



Chabot-Las Positas Faculty Association

Faculty Focus

Comments made at Board of Trustee Meeting About The BAM (Budget Allocation Model)

There was a lively Board of Trustee's Meeting on Tuesday, October 18th, at LPC. LaVaughn Hart, FA Vice President, LPC spoke in Public Comments about the BAM (Budget Allocation Model). See her speech reproduced herein. Others spoke as well, including Laurie Docktor, Chabot Senate President, Melissa Korber, LPC Senate President, and Charlotte Lofft, FA President.

Charlotte Lofft said that the FA has serious concerns about the way the District has currently applied the BAM and urged that there is still time to work out a solution if the parties will approach the topic together. She stated that a lot of goodwill is on the line and that we need to take that seriously.

To Board of Trustees Remarks

By LaVaughn Hart

October 18, 2016

My name is LaVaughn Hart and I am here tonight as the faculty co-chair for the District Planning and Budget Committee (the PBC).

This year, the committee will be conducting a comprehensive review of the Budget Allocation Model, affectionately known as the BAM. Many on the Board may remember that the BAM was developed in the Spring of 2013 after several years of work by the District Budget Study Group. The process of developing the BAM was not easy, it took many hours on the part of literally 100's of people over the course of at least two years. And you can believe me when I say that the discussions were not always pleasant. In fact, the discussions were often quite painful and contentious. But in the end an agreement was reached.

We are now in the 3rd year of using the BAM for allocation of funding to the four centers (Chabot, Las Positas, M & O and the District Office). The PBC has worked hard to monitor and review the use of the BAM throughout the last two years.

Over the last year, there has been increasing concern expressed by the PBC members in our meetings about how the Chancellor has implemented the BAM as monies received as general apportionment dollars have routinely, and against the expressed recommendations of the PBC, been withheld from the BAM. In addition, members of the committee have expressed concern about the unilateral shift in the percentage of funding between

CLPFA OFFICERS 2016- 2018

President

Charlotte Lofft 510.723.67873

Vice Presidents

Dave Fouquet 510.723.6868

LaVaughn Hart 925.424.1194

Secretary

Nancy Cown Pinio 510.723.7535

Treasurer

Debbie Fields 925.424.1113

Part-Time Representatives

Zac Walsh 510.723.6600

Victoria Austin 925.442.1000 ext
2660

Membership

Doris Hanhan 510.723.6911

Heike Gecox 925.424.1436

Grievance Officers

Jeff Drouin 510.723.6933

Heike Gecox 925.424.4136

Faculty at Large

Tom deWit 510.723.6821

Tom Orf 925.424.1304

Negotiations Team

Tom deWit (Chief Negotiator)

Dave Fouquet, Debbie Fields,
Charlotte Lofft, LaVaughn Hart and
Victoria Austin

WWW.CLPCFA.com
4682 Chabot Drive #11712
Pleasanton, CA 94588

About Misuses of the Budget Allocation Model

By: Laurie Docktor, Chabot Faculty Senate President,

Presented at the Board of Trustees Meeting of October 18, 2016

The Faculty Senate of Chabot College has concerns about the Budget for our District! The concern is the failure of our District to follow our Budget Allocation Model, the BAM. I have served on the committee that designed the allocation model and serve on the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC).

The District withheld funds that should go through the BAM last year and this year to require the college to meet certain criteria to receive this funding. There is no provision in the BAM for not putting all the general apportionment funds through the model.

The colleges are also being squeezed by setting Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) targets for the college at a lower level. The Level of the target guides the amount of money to the colleges.

At a time that the colleges are on stability the colleges are being force to go to a lower target. How we make it out of stability is greatly important to what kind of funding we will be getting in the future and what category of size each college is set at.

With the passage of the bond for facilities the community is expecting a growth in both colleges to meet the needs of our community. The need is to increase the ability of the colleges to offer the courses that students in our community need. The flow of less money to the colleges hampers our ability to serve the student. Another part of the BAM is the percentage of funds that flow to each college. The proposed budget for this year changed that percentage for each college such that Chabot will experience a \$428K deficit. These are decisions that need to be made at our shared governance committee, the PBC, not by the district.

The reserves required by the state of California is 5% the PBC recommended 8 % last year.

Now the percent of reserves is at \$28 million, or approximately **\$23.99 %**. This reserve is excessively high and would have our community question our resolve to truly serve the community. I would not want to see my community college District allocating that high of a sum at a time the community has pledged their support to float a Bond.

The Faculty Senate of Chabot College greatly disagrees with the lack of participation of shared governance in these decisions that are being made by our District.

BOT - Hart Continued from page 1

campuses without discussion with or by the PBC, which has the review of the BAM within its purview.

As part of the review of the BAM, the PBC will be making recommendations on the monies that will be subject to the BAM, how funding will be allocated to the four centers, the expenses to be included in Step 3A, the Reserve Levels (overall and within the four centers), and many other factors that make up our allocation model.

At one of the first meetings of the PBC two years ago, we established a Mission statement. The Committee strives to live up to this Mission statement. I've passed out a copy to the Board. This Mission statement was arrived at through a collegial process that sought to lay aside blaming and finger-pointing and focus on building on our common interests and goals.

As we enter into the process of reviewing the BAM, our discussions will be guided by this Mission Statement and the principals that guided the development of the BAM. It is our hope that by engaging in this review, we can arrive at a process that:

- Is fair to all
- Functions in up times and down times
- Is easy to understand
- Is revenue based, and
- Empowers decision making

And that we arrive at a process that is fair, equitable, and transparent and that produces budgetary recommendations in support of our central mission, to educate students while maintaining district and college financial integrity and accountability.

It is my hope that in the Spring I will be able to report to the Board that concerns of the Committee have been addressed, that open, collegial, and productive discussions have occurred, and that we have arrived at a process that, while not perfect, will serve the District well in meeting our obligations to our students, our staff, and our community.

Missing the Faculty Focus Newsletter?

Want to know who your officers are?

Need contract information?

New Faculty Orientation?

We have just the website for all this information:

www.CLPCFA.com

CLPCFA Association

4682 Chabot Drive #11712

Pleasanton, CA 94588

Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) Mission Statement

The Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) is committed to fair, equitable, transparent and consultative processes that produce budgetary recommendations in support of our central mission to educate students while maintaining district and college financial integrity and accountability.

The PBC makes decisions that reflect our institutional priorities:

- student learning,
- student success,
- completion of educational goals, and
- community engagement.

Resources will be distributed based on clear communication regarding available funding and the needs at each site. On-going assessment will evaluate how financial resources facilitate instruction and student support at all sites to improve resource allocation and institutional effectiveness.

In our committee processes, we practice clarity and civility by respecting our diverse viewpoints while making decisions that support the effective functioning of each college's and district's programs and services.

FA DUES STRUCTURE NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED

By Charlotte Lofft, FA President

The table below reflects the current Agency Dues charged by the represented unions in the Bay Area. As you can see, most of them charge considerably more than the FA.

Part of this is because we are not an affiliated union and therefore do not pay into a national or regional organization. The other reason is that we have enjoyed several years of relatively minimal attorney and negotiations cost. That situation has changed in the past few years, as the FA has incurred considerable legal and negotiation expenses.

The FA will be presenting you with a ballot measure in the near future to change our dues structure from a flat fee/month to a proportional fee/month similar to those below. We are thinking of 0.6% of the gross earnings/month over ten months. This is entirely within the ranges below and is fair in that faculty who earn less pay less than those who earn more.

Originally run Oct 2016

Dues charged by Faculty Unions

(Amounts reflect a monthly deduction.)

District (& Affiliation)	Full-Time Dues	Part-Time Dues
Los Rios -Sacramento (CFT)	10 mo. \$116.03 12 mo. \$96.09	\$32.81 \$16.41 temp.
Chabot-Las Positas (Ind.)	\$49.00	\$12.00
CLPFA Proposed >>	0.6% of gross	0.6% of gross
City College SF (CFT)	1.19% of gross	1.19% of gross
West Valley/Mission (CTA)	1% of base salary	\$20/semester
San Jose/Evergreen (CFT)	1.3% of gross	1.3% of gross
Peralta (CFT)	1.469% of gross	\$28.04/member
Foothill/DeAnza (Ind.)	0.6% of gross	0.45% of gross
San Mateo (CFT) GUA**/»I/	1.2% of gross	1.2% of gross
Ohlone/Fremont (Ind.)	10 mo./ \$18 month	\$3/month
Los Angeles (CFT)	1.4% of gross	1.4% of gross



2018-2019 Academic Calendar

Fall 2018

Thursday	August 16	Convocation Day
Friday	August 17	College Division Day
Monday	August 20	Classes Start
Monday	September 3 ¹	Labor Day Holiday
Monday	November 12	Veterans' Day Holiday
Wednesday – Friday	November 21-23 ¹	Thanksgiving Holiday ¹
Friday	December 14	Last Day of Instruction
Saturday	December 15	Saturday Finals
Monday	December 17	Finals
Tuesday	December 18	Finals
Wednesday	December 19	Finals
Thursday	December 20	Finals
Friday	December 21	Finals
Wednesday	January 2, 2019 by 11 p.m. via Internet	Grades Due

Spring 2019

Monday	January 14	Classes Start
Monday	January 21	Martin Luther King Holiday
Friday – Monday	February 15 – 18 ¹	Presidents' Weekend Holiday ¹
Monday – Friday	March 25 – March 29	Spring Break
Friday	May 17	Last Day of Instruction
Saturday	May 18	Saturday Finals
Monday	May 20	Finals
Tuesday	May 21	Finals
Wednesday	May 22	Finals
Thursday	May 23	Finals
Friday	May 24	Finals
Friday and Saturday	May 24 and May 25*	Commencement Ceremony
Monday	May 27	Memorial Day Holiday
Thursday	May 30 by 11 p.m. via Internet	Grades Due

¹No Saturday Classes.

*Commencement is scheduled on the same weekday at a particular college two Academic Years in a row then switched to the other day for two Academic Years in a row. (Article 8C.3)

1 Variable Flex Day for Faculty for the year

Summer 2018 Window Period: Tuesday, May 29 to Friday, August 3, 2018

Wednesday, July 4, 2018 Independence Day Holiday

Grades Due: Monday, August 6, 2018 by 11 p.m. via Internet