u>Percentage of Chabot degree recipients who had courses at LPC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2016-17, 33.2% • FY 2017-18, 32.0% • FY 2018-19, 27.5% • FY 2019-20, 27.6% • FY 2020-21, 27.9% <p><u>Percentage of LPC degree recipients who had courses at Chabot:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2016-17, 37.8% • FY 2017-18, 38.4% • FY 2018-19, 41.1% • FY 2019-20, 40.5% • FY 2020-21, 47.1% <p>In conclusion, a certain percentage of students attend both campuses which opens up more opportunities for collaboration between the colleges.</p>	
XX	<p>Budget Status Reports <i>For information</i></p> <p>VC Nicholas shared the budget status report through November 30, 2021. Expenditure rates are a little bit lower than this time last year. The budget is on track.</p>	

7.	<p>SCFF Revenue Distribution Breakout Rooms & Brief Report Out <i>For information</i></p> <p>The breakout rooms were divided by site to discuss the revenue allocated to the colleges. A report-out from each group will be had post-discussion.</p>	None
	<p>The District group articulated how the District and M&O will be funded, and listed their interests for how revenue could be allocated to the colleges: the allocations would be largely tied to DEMC recommendations; the revenue would be tied to the SCFF allocations, with reasonable assumptions on what will be received for State funding; and the hold-harmless money would distributed in a one-time fashion to remove the negative fund balances at the colleges, which again may be tied to the DEMC recommendations. The group had no strong opinions, but focused on what would be fair and equitable for the sites.</p> <p>Noell Adams reported out for Chabot. They are in favor of moving toward a model that is grounded in the SCFF and provides transitional funding to the colleges for several years.</p> <p>Anette Raichbart reported-out for LPC. They discussed the SCFF rollback money and how much is remaining. They looked at the DEMC recommendation to the Chancellor and talked about the projected 'SCFF-cliff' and wondered if [the budgeting] is on the right track. In response, VC Nicholas said the District reserves are approximately \$17M. Looking at budgeting as a whole, the negative fund balances at the sites have to be taken into consideration in conjunction with the hold-harmless rollback money allocations. The District reserve includes the mandatory 8% general reserve. Dave Fouquet asked how much of the SCFF reserve has been expended over the last couple of years due site expenditures exceeding the budget, and how much of this can be controlled moving forward. VC Nicholas offered to compile a rollback money analysis and suggested it be a future agenda item.</p>	
8.	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Success Allocation Info 2. Rollback fund analysis 	None

Meeting adjourned 2:31 p.m.