

Budget Allocation Model Task Force Meeting Notes for February 11, 2021

Members In Attendance:

Adil Ahmed, Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration
Thomas Renbarger, Academic Senate President
Donald Moore, DAS President
Jennifer Shanoski, President PFT
David M. Johnson, President, Merritt College
Scott Barringer, Local 39 Representative
Stacey Shears, Vice President of Student Services, Berkeley City College
Richard Thoele, Classified, President Local 1021
Derek Pinto, Vice President of Administrative Services, Laney College
Tami Taylor, Interim Budget Director, Finance & Administration

Richard Ferreira, Executive Assistant, District Finance & Administration, (Notes) Joan Davis-Pinkney, Staff Assistant, Finance & Administration (Notes)

Members Absent:

Jasmine Martinez, Classified Senate Representative, BCC Tina Vasconcellos, Vice President of Student Services, College of Alameda

Guests:

Marla Williams-Powell, Acting Executive Fiscal Director C.M. Brahmbhatt, Consultant, Cambridge West Partnership Dr. Nathaniel Jones III, President, College of Alameda

I. Agenda Items

Call to order 1:35 pm

1. Review of the Agenda for February 11, 2021

Approval of the Agenda as amended with the removal of Angelica Garcia, Rudy Besikof and adding Stacey Shears and Derek Pinto.

2. Approval of Notes from January 28, 2021

Notes approved from the previous meeting with no changes.

3. Five Year Overview by Locations
Marla Williams-Powell, Executive Fiscal Director



The Five Year Overview by Locations is from years 2016 through 2020 for all colleges. The information comes directly from the Adopted Budget. It begins with College of Alameda, Laney College, Merritt College, Berkeley City College and the District.

The District is not tracking revenues based on location by the colleges. The Peralta District brings in their local revenues into location 01 (District) and then redistributes it. However, it is the colleges that are generating the revenues. All faculty expenditures are taken off the top before allocating funds to the colleges.

If the colleges decide to move to have their own fund balances, then they may be faced with deficits. This may mean cuts. Up till now, the District has provided the same amounts regardless of surplus or deficits to the colleges so that their revenue funds did not change.

It was stated that students attend more than one college within the District to complete their education. We should be focused on Centralized Services and Utilities that are paid through the District for the four colleges.

A request was made to have the BAM percentage for the District included in the Five Year Overview by Location. It was also requested if the local revenue could be provided. This information would be helpful due to the different funds that are included. It was asked if there is any sort of adjustment or consideration to the actual cost of the programs and determining how we accommodate the mixed programs from one institution to another institution. The concern is how to make that allocation fair and equitable.

Based on the FTES the three other colleges are supporting Laney College unless a decision is made to change it.

It appears as if the District takes whatever it wants and then distributes the rest. There was a concern as a goal to place the District into the BAM.

4. Budget Allocation Model Presentation C.M. Brahmbhatt, Cambridge West, Partnership

Any changes may be made and we can adopt this Presentation. Decisions that we are making are about placing student centered (students first).

Other District Budget Allocation Models have worked for them. The Revenue to the District Office for District Services is 9.25% for Cypress College, Fullerton College and North Orange. This is standard and each of them spend within their means.



All of the colleges will be placed in the same model as an example. A side-by-side comparison for the BAM Taskforce of the old way and the proposed new way will be provided.

C.M. Brahmbhatt proposes that the BAM Taskforce go into the proposed items with an open mind and consider all the information before making decisions.

There may need to be discussions on the Home Campus/College and how it is defined.

This a great starting point, however, we have some unique challenges that we need to consider when we develop a new model and incentivize cooperation. It is also complicated and there is competition that exists between the colleges with regards to sharing students.

A suggestion was made that a portion of the SCFF be equally divided, and the rest goes to the college that got the completion.

Consider what is the realistic time line to review and consider the options. We will not likely be able to implement anything new until 2022-23. Proposed that everyone be open minded.

It may be a good idea for the Peralta District to review other community colleges districts within the Bay Area.

5. NOCCCD RAM

C.M. Brahmbhatt, Cambridge West, Partnership

C.M. presented details from North Orange County Community College District for their 2020-2021 Proposed Budget Revenue Allocation. The floor was opened to any questions or concerns. A concern was noted in regards to how far away the colleges listed on the presentation were from Peralta Community College District. It was stated that the colleges listed do indeed have inter-college students as well.

II. Next Meeting(s)

February 25, 2021 at 1:30 pm March 11, 2021 at 1:30 pm March 25, 2021 at 1:30 pm

III. Adjournment at 3:20 pm