RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Budget Allocation Model Meeting
February 22, 2013
RCC AD 109
9:00 - 11:00 a.m.
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I. Introductions

II. Dr. Gray: Introductory Comments

III. What is the BAM and what is it intended to do?

IV. Origin and History

V. The BAM and DBAC
   i. District Budget Allocation Survey

VI. The BAM and District Strategic Planning
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VIII. The BAM “To Do” List

IX. Issues and Concerns

X. Next Steps
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THE BAM

- Greatly Maligned

- Frequently Misunderstood

- The Boogeyman
THE BAM

What is it?

The BAM is a numerical articulation expressed in monetary terms of policy and strategic planning decisions. Thus, the BAM does not drive policy, program and planning decisions; rather, policy, program and planning decisions drive the BAM.
THE BAM

ORIGIN
(Handout)

• The Pre-BAM World

• FY 2007-2008: The Beginning

• The Players

• The Process

• The Principles

• The Outcome
THE BAM

REALITIES
Part 1

• No Perfect Model
  Frequently Revised

• FY 2008-2009
  The Implementation Year
  In The Midst
  Of a
  Global Fiscal Freefall

• The Missing Assumption:
  A Deep and Sustained Downturn
  (akin to the 100-year Flood)

• System-wide vis-à-vis College Decision-making
  Altered Perception of BAM Outcomes
  And a
  What if
The BAM and $60.6 million (2009)

MVC: $12.12

NC: $ 9.09

RCC: $27.88

DSS: $ 9.70

DO: $ 1.81
THE BAM

REALITIES
Part 2

• State Compliance and College Autonomy

• Maintaining the District as a Going Concern

• Systemwide Bargaining Units and The BAM

• Systemwide Bargaining Units and College Autonomy

• Budget Structure and BAM Perceptions
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Report No.: VI-B-1

Subject: Budget Allocation Model (BAM) for Resource 1000 - FY 2008-2009

Date: May 20, 2008

Background: The District's transition from a single-college District with two centers to a multi-college District necessitated a change from the existing Resource 1000 (General Operating) budget allocation model to a model that aligns better with a more decentralized and independent operational environment. This was recognized as a planning agenda item in each of the accreditation self-studies for the Riverside, Moreno Valley and Norco campuses and was indentified by the visiting accrediting teams as a critical step for Moreno Valley and Norco to achieve full accreditation status.

In response, the District's Chancellor called for the formation of a Budget Allocation Model Task Force and charged the group with developing a new budget allocation model that would best serve the needs of a multi-college district. The BAM Task Force was formed with the following member composition:

Aaron Brown - Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance (Chair)
Michael McQued - Associate Professor (Moreno Valley)
Dr. Bill Orr - Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley)
Tom Wagner, J.D. - Associate Professor (Norco)
Norm Godin - Vice President, Business Services (Norco)
Ajene Wilcoxson - Associate Professor (Riverside)
Cindy Taylor - Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside)
Becky Elam - Vice President, Business Services (Riverside)
Patti Braymer - Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance (District)
Vickie Vega - Administrative Assistant (Meeting Recorder)

The BAM Task Force began meeting in September 2007; meeting a total of twenty times through May 2, 2008. The initial meetings of the Task Force were devoted to: establishing timelines and communication processes; defining guiding principles and; discussing concepts such as reserve requirements, equipment and facilities standards, efficiency measures, and growth allocations.

The Task Force spent a considerable amount of time discussing community college financing complexities and the limitations imposed by regulatory requirements such as the 50% Law, the Full-Time Faculty Obligation (75/25 goal), reserve requirements and categorical program matching funds. The Task Force also evaluated sample budget allocation models from five California community college districts.

Beginning in January 2008, members of the Task Force were asked to "sketch" their own version of a budget allocation model by incorporating concepts discussed since the first meeting. This became a turning point of sorts in the BAM development process as the Task Force moved from
theoretical discussions to the practical application of concepts into a model. The Task Force considered the components of each “sketch” in great detail, noting what worked and what didn’t, eventually leading to the proposed new BAM.

Meeting agendas, minutes, budget allocation model sketches and supporting information, has been shared by members of the Task Force with various constituency groups throughout the BAM development process including Academic Senates, Strategic Planning Committees and Subcommittees, the District Academic Planning Council, the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet, bargaining unit representatives and, to the institution as a whole by email.

Attached for the Board’s information and consideration is the proposed new Budget Allocation Model; a flowchart; a description of BAM components and; worksheets to support the calculation of BAM components. The amounts shown in the proposed Budget Allocation Model are as of April 22, 2008. These amounts will change during the Tentative and Final budget development processes as more information becomes known and as budget assumptions are changed to reflect updated State and District information. The following were incorporated into the Budget Allocation Model:

Total Available Resources (TAF)

The sum of the beginning balance plus estimated revenues.

Total Available Resources Available for Allocation (TAFA)

TAF less the following reserves and set-asides: 1) 5% minimum contingency reserve, 2) 1% reserve for economic uncertainty, 3) inter/intrafund transfers, 4) new District/College programs and initiatives, 5) operating costs for new facilities and, 6) new positions/part-time faculty growth.

Allocation Increment (AI)

The difference between the prior year base expenditure budget and TAFA. The AI will be used to fund: 1) base budget adjustments for such items as bargaining unit negotiated increases, step and column increases, health and welfare increases, position reclassifications and, election costs; 2) the small college factor for Moreno Valley and Norco; 3) the college enrollment efficiency incentive; 4) a base budget increase for District Office and District Support Service areas and, 5) an allocation to the Colleges based on a three-year, weighted average of credit FTES.
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
RESOURCES-COMMITTEE

Report No.: VI-B-1

Date: May 20, 2008

Subject: Budget Allocation Model (BAM) for Resource 1000 - FY 2008-2009 (continued)

The BAM Task Force will continue to meet regularly throughout the next fiscal year to assess and evaluate the new Budget Allocation Model and to consider the following items:

- Review/Analysis of Base Expenditure Budgets
- Development of Discipline WSCH:FTEF Standards
- Student Success Incentive
- New Position Funding Allocation Methodology
- Treatment of Budget Savings
- Base Budget Adjustments
- On-Line Education FTES Allocation
- Other Incentives/Disincentives

Information Only.

James L. Buysse
Interim Chancellor

Prepared by: Aaron S. Brown
Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance
Riverside Community College District
Budget Allocation Model
As of April 22, 2008

Revenue
- Contingency from 2007-2008: $9,423,484
- Additional Revenue from 2007-2008: $6,135,352
- Unsuns DO/DSS 2007-2008 Budget: 900,000
- Unsuns Moreno Valley Campus 2007-2008 Budget: 300,000
- Unsuns Norco Campus 2007-2008 Budget: 300,000
- Unsuns Riverside Campus 07-08 Budget: 500,000

Total Available Funds (TAF): $17,558,836
Projected Revenue FY 2008-2009: 143,241,635
Total Available Funds for Allocation (TAPA): 160,800,471

Allocation Increment
- PY Base Expenditure Budget (2007-2008): $147,788,742
- CY TAPA (2008-2009): $147,788,742
- Allocation Increment (A.I.): $5,352,336
- Less, Base Budget Adjustments: $(3,011,774)
- Less, Small College Factor: $(1,300,000)
- Less, Enrollment Efficiency Incentive: $(543,538)
- Less, District Office/District Support Services: $(284,016)

Remaining Allocation Increment: $213,008

Expenditures
- PY Base Expenditure Budget (FY 2007-2008)
- Base Budget Adjustments
- District Office/District Support Services
- Small College Factor: 650,000
- Enrollment Efficiency Incentive: 131,701
- Remaining Allocation Increment: 49,606
- Base Expenditure Budget for FY 2008-2009

% Increase to PY Base Budget: 5.05% 6.44% 2.21% 1.53% 16.10% 3.76%
$ Increase to PY Base Budget: $1,357,056 $1,366,606 $1,455,049 $356,232 $817,393 $5,352,336
% of Allocation Increment: 25.35% 25.53% 27.19% 6.66% 15.27% 100.00%

NOTE:
The amounts shown in the Proposed Budget Allocation Model are based on budget assumptions as of April 22, 2008. Amounts will change during the budget development process as budget assumptions are adjusted based on updated information.
Riverside Community College District
Budget Allocation Model
Component Description Notes
FY 2008-2009

1. Per Board Policy BP 6200, the first item funded is the minimum 5% contingency reserve of Total Available Funds (TAF). Use of the contingency reserve requires a two-thirds vote of the Board of Trustees.

2. "1% Reserve for Economic Uncertainty" represents a set-aside to provide a "safety-net" to respond to significant unexpected, mid-year occurrences which impact the current year adopted budget. Such occurrences could include mid-year budget cuts imposed by the State, statewide property tax and enrollment fee shortfalls that are not backfilled by the State, unrealized District growth estimates, emergency situations (fires, floods, winds, earthquakes), mid-year utility spikes, information technology infrastructure failures, etc. The amount set aside in this reserve will equal 1% of TAF. Use of this reserve must be approved by Executive Cabinet.

3. "Interfund/Intrafund Transfers" represents monies set-aside to fund the District's match requirements for categorical programs such as DSP&S, Instructional Equipment and Federal Work Study, and to provide administrative support relative to programs such as Performance Riverside, Early Childhood Services, Customized Solutions and Self-Insured Health & Liability as approved by Executive Cabinet.

4. "New District/College Programs/Initiatives" represents budget set-aside to fund new or expanded District/College programs that have been approved through the District Strategic Planning/Executive Cabinet processes and that cannot be supported through existing base budget funding.

5. "Operating Costs for New Facilities" represents funds set-aside to provide for increased operating costs associated with new facilities that are coming on line in the next fiscal year. This line item is established to temporarily provide for projects that are already in the "pipeline" until a mid-range financial model is developed and the District's/College's planning processes are more fully developed and integrated. Included are items such as increased
Riverside Community College District  
Budget Allocation Model  
Component Description Notes  
FY 2008-2009

utilities costs, maintenance supplies, additional support staff, new equipment maintenance agreements, etc.

6. “Set-Aside for New Positions/PT Faculty Growth” represents budget provided to fund new full-time faculty; increased part-time faculty costs associated with anticipated growth; and new classified, confidential and management positions arising from the Program Review process, prioritized and approved by the Strategic Planning Committees, and Executive Cabinet after consideration for growth funding limitations, facility capacity, the Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON, 75/25 Goal), 50% Law, and applicable staffing standards (such as M&O).

7. “Base Budget Adjustments” represent expected changes to the adopted budget that arise during the current year for items such as staff reclassifications and promotions, new positions, etc. that will have an effect on the adopted Base Budget. Base Budget Adjustments also represent known or expected changes for the subsequent year that are not in the current year Base Budget for such items as bargaining unit contractual provisions, utility rate increases, contracts, election costs, etc.

8. "Small College Factor" represents an advance of new apportionment funding that the District will receive when Norco and Moreno Valley are recognized by the State Chancellor's Office as independent colleges for funding purposes. The amount that has been allocated to Norco and Moreno Valley will be added to their base budgets and will provide funding to begin addressing identified operating and staffing needs as they transition to full college status. A minimum of 50% of the allocated amounts will be committed to “Current Expense of Education” applicable expenditures in order to comply with the requirements of the 50% Law. The BAM Task Force will analyze the Small College Factor as a component of the BAM for fiscal year 2009-2010 and will make recommendations for modification as necessary.
9. “Enrollment Efficiency Incentive” represents funds added to a college’s base budget based on the results of effective enrollment management practices as measured by a three year weighted average of Fall Term WSCH:FTEF above the standard of 525. For fiscal year 2008-2009 only, the allocation methodology assigns a dollar value to each “unit” above the 525 standard. The “unit” value has been established at the 2008-2009 Base Credit FTES funding rate of $4,564.83. As an example, a campus whose three year weighted average WSCH:FTEF is 550 will receive an Enrollment Efficiency Incentive of $114,121 (550-525 = 25 “units” x $4,564.83). The BAM Task Force will analyze the Enrollment Efficiency Incentive as a component of the BAM for fiscal year 2009-2010 and will make recommendations for modification as necessary.

10. “District Office/District Support Services” (DO/DSS) allocation, added to the base budget for fiscal year 2008-2009, represents the increase provided to the DO/DSS areas to support: 1) the impact of institutional growth on the DO and DSS areas; 2) District Strategic Planning Committee/Executive Cabinet priorities and initiatives; 3) capital equipment and facility renovation needs, etc. The calculation of the DO/DSS allocation increment equates to 1% of the prior year DO/DSS Base Expenditure Budget. Historically, the District Office and District Support Services budgets have been combined under the “Axx” location designation in the District’s budget and accounting system. In fiscal year 2008-2009, the District Office budgets and the District Support Services budgets will be disaggregated. The District Office has been defined as the offices of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and Chief of Staff. District Support Services has been defined as those areas which support and assist the operations of the Colleges and District as a whole, including such areas as Finance, Purchasing, Payroll, Information Services, Risk Management, Diversity and Equity, Human Resources, Grants & Contracts, Administrative Support Center, District Facilities Planning Design and Construction, and all of the associated costs for those areas. The BAM Task Force will analyze the DO/DSS allocation methodology in the BAM for fiscal year 2009-2010 and will make recommendations for modification as necessary.
11. "Remaining Allocation Increment" represents the amount of remaining funds available to allocate after all other allocations have been made. This allocation is calculated using a three year weighted average of credit FTES.
Riverside Community College District
Prior Year Base Expenditure Budgets (FY 2007-2008)
As of April 22, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Norco</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>DSS</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
<td>54.41%</td>
<td>$26,852,718</td>
<td>$142,364,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21,233,736</td>
<td>$65,948,338</td>
<td>$23,324,271</td>
<td>$5,077,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-Year Weighted Average Credit FTES %

PY Base Expenditure Budgets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moreno Valley</th>
<th>Norco</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>DSS</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Percent Increase</td>
<td>$196,522</td>
<td>$187,431</td>
<td>$532,795</td>
<td>$124,778</td>
<td>$15,610</td>
<td>$1,057,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step &amp; Column</td>
<td>117,467</td>
<td>112,048</td>
<td>318,437</td>
<td>79,877</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>631,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>115,160</td>
<td>103,080</td>
<td>350,290</td>
<td>190,090</td>
<td>41,380</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclassifications and Other Personnel Changes</td>
<td>34,975</td>
<td>(1,117)</td>
<td>49,829</td>
<td>95,283</td>
<td>25,977</td>
<td>204,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor and President Recruitments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Adjustments</td>
<td>111,147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>9,815</td>
<td>(20,350)</td>
<td>90,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Utilities Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,170</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant and Categorical Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(13,431)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(13,431)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Other Adjustments</td>
<td>(49,522)</td>
<td>(44,700)</td>
<td>(14,847)</td>
<td>(164,738)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(273,807)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$525,749</td>
<td>$358,742</td>
<td>$1,239,674</td>
<td>$122,989</td>
<td>$766,620</td>
<td>$3,011,774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Riverside Community College District  
Budget Allocation Model  
Projected Ending Balance and Estimated 2008-2009 Revenues  
As of April 22, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance 7/1/07,</td>
<td>$18,576,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Revenue Budget for FY 2007-2008</td>
<td>$134,906,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007 Apportionment Recalculation Adjustment</td>
<td>$(2,140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008 Apportionment Adjustment</td>
<td>$7,883,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008 Property Tax Shortfall - Deficit</td>
<td>$(2,047,775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Sales</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmotology Sales</td>
<td>$(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Student Fees</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery from Grants and Categorical Programs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds (TAF) for FY 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>$159,618,152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deduct Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Expenditure Budget for FY 2007-2008</td>
<td>$(153,482,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Less) Plus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency from 2007-2008</td>
<td>$(9,423,484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Positive Budget Variance</td>
<td>$(2,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Expenditures for FY 2007-2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>142,059,316</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Ending Balance 6-30-08</td>
<td>$17,558,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beginning Balance 7-1-08</td>
<td>$17,558,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Revenue for FY 2008-2009</td>
<td>$143,241,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds (TAF)</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,800,471</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less, 5% Contingency</td>
<td>$8,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less, 1.0% Reserve for Uncertainty</td>
<td>$1,608,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less, Inter/Intrafund Transfers</td>
<td>$1,635,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for Allocation for FY 2008-2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>$148,857,457</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004-2005 (weighted .20)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Weighted Average Credit FTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Weighted Average Credit FTES %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005 WSCH (Common Disciplines) (weighted .20)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006 WSCH (Common Disciplines) (weighted .30)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007 WSCH (Common Disciplines) (weighted .50)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Weighted Average Fall WSCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units over 525 Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Three Year Weighted Average Credit FTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Three Year Weighted Average Credit FTES %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rounded to 4 decimals
Riverside Community College District
Budget Allocation Model
Interfund and Intrafund Transfers
As of April 22, 2008

Interfund and Intrafund Transfers to/from Resource 1000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource 1090 - Performance Riverside</td>
<td>$193,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource 1170 - Customized Solutions</td>
<td>173,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource 1190 - Grants and Categorical Programs DSP&amp;S</td>
<td>665,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment Match</td>
<td>86,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study</td>
<td>176,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource 3300 - Child Care</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource 6100 - Health and Liability Self-Insurance</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource 1110 - Contractor-Operated Bookstore</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,635,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE BAM
TO DO LIST

• Part-time Faculty Budgets
• How to Deal with Prop 30 Revenues
• Review BAM:
  – Program Review Results
  – Student Success Initiative
• Ensuring FON, 50% Law and Reserves Compliance
• Treatment of College-Based Revenues
• Allocating system-wide costs and liabilities to the Colleges
• The Tie to District Strategic Planning
• Tieing to College Strategic Planning
• Forthcoming DBAC Assessment
Enrollment Management Task Force, p. 5

Once the level of unfunded FTES has been reduced to the optimum range, the district, its instructional administrators, department chairs and faculty must endeavor to avoid a repeat of the circumstances that contributed to the current situation. Specifically, it is essential that future increases in class sections offered be made based on sound evidence (such as recent enrollment histories) that sufficient student demand exists to warrant their creation and that future enrollment growth does not significantly exceed the likely rate of state growth funding. The district must discontinue the practice of adding sections to the schedule simply to try and capture state-funded growth where insufficient evidence of student demand for class sections exists. Instead, section increases should be targeted toward disciplines and classes with high existing WSCH: FTEF rates, newly emerging programs or classes deemed by the college to be mission-critical. Further, as new instructional facilities come on line the district should endeavor to phase in the offering of classes in the new buildings to coincide with projected student demand and likely levels of state growth funding. Without adhering to these principles there is a significant risk that the district may once again find itself with above optimal levels of unfunded FTES in the future.

**Enrollment Management Principles and Guidelines**

Decisions concerning effective enrollment management should be based on an agreed upon set of *principles* and *guidelines*. Principles upon which enrollment management decisions are based may include the following:

- **The level of the organization at which enrollment management decisions are to be made.** In general, except under extraordinary circumstances, enrollment management decisions should be made at the college, as opposed to the district level. Within overall parameters established by the district through collaborative processes outlined later in this report, colleges should be charged with making operational decisions such as the number of class sections to be scheduled and the distribution of these sections across the college curriculum. Class schedules should be built by those in the best position to ascertain likely student demand (i.e. college instructional administrators in consultation with their faculty).

- **Student Academic Needs Should Drive Enrollment Management Decisions.** As a general rule, student academic needs (curriculum balance, quality of instruction, availability of courses, etc.) should be the primary factors guiding enrollment management decisions.

- **The need to practice responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.** Enrollment management decisions should be based on the principle of providing students access to courses and programs and fostering their success while optimizing the use of financial resources. Student-centered schedules should be planned, efficient and responsive to the communities served.
Enrollment Management Task Force, p. 6

In addition to the above principles, district- and college-level decision-makers can benefit from a set of guidelines to assist them in making enrollment management decisions. Several suggested guidelines will be discussed below in the context of the functions to be performed by the district and the colleges in managing student enrollment.

District-Level Functions

Three main functions are best performed by the district in support of its enrollment management strategies: 1) Setting overall enrollment targets and assigning projected growth to the constituent colleges; 2) Allocating sufficient resources to the colleges to support planned enrollment growth; and 3) Providing research and analysis to assist the colleges in making informed enrollment management decisions.

1) Establishing District and College Enrollment Targets

At the district-level, decisions need to be made regarding overall enrollment targets as well as the distribution of planned enrollment among the constituent colleges. The district enrollment target for the next academic year is established by the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance in collaboration with the District Educational Services Office based upon a) the level of funding proposed by the Governor in his/her January budget message; and b) the level of enrollment necessary to maintain the district’s “cushion” of unfunded FTES. The distribution of planned enrollment among the colleges is established by the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services. In determining this distribution, this office takes the following factors into consideration:

- The need for the district to adhere to the 75:25 law (which encourages districts to move toward delivering 75% of all instruction using full-time faculty);
- The need for the district to adhere to the 50% law (which requires that 50% of all district expenditures be allocated toward direct instructional costs);
- The “full-time faculty obligation” assigned to the district each year by the state (this number specifies the minimum number of full-time faculty members a district is required to employ);
- District and College Strategic, Educational and Facilities Master Plans and scheduled build out of new instructional facilities at each college; and
- Total costs of instruction, including the need for adequate facilities and student services to serve the planned student population.

While enrollment targets have always been established at the district-level and assigned to the colleges by the district office, the Task Force is recommending some enhancements to this process geared toward facilitating improved transparency and
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consultation intended to result in greater awareness of and adherence to the enrollment targets at the college level. With this in mind, the following process is proposed:

- During the fall semester, instructional vice presidents will confer with their respective faculties, student services administrators and support staff and review their Educational Master Plans and program review documents in anticipation of their participation in the enrollment management process.

- In late January, District Educational Services staff will meet with instructional vice presidents from each of the colleges to confer with them regarding the appropriate distribution of planned enrollment growth or contraction among the colleges.

- Based on this consultation, as well as on an analysis of the factors listed above, the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services will issue preliminary enrollment targets to each college in early February. These preliminary targets will be accompanied by a written rationale for the proposed distribution of planned enrollment between the colleges.

- In mid-February, each college instructional administrator will consult with representatives of the faculty in an effort to provide the district with feedback and suggestions concerning the enrollment targets.

- In late February, the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, relying primarily upon input provided by the colleges, will issue revised enrollment targets to each college.

2) Resource Allocation

In the spring of each year, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance will determine the preliminary allocation of budgetary resources to each college in accordance with the district Budget Allocation Model, which will take into consideration the costs associated with meeting the district and college enrollment growth targets. This process culminates with issuance of the Tentative District Budget in mid-June. The final distribution of budgetary resources is reflected in the adoption of the Final District Budget, which typically occurs in mid-September.

3) Research and Analysis

Over the course of the schedule-building process, the District Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Office of Institutional Reporting will respond to the needs of the colleges for research, data and analysis needed to guide them in enrollment management decision-making.