I. Welcome and Call to Order
II. Approval of Minutes
   A. January 31, 2014
III. BAM Revision – Continuation
   A. Implementation Issues:
      1. Utilities
         a. GSF/ASF calculation example (Gomez)
         b. Methodology discussion
      2. New Facilities Operating Costs
         a. FUSION and FTES data review (Gomez)
         b. Total Cost of Ownership (handout)
      3. Entity Budget Alignment
         a. College validation of FTES data provided by Bajaj
         b. College CTE and GE cost information review
      4. Capital Equipment (Furniture, Equipment, Computers)
         a. Update from ITSC
      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
         a. Part-time Faculty and Overload
         b. Health and Welfare
      7. Mid-year Budget Adjustments from the State
      8. Other Resources
         a. Parking
         b. Performance Riverside
         c. Community Education
IV. State Budget Update
V. Other Items
   A. Response to “Understanding BAM in 90 Sec” (handout)
   B. Discussion on Evaluators Reassignment
VI. Next Meeting
   A. Friday, March 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)
Tanya Wilson, Classified Representative (Norco)
Tim Ragusa, Classified Representative (District)
Jim Parsons, Associate Vice Chancellor, Strategic Communications and Relations (District)
Rachelle Arispe, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (Recorder)

ABSENT
Carrie Warren, Student Representative (Riverside)
Jennifer Lawson, Classified Representative (Riverside)
Nate Finney, Classified Representative (Moreno Valley)
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco)

I. MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER
   A. By Aaron Brown

II. MINUTES
   A. al-Amin moved, and Gomez seconded, approval of the minutes of December 13, 2013. Motion approved.

III. BAM REVISION – CONTINUATION
   A. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES
      1. Utilities – In the past, utility costs have been projected by the District Business office. Now, DBAC should consider creating a methodology/model to project
and allocate costs. We could consider a methodology similar to part-time faculty and overload: align in FY 2013-14 based on actuals, then utilize a methodology for FY 2014-15. (Brown) Historical utility cost data, by entity, was reviewed and discussed:

a) Historical utility data was emailed on 12/20/13. It shows costs for gas, electricity and water for each college (2012-13 and prior), budget vs. actual, and difference. It also includes a summary of all utilities for each year. (Brown)
   i. Usage looks similar throughout the years, except for the most recent year. Ragusa compared the utility percentage by college to the FTES percentage by college and NC was similar; RCC was just above, and MVC was below.
   ii. We should look into space/square footage and possibly monthly rates to see difference with new buildings. (Mayo)
   iii. We need to look at next year or beyond (2016-2017) since many buildings are coming online (RCC Student Services Building and Centennial Plaza). (Parnell)
   iv. Calculation could be done based on Gross Square Footage (GSF) or Assignable Square Footage (ASF). (Gomez)

b) Norco College Fuel Cell savings cannot be provided until FY 2014-15 since the project has been delayed. Information will be provided next fiscal year. (Gomez)

**Utilities Action Item** – Gomez will calculate GSF/ASF example for utilities and bring information to the next meeting.

2. **New Facilities Operating Costs** – DBAC should consider creating a model on how to allocate new facilities operating costs.
   a) At the 12/17/13 DBAC meeting, to estimate future facilities operation costs, the VP’s of Business were to gather FUSION and FTES data to provide at this meeting; however Gomez is still waiting for FUSION access, therefore data was not provided.
   b) It was suggested that members look at the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) (located within the Long Range Educational & Facilities Master Plan 2008) and bring to the next meeting. (Allen)

**New Facilities Operating Costs Action Items** – (1) FUSION data (ASF & GSF) including FTES data for efficiencies will be provided by Gomez at next meeting. (2) TCO information will be reviewed at the next meeting.
3. **Entity Budget Alignment** - CTE and GE Analysis Subgroup met to review CTE and GE courses to help inform the decision of how best to make adjustments to the BAM to achieve equilibrium. Copies of the January 10th meeting minutes were distributed and discussed, Raj Bajaj and Gomez’ FTES and CTE handouts were provided for review and comment.
   a) Bajaj’s first handout (colored green and yellow) indicates credit and total FTES for all three colleges and the district as a whole. NC and RCC’s 2012-2013 calculation on the credit FTES was reversed. It should be: NC 5,804.79, RCC 13,478.92 and MVC 5,768.63.
   b) Bajaj’s second handout identifies percentages of total FTES and total load by college, separated by “CTE” and “OTHERS” (does not include CSU required courses).
   c) Gomez’ handout is an analysis of Bajaj’s data and provides a ratio of differences by college.
      i. CTE courses are costly because of the 1 to 10 ratio which impacts efficiency. (Parnell)
   d) Suggestions to provide entity alignment budget: (1) Take budget savings from 2012-13 and an estimated amount from 2013-14 and reallocate to the Norco College budget beginning FY 2014-15. This will show that we are making progress on entity budget alignment. (2) Designate a portion, for example 33% of the “Access/Restoration” funds, to Norco College. Plan to review the imbalance each year until it meets the District proposed FTES driven budget. (Parnell)

**Entity Budget Alignment Action Item** – Colleges will validate Bajaj’s data and return to the next meeting with cost information. Cost information will be evaluated by the group for consideration of an entity budget alignment and timeline for FY 2014-15 and beyond.

4. **Capital Equipment (Furniture, Equipment, Computers)** – DBAC should consider a methodology of allocating funds for capital equipment. Do we want an annual assessment or set-aside? (Brown)
   a) Instructional equipment is the responsibility of the college; however we need to know what the differences are between instructional equipment and the overall assessment with the IT Audit. What is the implementation timeline for replacement of technology? It is not clear with the assessment at the District level and how it filters down to the college. (Allen)
   b) Technology infrastructure is important. It has been discussed at the Information Technology Strategy Council (ITSC) regarding establishing a “Technology Reserve”; possibly a computer/software tax on a per
employee basis. Without a reserve, we spend uncommitted funds. Shortfalls have been identified and plans need to be implemented. A technology reserve is still being discussed at ITSC. (Gomez)

c) Interface is vague. The District is a support service so we need to create a collective system so we can agree on resources. The District needs to know when and how to upgrade technology for management, students, staff, etc. (Isaac)

d) Instructional equipment funds have been non-existent for at least 10 years. Instructional equipment has been mostly paid by grants, this has created distortions. (McQuead)

e) We should add money in grants for not only the personnel but also equipment/technology. (Parnell)

f) Multiple millions of Measure C dollars have been used for new equipment, which will need to be replaced at some point. (Brown)

g) The Governor’s Proposal has a huge amount of instructional equipment funds for the District in comparison to what it has been in prior years – $3.85 million in combined instructional equipment and scheduled maintenance (50/50). (Brown)

h) There has been a lot of personnel turnover in the Associate Vice Chancellor (AVC) position within the IT department which has caused delays in IT related updates/issues – staff is not to blame. (McQuead)

i) During the last two ITSC meetings members prioritized outstanding items on the IT Audit and have distinguished what is college or district related issues. The prioritization is 95% completed. (Godin)

**Capital Equipment Action Items** – (1) Brown will contact Rick Herman (IT AVC) for ITSC meeting minutes and will email to DBAC members. (2) ITSC updated will be provided at the next meeting.

VII. OTHER ITEMS DISCUSSED

A. A suggestion was made to provide “RCCD-ALL” a basic fact sheet regarding the BAM prior to the Accreditation visit (March 3, 2014). The document can be a graphic approach to visually reinforce what the BAM is and does, how it works and who it affects. It can possibly be posted on the accreditation site? (Parsons)

1. **Consensus** – (1) Members agreed to develop a BAM fact sheet. (2) Parsons will draft the fact sheet and email it to members for review and comment.

IV. ACTION ITEMS / NEXT MEETING

A. **Friday, February 28, 2014**

1. BAM Revision Implementation – Continuation
a) **Utilities** – Review ASF example for utilities. (Gomez)
b) **New Facilities Operating Costs** – (1) Review FUSION data (ASF & GSF) including FTES data for efficiencies. (Gomez) (2) Review TCO template.
c) **Entity Budget Alignment** – Review cost information from VP’s of Business and evaluate for a budget alignment and timeline for FY 2014-15 and beyond.
d) **Capital Equipment** – ITSC Update

2. Discussion on Evaluators Reassignment
3. Brown will email members the most recent Governor’s Budget summaries prior to the next meeting.
Information Technology Strategy Council
Meeting
Tuesday, February 11, 2014
2:00 p.m. – Digital Library 409, Riverside City College

Minutes

Members Present:
Rick Herman (D)        Beth Gomez (N)        Norm Godin (M)
John al-Amin (R)        Gloria Aguilar (recorder)

Absent: Damon Nance (N), Felipe Galicia (M), Noemi Jubaer (S), Ruth Leal (N)

Note: Chris Carlson (D), and Julio Cuz (M) have been added to the ITSC.

Handouts (attached):
Agenda, 12/6/13 Meeting Minutes, ‘Draft’ Status Report, and RCCD Video Conference Locations list

Past Meeting Minutes: Rick Herman
12/6/13 meeting minutes were distributed at the meeting; these meeting minutes may be located on the ITSC Wendy shared drive folder.

Welcome and New/Old Business: Rick Herman
Rick welcomed John al-Amin to the ITSC and provided a brief background history of the committee.

Norm requested to add an item to the agenda; he would like to discuss the recent upgrade to the telephone system and how it impacts the Automated Attendance System and the future of it.

ITSC future meetings are scheduled through June 2014; they follow the DBAC meeting schedule.

It has been suggested that the ITSC group provide an update status report of progress to Executive Cabinet. The last IT Audit update was given about December 2012 by the IT Implementation Committee.

Projects (refer to handout): Rick Herman

- Exchange vs. Office 365 – RCCD is currently experiencing mailbox size issues (running out of space); two options are available, option one is an upgrade to the existing Exchange system and option two is to move to Office 365. Rick shared that the recent telephone system upgrade cannot be completed and the Unified Messaging issues cannot be resolved until either option one or two occurs. Following a brief discussion the group agreed to further discuss this matter with all available content so a
recommendation could be made. Rick stated that he would compile a document that will provide all the pros and cons for the two options, short and long term financial impact, current/new services available between the two options, all potential risks, and a list of other Colleges who utilize option two. This will be an agenda item for further discussion.

**Planning / Organization:**  Rick Herman

- **ITSC Membership** – Chris Carlson, Chief of Staff & Facilities Development, has been added to the group per Dr. Azari and Aaron Brown. Julio Cuz, Communications & Web Development Manager, is also co-chair of the MVC Technology Advisory and will also be added to the ITSC.

- **ITSC Organizational Structure** – Rick asked the group if every fall semester, one meeting could be set aside to review the current membership to see if any key players need to be added, to set goals for the group to accomplish, review the groups work for the year, and provide an end of the year report to Executive Cabinet. The group agreed to this idea and would prefer to do this towards the end of the spring term. The suggested timing would line up with the Colleges Program Review timeframe; this will allow the Colleges to possibly implement the goals into their Program Review when preparing for the next school year.
  - ‘Draft’ Information Technology Audit Status Report – The original intent was to provide this to one of the Colleges that requested an update of the ITSC IT Audit. Rick suggested that the group could utilize this as a reporting mechanism to update Strategic Planning, Technology Advisor Groups, and other committees along with Executive Cabinet and the Board of Trustees as to what was accomplished for the year. This document could be provided annually or as requested. The group agreed to the new report format, and was asked to review the document and provide any input, changes, or recommendations.
    - Norm – third page, area ‘Next Steps’, add the word “District”.
    - Beth – page two, area “12 Key Considerations”, add “Grants” to the list.

**Standards / Policies:**

- **Cell Phone Policy** – The group feels that this topic needs to be reviewed thoroughly and a policy should be established. In order to appropriately establish and recommend a policy the group will need: a list of all current users, current total cost of cell phones, sample stipend plans that are being utilized from other Colleges, a cost comparison of stipend plans vs. current RCCD cell phone related costs, review the cost comparison plans, create a matrix of cell phone users, and review the ‘draft’ of the Cell Policy that was created by the previous Information Services, Associate Vice Chancellor. With all the proper material, research and legal input the group then could establish and recommend an appropriate policy for possible adoption by RCCD.

- **Building Access** - Norm requested that ‘Building Access’ should be included with Physical Security Systems.

**Other Items Discussed:**

- **RCCD Video Conferencing** – The list was provided by Gloria; Norm stated that a room may be missing for MVC; he will verify and let us know.

- **Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI)** – A discussion on this topic should begin soon if this is an option the District considers moving toward in the future. Area experts from Network will be brought in to discuss the financial and security aspects and the accessibility benefits of VDI. This topic was discussed as it relates to storing and securing highly confidential information on RCCD equipment.
**Action Items / Next Meeting Topics:**

- **Cell Phone Policy** – A copy of the ‘draft’ Cell Phone Policy, a list of current users, and the cost of the cell phones will be uploaded on the ITSC shared drive folder.

- **VPN Access** – The group requested a current list of VPN users; the list will be reviewed, will discuss the potential risks of VPN access, determine who needs access and begin establishing standards and polices for obtaining VPN access. A list of the current users will be uploaded on the ITSC shared drive folder.

Meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

Next Meeting: 2/28/14 8:30 a.m. AD 109
Minutes

Members Present:
Rick Herman (D)  Norm Godin (M)  Beth Gomez (N)
Damon Nance (N)  Gloria Aguilar (recorder)

Absent:  Felipe Galicia (M), Noemi Jubaer (S), Ruth Leal (N)  John al-Amin (R)

Note:  Amber Casolari (R) has been added to the committee to replace Janet Lehr (R)

Handouts (attached):
Agenda

Past Meeting Minutes:  Rick Herman

Welcome and Old Business:  Rick Herman
Rick stated that a re-assessment of the IT Audit Priority list needs to be conducted by the ITSC members due to various reasons such as: verify if priorities listed are still valid, College technology needs may have changed, and items on the list may have been completed and/or are no longer needed. The members agreed that a re-assessment of the list is needed.

The members finished discussing and designating responsibility to the remaining 22 items on the list. The members agreed that updating the recommendation is needed when re-assessing the list.

It was noted by Rick that some of items listed will fall under Physical Security and Mike Simmons is responsible for this area. The ITSC members will still discuss these items and will invite Mike Simmons to these meetings for discussion.

The members agreed that they will need to establish goals from the list and will prioritize the items; this list will help to guide the members in accomplishing the IT Audit.

Other Items Discussed:
• 2014 Meetings - The ITSC members agreed that a monthly meeting with an extended timeframe is preferred rather than meeting twice a month. It was also agreed that it would be best to meet on the same day as DBAC meetings. Gloria will work with Rachelle Arispe to schedule the ITSC meetings and will send out meeting invites.
• **Student Representative** – The current student representative has not been able to attend the last few meetings. The group agreed to have the Vice Presidents of Student Services of each College select a student to represent their College on the council. Rick shared with the group that these student representatives have multiple meetings to attend and may not always be present. Therefore, if the ITSC had a student from each College, this would increase the likelihood of having a student present at the meetings.

**Action Items / Next Meeting Topics:**

- **# 49 Video Conferencing** – The ITSC members requested a list of all the available video conferencing rooms throughout the District. Gloria will provide this list at the next meeting.
- **# 65 IT Standards for Construction** – The ITSC members requested to review this document.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Next Meeting: Meeting dates will be established for 2014
PROPOSED "INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY COUNCIL"

Background:

PlanNet recommended that “four District-wide governing bodies focused on functional areas, not locality,” be established to “maintain consistent and uniform decision-making across the District.” The proposed governing bodies were:

- Executive Technology Strategy Council
- Academic Technology Committee
- Infrastructure Technology Committee
- Enterprise Technology Committee

PlanNet suggested that the Executive Technology Strategy Council meet quarterly, and examples of responsibilities to be assigned to the Council were listed.

PlanNet went further to note that “additional subcommittees could be formed to shadow IT management and serve as advisory boards.” Examples listed by PlanNet included:

- Information Assurance Subcommittee
- Web Design and Planning Subcommittee
- Document Imaging Task-Force
- One-card Task Force

PlanNet also observed that the “colleges should retain existing or charter new committees to formulate constituent-specific initiatives and priorities, such as the Technology Advisory
Committees.” PlanNet envisioned that the Chairs of these committees would be expected to participate in relevant District-wide committees. Additionally, they noted that these committees would meet bi-monthly, with subcommittees and task forces meeting more frequently as needed. PlanNet also listed examples of responsibilities that would be assigned to these committees.

The Information Technology Implementation Committee (ITIC) reviewed PlanNet’s proposed governance structure and considered it far too elaborate and cumbersome. Further, the ITIC did not believe that the District would have the resources, even in good times, to provide membership of the committees, subcommittees and task forces and the staffing support all would require. However, the ITIC did believe that a governance model was needed at the District level. It therefore recommended the establishment of an “Information Technology Strategy Council (ITSC).” As envisioned by the IT Implementation Committee, the ITSC essentially would have the following mission:

The Information Technology Strategy Council will provide a collaborative forum to advise and inform the Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet and the District Strategic Planning Committee in setting priorities and making strategic decisions involving the provision of information services and technology to advance the institutional goals of the Riverside Community College District and its three colleges.

The ITIC further recommended that the ITSC be chaired by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Services. Suggested members could include the following:

- Vice President of Business Services for each college
• A Web Development representative (if this area remains in the unit to which it currently is assigned)

• Director, Open Campus (if this area remains in the unit to which it currently is assigned)

• Chair of each college’s technology committee or the committee which is assigned oversight responsibility for IT

The council would meet quarterly, with additional meetings scheduled as needed. It would also utilize task forces to address specific issues. Among its assignments would be:

• Oversight of the District’s efforts in implementing “IT audit” recommendations

• IT strategic planning, including the establishment and prioritization of initiatives from the IT Strategic Plan and interaction as appropriate with the District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC)

• Rationalize tactical plans to the strategic plan

• Determine priorities and costs and recommend funding for committee-vetted projects

• Recommend IT policies to DSPC, the Chancellor, the Executive Cabinet and/or the Board of Trustees as appropriate

• Recommend IT infrastructure standards for new construction and renovation projects

• Periodically review the District’s IT organizational structure and staffing pattern and make recommendations as appropriate
• Review and recommend purchasing and service standards for strategic, budget and operational planning

• Determine high-level performance metrics and associated reporting systems

• Assure coordination of IT efforts across the District and colleges

• Interact with the District Budget Advisory Council on an annual basis relative to ITSC funding recommendations

• Issue an annual status report to DSPC, DBAC and the Executive Cabinet
TOTAL COST OF OWNERSHIP

OVERVIEW

As part of its institutional master planning process, the Riverside City College is committed to developing a systematic, college-wide approach for all planning and budgeting activities. This approach includes the assessment of all current functions and activities and the development of a district-wide process for the on-going assessment of future programs, services and facilities. Preliminary discussions have suggested that the concept of “Total Cost of Ownership” (TCO) may be a viable approach to addressing this concern.

Definition of Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)

Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), as used for college facilities, shall be defined as the systematic quantification of all costs generated over the useful lifespan of the facility (30-50 years). The goal of TCO is to determine a value that will reflect the true, effective cost of the facility including planning, design, constructing and equipping of the facility and also the recurring costs to operate the facility over the useful lifespan of the facility (30-50 years). The one-time costs or capital construction and related costs shall be as listed on the JCAF-32 report developed by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. The recurring or operational costs shall include staffing, institutional support services, replaceable equipment, supplies, maintenance, custodial services, technological services, utilities and related day-to-day operating expenses for the facility.

Purpose of the Process

The College and the District should consider a standardized procedure for determining the “Total Cost of Ownership” (TCO) for existing facilities as well as for remodeled or new facilities that may be constructed throughout the District. The basis for the procedure shall be the concept of Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) as it is typically used in areas such as information technology, governmental cost assessments and corporate budget analysis.

The purpose of TCO will be to provide an institutionally agreed upon, systematic procedure by which each existing facility in the district is evaluated and, at the same time, to establish a quantitative, data base that will assist the district and each college in determining the viability of existing facilities as well as the feasibility of remodeling and/or constructing of new facilities.

Objectives to be Achieved

The objectives to be achieved by the development of this procedure are as follows:

1. Establish an agreed upon systematic procedure for the evaluation of existing and proposed college facilities.

2. Utilize the concept of “Total Cost of Ownership” (TCO) to develop a process for the evaluation of facilities that can be integrated into the overall TCO program of the district.

3. Develop a procedure for the assessment of existing and proposed facilities that utilizes existing data from college files as well as information from the state-wide files of the Community College Chancellor’s Office.

4. Ensure that the database developed for the procedure is compatible with current state reporting systems such as Fusion.

5. Design the prototype system in a manner that allows the college to annually update the information in the system and add additional data elements as may be needed as part of the institutional planning and budgeting process.
**Approval Process**

The facilities planning module is but one portion of the overall Total Cost of Ownership planning model that must be developed by the College and the District. As such, it must be integrated into the overall planning system and ultimately approved through the District/College’s shared governance process.

**ASSESSMENT FORMAT**

Outlined in the table is a draft of the format that has been developed for the assessment of a proposed facility project. It can be used for either a new project or a remodeled project. The costs listed in the analysis must be obtained from the general operating fund of the district for the previous fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riverside Community College District TCO Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requestor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Name of Facility:  
B. State Inventory Building Number (If existing facility):  
C. Project Description:  
D. Project Justification:  
E. History of Building:  
F. Assignable Square Footage:  
G. Gross Square Footage:  
H. Initial Date of Occupancy:  
I. Programs/Services Housed in the Facility: _______ (Instructional Program/Support Svc.)  
J. Total Project Cost:  
   1. Construction Cost  
   2. Architecture/Engineering Other “soft” costs  
   3. State Contribution  
   4. Local Contribution  
   5. TOTAL Project Cost  
K. Analysis of Interior Space:  
   1. Classroom (100 space)  
   2. Laboratory (200 space)  
   3. Office (300 space)  
   4. Library (400 space)  
   5. AV/TV (500 space)  
   6. All Other Space  
L. Weekly Student Contact Hour Capacity (WSCH):  
M. Capacity Load Ratio/Utilization of Facility:  
   1. Classroom Load (State Std.) 32-35 Hours/week  
   2. Classroom Use (F-06) _______Hours/week  
   3. Laboratory Load (State Std.) 28-32 Hours/week  
   4. Laboratory Use (F-06) _______Hours/week
**Infrastructure/Utility Systems**

In addition to the capital construction cost for facilities, the district must also construct major infrastructure improvements throughout the project site/college campus. As part of the total cost of ownership, each building must assume a proportionate share of the infrastructure capital improvement costs. The proportionate share or ratio for a particular facility is based on the Gross Square Footage (GSF) of that facility divided by the total Gross Square Footage (GSF) for the campus. In turn, this ratio is applied to the estimated total cost of the campus-wide infrastructure system. A typical present-value cost of a campus-wide system has been estimated at $29,800,000. The breakdown of costs by major category is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS-WIDE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COST (SAMPLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer/Storm Drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, Parking, Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading, Misc. Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The table that follows provides the College with an outline of the information that will be needed to implement a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) analysis for any proposed, new, or remodeled facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>TCO FACTOR</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignable Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Date of Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost for Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV/TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCH Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Load Ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV/TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Costs (2 FTEF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff Costs (___FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Aide (___FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Mgt. (___FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Operating Costs (Prorated share of Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Operating Costs (Prorated share of Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer/Waste Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Operation Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Operation Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Grounds/Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide Indirect Cost Factor (0.668 of all other costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Using the previously completed Strategic Plan and this Educational/Facilities Master Plan, establish an on-going, college-wide master planning process that will serve as the basis for all future educational and financial decisions for the district.

2. As part of the curriculum review process, determine what "magnet" programs will be offered at each of the various District locations. In turn, develop an aggressive marketing and recruitment program for each location that will showcase these programs.

3. Continue to pursue the development of public/private partnerships for the education/job training of students. Both off-campus and on-campus locations for the training programs should be considered. Specific examples to consider include partnerships with other public agencies such as the City and County of Riverside, Immigration Services and Homeland Security.

4. Establish a College-wide enrollment management program including:
   a. The annual assessment of the WSCH/FTEF ratio for all instructional programs with a 2015 target of 525 WSCH/FTEF. This includes limiting the growth in the number of net sections to the college-wide and departmental targets established in the Educational/Facilities Master Plan.
   b. Address the delivery systems for all instructional programs at the college. Identify the courses/programs that can be offered via online/web based and hybrid systems. Develop a College-wide plan to monitor student demand and success in these courses. The college should monitor demand and success in online courses and deliver online instruction in a way that meets student needs. The College should work toward a minimum of 10% of all course sections to be offered via online/web-based or hybrid systems.
   c. The District and College Administration and the APC (Academic Planning Council) must reassess the current timelines and re-evaluate the process by which curriculum changes are approved and the manner in which courses are added or deleted from the college’s curriculum. An assessment must be made of all course prerequisites and related testing/placement procedures that limit the student’s ability to enroll in desired courses. The result of the assessment should be the implementation of College-wide procedures that support the marketing and enrollment management objectives of the colleges and the district.
   d. The District and College Administration and the APC must reassess the current procedures for scheduling classes to maximize students’ ability to have access to the classes they need in the most efficient timeline possible. The efficient use of classroom and laboratory spaces (matching section and room sizes and equipment) should also figure prominently in this assessment.
   e. An on-going review and monitoring needs to be made of all course offerings offered by the college in an effort not to duplicate expensive and/or specialized programs at more than one site in the district.

5. With respect to the facilities master plan, consideration should be given to the following items:
   a. Affirm and follow the recommendations included in the Long Range Educational & Facilities Master Plan. This includes the renovation of existing facilities to meet the future space needs.
   b. All future building projects must be scoped and designed in accordance with state standards with specific attention give to the Capacity Load Ratios as established in Title 5-The Administrative Code of the State of California.
   c. In implementing the Master Plan, the first priority shall be the removal of all portable or temporary facilities followed by the renovation of existing permanent facilities.
6. In response to the projected cost of the proposed capital construction program, consider the following financing options for funding the proposed capital improvements:

a. A new local bond issue with the understanding that the current level of assessment per $100,000 of evaluation will be the guideline for future assessments.

b. Maximize the potential for state funding.
Understanding BAM in 90 Sec

What is BAM?

BAM stands for Budget Allocation Model. BAM determines how to allocate funding from all sources to RCC, MVC, NC and the District.

Who developed BAM?

A district committee of faculty, classified staff and managers from each college and the district offices.

How long has BAM existed?

The first formal BAM started in FY 2008-09 in preparation for the Moreno Valley and Norco campuses seeking full college accreditation. It is a living model, evolving as changes occur in our multi-college district. A major revision to BAM occurred in FY 2013-14 when BAM became an FTES-based model.

What does BAM affect?

EVERYTHING. The BAM allocates money based on FTES. Funding is used by colleges and the district offices for personnel, equipment, professional growth, operations, etc.. Some expenditures are paid “off the top” before allocation—e.g., step/column increases.

BAM 2013-14 Goals

★ Evaluate the effectiveness of nine revisions to the existing BAM were made to ensure that the BAM was responsive to changes in the multi-college district.
★ Define the way in which compliance with statutes, regulations and policies will be ensured (e.g. 50% Law, categorical match)
★ Define the roles of the District Offices vis-à-vis the colleges in the development and execution of the budget
★ Define DSPS services and funding levels.

BAM Principles (simplified)

1. Financial equilibrium is maintained by assuring that ongoing expenditures don’t exceed ongoing revenues and that required reserves are maintained.
2. Resource allocation is linked to District strategic planning.
3. Allocate resources equitably to the colleges and the District offices, while ensuring compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.
4. Enrollment management decisions drive the allocation of operational resources.
5. BAM is simple, communicable and as easy to understand and administer as possible.
6. BAM is defined in measurable terms and the outcome is independently verifiable.
7. BAM is driven by verifiable data.

BAM Implementation

Many issues are being discussed. So far:

Consensus reached on the following:

- Budget plans will go to Executive Cabinet (or Chancellor and Presidents) and then to District Strategic Planning.
- A rate will be applied to each dollar of payroll for general liability insurance.
- Costs for personnel reclassifications, department reorganizations, and vacancy rehires will be the responsibility of the college or district office.
- Professional growth costs are the responsibility of the college or district office.
- Annual and Mid-year step and column increases will be budgeted “off the top” each year, before funds are allocated by the BAM.
- Allocation will continue to be by FTES.

Learn more about BAM: http://www.rccd.edu/administration/adminfinance/Pages/DBAC.aspx