

Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes September 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)	Angela Castellanos	
🛛 Jonah Nicholas (DO) non-voting	⊠ Noell Adams (CC)	Dave Fouquet	
⊠ Cathy Gould (DO)	\boxtimes David Rodriguez (LPC)	Rosalie Roque	
\boxtimes Sarah Thompson <i>Interim</i> (LPC)	Pedro Ruiz de Castilla	Tina Inzerilla	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Sui Song	
🛛 Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	🛛 Virginia Criswell (CC)	Chasity Whiteside	
\boxtimes Dale Wagoner (CC)	\boxtimes Stephany Chavez (LPC)	Bobby Nakamoto	
🖾 Anette Raichbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)	Tom De Witt	
🖾 Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Tamica Ward	
□ Vacant (CC)	🗆 Michelle Diaz-Nava (LPC)	Jeanne Wilson	
Faculty Association (2)	\Box Stacy Harris (CC)	Nathaniel Rice	
⊠ Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Dr Matthew Kritscher	
\boxtimes Thomas Orf (LPC)	Rachel Ugale	Betty Castaño	
Academic Senate (4)	Dr. Matthew Kritscher	Dr. Cynthia Gordon da Cruz	
🖾 Miguel Colon (CC)	Rachael Tupper-Eoff	Dr. Teri Anderson	
⊠ Ashley Young (LPC)	Dr. Dyrell Foster	Dr. Kristina Whalen	
🛛 Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Christina Read	Daniela Baliff	
Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Jennifer Lange	Billy delos Santos	

Meeting commenced 12:35 p.m.

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1.	Welcome Guests and Quorum Check For information	None
	No new guests, quorum met with 15 voting members, excluding VC Nicholas.	
2.	Approve Today's Agenda For action	September 3, 2021 Agenda Approved
	Agenda reviewed. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve today's agenda. Miguel Colon moved and Anette Raichbart seconded the motion. <u>Agenda approved, unanimously</u>	
3.	Approve Previous Minutes For action	August 20, 2021 Minutes Approved
	Minutes reviewed. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve minutes. Ashely Young moved to approve as amended and Sarah Thompson seconded the motion. One member logged in after vote. <u>Minutes approved</u> , <u>unanimously</u> .	
4.	DEMC Recommendation for Enrollment Recapturing Strategy For discussion/possible action	Recommendation Tabled
	DEMC expressed a need to mobilize funds for enrollment recapturing strategies. In the restricted categorical fund, \$1.6M is already going to the colleges for these efforts. Discussion ensued.	
	Consensus was built to recommend a planning priority to the Chancellor. A recommendation with clear language needs to be written and presented to the PBC. Dave Fouquet made a motion to table this item until the next meeting, Cathy Gould seconded the motion. Tabling the recommendation to the Chancellor passed unanimously without further discussion.	

5.	Membership and Chair Discussion/Vote For information	New members and tri-chairs installed
	Members were identified. Tina Inzerilla will replace Ashely Young for Academic Senate rep for LPC; Chasity Whiteside will replace. Pedro Ruiz de Castilla as Classified Senate rep for District; Chabot has a vacancy for an administrator. For tri-chairs, Cathy Gould made a motion to nominate Noell Adams, Noell accepted the nomination, David Rodriguez seconded the motion. No discussion had, Noell Adams as tri-chair from Chabot approved unanimously. Thomas Orf moved to nominate Sarah Thompson as the LPC tri-chair, Miguel Colon seconded the motion. No discussion had, Sarah Thompson as tri-chair from LPC approved unanimously.	
6.	True-up For information	None
	VC Nicholas reviewed the completed true-up (funds have already been distributed to the colleges) and showed the figures of what was budgeted, the actual expense and the difference between the two. The District budgets for a 1% deficit factor, at the state level, the deficit factor came in below 1% which is why there is additional non-foundation apportionment revenue. SCFF rollback money is not run through the model because it is not being used in an ongoing fashion. The SCFF rollback money also shows more than was budgeted due to the 1% deficit factor, which is applied evenly to apportionment revenue as well as rollback revenue. SCFF Projects show a revenue differential of about (\$300K), but when looked at from an expenditure side, it nets to zero in the 3A true-up. The lottery and mandated cost block allocation show an increase. With a hat-tip to Dave Fouquet who brought awareness to this early on, VC Nicholas highlighted that outside the total computation revenue on the apportionment schedule there has been an allocation for the colleges for full-time faculty hiring that was not previously distributed. That sum is approximately \$2.5M; these funds can be used as a remedy to alleviate some of the negative fund balances at the colleges.	
	The true-up shows \$3.6M was distributed above what was in the adopted budget. The three years' worth of faculty-funds that were not previously distributed were given directly to the colleges using the 57.8%-42.2% split. These funds were not run through the model therefore the percentages for the District and M&O were not taken out. No discussion had.	
7.	Approved Adopted Budget For information	
	VC Nicholas went through an overview of the adopted budget. All sites presented a balanced budget. Data indicates good news on the adopted budget. No discussion had.	

8.	Discussion: District Office and M&O Funding	
	<i>For discussion</i>	
	VC Nicholas made calculations based on the 2018 recommendation to the Chancellor for the committee to consider and think about. This scenario shows the funding model if the District and M&O were to be changed from percentage of total base with augmentation based on metrics. Questions that arise in this model are: if District and M&O are disassociated from percentages, will this model have a step 3A? If so, how does step 3A get paid for? Currently, step 3A is paid for before distributing revenue in order for the District and M&O to pay their percentage of the total. If the District and M&O funding is associated with FTES and square footage, the assumption is that all future step 3A increases will be borne by the colleges. No modeling of this formula has yet been done.	
	Clarity is needed on how and when the gross square footage would change in the model throughout the year. Also, if the District as a whole declined in FTES year after year and the District were to receive stability funding, would the District Office still be reduced?	
	The remainder of the 2018 recommendation was reviewed. VC Nicholas asked for general feedback, particularly on step 3A. A math problem exists in the proposed model from the 2018 recommendation to the Chancellor. Discussion ensued.	
	Consensus built to continue talks and model District and M&O funding.	
9.	Future Agenda Items For discussion	
	 DEMC Recommendation BAM Modeling Two sets of minutes to approve 	

Meeting adjourned 2:31 p.m.