



District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC)
Meeting Agenda – May 19, 2022, 2:00 p.m.
Via Zoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/360544163>
Or Dial-In: 669-900-6833 (Meeting ID: 360 544 163)

I. Welcome & Introductions – Jose Torres, Chair

II. Approval of Minutes

- A. Confirm a Quorum
- B. Approve Minutes of March 3, 2022

III. Current Topics

- A. Unrestricted General Fund Tentative Budget
- B. DBAC Evaluation Results
- C. Change of Meeting Day

IV. Future Topics

Any Member Suggestions?

V. Next Meeting Date & Adjournment

The next meeting of is scheduled for 2 p.m. on June 16, 2022, via Zoom.

SBCCD Mission: *Transform lives through the education and training of students for the benefit and enrichment of our diverse communities.*

DBAC Charge: *The objective of the District Budget Advisory Committee is to share budget information with identified constituencies. It is intended to provide a forum for budget discussion and input. It is also a committee where explanations of Board action can be discussed. The committee is neither a decision-making body nor is it intended to undermine or replace the budget allocation processes of the colleges. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following.*

- *Review and evaluation of current, projected or proposed Federal, State and local funding affecting California Community Colleges and SBCCD.*
- *Review of budgetary policies, administrative procedures, allocation model formulas and guidelines, and the financial well-being of the District. (Union issues which are conducted as a part of labor negotiations are not a part of this Committee's responsibility.)*
- *Review of both general fund unrestricted and restricted revenue sources, enrollment growth projections, and other workload measures.*
- *Review and make recommendations to Chancellor's Council regarding budget assumptions (revenues, allocations, COLA and growth).*
- *Promote budget awareness and communicate budget issues.*



District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC)
Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2022, 2:00 p.m.

I. Welcome & Introductions

Jose Torres opened the meeting at 2:07 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Confirm a Quorum

Quorum was confirmed.

B. Approve Minutes of February 3, 2022

Mike Strong made a motion to approve the minutes from February 3, which Larry Strong seconded. The motion was approved. Mary Valdemar and Romana Pires abstained.

III. Current Topics

A. Addition of Membership Role for Asian Pacific Islander Association (APIA)

Jose shared that last December Chancellor's Council had approved advisory committee representation for the newly formed Asian Pacific Islander Association. Mary Valdemar made a motion to approve this position for the DBAC roster, which Corrina Baber seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Chancellor's Council will be notified of the action.

B. Multi-Year Forecast (MYF) | Resource Allocation Model (RAM)

Jose advised he was sharing a presentation with the committee to provide historical context on the Multi-Year Forecast, which is also known as the Resource Allocation Model. The PowerPoint will be forwarded to the DBAC.

At the mention of the College Brain Trust, Kevin Horan advised that there were numerous recommendations for CHC in the 2014 study which have been enacted.

Larry went through the Multi-Year Forecast (MYF), also known as the Resource Allocation Model (RAM). Usually the MYF is shown with the current year and 4-5 years into the future. The RAM is applied in the MYF. Larry referred to the different sections – A, B, C and D.

He pointed out the state-based revenue. All colleges get some funding based on their size. CHC is classified as a small college and SBVC is as a medium college.



He mentioned that for Credit FTES, the State uses the three-year average and pointed out the State rate paid for each FTES. Special Admit and CDCP categories get a different rate.

Larry reviewed lines 16, 16a and 16b which indicate that SBCCD is currently receiving \$1.4 million over and above the FTES calculation. This is stability protection from the State.

He advised that the percentages on line 17 represent how much of the revenue is generated from Valley and how much from Crafton. These percentages inform how revenues are divided.

Delmy Spencer confirmed with Larry that data components are reviewed and verified by the SBCCD Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness in conjunction with the colleges. Jose mentioned that the States student centered funding formula was implemented before the data could be established and the effort to reconcile SBCCD data with the State is ongoing even now.

Mike confirmed that he, and now Tenille Norris, meet with Christopher Crew to review and discuss the various FTES metrics.

Mary commented that a lot of expenses have shifted from the colleges that earn FTES to the district entities. She asked about district income. Larry advised that all the State income for the entire district comes from students and FTES.

Mike asked about the term "Revenue Shortfall" on line 19. Larry explained that once the State determines the amount owed to all the colleges based on the State formula, that amount is compared with forecasted State income. If they find they can't fund what the districts are owed, they announce a Revenue Shortfall and the districts do not get the calculated amounts for that period.

Romana Pires stated her desire that DBAC members have input on how the budget should be spent, rather than simply getting a presentation on something over which they have no control.

Kevin responded that from his perspective what Jose and Larry presented is an overview to bring everyone to the same page so that input can be given to the RAM. Earlier in the presentation Jose referenced the College Brain Trust study which had a recommendation for the district RAM to be reevaluated and examined. That's what the DBAC will be giving input on – how the assessment from the district is handled. Each college has its own budget committees to discuss inputs at the college level.

Romana asked if there will ever be any discussion of money. Larry advised her that the DSO expense budget had been reviewed in depth at the February 3 meeting and offered to meet with her one on one if she wanted a recap of that presentation.



Romana asked if changes could have been made to the budget at that time. Larry advised that during this process input is given and changes can be made if there's enough concern about a certain area. Currently, the DSO draft budget is waiting for the campus budgets, which are due March 14. Then it all gets put together and this committee will have a chance to review the combined budget.

Jose advised that DBAC will be having discussions in the coming meetings that get into all the details, but it was very important to make sure everyone is on the same page, before we begin those conversations.

Denise Knight expressed her concern about the missing FTES and how SBCCD would make up that shortfall. Jose advised that through SBCCD's multi-year forecast this issue has been identified. Over the next couple years, SBCCD will be under stability protection in the form of hold harmless or emergency conditions allowance, but the goal will be to grow 4% each year.

Erik Morden mentioned the budget presentation made at the February 24 Board strategy session. It was jaw-dropping to see the \$8 million deficit. Jose mentioned that the numbers will change as the budget develops.

As we start talking about what SBCCD can do to make a balanced budget, Jose wants to make sure we get to this level of understanding.

Mike asked Jose for any recommendations on what discussions he'd like DBAC members to have at the colleges in preparation for that future districtwide discussion. Jose felt it is important to understand the three different revenues types that SBCCD receives, the options of hold harness, emergency conditions allowance, and the SCFF.

It's important to understand that in 2024-25 those protections will no longer to be there.

IV. Future Topics

This topic was not discussed due to time constraints.

V. Next Meeting Date & Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for April 7, 2022 at 2:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.



District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC)
Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2022, 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Attendance

QUORUM: Definition of Quorum is established by Chancellor’s Council. Committees cannot vote or make decisions unless they have met quorum, but in order to encourage participation, committee members can provide a designee or a proxy if they are not able to attend.

<u>yes</u>	1) 50% + one of appointed voting members (not 50% of members plus vacancies).
<u>yes</u>	2) Two persons from each site (CHC, SBVC, DSO)
<u>yes</u>	3) Three of four constituent groups represented (faculty, classified, student, management)

	Representation	Member Name or Vacant	Present or Absent?
1	Faculty, CHC (1 of 2) (appointed by Academic Senate President)	Brandi Bailes	<i>Absent</i>
2	DSO (appointed by CSEA)	Corrina Baber	<i>Present</i>
3	Faculty, SBVC (1 of 2) (appointed by Academic Senate President)	Davena Burns-Peters	<i>Absent</i>
4	Black Faculty & Staff	Denise Knight	<i>Present</i>
5	Latino Faculty & Staff	Erik Morden	<i>Present</i>
6	Classified, SBVC (appointed by Classified Senate President)	Girija Raghavan	<i>Present</i>
7	Executive Vice Chancellor, Chair	Jose Torres	<i>Present</i>
8	Faculty, CHC (2 of 2) (appointed by Academic Senate President)	Josh Robles	<i>Present</i>
9	Management, CHC (appointed by college president)	Kevin Horan	<i>Present</i>
10	Director of Fiscal Services	Larry Strong	<i>Present</i>
11	Classified, CHC (appointed by Classified Senate President)	Laura Van Genderen	<i>Present</i>
12	Chief Technology Officer	Luke Bixler	<i>Present</i>
13	CSEA Treasurer (appointed by CSEA)	Mary Valdemar (proxy)	<i>Present</i>
14	VP, Admin Services, CHC	Mike Strong	<i>Present</i>
15	ASG President or designee, CHC (<i>arrived 3:09 p.m.</i>)	Robert Alexander	<i>Absent</i>
16	Faculty, SBVC (2 of 2) (appointed by Academic Senate President)	Romana Pires	<i>Present</i>
17	Management, SBVC (appointed by college president)	Scott Thayer	<i>Absent</i>
18	Business Manager	Steve Sutorus	<i>Absent</i>
19	VP, Admin Services, SBVC	Tenille Norris	<i>Present</i>
20	ASG President or designee, SBVC	Samantha Zamora	<i>Absent</i>
21	CTA (appointed by CTA)	Vacant	<i>n/a</i>

2022-23 MULTI-YEAR FORECAST SUMMARY
Unrestricted General Fund

	Estimated Actuals 2021-22	Draft Budget FY 2022-23	Forecast FY 2023-24	Forecast FY 2024-25	Forecast FY 2025-26	Forecast FY 2026-27
Revenues						
State-Based Revenue	105,907,372	110,857,648	113,532,803	114,355,036	116,159,817	119,978,802
Other Revenue	7,727,403	12,441,903	12,441,903	12,441,903	12,441,903	12,441,903
PARS Trust Gains	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
FCC Legal Fees Reimbursement/DSO Portion FCC	-	1,650,000	950,000	400,000	-	-
Commercial Building Profits	-	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-	-
Total Revenues	115,684,775	128,499,552	130,474,707	130,746,939	130,651,721	134,470,705
Expenditures						
1000 - Academic Salaries	46,008,761	50,275,037	50,783,807	51,304,025	51,835,947	52,379,838
2000 - Classified Salaries	31,662,539	32,151,058	32,734,102	33,330,264	33,939,840	34,563,131
3000 - Benefits	27,191,080	29,913,727	30,484,335	30,987,824	31,504,571	32,034,930
4000 - Supplies	1,221,998	1,593,538	1,609,473	1,625,568	1,641,824	1,658,242
5000 - Other Expenses and Services	11,686,603	13,746,606	13,884,072	14,022,912	14,163,142	14,304,773
6000 - Capital Outlay	439,838	627,727	634,004	640,344	646,748	653,215
7000 - Other Outgo	600,095	812,021	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Total Expenditures	118,810,913	129,119,714	130,929,794	132,710,938	134,532,071	136,394,130
Other Adjustments						
Golden Handshake Costs (1/4) ***	(1,025,000)					
Golden Handshake Savings (1/4) ****		659,386	526,157	445,484	341,684	260,937
Total Other Adjustments	(1,025,000)	659,386	526,157	445,484	341,684	260,937
Annual Increase/(Decrease) to Fund Balance	(4,151,138)	39,224	71,070	(1,518,515)	(3,538,666)	(1,662,487)
Beginning Fund Balance	24,893,310	20,742,172	20,781,396	20,852,465	19,333,950	15,795,284
Ending Fund Balance	20,742,172	20,781,396	20,852,465	19,333,950	15,795,284	14,132,797
Fund Balance in Months	2.08	1.94	1.92	1.75	1.41	1.25



District Budget Advisory Committee Self-Evaluation, 2021-2022

Q1 - What is your primary location?

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	CHC	36.36%	4
2	SBVC	27.27%	3
3	District	36.36%	4
Total		100%	11

Q2 - What constituency group are you representing on this committee?

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	Administrator/Supervisor	45.45%	5
2	Classified/Confidential	27.27%	3
3	Faculty	9.10%	1
4	Student	18.18%	2
5	Other	0.00%	0
Total		100%	11

Q3. How many years have you worked or been a student (if you are a student rep.) in the district?

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	Less than a year	0.00%	0
2	1-3	0.00%	0
3	4-7	27.27%	3
4	8-10	9.10%	1
5	11 or More	63.63%	7
Total		100%	11

Q4. How many years (total) have you served on this committee?

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	Less than a year	50.00%	5
2	1-3	10.00%	1
3	4-7	20.00%	2
4	8-10	20.00%	2
5	11 or More	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	10

Q5. How many other district committees did you serve on this year?

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	0	10.00%	1
2	1	10.00%	1
3	2	30.00%	3
4	3	20.00%	2
5	4 or More	30.00%	3
	Total	100%	10

SUMMARY OF SELF-EVALUATION QUESTIONS (SCALE 1 – 5):

✚ The range of responses was Strongly disagree to Strongly agree (scale 1-5).

✚ This is true of all questions below (6-15).

Item #	Question	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Count
Q6	Constituency groups are adequately represented for the purposes of this committee	4.00	5.00	4.80	10
Q7	Meetings are well attended by constituency groups.	4.00	5.00	4.60	10
Q8	The roles and responsibilities of each committee member are clear.	3.00	5.00	4.50	10
Q9	The committee promotes the shared values, mission, and goals among the Colleges and the District.	3.00	5.00	4.40	10
Q10	The committee provides effective communication (e.g., accurate, relevant, timely, accessible, clear, and concise) on relevant information for decision-making.	3.00	5.00	4.40	10

Question	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Total	Mean
Q6	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	2 20.00%	8 80.00%	10	4.80
Q7	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	4 40.00%	6 60.00%	10	4.60
Q8	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	1 10.00%	3 30.00%	6 60.00%	10	4.50
Q9	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	1 10.00%	4 40.00%	5 50.00%	10	4.40
Q10	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	1 10.00%	4 40.00%	5 50.00%	10	4.40

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neither A nor DA; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

Item #	Question	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Count
Q11	The committee promotes a climate of openness and transparency (e.g., ongoing communication, opportunities for two-way communication regarding discussion, plans and policies).	2.00	5.00	4.10	10
Q12	Discussions were facilitated in a way that provided adequate opportunities for all constituency groups to participate.	2.00	5.00	4.00	10
Q13	Decisions were made in a manner appropriate for this committee.	3.00	5.00	4.10	10
Q14	I feel that the working relationships among the members of the committee are professional, respectful, and collegial.	4.00	5.00	4.50	10
Q15	The members of the committee support diverse opinions, ideas, and actions of others.	2.00	5.00	4.30	10

Question	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Total	Mean
Q11	0 0.00%	1 10.00%	1 10.00%	4 40.00%	4 40.00%	10	4.10
Q12	0 0.00%	2 20.00%	0 0.00%	4 40.00%	4 40.00%	10	4.00
Q13	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	3 30.00%	3 30.00%	4 40.00%	10	4.10
Q14	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	5 50.00%	5 50.00%	10	4.50
Q15	0 0.00%	1 10.00%	0 0.00%	4 40.00%	5 50.00%	10	4.30

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neither A nor DA; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

Q16 - Please indicate all means in which you communicate committee decisions/discussions to your constituency group.:

Item #	Answer Choice	Percent	Count
1	In-person	22.73%	5
2	Email	27.27%	6
3	College/District website	4.55%	1
4	Updates in committee meetings	45.45%	10
5	Other	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	22

COMMENTS

Q17 - Please enter the improvement(s) most needed by this committee in its processes, interactions, outcomes, or other aspect of its work:

I specifically "agreed" with the comment on effective communication based mostly on the updates/minutes provided by Kelly Goodrich only.

The committee has been reporting and informing rather than discussing issues and developing recommendations. It is hard to have discussions when individuals come polarized to one side or another. We need to look at the financial projections and review potential solutions.

I appreciate the use of a survey but I am disappointed with the questions. The questions selected do not address the effectiveness of the committee. Although the questions were good for as far as they went, based on the questions, one can only surmise that the committee was well run. I was expecting question such as: Did the committee review and evaluate current, projected or proposed Federal, State and local funding affecting California Community Colleges and SBCCD. Why didn't any of the questions address the responsibilities of the committee? If one was to assess what the committee actually achieved, I think acknowledgement of the API group was it. We did not put forth any recommendations regarding the forecasted deficit. The meetings are well run but productivity is the key. Each member should be able to state a series of recommendations that resulted in this years meetings. There are no recommendations at this point that I can share with other faculty members. I think we needed far more strategizing eventhough the budgetary information was not available. I am disappointed that more was not accomplished.
