



Budget Development Committee

September 24, 2021 | 8:30 am – 10:30 am | Zoom

Meeting Minutes

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Implement the integration of all ACCJC standards throughout campus structure and processes.
- ❖ Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision-making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities.
- ❖ Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus.
- ❖ Coordinate resources and provide professional development for effective online instruction and remote delivery of student support services and college processes to advance equitable student outcomes.

Budget Development Committee

Quorum: 7

Members (non-voting):

Chair, Anette Raichbart

Members Present (12 voting):

Administrator, At-Large-1, Kristian Whalen

Administrator, At-Large-2, Erick Bell

Faculty-1 (appointed by F/A), Heike Gecox

Faculty Member, At-Large-1, Tina Inzerilla

Classified Professional-2, Stephany Chavez

LPCSG Student-1, Vacant

PBC Member-2, Rajinder Samra

PBC Member-3, David Rodriguez

PBC Member-4, Sarah Thompson

PBC Member-5, Thomas Orf

PBC LPCSG Student-1, Vacant

Guest:

LPC Admin Services Officer

Sui Song

Member Absent:

Faculty Member, At-Large-2, Ashley Young

PBC Member-1, Rajeev Chopra

SEIU Rep, Mike Alvarez

1. Call to Order at 8:07 am

2. Review and Approve Agenda

Motion, Rajinder Samra

Second, Sarah Thompson

Motion passed unanimously

3. Review and Approve 9/14/21 Minutes

Motion, Thomas Orf

Second, Rajinder Samra

Abstention, David Rodriguez

4. Review Proposed BAM

- The committee addressed their concern about the inability to review in detail a proposed BAM which came out the morning of the 9/17/21 PBC meeting and was not on the planned agenda
- How to fund M&O came off of the agenda as the decision to follow a total cost of ownership model
- The last-minute presentation of unrelated documentation at the last two meetings pushed the timeline off track
- The disruption delays conversation about how to fund the District Offices
- The budget model presented at PBC put LPC at a loss
- The committee worked through a pros and cons worksheet to vet each of the four proposed budget models.
- The committee feedback derived from if the model encouraged fairness, responsibility, transparency, accountability, trust, meets the mission of serving students, and its ability to function during the rise and fall of the economy
- The 2018 Rollover/Hold Steady holds the District at its current funding/dollar amount with a set percentage increase
 - Pro: meets the mission of serving students as increases go to colleges, accountability
 - Cons: does not meet negotiated obligations or function in challenging FTES times
- The At Cost/Chargeback – Bill the Colleges Model, presented by CWP consultants, enables the District Office to operate independently and bill the colleges for services rendered
 - Pros: Colleges can utilize the District Office as needed
 - Cons: No accountability, does not control cost, and requires someone assigned to oversight
- The Percentage/Off the Top Model is the current CLPCCD model, which provides the District with funding off the top
 - Pros: District autonomy with a constant revenue stream
 - Cons: May not meet actual costs, the mission to serve students or fairness aspect, leaves ending balances, disproportionate District growth, doesn't acknowledge District's fixed cost
- It is important to note the model presented at the 9/17 meeting is similar to the percentage model

- The final model is a three-year rolling average of actuals with an increase of reserves in the event of a funding emergency and COLA
Pros: Fairness, encourages accountability,
Cons: Needs process for right sizing and to meet obligations for step and column increases, limits safety net for instances of overspending
- The committee decided to table the suggestion to set a cap on the three-year rolling fund model as it may stagnate the negotiation process
- The committee believed the bill the colleges/chargeback model and 2018 Rollover model were not in the best interest of LPC and removed them from the selection process
- At the next PBC meeting, members will advocate for the percentage off the top and three-year rolling average
- To plan and prepare for the October 1 PBC meeting, a copy of the worksheet will go out to the Chabot team in hopes it enables both colleges to come prepared to discuss the proposed budget models

5. BAM Timeline

- The timeline instituted at PBC, which went up for a vote and approved, has not been followed
- Timeline discussion points planned for the October 1 meeting are the Modeling/data(3A)
- The published PBC agenda does not reflect the agreed-upon topics at the chair meeting, and the suggested action is to query the matter during the approval vote

6. Budget Update

- The committee received an FY 2021- 22 budget presentation, which provided a comparison with FY 2020-21
- The year LPC has a budget of \$40 million compared to the \$39.6 million received last year
- Certificated salaries have a budget of \$22 million, with \$2.8 million spent during July and August
- July payroll tends to be smaller due to the absence of ten-month pay schedule employees
- Classified salaries have a \$6.4 million budget with about \$1 million spent – the ten-month salary schedule applies here as well
- Benefits have a budget of \$10 million with \$1.5 million spent; benefit payments run over twelve months regardless if an employee is ten-months
- Materials and Supplies have \$200 thousand budgeted with a \$14 spent
- Services have a budget of \$1 million and \$250 thousand spent or encumbered
- Capital expenses \$10 budgeted with \$2700 spent
- Transfer typically occur at the end of the year
- September payroll will reflect at the next meeting

- It is imperative to note that without the CARES money, overspending at LPC is 2 million
- The success metrics are not necessarily a clear reflection as students take classes at both colleges
- There is a belief that Chabot will continue to push for additional FTEF for the Sheriffs Academy
- At the next DEMC, targets for next year will be up for conversation

7. CARES Act Update

- No updates were available
- Updates provided once a month moving forward

8. Good of the Order

9. Adjournment at 9:52 am