



Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes

October 15, 2021 9:30 a.m.

Special Meeting

Recorder: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Julia Dozier	Dave Fouquet
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonah Nicholas (DO) non-voting	Noell Adams (CC)	Bruce Griffin	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Heather Hernandez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson <i>Interim</i> (LPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chasity Whiteside	Dr. Teri Anderson	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Walt Blevins	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell (CC)	Angela Castellanos	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dale Wagoner (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephany Chavez (LPC)	Kirti Ready	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raichbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)	Linda Pine Schoomaker	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Tamica Ward	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nathaniel Rice (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Blakely (LPC)	Danita Romero	
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)	Rosalie Roque	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Christine Herrera	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Billy delos Santos	Bruce Griffin	
Academic Senate (4)	Daniela Baliff	Jennifer Lange	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Betty Castaño	Mujeeb Dadgar	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tina Inzerilla (LPC)	Rachel Ugale	Heike Gecox	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Ashley Young	Dr. Kristina Whalen	
Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Sui Song	Dr. Dyrell Foster	

Meeting commenced 9:33 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 VC Nicholas.</p>	None
2.	<p>Approve Today's Agenda <i>For action</i></p> <p>Agenda reviewed, no discussion had. VC Nicholas asked for a motion to approve, Dale Wagoner moved and Cathy Gould seconded. <u>Agenda approved, unanimously.</u></p>	October 15, 2021 agenda approved
3.	<p>Approve Previous Special and Regular Meeting Minutes <i>For action</i></p> <p>The minutes were reviewed. Dale Wagoner to approve, Miguel Colon seconded. <u>Minutes approved, unanimously.</u></p>	September 17, 2021 minutes approved
4.	<p>Review of Revised Ground Rules <i>For information</i></p> <p>The scope and ground rules are a living document and standing item for PBC special meetings. The purpose is to establish accountability to each other as the committee continues to proceed in this work. This is a living document and at any time, members are encouraged to offer revisions, additions or comments to the group.</p>	None
5.	<p>Funding the District Office Model <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Sarah Thompson reviewed each model in the Type of Funding worksheet and reviewed the pros and cons of each as discussed at LPC. Noell Adams discussed the Type of Funding worksheet at Chabot. Chabot group found it difficult to identify the pros and cons as it depends on how the model is implemented as well as other variables in the budget allocation process.</p>	None

	<p>Concern was voiced about the metrics in the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) and the disadvantages posed to LPC when the SCFF is implemented. In response to how the District’s funding model will adjust when the SCFF is implemented, VC Nicholas said the revenue side of the model should match how we are funded by the State. How that revenue is distributed is the pressing issue at hand. Discussion ensued.</p> <p>The 3-year rolling average, when based upon expenditures, incentivizes bad behavior and is disassociated with the revenue side of the model. If the sites are overspending based on current allocations, basing the model on current expenses will be problematic. Concerns were raised about the District’s performance factor and how to measure it; also, how to use the state-metrics to fund the District Office. Multi-college districts generally get funded at 10 to 10.5%. VC Nicholas reminded the committee that he does not like pitting sites against each other and asked the committee to bring solutions and evidence to these discussions instead of only opposition. Sarah Thompson said the (colleges) concerns were the ending balances, where reserves are kept and fairness when it comes to cutting costs. The desire is to have these concerns built into the model; VC Nicholas concurred. Consensus was built to have the VC build a new model so the committee can clearly see the District Offices’ allocation not as fixed. Consensus was built to fund M&O on total cost of ownership (TCO) and it was also noted that this is now Board policy. Bruce Griffin looks forward to continuing the conversation of how IT/ITS is funded, and clarified the ITS system was not built on a total cost of ownership model. The TCC (Technology Coordinating Committee) will review TCO and pull those numbers for PBC to review. What the TCO for M&O will look like in the model is still to be determined. Consensus was built to look at other models.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decision points for 3A, shared districtwide expenses and what District expenses should be 2. Should ITS be its own cost center 	<p>None</p>

Meeting adjourned 11:00 a.m.