

DRAFT
Los Angeles Community College District

District Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2012

1:30-3:30 p.m., Board Room, District Office

Roll Call

Committee members present as indicated (X).

Academic Senate

David Beaulieu	X
Dana Cohen	X
Jeff Hernandez	X
Lauren McKenzie	X
Tom Rosdahl	X
Michael Climo	

L.A. Faculty Guild

Paul Doose	
Carl Friedlander*	X
John McDowell	X
Armida Ornelas	X
Olga Shewfelt	X
Joanne Waddell	X

Unions/Association

Allison Jones or Bobbi Kimble	X
Leila Menzies	X
James Bradley	
Velma Butler or Dorothy Rowe	X
Lubov Kuzmik	
Richard A. Rosich	

College Presidents

Tyree Wieder	X
Jack E. Daniels III*	X
Jamillah Moore	X
Monte Perez	X
Kathleen Burke-Kelly	
Marvin Martinez	X
Roland Chapdelaine	
Sue Carleo	X
Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh	X

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Brandon Batham

Also Present

Resource Persons

Daniel LaVista
Cathy Iyemura
Adriana Barrera
Vinh Nguyen
Jeanette Gordon
Yasmin Delahoussaye

District Office

Felicito Cajayon
Joan Steever
Karen Martin
Perrin Reid
Michael Shanahan

Guests

Ann Tomlinson
Ken Takeda
Paul Carlson
Ferris Trimble
Alex Immerblum
Mary P. Gallagher
Tom V. Jacobsmeyer
Allison Moore
Don Gauthier
Rod Oakes
Maureen O'Brien
Susan McMurray
Anna Davies

1. Call to Order

Co-chair Jack Daniels called the meeting to order at 1:35.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved without changes.

3. Approval of minutes for Feb. 15, 2012

The minutes were approved without changes.

4. Executive Committee Report and Recommendation

--Motion on Budget Allocation Model Recommendations

Jeanette Gordon distributed and briefly reviewed the revised allocation model handout which included the background, rationale, and proposed changes to the model (in two phases). Jeff Hernandez asked why more was included in the M&O calculations than just staff and utility expenses. Vinh Nguyen said anything beyond those two categories was small in number but still should be included if they are related M&O expenses. David Beaulieu asked for an explanation as to why FTES was not factored into the M&O calculation. Carl Friedlander said we would then end up with allocation numbers close to what we have currently. He added that FTES figures change often, so recalculation would have to be done.

Joanne Waddell said she would like to see M&O square footage projections to the end of the bond program. A handout detailing that was distributed, as it had been discussed in the last Exec meeting. The data is based on the assumption of a full build-out of the program, since no decisions have yet been made about eliminating projects. Armida Ornelas argued that the proposed model was seriously flawed, given that we don't know the final square footage at the end of the bond program. She also said there was significant student volume independent of the actual FTES total (due to students not continuing).

John McDowell stressed that the "recommendations" of the proposal (page 3) were a misnomer and should have been titled "basis for allocation." That is, the proposal is not a staffing plan but an allocation model. How the colleges choose to staff is their decision. He also said item #3 about district assessments (in the Background section, page 2) was confusing. After some discussion, its intention was clarified. Beaulieu still objected to it, however, as it hadn't ever been discussed in Exec and seemed to be counter to the intention of the rest of the proposal. It was agreed to shorten the phrasing, at least, to the following:

To review the funding assessment methodology for the District Office, District-wide Centralized Services, and the Contingency Reserve.

Friedlander said he completely agreed with #4 (page 2), in terms of looking at participation rate, but wanted to see other factors considered (following the state practice, which looks at high school graduation rates, e.g.).

Monte Martinez said the M&O criteria followed reputable national standards. Hernandez preferred that the bond moratorium criteria be followed. He also challenged whether all the colleges had adequate funding to meet their FTES base with the new model. Gordon replied that the DBC can't assure that colleges avoid deficits; that's a question of management.

In response to the chancellor's question about the aim of the Exec proposal, Beaulieu said the goal was not to get as close as possible to equal college allocations, given that college service area populations are considerable different in size with varying participation rates. If the gap between some colleges is very large, we shouldn't be concerned about it, as it may be the most equitable distribution.

McDowell moved approval of the proposal, with the elimination from the formal proposal of the descriptive material in the Phase II Planning Timeline (page 4).

Sue Carleo proposed an amendment that an annual review of the new model be conducted. Some on the Exec said that wasn't necessary, as the model would be assessed on a regular basis as a matter of course. The motion carried, however, with three dissenting.

It was further clarified that the motion kept the planning timeline and implementation dates as stated in the handout. Also, it was agreed that the term "recommendations" would be changed to "basis for allocation," in order to avoid confusion.

Bobbi Kimble asked whether the Exec would be looking further at the administrator totals listed in the proposal. The reply was that it wouldn't, at least not in the short term.

The amended motion was passed, with all in favor but for three "No's" and one abstention.

Kimble asked that the Exec keep the DBC regularly informed of its discussions.

5. DBC Recommendations to the Chancellor

The proposal will be sent to the chancellor for his consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50.

Future Meetings:

April 18, May 16, and June 13