

Meeting date **September 20, 2019** Time **9:00** | Meeting location **Rm. 270, District Office**

Meeting called by VC Business Services
 Type of meeting SCFF
 Tri-Chairs Doug Roberts, Cynthia Gordon da Cruz & Rajinder Samra
 Note taker Dawn Neideffer
 Timekeeper Doug Roberts

Attendees: Heidi Ulrech, Noell Adams, Cynthia Gordon da Cruz, Chasity Whiteside, Heike Gecox, Craig Kutil, Sarah Thompson, Paulette Lino, Tamica Ward, William Garcia, David Rodriguez, Patrick Chappell, Bruce Griffin, Kathy Medina, Stacy Thompson, Trish Shannon, Theresa Fleischer-Rowland, Diane Brady, Julia Dozier, Ashley Young, Kristina Whalen, Matt Kritscher and Dawn Neideffer. On the phone: Miguel Colon & Andi Schreibman.

AGENDA TOPICS | MEETING COMMENCED AT 9:05

Time allotted | **2 min** | Agenda topic | **1.0 Approve Agenda** | Presenter **Doug**

Discussion No discussion had.

Conclusion Agenda approved as presented.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

1. Agenda approved by consensus

Time allotted | **3 min** | Agenda topic **2.0 Approve Minutes** | Presenter **Doug**

Discussion No discussion had.

Conclusion Minutes from May and June 2019 approved.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

1. Both sets of minutes approved by consensus

Time allotted | **5 min** | Agenda topic **3.0 FFC Membership for Quorum Report Out** | Presenter **Dawn**

Discussion Item 8 from the FFC minutes in June reviewed with the group.

Conclusion When FFC was formed, the Ad Hoc Committee aired on the side of inclusivity and did not want to limit representation. Voting membership to be reinforced and not reduced.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
None noted		

Time allotted | Time **15 min** | Agenda topic **4.0 Refresher of the Charges for FFC, PBC & ESS** | Presenter Names | **Rajinder and Theresa**

Discussion Rajinder presented an IPBM flow chart and the charges of each committee. About six years ago, the Chancellor created multiple committees to give recommendations to the Board. Theresa said the charge of ESS is to allocate resources and there is some overlap with other committees. PBC is in charge of the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) and items outside the BAM. FFC is about maximizing the funding formula. FFC makes recommendations to PBC. It was reiterated that the FFC is a temporary committee and will disband when the State implements the SCFF in 22-23FY.

Conclusion At FFC's inception, it was noted that the committee may not need to meet every month and that it will disband when the SCFF is implemented in 22-23FY. IPBM was created in 2014 and is now called PBC.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. None noted		

Time allotted | **15 min** | Agenda topic **5.0 Approve the SCFF Project Proposal Timeline with Response from Counsel on the Brown Act** | Presenter **Doug**

Discussion The Brown Act does not address the subject of first or second readings. Thus, there is no provision of the Brown Act that requires a committee covered by the Act to hold first and second readings of items brought before them for approval. The SCFF-proposal-timeline dates were discussed.

Conclusion In regard to the FFC Proposal Subcommittee and the timeline for SCFF application review, it was discovered the October 25th date will be difficult for the VP's on the subcommittee to attend due to previous commitments. The timeline was approved by consensus with a note to revisit the timeline process for Spring 2020.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Fall 2019 Timeline approved by consensus		

Time allotted | 10 min | Agenda topic 6.0 Establish FFC Subgroup to Review, Score and Rank SCFF Applications. The discussion from FFC on June 6th recommends 9 members: 1 District Representative, 2 IRs, 1 from each campus; 2 VPs of Administrative Services, 1 from each campus; 2 Academic Senate members, 1 from each campus; and 2 Classified Senate members, 1 from each campus | Presenter Doug

Discussion The new subgroup will be called the *FFC Proposal Subcommittee*. Conversation about how many members to have and from which areas ensued. Five-person group is nimbler, but a nine-person group has good information from the stakeholders and the expertise to evaluate proposals.

Conclusion For a more thorough analysis of SCFF application data, it was decided a 9-member subcommittee would provide the expertise needed for evaluation. The motion passed by consensus to approve the subcommittee as presented.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

1. Nine member FFC Proposal Subcommittee was approved by consensus

Time allotted | 45 min | Agenda topic 7.0 CW/P Budget Model Examples | Presenter George

Discussion Consultant gave budget model examples from other colleges as related to the SCFF. Conversation about reaching student goals, focusing on technology for financial aid and increasing fee waivers ensued.

Conclusion Demographics play a big role in Supplemental allocation. Colleges to think about what to do for Success allocation. CLPCCD is as far, or further, along as other State community colleges. Budget models will be discussed in PBC and in upcoming FFC meetings.

Action items	Person Responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

None noted

Time allotted | 20 min | Agenda topic 8.0 Consideration of Equitable Disbursements of SCFF/Rollback Funding | Presenter Cynthia & Rajinder

Discussion Doug handed out an updated [Unrestricted General Fund \(UGF\) chart](#). The last time the UGF was reported, the SCFF reserve showed \$4.6M. Because EDCE already has a dedicated fund balance allocated to itself, it did not make sense to duplicate that in that in the 8 percent reserve for total unrestricted general fund. This freed up \$1.3M from the 8 percent reserve to put in the SCFF reserve. The District also had a big liability expense of \$1.4M for CalSTRS. Instead of taking that expenditure from the general fund, it was redirected to District Services. The [SCFF Proposal Rubric](#) was handed out and reviewed.

Conclusion

The recalculation brings the SCFF reserve to about \$7.5M and a lot closer to what was originally projected. It was noted an ongoing assessment process of the approved SCFF projects is needed to track return on investment (ROI). Prioritizing projects that are District-wide will earn more ROI; therefore, focus should be placed on District-wide projects. If only one College pilots a program and it is successful, the project can then be shared and implemented District-wide. It was noted that some of the SCFF reserve should remain in the reserve until 22-23FY when the District is off hold harmless status. It was suggested that the FFC make a recommendation to the PBC regarding allocation of SCFF reserve. Equitable distribution of SCFF funds will be revisited as the SCFF proposals rollout.

Action items

Person Responsible

Deadline

None noted

Time allotted | **5 min** | Agenda topic **9.0 Future Agenda Items** | Presenter **All**

None suggested by group

Summary of Action Items

1. Agenda approved
2. Minutes approved
3. Fall 2019 Timeline approved
4. Nine-member subcommittee to review, rank and score SCFF applications approved

Future Meeting Dates

10/18/19

11/15/19

12/20/19

| Meeting adjourned at 10:51