



# Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes

## October 16, 2020 9:30 a.m.

### Special Meeting

*Recorder: Dawn Renee Neideffer*

*Note: 10 members required to meet quorum*

**Attendance:**

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

Meeting commenced 9:30 a.m.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1.	<p><b>Welcome Guests and Quorum Check</b>  <i>For information</i></p> <p>All welcomed. Quorum met with 14 voting members, excluding Ron.</p>	None
2.	<p><b>Approve Today's Agenda</b>  <i>For action</i></p> <p><a href="#">Agenda</a> reviewed, no discussion had. Ron asked for a motion to approve, Sarah moved and Dale seconded; <u>agenda approved, unanimously.</u></p>	Oct. 16, 2020 agenda approved
3.	<p><b>Approve Previous Minutes from September 18, 2020</b>  <i>For action</i></p> <p>September 18<sup>th</sup> <a href="#">minutes</a> were reviewed. A correction is needed at the bottom of page 3, the term in brackets, "SCFF projects" should be "SCFF metrics" With this correction, Ron asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Sarah moved, Dale seconded and the corrected minutes were approved unanimously.</p>	September 18, 2020 minutes approved, with correction
4.	<p><b>Review Scope of Special PBC Meetings and Revisit Ground Rules</b>  <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Members reviewed the revised <a href="#">scope and ground rules</a> for PBC . Theses ground rules are a standing agenda item to be reviewed at each special meeting as a check-in on accountability to each other as we continue to proceed in this work.</p>	None
5.	<p><b>Continuum of Review of Existing BAM &amp; Budget Data</b>  <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Recap: PBC special meetings began in August to continue the work on creating the new budget allocation model (BAM). PBC members have been evaluating the current BAM and areas where it is serving us well and where it needs improvement. FTES targets is a major driver in expense budgets. DEMC has had similar discussions during this same time period. PBC members looked at staffing levels and histories going back 12 years. Increases in</p>	None

staffing-levels across the district has significantly outpaced enrollment, hence has outpaced revenue generation. At the last special meeting, the following questions were raised:

- 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?
  - 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
  - E.g.: 50% law of FON

Ron reviewed the handout called [Comparison EE FTE and Fiscal](#). First table shows FTES comparisons of other college districts from the State Chancellor's office, as of fall 2019 (the most current data available for analysis). It is noted that how districts report classified positions varies from district to district. The State's descriptors differ a little from CLPCCD's but in Ron's experience, the data can be combined to have meaningful conversations. For our purposes, it helps to combine Classified Administrators and Classified Support. CLPCCD is mid-range in the comparison. VC Theresa F. Rowland asked about comparing numbers with multi-college districts that are more similarly structured to CLPCCD. Ron asked PBC members if they would like to look at districts with similar demographics, academics and programs. Noell added that a look at M&O and ITS infrastructure would help us see where CLPCCD utilizes Classified Professionals in lieu of advanced technology. Trish suggested Bay 10 as a demographic to look at for cost of living and expense data of rural areas compared to urban areas; urban areas tend to pay more for everything. Rajinder said some rural colleges pay the same rate for Classified Administrators as urban areas and there are many variables to consider. Walt said we are close to Ohlone with FTES and other metric values. Sarah said this is good data to look at the range of statewide. Ron agreed and will show data on our cost of living. Trish asked if there are overall trends [in these comparisons] that are helpful to CLPCCD; is our District in the ballpark with other districts as far as wages, costs and relationships between the various categories of employees. Discussion about the comparisons ensued.

The first page of [Comparison EE FTE and Fiscal](#) takes a broad look at the number of employees and their salaries per classification. The numbers on the second page come from source data derived from the State Chancellor's 311 reports. The 311 reports are annual fiscal reports all California community colleges submit to the State. This document follows our taxonomy of progress manual as well as our accounting manual, which conveys the structure and criteria districts follow across the State. Page two of this handout includes enrollment data and financial data from the perspective of cost per FTES for FY18-19. The data shows CLPCCD's unrestricted general fund comprises 88.1% of the total general fund; meaning our categorical programs and grants are about 12% of our total general fund. Ohlone and Contra Costa CCDs have percentages close to ours. All grants types fall under the unrestricted general fund; the data shows expenditures only in said fiscal year. Kathy Blackwood clarified that parcel taxes go

	<p>into the special revenue fund and are not part of the general fund; those taxes are not included when calculating the 50% law for the FON. Data shows CLPCCD is average in terms of academics; in terms of the 50% law, we are the highest in the group. Reassign time may be a factor in why CLPCCD is high in the 50% law. Discussion ensued. Ron continued to present the numbers on page two of the handout. Sarah noted that in addition to our students being in a higher cost of living area, our classified employees are being paid higher than other districts in order to achieve a livable wage; this may be important to bring to the State's SCFF oversight committee for their consideration.</p> <p>For future discussion, members considered other districts (other than the Bay 10) to which to compare CLPCCD. PBC members to clarify what the goal of the data analysis is. Ron's goal is to flesh out the comparisons to see where CLPCCD is at and then look at the comparable districts' budget allocation models.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Future Agenda Items</b>  <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continuum of Review of Existing BAM &amp; Budget Data</li> <li>2. Clarify the end-goal for the data analysis</li> </ol>	None

**Meeting adjourned 11:35 a.m.**