AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order
II. Approval of Minutes
   A. December 13, 2013
III. BAM Revision – Continuation
   A. Implementation Issues:
      1. Utilities
         a. Three years of utility costs by entity (emailed by Brown)
         b. NC impact/fuel cell savings (Gomez)
         c. Members methodology discussion
      2. New Facilities Operating Costs
         a. FUSION data and FTES data (VP’s of Business)
         b. College estimates?
      3. Entity Budget Alignment
         a. CTE and GE Analysis Subgroup met January 10th
            - Subgroup consists of Brown, Gomez, Godin, al-Amin, McQuead, Legner and Bajaj
            - Minutes (handout)
      4. Capital Equipment (Furniture, Equipment, Computers)
      5. Common/Shared Expenditures (Basis of Allocation)
         a. Student Systems (Ellucian)
         b. Financial/Budget System (Galaxy)
         c. Network Infrastructure (Hardware/Maintenance Agreements)
         d. La Sierra Loan Repayment
      6. Personnel – Budget Adjustments
         a. Health and Welfare
      7. Mid-year Budget Adjustments from the State
      8. Other Resources
         a. Parking
         b. Performance Riverside
         c. Community Education
IV. Discussion on Evaluators Reassignment
V. State Budget Update
VI. Next Meeting
   A. Friday, February 28th at RCC DL 409, 1-3p.m.
MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT

Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor, Business and Financial Services (District)
Sandra Mayo, President (Moreno Valley)
Paul Parnell, President (Norco)
Wolde-Ab Isaac, Interim President (Riverside)
Norm Godin, Vice President Business Services (Moreno Valley)
Beth Gomez, Vice President, Business Services (Norco)
John al-Amin, Interim Vice President, Business Services (Riverside)
Mary Legner, Professor, Mathematics (Riverside)
Tom Allen, Associate Professor, English & Media Studies (Riverside)
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley)
Nate Finney, Classified Representative (Moreno Valley)
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco)
Tanya Wilson, Classified Representative (Norco)
Jennifer Lawson, Classified Representative (Riverside)
Tim Ragusa, Classified Representative (District)
Rachelle Arispe, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (Recorder)

ABSENT

Jim Parsons, Associate Vice Chancellor, Strategic Communications and Relations (District)
Carrie Warren, Student Representative (Riverside)

I. MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER

• By Aaron Brown

II. MINUTES

• Legner moved, and Gomez seconded, approval of the minutes of November 8, 2013.
  Motion approved with changes as indicated below:
  – As requested by Godin (page 3, 4th solid bullet): Changed last sentence to “…if we
    should go in a different direction?”
- As requested by Mayo (page 3, 7th solid bullet): Changed anomalies information to “Ben Clark and Allied Health (both low student to faculty ratio).”

III. MEETING STATUS

- **DISTRICT SERVICE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS TASK FORCE** - Created to determine district service level requirements that we can incorporated into the BAM.
  - Working on scheduling first meeting

- **CTE & GE ANALYSIS SUBGROUP** – Created to obtain and analyze the full inventory of CTE and GE programs to get the true cost by college.
  - First meeting scheduled for Friday, January 10, 2014

IV. BAM REVISION – CONTINUATION

- **IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**
  - **Handout** provided by Brown, “Implementation Issues/Open Items” – Shows inventory of issues DBAC has been discussing; whether or not the issue has been resolved; and what the resolution was.
  - **Utilities**
    - Allen commented that the utilities should be a college responsibility. If the college is opening new facilities it they should plan for the costs and pay for it.
    - Isaac suggests a review of data from the last three-five years to see how it correlates with the FTES model.
    - Wagner commented that we need to look at rates, projected increases and the difference in costs.
    - al-Amin commented that past data is great, however we need to look at how we project for future rate increases and if rate increases do not materialize then the funds should go back to the college. Utilities are a fixed cost no matter what programs are provided.
    - Gomez commented that Norco College (NC) would not benefit by implementing the fuel cell if we keep funding increases on top of increases.
  - **Consensus** – (1) Brown will email three years of utility costs by entity for members to review. Members can advocate for a methodology at the next meeting. (2) Gomez will look at how NC will be impacted and how the fuel cell savings can be factored into the equation.
New Facilities Operating Costs – Historical background: When we have new facilities planned there are added costs. Currently, Brown works with the Vice Presidents (VP’s) of Business Services for potential costs, then an allocation is set aside.

- Brown indicates that there are only personnel standards for maintenance and custodial. Currently, the actual number of custodians at all three entities is lower than the standard.
- Brown commented that the total estimated budget for custodial and maintenance positions (and other facility related costs) associated with bringing new facilities online has not been allocated in the annual budget over the past several years because there has not been enough funding.
- Isaac asked how much we have deviated from the standards. Godin responded:
  - Actual M&O positions at the colleges have significantly deviated from the standards; however some of the Maintenance and Operations matrix (October 2008) is questionable since it has not been reviewed in a number of years. It may need to be revisited.
  - New facility operating cost allocations have helped shore-up some of the deficits in maintenance and operations.
  - The elements of the BAM only help us to maintain, not increase, the current status of M&O positions.
- Lawson asked where Grounds and Custodial services for the District are charged. Brown and Godin responded:
  - Grounds and Custodial services for District offices are based on Gross Square Feet (GSF).
  - District office GSF located on Riverside City College (RCC) is added to RCC’s GSF then RCC is allocated additional funds to support the services.
  - The District Office on Spruce Street is charged to a District Office budget code in the general fund.
  - The System Office on Alessandro Blvd. is charged to Redevelopment funds.
  - The Economic Development program on Sixth Street in Corona is charged to NC M&O (funds were added to NC based on GSF).
Allen commented that we need to allocate FTES to bring up load ratio’s to assist in facilities cost.

Parnell suggests keeping it a transition plan of approximately six years.

Isaac suggests we keep the same system since we do not have a better alternative.

Allen added that we cannot continue to keep redistributing the FTES, suggests two options: growth/restoration to populate the buildings and be more efficient by reaching an equilibrium.

Isaac commented that there are ramifications if the colleges incorporate Allen’s two options listed above. We need to look at the inequalities historically and review facilities operating costs.

Godin suggests to look at historical data (utility costs) as it relates to new facilities.

**Consensus** – (1) VP’s of Business will gather FUSION data (ASF & GSF), including FTES data for efficiencies, and they will return with suggestions of how to estimate for future facilities operating costs. (2) Beth will share NC’s estimates/format to Godin and al-Amin. (3) Brown suggests that Presidents should advocate at Enrollment Management for a recommendation to drive the FTES.

VII. **ITSC UPDATE**

- **Enrollment Management**
  - Information Technology Strategy Council agreed to use existing tool with expansion. Rick Herman has been meeting with academics of each college. IT is planning to use the software in the winter/spring.

VIII. **ACCREDITATION UPDATE**

- Allen indicated that RCC is adapting to the revised BAM and implementing a college BAM. Allen continued…
  - We need to show that we are moving towards college autonomy;
  - Our weakness is college/district planning alignment;
  - With an integrated action plan (required to be part of the addendum), the District BAM and colleges are in sync, which demonstrates an interaction between the two.
Our action plan should be connected with DSPC’s action plan and integrated before the Accreditation visit.

DBAC’s action plan and the District’s action plan should be posted on the Accreditation website.

- Parnell commented that NC has a plan but not a college BAM.
- Gomez agreed with Allen’s comments and said we need to implement by March.
- Isaac commented that RCC is creating concepts to an internal college BAM.

IX. NEXT MEETING

- **Friday, January 31, 2013**
  - BAM Revision Implementation - Continuation
  - VP’s of Business to provide and discuss a plan to fix the budget issue created when Evaluators were reassigned from being centralized at the District to decentralized at each college.
### Implementation Issues/Open Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Organization:</th>
<th>Open/Resolved</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Defining the roles of the District vis-à-vis the District’s four major entities in the budget development and execution process. (a.) What is the expected level of services to be provided by the District Office? (DSPC)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Brown indicated that this item would be going to the DSPC on 10/11/13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Defining the way in which compliance with statutory, regulatory and policy requirements shall be assured (e.g. FON, 50% Law, categorical match). (DBAC?)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached that budget plans should go to Executive Cabinet (or Chancellor and Presidents) and then, once agreed upon, would then go to DSPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Defining self-insurance funding. (DBAC?)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Consensus was reached to institute a rate to be applied to each dollar of payroll for general liability insurance, along with a policy deductible amount beginning in FY 2014-2015. Brown to work with Mike Simmons and the college Vice Presidents of Business Services on this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Defining DSP&amp;S services and funding levels. (DBAC?)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>It was agreed that the college Vice Presidents of Business would discuss with their presidents and then would bring back to DBAC for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Personnel:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a.) Faculty</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) Classified</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.) Adminstrators</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Personnel - Budget Adjustments (positive and negative) associated with:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a.) Reclassifications</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with personnel reclassifications, both employee initiated and management initiated, should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) Reorganizations</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with department reorganizations should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.) Vacancy Rehires</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with position vacancy rehires should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.) Professional Growth</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with professional growth should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.) Step and Column (mid-year)</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with mid-year step and column movement should be budgeted “off the top” each year, similar to the annual step and column budget allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Implementation Issues/Open Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Open/Resolved</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(f.) Health and Welfare (Open Enrollment/Personal Changes)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Contracts/Agreements</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>The District will continue the same processs and allocate by FTES. The exact dollar amount will be decided at a later date by consulting with the colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Utilities</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Three years of utility costs by entity emailed by Brown to members. Members need to advocate for a methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. New Facilities Operating Costs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>FUSION and FTES data to be reviewed by VP's of Business and conduct college estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Capital Equipment (Furniture, Equipment, Computers)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Common/Shared Expenditures (Basis of Allocation):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a.) Student Systems (Elucian)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) Financial/Budget System (Galaxy)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C.) Network Infrastructure (Hardware/Maintenance Agreements)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.) La Sierra Loan Repayment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Entity Budget Alignment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Subgroup met on 01/10/14 to obtain and analyze the full inventory of CTE and GE programs to get the true cost by college and FTES. Subgroup to review data and have further discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Associate Faculty and Overload Budget Allocation Methodology</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There are a combination of factors that need to be taken into consideration, therefore the group wants to wait until we receive results from the alignment work that will occur, and find out what is causing the overages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Mid-year Budget Adjustments from the State</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Other Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a.) Parking</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) Performance Riverside</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.) Community Education</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTE & GE Analysis – Meeting Minutes
Friday, January 10, 2014
District Office, 3rd Floor – Room 319
1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Attendees:
Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor, Business and Financial Services (District)
Norm Godin, Vice President Business Services (Moreno Valley)
Beth Gomez, Vice President, Business Services (Norco)
John al-Amin, Interim Vice President, Business Services (Riverside)
Mary Legner, Professor, Mathematics (Riverside)
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley)
Raj Bajaj, Dean, Educational Services (District)
Rachelle Arispe, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (Recorder)

MEETING MINUTES

• The goal of this meeting is to review CTE and GE courses to help inform the decision of how best to make adjustments to the BAM to achieve equilibrium.
• Raj provided the group with a spreadsheet of FY 12/13 costs related to CTE that meet requirements for CSU/UC and IGETC (Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum – series of courses that CCC students may complete to satisfy the lower-division breadth/GE requirements at both CSU/UC college or school). Based on that criteria, “other courses” are specified on the spreadsheet as “other”.
  o Some courses are overlapping
  o Not a one-to-one relationship between a course and a program
  o There is no automatic system to specify an elective, it must be done manually
  o The “Others” classification does not include CT or CSU requirement (i.e. kinesiology, art, dance, etc.)
• Bajaj suggested staying away from “programs” and use course levels only.
• Bajaj provided a handout “ResFtes 2012-2013” – based on actual apportionment FTES (includes BCTC)
• Large costs for Ben Clark Training Center program due to administration and infrastructure including charges for rent, directors, dean, administrative assistants.
• Brown suggested eliminating grant funded courses.
• Gomez commented that international rectifier (electronics) should not be included since we do not receive apportionment.
• Bajaj commented that there are no significant differences in costs between face-to-face and online courses.
• Gomez suggested using only direct instruction costs as a starting point.
• Godin suggested segregating BCTC for budget purposes.
• Gomez suggested having BCTC come off the top like Center for Social Justice & Civil Liberties or take out the rent for BCTC.
• Brown commented that there is a problem with separating the courses since some departments are combined and share costs.
  ➢ Consensus – Bajaj will email spreadsheet to the group by 01/17/14 with the same detailed information as presented; however, it will be sorted by CTE and OTHER for FY 2012-2013. (Gomez suggested the CTE people can sort through the courses.)