AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes
   A. October 24, 2014

III. BAM Revision – Continuation
   A. Implementation Issues Update
      1. Student Technology Fee
      2. Entity Budget Alignment

IV. Other Items
   A. State Budget Update
   B. General Liability and Property Insurance Rate
   C. Scheduled Maintenance
   D. Indirect Cost Reimbursement
   E. Review Survey Questions

V. Next Meeting
   A. Friday, December 19, 2014, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in DL 409
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
District Budget Advisory Council Meeting  

October 24, 2014  
RCC – DL 409  
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.  

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT
Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor, Business and Financial Services (District)  
Norm Godin, Vice President Business Services (Moreno Valley)  
Michael McQuaid, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley)  
Nate Finney, Classified Representative (Moreno Valley)  
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco)  
Mark Sellick, Associate Professor, Politics (Riverside)  
Mary Legner, Professor, Mathematics (Riverside)  
Jennifer Lawson, Classified Representative (Riverside)  
Tim Ragusa, Classified Representative (District)  
Rachelle Arispe, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (Recorder)

ABSENT
Beth Gomez, Vice President, Business Services (Norco)  
Mazie L. Brewington, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside City College)  
Arturo Quiroz, Student Representative (Riverside)  
Jim Parsons, Associate Vice Chancellor, Strategic Communications and Relations (District)  
Tanya Wilson, Classified Representative (Norco)

GUEST
Ruth Adams, General Counsel, Risk Management and Legal (District)

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

II. MINUTES
   A. Godin moved, and Legner seconded, approval of the amended minutes for August 14, 2014. Motion approved.  
   B. Legner moved, and Sellick seconded, approval of the minutes for September 26, 2014. Motion approved.

III. BAM REVISION – CONTINUATION
   A. Implementation issues  
      1. Student Technology Fee – Ruth Adams (guest)  
         a) Adams received the name of the attorney that has been assigned to respond to our question regarding the Student Technology fee, however, Adams has not
received a response. Adams indicated that the State handbook shows that a technology fee is permissible unless a college receives State funds. Instructional and TTIP money could be considered State funds – Adam will confirm with the State attorney.

b) Adams found that only two districts have Student Technology Fees:
   i. Butte College approved a Technology Fee in 2010. The fee generates $400k per year with approximately 14,300 students. The fee did not impact the 50% Law since it was all equipment. The fee was charged for all four sessions (Fall/Winter/Spring/Summer) at a rate of $20 per student.
   ii. Redwood College approved a Technology Fee in 2013. There are approximately 6,100 students however the college did not indicate the amount of revenue they would receive. A $10 fee is charged per student for all four sessions. They are using the funds to increase the availability of technology, resources and services to students (music/theatrical/gaming equipment).
   iii. Cerritos College planned for a Technology Fee with approval from all constituents, however, their Board did not approve it. The fee would have been $5 per student during Fall and Spring, and $3 during intersessions, generating approximately $150k in revenue.
   iv. Adams noticed that some of the above colleges have used the funds to increase their Wi-Fi access.
   v. State has not defined the definition of Technology fees or expenses.
   vi. UCR has a Technology Fee with undergrads being charged $4 per unit and graduates $2 per unit. UCR also has a Technology Committee and a lot of information and good ideas on their website.
      • McQuead commented that he has direct contact with a primary UCR technology support employee and they have indicated that UCR receives a substantial amount of money, approximately $2-4 million a year and it has helped secure a lot of resources.
   vii. Brown suggested that Adams continue to contact the Chancellor’s office to get clarification on the fee. Once received, we can move forward. ITSC can formulate a fee proposal. The proposal should specify what the fund will be used for, including infrastructure.
   viii. Godin reminded the members that ITSC is discussing a capital outlay fee to be assessed against employee payroll, similar to workers compensation, to generate capital resources as well. The major focus for this fee is to help with infrastructure.
   ix. Brown commented that the self-insured general liability assessment is assessed on a payroll per dollar basis. This is a manual process and the county will not permit the District to use the payroll system if it is not payroll related, therefore, if a capital outlay fee (suggested by ITSC) is established the District will need to verify that there are no limitations.

2. Entity Equilibrium Budget Alignment – Brown has not received a response from Vice Chancellor Steinback so we are at a standstill to move forward. Steinback has indicated to Brown that she has done some analysis, however, she would like to engage the College
Academic Affairs Vice Presidents to get their input. Brown will discuss the status with the Chancellor to see if he can get some movement on a response.

IV. OTHER ITEMS

1. Indirect Cost Recovery – The majority of grants have administrative costs that cannot be charged directly to a grant. Administrative costs are indirect costs. Usually the amount charged is based on a percentage of the grant total. Historically, on particular grants, the District has treated the indirect cost as a transfer from a restricted resource to the general fund - part of our base revenue. The District has budgeted this indirect charge every year. A historical analysis since 2005-2006, is shown in the handout provided. A differential is shown because there is a difference between budgeted amount and actual amount realized due to the indirect charge only against actual expenditures. The VP’s of Business would like the ability to expend the indirect costs realized for each college, however, use of the indirect will need to be defined. The indirect cost recovery has been part of the base budget for revenue but a specific expenditure line to offset has not been budgeted. This offset would increase the base expenditure budget. Approximately $360k was budgeted for FY 2013-14.

   a) There are 3 types of grant funds: private, state and federal. The District applies for the federal rates which includes an onsite and an offsite rate. The rate is good for three to five years. There are no restrictions on the use of the funds once it is awarded.

   b) The VP’s of Business would like to reinvest the funds back into the institution and would like the funds to be restricted in order to help support the acquisition of additional grants; such as a grant writer, grant reader or professional expert (dependent on what type of grant it is for).

   c) In order to come to a consensus the impact needs to be assessed since there are many components; timing, allocation methodology, etc. The VP’s of Business and Brown will work together in detail and return to DBAC with a recommendation.

2. Instructional Equipment Survey – The State Chancellor’s office emailed a survey to the CBO list serve requesting costs (for past and future) of instructional equipment at each District and/or College. The survey will help the State identify and build inventory for future Instructional Equipment funds. The survey is due to the Chancellor’s office on December 1st.

   a) Brown encouraged the VP’s of Business to collect their data in order to complete the survey by the deadline.

   b) Brown indicated that he has had a conversation with Rick Herman, AVC of Information Services, to have an overarching infrastructure technology plan to support all the systems District-wide. The District office will be separate from the colleges and the entire District.

3. DBAC Survey – The last survey was conducted Spring 2012. A synopsis of the survey was provided by Dr. Buysse and Tom Allen - March 2013 (handout). Now members must assess and discuss how to approach the next survey.

   a) Suggestions/Thoughts – (1) Should we build upon the past survey or build a new one? (2) Should we still have consistency to the survey so we can measure changes, however, questions could be added at the end of the BAM survey
regarding DBAC? (3) We should have an outreach effort to target individuals on the list and send reminders prior to the survey being emailed? (4) Use the word “reasonably” that way it is student centered? (5) On operational concepts, we should add definitions of terms to the survey that way it is clearer. (6) Add an open ended area to respond.

b) For the next meeting, members will recommend updated/new survey questions. Members can then finalize the questions and come up with a timeline to best send out the survey, possibly beginning of March 2015.

c) Brown will meet with David Torres to discuss survey questions, concerns and provide to him with the 2012 survey information since Daniel Martinez worked on the survey last.

d) The survey distribution list will be updated and finalized by members in January-February since committee members’ change.

V. NEXT MEETING

A. Next DBAC meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 26, 2014, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at DL 409.