



Special Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Minutes

December 18, 2020 9:30 a.m.

Special Meeting

Recorder: Dawn Renee Neideffer

Note: 10 members required to meet quorum

Attendance:

Chairs (3)	Classified Senate (3)	Sui Song	Dr. Stacy Thompson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ron Gerhard (DO) non-voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noell Adams (CC)	Tamica Ward	Jennifer Aries
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathy Gould (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Rodriguez (LPC)	Rosalie Roque	Cynthia Gordon da Cruz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedro Ruiz de Castilla	Mujeeb Dadgar	
Administration (5)	Classified Union (3)	Dr. Kristina Whalen	
<input checked="" 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)	Heather Hernandez	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anette Raischbart (LPC)	Cathy Gould (DO)	Kirti Reddy	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rajinder Samra (LPC)	Student Senate (2)	Dr. Susan Sperling	
<input type="checkbox"/> Vacant (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Diaz-Nava (LPC)	Danita Romero	
Faculty Association (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Stacy Harris (CC)	Rachael Tupper Eoff	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Drouin (CC)	Guests:	Christine Herrera	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Orf (LPC)	Jonah Nicholas	Chasity Whiteside	
Academic Senate (4)	Betty Castano	Kathy Blackwood	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Nathaniel Rice	Billy delos Santos	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Thompson (LPC)	Tamica Ward	Rachel Ugale	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dr. Patricia Shannon (CC)	Arnold Paguio	Walt Blevins	
Rajeev Chopra (LPC)	Na Liu	Yvonne Craig Wu	

Meeting commenced 9:30 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 14 voting members, excluding Ron.</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, with one abstention</u></p>	<p>Dec. 18, 2020 agenda approved: 13 Yes 0 No 1 Abstained</p>
3.	<p>Approve Previous Minutes from November 20, 2020 <i>For action</i></p> <p>November 20th minutes were reviewed. No discussion had; David Rodrigues moved to approve, Dale Wagoner seconded. <u>Minutes approved unanimously.</u></p>	<p>Nov. 20, 2020 minutes approved</p>
4.	<p>Review Scope of Special PBC Meetings and Revisit Ground Rules <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>Members reviewed the scope and ground rules for PBC special meetings . 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. 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>Continuum of BAM & Budget Data <i>For discussion</i></p> <p>A review from previous special PBC meetings of what works and what needs improvement:</p> <p>What works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straight forward and simple to understand 	None

- Conducive to planning
- Philosophy works
- Integration of contract education planning
- Recent evaluation
- Setting reserves, districtwide and by site (incentives)
- Funding M&O based upon Total Cost of Ownership
- What can be improved:
- Relationship between DEMC & PBC (planning and budget)
- Equity lenses (scorecard)
- Evaluative consistent (all sites)
- Consideration for basic operational needs
- Revenue allocation model focus
- Inconsistency of autonomy versus centralization – expense allocations
- Find balance between revenue and expense that meets the needs between all sites
- Does not provide incentives to allow college/site to grow and therefore generate additional funding benefiting entire district
- Colleges at bottom of model
- Accountability, closing the loop
- No long-term planning/vision
- Put stress on colleges
- Does not feel like shared endeavor
- Incomplete, in terms of loose ends
- Staffing levels
- Connections with staffing
- BAM is general fund focused, need to look at reliance on soft funding for general operations
-

Discussion on how to improve the funding model continued on September 18, 2020 and included:

- 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 missions; 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
- Complexity – mission is education, not isolated to finance; let the mission drive the BAM
- Target and accountability, how to define it in the BAM conversation and measure it for accountability
- Fixed cost recognition; there are large fixed cost in our budget and in our finance framework that are largely fixed in nature and there is a need to look at, identify and determine how much is truly fixed

Members were asked if they had anything more to add to this synopsis of a past discussion; nothing was added. Also in September 2020, members reviewed twelve-years of position control. In looking at staffing trends, it was noted that there has been a lot of volatility in staffing patterns; looking back from FY08-09 to FY19-20, the Great Recession, as well as evolving staffing needs, attribute to some of the volatility. Reductions in staffing and layoffs were grown back; the restoration of those staffing levels far outpaced our enrollment. Back in that twelve-year period, enrollment grew a little over 12%, while staffing (mostly in terms of full-time staff) grew to about 28-29%. Also, during this twelve-year period, the State funding was a lot lower than the statutory, meaning CLPCCD's funding level derived from the State did not keep pace with inflation and was not funded at the level the State would normally require. In October 2020, members also looked at [financial comparisons](#) to other districts.

Today's goal is to look at funding post hold-harmless status. Comparisons in the [Student Financial Aid Comparisons – Promise Grants](#), from November's special meeting were reviewed. In past conversations, it was asked whether or not CLPCCD's funding model should match how funding is received by the State. After discussion, members concluded that if PBC recommends a yes in that allocation-model scenario, supplemental-allocation targets would have to be established; no discussion to the contrary was had. A request was made for a document showing the percentages from FY18-19 and/or FY 19-20 as we move toward the 20% supplemental-allocation goal of attaining Promise grants for students.

CLPCCD colleagues had been attending the SCFF Oversight Committee at the State to advocate for change to the funding metrics for high-income regions with low-income students; it was noted that though other college districts will remain on hold-harmless funding, CLPCCD's low-income students, or first generation college students, are negatively impacted by SCFF funding metrics. FTE is important to consider with enrollments and it is important to retain students for the first metric. The current enrollment numbers show we need to bring students in and keep them. If the number of Promise grant recipients is increased, then the success metric is increased as they began to hit thresholds like Associates degrees or attaining a living wage. In regard to FTES, to generate another \$4M, at roughly \$3,800 per FTES, we would have to enroll another 1000 more FTES to make up the gap created by the supplemental metric; not 1000 more students, rather 1000 more full-time equivalent students. Not one source will be the answer to maximizing the SCFF metrics. Method C on the handout is where CLPCCD would see the change in the cost of

	<p>living metric; but due to the lag between data submission and reports, October 2021 is when we may see these changes in data at the State level. Only 9.4% of students awarded Promise grants come from method B; in Contra Costa CCD, 59% are receiving Promise grants based on income standards. The State’s SCFF Taskforce is running scenarios at a systems level to analyze the data of CCD’s in hold harmless status; the data is not yet all in to tabulate, but will be later this year. Another point of focus is to increase persistence and customer service. Cerritos may be a good district to look at for Pell grant comparisons, especially to see how their financial aid department is setup to acquire Pell grants.</p> <p>Chancellor Gerhard suggested a future discussion to look at awarding certificates and degrees in the success metric and analyze how it relates to the new allocation model. Other data to look at 1) increasing Promise grant recipients with a look at comparisons from other districts, 2) a look at the recommendations from DEMC to the Chancellor for FTES and FTEF which informs how the revenue and expenditure budgets are built and how they will include 20% of promise grants and 10% success allocations, 3) balance practical aspects of building the allocation model with impact, equity and ethics as it pertains to education. It was suggested PBC form a taskforce to collect data to look at other district’s allocation models and practices under the SCFF. Important to note, is that CLPCCD will not have the same access to low-income students as in other districts (like Cerritos) and a taskforce may not be able to work around these facts; also noted is Title V includes first-generation college students.</p> <p>Consensus was built by members to form a taskforce; volunteers are: Miguel Colon, VC Nicholas, Rajeev Chopra, Dr. Patricia Shannon, and Rajinder Samra.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Future Agenda Items <i>For discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A breakdown showing percentages for Promise grant attainment 2. Number of certificates and degrees awarded 3. Discuss, for new BAM, the idea of including PELL and Promise grant recommendation 	<p>None</p>

Meeting adjourned 11:40 a.m.