

Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes
April 16, 2021 9:30 a.m.
Special Meeting

Recorder: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Rosalie Roque	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ron Gerhard (DO) non-voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (CC)	Na Liu	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Gould (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Heather Hernandez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedro Ruiz de Castilla	Dr. Cynthia Gordon da Cruz	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Rachael Tupper Eoff	
<input type="checkbox"/> Dr. Theresa Fleischer Rowland (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell (CC)	Ashley Young	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dale Wagoner (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephany Chavez (LPC)	Dr. Susan Sperling	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raischbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Samantha Kessler (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Diaz-Nava (LPC)		
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Jonah Nicholas		
Academic Senate (4)	Dr. Dyrell Foster		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Chasity Whiteside		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Dave Fouquet		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Karen Metcalf		
Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	Sui Song		

Meeting commenced 9:31 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 15 voting members, excluding Chancellor Gerhard.</p>	None
2.	<p>Approve Today's Agenda <i>For action</i></p> <p>Agenda reviewed, no discussion had. Chancellor Gerhard asked for a motion to approve, Thomas Orf moved and Cathy Gould seconded. <u>Agenda approved, unanimously.</u></p>	April 16, 2021 agenda approved
3.	<p>Approve Previous Minutes from March 19, 2021 <i>For action</i></p> <p>March 19, 2021 minutes were reviewed. No discussion had; Noell Adams moved to approve, Dale Wagoner seconded. <u>Minutes approved.</u></p>	<p>March. 19, 2021 minutes approved</p> <p>Yes 14 No 0 Abstain 1</p>
4.	<p>Review Scope of Special PBC Meetings and Revisit 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>Look at BAM/SCFF Model Simulations <i>For information/discussion</i></p> <p>VC Nicholas revisited the spreadsheet reviewed at last month's special PBC meeting. Dave Fouquet said there's room in the success metric for credit-certificates, for both Colleges. Discussion ensued.</p> <p>Chancellor Gerhard reminded the group that the spreadsheet looks at the success allocation metric, and the 10% of the funding which informs how it is distributed to our Colleges and the District. There is another tab that looks at</p>	None

	<p>the supplemental allocation in a similar way, but informs how 20% of revenue is distributed; and then there is the FTES allocation which informs how 70% of the funding is derived. This simulation looks at a three-year rolling average of FTES, which would be a significant difference in models when compared to the current BAM. The current BAM looks at allocated funding based on one-year of FTES projections/targets as informed by DEMC. This simulation also has this component, but only one-year is based on projections/targets; the other two years are based on the actuals. Our current BAM model does not have a reconciliation, or true-up, to account for a college/site not hitting the DEMC-FTES target. This model would address this discrepancy because two of the three years would be based on actuals and not targets or estimates. VC Nicholas said the real meat of the conversation is with the 70% and reminded the group that the State Chancellor’s Office provides funding on actual numbers and not targets. For example, at the beginning of the year, the DEMC target would be used, but a true-up would be done at the end of the year, and that target would then be replaced by the actuals. Those actuals will ultimately determine the three-year average. Discussion ensued.</p> <p>Chancellor Gerhard asked for group consensus to move forward with FTES in the methodology displayed in this simulation. No discussion had. VC Nicholas said this simulation is setup to look at revenue generated at the Colleges; a future discussion will encompass how the District and M&O is allocated in this scenario.</p> <p>General consensus from the group was built for the methodology in this scenario on the revenue side. We will look at expenditures in the upcoming meetings. We will also look at accountability if there is overspending, in addition to how we will we comply with the FON and other compliances.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>1. BAM: SCFF-model simulations, with a focus on expenditures</p>	<p>None</p>

Meeting adjourned 11:30 a.m.