I. PURPOSE
II. GROUND RULES
III. PROCESS
IV. PRINCIPLES
V. METHODOLOGY – FACTORS TO CONSIDER
VI. NEXT STEPS/MEETING SCHEDULE
VII. OTHER
VIII. ADJOURN
Task Force Members
Aaron Brown, Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance - Present
Patti Braymer, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance - Present
Becky Elam, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside) - Present
Norm Godin, Vice President, Business Services (Norco) - Present
Bill Orr, Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley) - Present
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco) - Present
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley) - Present
Don Wilcoxson, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Riverside) - Absent

The Task Force discussed the following ideas/theories/issues related to development of the new Budget Allocation Model.

I. PURPOSE
   - To develop an equitable resource distribution model that best serves the needs of students in a three-college district
   - Enhancing predictability of Campus and District support areas resources resulting from FTES growth or decline
   - Integrate campus strategic planning committees more fully in the resource allocation process
   - Develop straightforward resource allocation policies and procedures
   - Respond to Accreditation recommendations

II. GROUND RULES
   - First and Foremost – It must serve the needs of students
   - Must protect the financial viability of the institution as a whole
   - Task Force approach - “Win/Win”
   - De-emphasize “Campus Only” and “District Support Area Only” viewpoint during the development process – Think in terms of what’s best for the whole
   - Think in terms of “Power of 3” (three colleges together make for stronger individual colleges and a stronger District)

III. PROCESS
   - Task Force members will be responsible for sharing information with their Campus and District constituents such as Campus and District Strategic Planning Committees, Executive Cabinet, Campus leadership and other interested groups and individuals. Task Force members will, in turn, share information and input from their constituents at Task Force meetings.
   - Communication
     • Consider establishing a Blog to share ideas and to comment on proposals
     • Distribute meeting minutes
     • Email
III. PROCESS (continued)
   - Timeline
     • Preliminary model by April 2008 for use in FY 08-09 budget development cycle
   - Initially the Task Force will meet every other Friday until further notice

IV. BAM PRINCIPLES
   - K.I.S. – Keep It Simple (ease of administration)
   - Transparent
   - Fair
   - Independently verifiable
   - Predictable
   - Justifiable
   - Incentives/Disincentives
   - Data Driven
   - Needs Driven
   - Compliment District and campus missions and goals

V. BAM METHODOLOGY – FACTORS TO CONSIDER
   - Institutional reserve requirement (Minimum 5% by board policy)
   - Accept ownership and responsibility for maintaining and managing resources allocated
to Campus and District Support Service areas
   - Effective integration with the program review process
   - Educational Master Plan
     • New Program Development
     • Program Discontinuance
   - Facilities
     • Master Plan
     • Infrastructure
     • Facilities Standards
       ➢ Equipment
       ➢ Staffing
       ➢ Appearance
       ➢ Maintenance
     • “Older” vs. “Newer” - Campuses/Centers
       ➢ “Creation” vs. “Maintenance”
       ➢ Remodels “6226”
   - Technology
     • Replacement Plan (Instructional and Non-Instructional)
     • Lease vs. Buy decisions/consideration
     • Network/Infrastructure
     • District/Campus considerations
   - External Factors
     • State Economy
     • PERS/STRS rates
V. BAM METHODOLOGY – FACTORS TO CONSIDER (continued)

- Utilities
- Acts of God (Earthquakes, Fires, Flooding)
- Health and Welfare

- Efficiency
  - Measurement
  - Effect

- “High Cost Programs” vs. “Low Cost Programs”
- Bargaining Unit Agreements (Compensation represents 83% to 85% of total budget)
- Part-time faculty cost management
- New Positions (Process)
- Staff Development (Standards)
- Campus Reserves
  - Naming (Venture/Contingency/President’s Fund)
  - Define use
  - Campus Directed
  - “One-time Funding” vs. “Ongoing Funding for Expenditures”
  - Rollover budget savings year-to-year
  - Temporary assistance from District for campus overextension
    - Repayment provisions
- Object Codes
  - Salary & Benefit Savings (%)
  - “Discretionary” only (%)
  - All object codes (%)
  - Institution’s historical budget savings

- Impact of Other Resources
  - Categorical & Grant Programs (Resource 1190)
    - Positions (moving in/out of Resource 1000)
  - Performance Riverside (Resource 1090)
  - Customized Solutions (Resource 1170)
  - Parking (Resource 1050)
  - Child Care (Resource 3300)
  - Food Services (Resource 3200)
  - Self-Insurance
  - Health and Liability (Resource 6100)
  - Workers’ Comp (6110)
- Athletic Programs
- Compliance
  - 50% Law
  - 75/25 Obligation
  - Grants/Categorical Programs
VI. OTHER
- Copies of “Budget Allocation Model - Notes” prepared by Dr. Buysse were distributed to the Task Force members for discussion at subsequent meetings

NEXT MEETING
- The members will recommend classified staff to join the Task Force
  • Date: Friday, October 12th
  • Time: 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
  • Location: College House, 1st Floor
- Becky Elam and other Task Force members will distribute “sample” BAM’s from other Districts for discussion at future meetings
- Discuss Dr. Buysse’s “Budget Allocation Model – Notes”
- Begin discussion of “Nuts and Bolts” of the Model and diagramming framework
AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes
   -- September 28, 2007

III. BAM Development Task Force

IV. Dr. Buysse’s “Budget Allocation Model-Notes”

V. Sample Models from other Districts

VI. Other

VII. Next Meeting

VIII. Adjournment
I. Minutes of September 28, 2007

The minutes of the September 28, 2007, were reviewed approved.

II. Classified Representative Nominees

Bill Orr nominated Ron Ricard, Microcomputer Support Specialist at the Moreno Valley campus. Ron said he would represent the classified staff pending authorization from his supervisor.

Becky Elam nominated Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator and Michelle Davila, Secretary IV Occupational Education both are located on the Riverside campus.

Tom Wagner nominated Dave Dieckmeyer, Instructional Support Specialist at the Norco campus.

Task Force members discussed each nominee and if they have served on any committees with them. Aaron said he had served on several committees with Cindy Taylor. The Task Force voted and agreed on Cindy Taylor to represent the classified staff. Becky Elam would make contact with her to see if she could commit to participate on the BAM Task Force.

III. Dr. Buysse’s “Budget Allocation Model-Notes”

Dr. Buysse’s notes on the framework for a Budget Allocation Model were discussed. The Task Force agreed to consider incorporating the same basic principles in RCCD’s model.

Things to consider:

- Beginning Balance
+ Projected Revenues
  = Total Available Funds
- 5% Minimum Reserve Requirement
  = Amount Available for Expenditure
  o Base budget as a starting point, plus COLA and Growth. Identify available revenues
  o A, B & C budgets concept – Need to define:
    A = Fixed Costs (e.g. Salary & Benefits)
    B = Variable (e.g. Hourly Salaries)
    C = Capital (Equipment - Ongoing technology needs based on technology standards)
    D = Capital Facilities (Total Cost of Ownership)
  o “Entities” need to be defined more specifically. Currently we have four “Entities” - District Office, Riverside, Moreno Valley, and Norco. (Need to consider Ben Clark, Rubidoux Annex, Culinary, etc.).
  o Fourth “Entity” considerations (define):
    • Resource 1000 impact
    • 5% Reserve
    • Non-FTES generating which may include:
      - Economic Development
      - Customized Solutions
      - Performance Riverside (designed to be self-supported)
      - Community Education
    • District Office
    • “Districtwide” (e.g. legal, audit, utilities, facilities)
      o Chart of Accounts coding must reflect what really is happening
      o New Positions – (Executive Cabinet level final decision making?)

IV. Sample Models from other Districts

Budget allocation models from several districts were discussed. Comments from Task Force members:

- Los Rios Community College District -
  o Complex
  o Instructional staffing linked to FTES growth (Chart)
  o Heavily formula driven
  o Planning link is not apparent
  o Identifies base reserves and costs as the basis of the model and incorporates one-time revenues and costs
  o Allocates new revenue sources (COLA & Growth – very little flexibility)
  o 80/20 Concept (80% to compensation / 20% to operations)
  o FTE counseling standard
  o Model is very rigid

- San Mateo County Community College District -
  o Complex
- West Hills Community College District -
  o Task Force agreed they might want to use this Budget Allocation Model as a building block for the District’s model
  o Based on prior year budget as opposed to actual expenditures from the prior year
  o FTES (3 year average)
  o Simple and easy to understand
  o Program review component
  o Standards for technology

The models/samples identified many key issues that the Task Force will consider during the Budget Allocation Model development process:
  o Base Budget (Carefully consider what comes “off the top”)
  o Is a 5% Reserve sufficient? (Need input from campuses)
  o Technology is becoming a fixed cost. Technology should be driven by the planning process, not driven by formula at campus level
  o Calculation worksheets are a good tool (Calculation flow needs to be seen)
  o Consider 75/25 obligation Districtwide
  o Salaries and benefits from previous year as the base. Model 85%/15% (salaries and benefits/other) against available revenues to determine impact
  o Structural imbalance needs to be addressed
  o 50% Law compliance by campuses?
  o Consider using an Instructional Staffing Chart
  o Inflation consideration at campus level
  o Campuses priorities – autonomy to decide where resources are spent
  o FTES (3 year average)
    - Consider a 4 year average with the fourth year being the budget year projection
    - Consider using a factor for over or under-projection as a hedge
  o Lottery
    - Consider budgeting only the prior year actual revenue
    - For Prop 20 Lottery (Instructional Supplies)
      - Restricted Resource 1190 should be used first, then unrestricted Resource 1000
  o Consider a student persistence/retention factor
Organizational structure needs to be analyzed to align functions with “Entities” (e.g. District Deans)
Consider an ongoing BAM Committee
Facilities Standards (Guidelines) need to be developed (min/max)
Consider a flowchart, similar to one used by Rancho Santiago Community College District, to show allocation of resources
Remember the BAM Principles set forth by this Task Force:
  K.I.S. – Keep It Simple (ease of administration)
  Transparent
  Fair
  Independently verifiable
  Predictable
  Justifiable
  Incentives/Disincentives
  Data Driven
  Needs Driven
Compliment District and campus missions and goals

V. Other

Norm reported results of the initial BAM meeting to the Norco Senate.

The campus representatives on the BAM Task Force must share information with their Strategic Planning Committees. Input from campus Strategic Planning Committees is critical and needs to be shared at each BAM Task Force meeting.

Norm and Becky will provide the Task Force members with additional information on West Hills, Rancho Santiago, and San Mateo Budget Allocation Models. Task Force members will email their comments.

VI. Next Meeting – November 9, 2007

Define “Entities”
Define Costs
Review Rancho Santiago Model
Schedule BAM meetings through March 2008
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force
Friday – November 30, 2007
9:00-11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes
   -- November 9, 2007

III. Input from Strategic Planning Committees

IV. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model
   - Revenues (continued from last meeting)
   - Base Budget
   - Costs
     • Fixed Costs
     • Variable Costs
     • Capital
       o Equipment
       o Remodels
     • Transfers/Match

V. Other

VI. Adjournment
MINUTES

Task Force Members
Aaron Brown, Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance - Present
Patti Braymer, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance - Absent
Becky Elam, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside) - Present
Norm Godin, Vice President, Business Services (Norco) - Present
Bill Orr, Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley) - Present
Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside) - Present
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco) - Present
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley) - Present
Ajene Wilcoxson, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Riverside) - Present

I. Minutes of November 9, 2007
The minutes of the November 9, 2007, were reviewed and approved with the following corrections:

Correction to Task Force Members:
Addition of Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside) – Present
Correct Ajene’s name to reflect Ajene instead of Don.

II. Input from Strategic Planning Committees (SPC)
The Task Force discussed input from campus SPC’s:

Bill/Michael – The Finance Sub-Committee did not meet. They are meeting next week. Bill will inform Sub-Committee about BAM Task Force progress and request input.

Norm/Tom – No report. BAM Task Force progress is on agenda for next Tuesday.

Becky – Riverside is working through the Sub-Committees. This year will be a “Test Case” for the process. An online folder has been created for the Sub-Committee members to access the BAM Task Force information electronically. The BAM is on each Planning Committee agenda to share information with the committee.

Aaron – The BAM Task Force members need to take information to the Committees and encourage information sharing and feedback.
III. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model

Revenues (continued from last meeting)

Aaron discussed calculation basics for State General Apportionment revenue.

FTES

- Base Credit: 26,203
- Base Non-Credit: 121

Funding Rate

- Base Credit: $4,367
- Base Non-Credit: $2,626
- Growth Credit: $4,565
- Growth Non-Credit: $2,746

Funded Growth Rate

- Community College System: 2.000%
- RCCD: 2.498%

**Growth Funding

- Considered one-time in year of growth
- Becomes base revenue in subsequent years

Calculation

Base

- Base Allocation: $7.4 million
- Base Revenue:
  - Credit: $104.1 million
  - Non-Credit: 0.4 million
  - Total: $104.5 million
- Total: $111.9 million

Inflation Adjustment (COLA)

- COLA Rate (4.53%): $5.0 million
- Restoration: $10.8 million
Growth (2.498\%)

Credit $ -
Non-Credit __-

Total Growth $

Computational Revenue $ 127.7 million
Less, Property Taxes (31.5) million
Less, Enrollment Fees (98%) (8.2) million

Net State General
Apportionment Revenue $ 88.0 million

Current Basic allocation for RCCD is as a single college district with two centers. If accreditation for Norco and Moreno Valley is obtained, we will receive an allocation as a multi-college District and will receive an increase to the basic allocation of approximately $2.7 million (if recognized in FY 07-08).

Dr. Orr asked how much we receive in Federal grant income. Aaron responded that the total amount budgeted in resource 1190 is $10.4 million (does not include Financial Aid).

Base Budget

In general, terms there are two components
- Base Revenue
- Base Expenditures

Budgeted Revenue - $134.9 million (ongoing and one-time sources)
Less, Budget Expenditure - 144.0 million (ongoing and one-time uses)
$ (9.1) million

Beginning balance of $18 million.
Structural imbalance of approximately $5.7 million including Salaries & Wages, Health & Welfare, etc. (ongoing only).

Fixed Costs

The Task Force discussed and began to identify fixed costs. Presented below is a preliminary list that will need to be refined and defined.

1. Full-Time Salaries & Benefits
2. Part-Time Salaries & Benefits (will be discussed further)
3. Utilities (gas, electricity, telephone, waste & water)
4. Contractual Obligations
5. Insurance
6. Legal/Audit/Election Costs/Compliance (GASB 45)
7. Technology (infrastructure, inventory, TCO, standards)
8. District Match (Instructional Equipment, DSPS, Federal Work Study)

Questions/Issues

Part-Time Salaries & Benefits:
- Dr. Orr - Prefers part-time faculty salaries as affixed cost.
- Norm - Wants to consider further.
- Dr. Orr asked what percentage salaries and benefits were to total expenditures. Aaron estimated from 83% to 85% (actual Resource 1000 Budget 84.9%).

Contractual Obligations:
- Tom Wagner - Very broad - needs further definition.

Technology:
- Aaron – Recognizing Technology as a fixed cost means that we are making a funding commitment.
- Norm - Questions technology as a fixed cost. It should be a campus level decision. It should not come off the top of the overall District budget. Campuses need to determine technology needs and funding. Need to carefully consider putting it into the model. Campuses should make technology decisions. The Planning process needs to drive those decisions. This might be a good homework assignment for a small group of the BAM Task Force to work on and bring back to the Group. There may not be a general awareness in the District of the cost of technology.
- Dr. Orr – Technology funding should come off the top.
- Mike – Pleased to see that the Task Force is considering the need to fund Technology on an ongoing basis.
- Becky - Steve Gilson has a very good idea what future costs will be and suggested he should be contacted.
- Norm - Agreed.

5% Reserve:
- Aaron - Mandated by Board policy (5%).
  
  \[
  \text{Revenue} - \text{Expenditures} = \text{Ending Balance}
  \]

  The ending balance rolls over to the next year and becomes the beginning balance of the new budget year. Beginning balance is a component of Total Available Funds (TAF).

  \[
  \text{Current Year Revenue} + \text{Beginning Balance} = \text{TAF} - 5\% \text{ Reserve} = \text{Funds Available for Expenditure}
  \]

- Cindy - Asked how many times we have gone below 5% reserve.
o Aaron - Not sure exactly, but not many times.
o Becky - This should be the first rule of BAM guidelines/policies.

Task Force agreed: Board mandated 5% reserve will be the first item budgeted.

Variable Costs / Discretionary Costs

Task Force discussed whether to call costs “Variable”, “Discretionary”, or something else. No final decision was made. The term “Variable Costs” will be used for now.

1. Supplies
2. Part-Time Classified Hourly
   - Vacation Payoff
   - Overtime Payoff
3. Travel/Conferences/Meals
4. Consulting / Contractual Obligation / Professional Services
5. Staff Development
6. Memberships
   - CASBO
   - ACCCT
   - CCLC
   - ACCCA

IV. Other

The Task Force “Homework Assignment”

• Think of Variable Costs in the framework of the model (Overall costs vs. campus costs).

• Next Meeting will discuss Capital and Facilities Standards and how to fold them into the model.
AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes
   -- October 12, 2007

III. Input from Strategic Planning Committees

IV. Sample Models from other Districts (Continued)

V. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model

VI. Other

VII. Next Meetings

VIII. Adjournment
I. Minutes of October 12, 2007

The minutes of the October 12, 2007, were reviewed and the following corrections were made:

Page 3, - West Hills Community College District -, item 2:
   Based on prior year budget as opposed to actual expenditures from the prior year should read:
   Based on prior years expenditures as opposed to budget from the prior year.

Page 4, under Other:
   Norm reported results of the initial BAM meeting to the Norco Financial Resources Sub-Committee, not the Norco Senate.

No other changes were made and minutes were approved.

II. Input from Strategic Planning Committees (SPC)

The Task Force discussed input from campus SPC’s:

Norm/Tom – The Norco Resources Sub-Committee was very impressed with the details and the complexity of the issues involved with developing a BAM.

Becky – The Riverside Resources Sub-Committee is reviewing information from the BAM Task Force and gathering information from Program Review to set budget priorities.

Bill/Michael – The Moreno Valley SPC has not discussed BAM Task Force progress yet.
Task Force members discussed:

- Bill/Michael - Moreno Valley
  - A set model in 3 to 5 years
  - At some point distribute minutes of the BAM Task Force to the larger RCCD community
  - Tie the budget process to the Program Review process
  - Interested in college self-determination, financial and otherwise

- Becky/Ajene - Riverside
  - 8 different sub-committees of the RCC SPC evaluate Program Review outcomes for allocation purposes
  - Distribute information broadly using technology

- Norm/Tom - Norco
  - Program Review identifies priorities
  - Model should bridge information gap between District and campus
  - At some point distribute information to RCCD community (post to a website)

- Aaron - District
  - Develop a BAM that will serve all 3 campuses
  - Include BAM as a permanent item on the Strategic Planning Committee agendas

III. Sample Models from other Districts (continued)

- Rancho Santiago -
  - Easy to understand for those with minimal financial experience
  - Format is clear
  - Comprehensive
  - Specific detail is provided, yet the detail is not too complicated
  - FTES/Formula components
  - Page 3 identifies general model guidelines (consider for RCCD’s model)
  - Page 8 shows a BAM flowchart (Easy to follow. Consider incorporating a flowchart into RCCD’s model.)
  - Growth revenue is allocated to campuses/colleges
  - Linkage to planning is not clearly identified
  - Consider using Rancho’s model as a base model to build upon for RCCD’s model

IV. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model

General Comments/Questions to Consider

- Determine what factors to use for District allocation.
- Consider District function as a fixed cost that should come “Off the Top.”
- Consider including a flowchart to describe State Budget Cycle. Link Strategic Planning Committee calendar to the State Budget Cycle.
• Link BAM to accreditation standards, planning and Program Review process.
• Revenue concept --- All revenue is considered “District” revenue:
  - Majority of revenue is generated by FTES.
  - Determine campus/college base revenues.
  - Future campus/college revenue distribution.
  - Maximize revenues through growth.
  - How much can we grow on overall basis?
  - By campus/college?
    - Growth needs to be program driven.
• Consider revenue allocation by FTES.
  - Equity?
  - Existing Costs?
• Use Rancho’s model as a starting point, but modify it to fit RCCD’s needs
  - Campus/college Strategic Planning Committees to review, make
    suggestions/comments/recommendations and ultimately approve.

Identifying “Entities” (For Resource 1000 Purposes – FTES Generating)

• Colleges

  1) Riverside Campus, including:
     - Innovative Learning Center
     - Rubidoux Annex
     - March Education Center (Nursing)
     - Culinary Academy
     - Riverside School of Arts (Future)
  
  2) Norco Campus, including:
     - South Corona (Future?)
  
  3) Moreno Valley Campus, including:
     - March Dental Education Center
     - Ben Clark Training Center
     - Allied Health Center (Future?)

• District Office
  - Board of Trustees
  - Chancellor’s Office
  - Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
  - Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance
  - Vice Chancellor, Human Resources & Diversity
  - Vice Chancellor, Student Services,
  - District Facilities Planning & Construction
  - Chief of Staff
- **Districtwide Support**
  - Administrative Communication Center
  - Finance
  - Foundation
  - Audit
  - Legal
  - Utilities
  - Other (?)

**Additional Entity Considerations**

- Open Campus (?)
  - Campus/college revenue generation/allocation?
  - District support roll?
  - Cost coding evaluation?

- New Centers
  - Link to colleges
  - Regulated by the State Chancellors Office

- “4th Entity” concept
  - Customized Solutions
  - Economic Development
  - Community Education
  - Other (?)

**Identifying Total Available Funds (TAF) (Revenue)**

1) Federal (Unrestricted)
   - Veteran Education Administration
   - Student Financial Aid Administration

2) State General Apportionment (main source of funding)
   - Comprised of:
     - Rate x FTES (Base/COLA/Growth)
     - Enrollment Fees
     - Property Taxes

3) Other State Funds
   - Lottery (Unrestricted/Restricted)
     - Prop 20 Resource 1190
   - Part-Time Faculty compensation funding ($1.083 million)

4) Local Revenue
   - Interest Income
   - Non-Resident Tuition
   - Misc.
* Will start from here next meeting

V. Other

- Norm to provide West Hills worksheet

- Becky to provide San Diego BAM narrative and a link to the *California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Strategic Plan Executive Summary*.

VI. Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Friday, November 30, 2007
Friday, December 7, 2007
Friday, December 21, 2007
Friday, January 4, 2008
Friday, January 18, 2008
Friday, February 1, 2008
Friday, February 29, 2008

All meetings will be held at 9:00 a.m. in the College House.
AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes
   -- November 30, 2007

III. Input from Strategic Planning Committees

IV. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model
   - Costs
     • Capital
       o Equipment
       o Remodels
     • Transfers/Match
   - Facilities
     • Standards
     • Funding
   - Incentives/Disincentives

V. Other

VI. Adjournment
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force
Meeting of December 7, 2007

MINUTES

Task Force Members

Aaron Brown, Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance - Present
Patti Braymer, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance - Present
Becky Elam, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside) - Present
Norm Godin, Vice President, Business Services (Norco) - Present
Bill Orr, Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley) - Absent
Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside) - Present
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco) - Absent
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley) - Present
Ajene Wilcoxson, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Riverside) - Present
Patricia Worsham, Instructor, Business (Norco) - Sitting in for Tom Wagner

I. Minutes of November 30, 2007

The minutes of the November 30, 2007, were approved.

II. Input from Strategic Planning Committees (SPC)

The Task Force discussed input from campus SPC’s:

Becky/Ajene – Riverside continues to work on incorporating the Program Review process into the SPC process. Ajene suggested uploading BAM information onto the RCC Website. Becky concurred. Ajene will research what needs to be done regarding uploading information and get back to the Task Force with details. Ajene suggested establishing a faculty open forum to share information once a month. Perception is that not everyone is getting information.

Michael – Bill sent out an email of past BAM minutes. No input from Moreno Valley Campus community yet. The next SPC meeting will be the week of December 10th. They expect to hear some feedback at that point. There has been some concern from the Academic Senate that information is not getting out. Uploading information onto the Website would be a good tool.

Norm/Patricia – Norm shared with the SPC, Aaron’s apportionment calculation discussion at the last meeting. They found it helpful. Norm asked the Academic Senate to put a BAM item on their agenda so BAM information can be discussed. Norm posts BAM information on the Norco website. People seem to want to look for information there. He also sends the BAM information to the Norco Resources Committee and the President’s Cabinet.
Aaron – Shares BAM information with the Mag 7 group. He will make sure Executive Cabinet and District SPC are kept informed. He indicated that the BAM Task Force has not yet received much input from the campuses. The BAM Task Force members need to be proactive at the campus level to solicit input.

Cindy – Gustavo Segura asked how she was selected to be on the Task Force and wanted to know if other classified staff can participate. The consensus of the Task Force members agreed that two additional classified staff members, one each from Moreno Valley and Norco, could be added to the Task Force if an interest is expressed.

III. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model

Costs (continued from last meeting)

Capital Items (Resource 1000)

Aaron indicated that Steve Gilson confirmed equipment replacement guidelines exist. Norco took the lead to develop them for their campus. Steve indicated it was a good model to use Districtwide. Aaron will email the guidelines to Becky, per her request.

Instructional Equipment (Resource 1190)

- Historical allocation (past 2 years):
  - Based on a 3-year average of Campus FTES
  - Consensus from the Task Force is that this allocation methodology is working and should continue
  - Instructional Equipment funds from the State are restricted
    - Held in Resource 1190
  - 3 to 1 District match
    - Annually funded from resource 1000

Non-Instructional Equipment (Resource 1000)

- Historical allocation (past 2 years):
  - Based on 3 year average of FTES
  - Allocation based on available resources
- Historically, an additional allocation was set-aside for each new position
- Aaron – Should there be District Standards/Guidelines established for Non-Instructional Equipment or should this be a campus determination?
  - Where should the allocation fall? District allocation (off-the-top) or campus allocation? Is this something we should be setting funds aside for each year?
  - Patti – Program Review should dictate needs
  - Norm – FTES split is fair and not quite sure if we are there yet for Program Review
  - Mike – Agrees with the FTES split
** Norm – Revisit Non-Instructional Equipment. Campuses should be making these decisions
Presidents/Administrative Contingency/Reserve

- No set amount at year-end
  ** Put on the agenda for future discussion, terminology and process

Remodel “6226” (Resource 1000)

- Historical allocation:
  - Electronic requests sent to District Facilities
    - They review and prioritize for Health & Safety issues first
  - Aaron – Should be addressed by the Facility Standards Task Force
  - Becky – Some should go through Program Review to prioritize and match with available funds
  - Norm – Should adhere to overall campus goals
  - Aaron – Is FTES allocation appropriate?
  - Becky – Square footage and age of facilities should also be considered
  - Aaron – Campus based or “Off-The-Top” allocation?
  - Aaron – Depending upon the scope of the remodel, would it qualify for Measure C funding?
  - Norm – Typically, “6226” projects are around $10k to $20k
  ** Need to come back to this as well

District Match/Inter/Intra Fund Transfer Funds

Intra and Interfund Transfers (funded from Resource 1000)

- Intrafund Transfers (e.g. to/from Resources 1000, 1050, 1070, 1080, etc.)
- Interfund Transfers (e.g. to/from Fund 11 and Fund 33)
- Resource 3300 – Child Development
  - Resource 3300 is supposed to be self-supporting, however currently District is supporting the three campus operations ($220,000) and The Learning Center ($20,000)
- Resource 6100 – Self Insurance Liability
  - Self-Insured, Health & Liability Resource
  - District supports with $250,000/yr

District Match (funded from Resource 1000)

- Instructional Equipment (3 to 1 match)
  - District match for Instructional Equipment is funded out of Resource 1000 unspent
  Instructional Equipment is a carried-over
- DSPS & FWS – Based on needs or volume of the project
  - Aaron – District match has been rolled-over from year to year, but it also fluctuates from year to year. Process is fairly simple and meets our obligation
- Norm – District match should be considered as a fixed cost
IV. Other

The Task Force “Homework Assignment”

• VP’s will get together to discuss Administrative Contingency and other items

• Next Meeting will start with Intrafund Transfers
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force
Friday – December 21, 2007
9:00-11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes
-- December 7, 2007

III. Input from Strategic Planning Committees

IV. Report from meeting of District and campus Business Offices

V. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model
   - Intrafund Transfers
   - Facilities
     • Standards
     • Funding
   - Incentives/Disincentives
   - New Positions
   - Other

VI. Other
   - Homework Assignments

VII. Next Meeting
    - January 4, 2008

VIII. Adjournment
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force
Meeting of December 21, 2007

MINUTES

Task Force Members

Aaron Brown, Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance - Present
Patti Braymer, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance - Present
Becky Elam, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside) - Present
Norm Godin, Vice President, Business Services (Norco) - Present
Bill Orr, Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley) - Present
Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside) - Present
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco) - Present
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley) - Absent
Ajene Wilcoxson, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Riverside) - Present

I. Minutes of December 7, 2007

The minutes of the December 7, 2007, were approved without change.

II. Input from Strategic Planning Committees (SPC)

The Task Force discussed input from campus SPC’s:

Bill – Little discussion from the Senate and SPC. Mike and Bill are planning on creating a campus ad-hoc committee, to specifically address BAM development issues. The committee will be comprised of 2 members each from the Senate, administration, CTA, and CSEA along with Bill and Mike as members. Bill and Mike will not have voting rights. Their first meeting will most likely be in February. Bill will continue to share information from the BAM Task Force with the campus community.

Becky/Ajene – Not receiving much feedback yet from the Resources Sub-Committee. When more tangible information is distributed, there will be more feedback.

Norm/Tom – No SPC meeting since the last BAM meeting. The next SPC meeting will be held in February.

III. Mapping/Defining RCCD’s Model

Meeting of the Campus Business Officers and Patti Braymer
There was a considerable amount of discussion about operational issues. Not much was
discussed on BAM issues. Norm has offered to create a spreadsheet/chart to keep track of
open BAM development issues. He will be working on it over the break. Becky is also going
to put open issues into a matrix for tracking purposes.

Patti – Carryover needs to be defined.

**Facilities**

- Standards
  - Task Force (M&O)
  - Report (Jan/Feb)
- Funding

Norm – Ralph Perez is working on Facilities Standards. There should be a final draft
towards the end of January. This will be helpful to the campus communities in helping
them understand the whole scope of Facilities issues for budget priority purposes. Norm
will send the current report to Aaron for his information.

Becky will bring the Report to the Mag 7 group on January 2nd.

**Incentives/Disincentives**

- Long Range Planning
  - Program Review Outcomes
- Budget Savings/Deficits
  - How will these be handled?
  - What objects go into budget savings/deficit determination?

Bill – Current campus perception is that, “if you do not spend it you will not get it next
year”.

Becky – Promote long-range planning to enable the campuses to provide funding for
projects a couple of years down the road (computer replacement in a lab).

Becky – Consider rolling-over campus budget savings for the benefit of the campus.

Aaron – One-time funds for one-time purposes, not ongoing expenditures. We want to
keep it administratively simple as we work through the model.

Bill – The Program Review Process should drive expenditure of these funds.

Norm – It’s crucial that those funds address items from the planning process. Retaining
campus budget savings would be very positive for the campus.

Tom – Consider using the term “Long Range Planning Fund”.
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Patti – What does the Task Force consider to be “Budget Savings”?

Positions (New)

- Faculty (FON) (75/25)
- Staff – Program Review
- Administrators

The Task Force discussed whether or not new position decisions should be campus-based
or District determined and how they are to be allocated. Currently all new position
requests go through Executive Cabinet.

Aaron – We will need to consider 50% law impact and 75/25 impact.

**BAM TASK FORCE RECAP**

Since BAM Task Force Started in September

- Established Ground Rules
- Established Principles
- Discussed Dr. Buysse’s Notes
- Looked at a number of sample models from other CC Districts
- Defined Terms
- Discussed concepts and ideas
- Provided context/background on what RCCD has done historically

**Items for Future Resolution**

- Further define Fixed Costs
- Further define Variable/Discretionary Costs
- Capital Outlay
  - Equipment/Non-Instructional Equipment
  - Remodels (Scope/Measure C)
- Incentives/Disincentives
- Budget Savings/Deficits
- New Positions
- District Office/District Support Services
- Inter/Intra Fund Transfers
- Budget Contingencies (Unforeseen)
  - District
  - Campus
- “High Cost” Programs

**IV. Other**
The Task Force “Homework Assignment”

- Based on the concepts and discussions that have occurred and sample models reviewed, the BAM Task Force VP’s, faculty and staff representatives are to pencil out their ideas of a model for RCCD. Bring this back to the next meeting so we can share ideas and start building the model.

- VP’s to identify their campus “High Cost” Programs and bring back to next meeting for discussion