I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes
   A. November 26, 2014

III. BAM/DBAC Survey Update with guest David Torres
    1. Develop/update questions & timeline

IV. Other Items
   A. Indirect Cost Recovery – Update
   B. GASB 45 – OPEB Liability Funding Plan
   C. FY 2015-16 State Budget Update

V. BAM Revision
   A. Student Technology Fee – Update
   B. Entity Budget Alignment

VI. Next Meeting
   A. Friday, February 27, 2014, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm at RCC’s DL 409
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
District Budget Advisory Council Meeting

November 26, 2014
RCC – DL 409
9:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.

MEETING MINUTES

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

ABSENT
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)
Mark Sellick, Associate Professor, Politics (Riverside)

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

II. MINUTES
   A. Legner moved, and Godin seconded, approval of the minutes for October 24, 2014. Motion approved. Diann Thursby abstained since she was not at the last meeting.

III. BAM REVISION – CONTINUATION
   A. Implementation Issues
      1. Student Technology Fee – Ruth Adams received a favorable response regarding the Student Technology Fee from a District legal counsel meeting held in October. We should be receiving information shortly from the State Chancellor’s Office regarding the fee. Once we receive it, then ITSC can review and make their recommendation.

      2. Entity Equilibrium Budget Alignment – Brown has not received a response from Interim Vice Chancellor Steinback, however, Chancellor Burke requested Brown to provide some information so he can discuss with the Presidents to get some movement. Brown needs some direction from the Chancellor and Presidents before he can articulate and return with information to DBAC.

IV. OTHER ITEMS
   A. State Budget Update – Brown indicated that the Governor’s Budget will be released on January 9th. Brown will be attending the State Budget Workshop on January 14th. Brown learned last week at an
ACBO Board Meeting that the LAO came out with a projection for the remainder of this fiscal year of another $2 billion dollars, which is more than what had been budgeted for FY14-15. The community college share of the $2 billion would be approximately $160 million (11%) and the remainder would go to K-12. Sixty million ($60 million) would be designated to pay down FY 13-14 deficit and the remaining $100 million is undecided. If the State applies the $60 million it will wipe out the deficit. If the deficit gets completely wiped out, it will benefit our district, however, we won’t know until June. For the remaining $100 million, some have suggested that part of the funds go to pay down mandates (probably on an FTES base), deferred maintenance, and TTIP (Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program).

B. New Growth Formula – The new growth formula has five categories; educational attainment, unemployment, PELL, college participation rate, and unfunded FTES. Each one of the categories is weighted 20%. The State did a projection for each district to show how it would impact the growth rate for each. RCCD’s projection was favorable based on $100 million in growth funding. RCCD’s unconstrained growth rate based on the new formula is 3.5%; constrained is 3.11%. System-wide the growth rate is 1.66%, therefore, RCCD would be receiving more than the system-wide rate. Some of the districts are taking exception to the new formula because they would not be able to meet the growth rate target. Due to complaints, the State Chancellor’s office, wants to re-evaluate the formula (possibly delay for a year); however the Department of Finance is very eager to move forward. If the new growth formula is delayed for FY 15-16, RCCD will still garner more than the system-wide rate under the existing rules.

C. General Liability and Property Insurance Rate – The District has had some difficulty with the application of the rates to Grants and the Categorical programs. Since our District has been informed that Federal and State programs are going to disallow this cost, we are going to suspend the application of the rates to these programs. The budgeted amount of $182,000 (Resource 1190) will have an impact on the general fund, therefore, we are reassessing the planned projects in the self-insured, general liability and property insurance fund. We may have to delay a couple of the planned initiatives until we can re-evaluate. Gomez volunteered to look at how her former District applied the rates and will report back. The rate is determined based on actuarial valuations and what is programmed into the self-insurance fund. If the rate is not applied across Grants, then the rates will be potentially higher for the rest of the Resources. We will have to regroup for the FY15-16 budget.

D. Scheduled Maintenance & Instructional Equipment – Funds have been divided between SM and IE (roughly $1.8 million each), however, the scheduled maintenance funding has to be “encumbered/expended” by June 30th and instructional equipment has to be “fully expended” by June 30th. The State will not permit an extension of the deadlines. Scheduled maintenance includes; roofs, infrastructure, carpeting, boilers, fire alarms, HVAC, etc. The bid process can create a problem because it takes time to complete. In September, the State’s Chancellor’s Office requested that all of the community colleges provide data to support future funding requests for instructional equipment and library materials. Our colleges provided the data, using their program review processes. They also included anticipated instructional support items for FY 2014-15, and anticipated instructional equipment for the next five years. The State Chancellor’s Office will use the Statewide data to advocate for more funding in the next budget cycle.

E. Indirect Cost Reimbursement – The VP’s of Business are going to provide a proposal to set-aside funds for Grant specific expenditures to deduct from the base budget. Per Gomez, grants currently cannot operate with an indirect cost rate of 38%. Brown indicated that once this recommendation is approved by DBAC, he will take the recommendation to the District Strategic Planning Committee for approval.
F. **DBAC Survey** – Brown met with David Torres (Dean, Instructional Research & Strategic Planning) to discuss the next DBAC survey. Brown provided Torres with the last two surveys, and Jim Buysse/Tom Allen's summary (dated 03/01/13). Torres commented that changes to the questions on the survey could be made, however, the survey could lose some accountability. Torres thought adding definitions was a great idea, however he did not agree with using the word “reasonably”. Torres suggested that the survey use a rating based on a scale of 1-5. Torres will attend the next DBAC meeting on Friday, January 23, 2015. Godin commented that the group needs to carefully review the questions that way they are not too vague. Brown suggested that the members prepare for the next DBAC meeting so the survey questions can be discussed and reviewed with Torres. The group will also need to establish a projected timeline.

G. **AB 86 Adult Education Update** – Gomez indicated that she is involved with an Adult Educational Regional Consortia that is funded by the AB 86 Adult Consortium Planning Grant for FY 2013-14. The grant provides planning and implementation grants to regional consortia of community college districts and school districts for the purpose of developing regional plans to better serve the educational needs of adults. Our district's consortia called, “Riverside A Bout Students Regional Consortium”, includes RCCD and the six unified school districts (Alvord, Corona-Norco, Jurupa, Moreno Valley, Riverside, and Val Verde) within our geographical boundaries. Gomez commented that the consortium is identifying what “has been” provided as a region, what “now” is provided, what the “gap is”, and what “could” be provided to service the educational needs of adults. Results are due December 2014. The five program areas of focus are: (1) elementary and secondary basic skills; (2) education services in citizenship and English as a second language; (3) education programs for adults with disabilities; (4) short-term career technical education programs; and (5) programs for apprentices. Legner commented that she had concerns because she did not think that the Academic Senate was aware of the consortium and she believed a representative should have been included. Gomez responded that the consortium was not recommending action, it was only identifying the needs of the five program areas. Gomez will email members the final draft of the results once it is submitted in March 2015.

V. **NEXT MEETING**

A. Members agreed to cancel meeting for Friday, December 19th, and resume in 2015. Next DBAC meeting scheduled for Friday, January 23, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in DL 409.
Arispe, Rachelle

From: Brown, Aaron  
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 9:01 AM  
To: Arispe, Rachelle  
Subject: FW: Suggested changes to the DBAC survey

FYI – For DBAC Survey

From: Torres, David  
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2014 6:32 PM  
To: Brown, Aaron  
Subject: Suggested changes to the DBAC survey

Hi Aaron,

Sorry this is later than I anticipated. The DBAC survey as written I think is very good. I couldn’t think of any substantive changes that I’d made. I’d make some minor changes like when asking if the respondent was currently –or ever- a member of DBAC, I’d split the Yes answer to Yes, in the Past and Yes, Presently Serving. Another minor change might be to the item “District Budget allocation process has encouraged participation and input from the lowest applicable level – maybe change lowest to something less pejorative sounding, but, as I say, these are minor changes.

If we can keep the questions then we’ll have a set of comparable responses.

Also, when looking at the sample, I saw the college populations sampled, but didn’t see any district respondents. I’m assuming they were sampled.

Let me know how you’d like to proceed. I’m looking forward to collecting / analyzing this data.

Thanks

dt

David Torres  
Dean, Institutional Research & Strategic Planning  
(951) 222-8075

Riverside Community College District

To submit a DISTRICT research request, please use the web address below:  
(For security reasons, the link is disabled. Please access through your browser.)

http://academic.rcc.edu/ir/request_form.html
Response to the Accrediting Commission’s Recommendations

District Recommendation 1

In order to meet Standards, implement a plan to fund contributions to the District’s other post-employment benefits (OPEB) obligation. (Standard III.D.3.c)

Descriptive Summary

Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement 45 is an accounting and financial reporting provision requiring governmental employers to measure and report the liabilities associated with other (than pension) post-employment benefits (OPEB), both funded and unfunded. Reported OPEBs may include medical, pharmacy, dental, vision, life, long-term disability and long-term care benefits. There are two considerations when determining this liability. The annual required contribution (ARC) consisting of the normal cost plus an amortization component and the long term liability which is the cumulative difference between the amounts expensed and the amounts contributed to a plan.

The District’s plan is a single-employer defined benefit healthcare plan which is administered by the District. The plan provides medical and dental insurance benefits to eligible retired academic, classified, confidential and management employees and one dependent until age 65 (BP/AP 7380). Eligibility is available to all retirees who have a minimum of 10 years of service with the District and who have reached the age of 55.

On July 1, 2014, an actuarial valuation was performed to determine the District’s liability for its post-employment benefits. Currently, the District utilizes the pay-as-you-go method to finance its OPEB contributions.

The net OPEB obligations for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014, ending June 30, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual OPEB Cost</th>
<th>Actual Contributions</th>
<th>Percentage Contributed</th>
<th>Net OPEB Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,462,715</td>
<td>$766,350</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$1,653,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,262,462</td>
<td>$577,224</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$3,338,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2,242,316</td>
<td>$1,199,115</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$4,381,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,872,832</td>
<td>$1,209,729</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$6,044,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2,960,168</td>
<td>$1,159,902</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$7,844,898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To date, the District has partially allocated resources to support future liabilities related to post-employment benefits, leave time, and other related obligations. Leave balances are paid when used through existing resources, and the District finances its current post-employment benefit obligations annually. The District’s annual required contribution is $3,041,672 and annual OPEB cost is $2,960,168 based on the FY 2013-14 Annual Audit. (III.D.3.c, III.D.3).
Self-Evaluation

All audits of the institution have been unqualified. The District plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including other post-employment benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations as disclosed in all annual audits.

Actionable Improvement Plan

In addressing the Commission’s district recommendation, a number of options were considered to address the OPEB liability. These included the formation of an irrevocable trust, the establishment of a restricted fund, the issuance of OPEB bonds, or the initiation of a self-assessment. The District has historically maintained a “pay-as-you-go” methodology and, since the inception of GASB 45, has not funded the future cost of the Annual Required Contribution (ARC). Annual “pay-as-you-go” costs of the ARC approximate $1.2 million. The most recent actuarial valuation puts the annual funding of the future cost of the ARC at approximately $1.2 million. Therefore, to fully fund the GASB 45 liability an additional annual contributions of between $.80 million and $1.0 million (the remaining portion would presumably be from investment earnings) would be necessary. At this point, that is cost prohibitive for the District. However, to address the recommendation and to begin providing some level of funding, a funding plan proposal has been developed to respond to the accreditation recommendation. The plan consists of the following:

1. Effective July 1, 2015, establish a new, restricted Resource to pay current retiree health costs and to accumulate funds for future costs to offset the OPEB liability;

2. Develop a rate to apply to every dollar of payroll, in all Resources that have payroll, to cover the annual current cost (“pay-as-you-go”) plus a minimum of $250,000 annually to begin providing for future retiree health costs;

3. Investment earnings over time will contribute to the reduction of the outstanding OPEB liability so the total amount of funds set-aside by the District and accumulated to pay for future retiree health costs will be limited to a maximum of 50% of the outstanding OPEB liability.

4. Transfer all funds provided by the retiree healthcare rate to the new, restricted Resource;

5. Pay all retiree healthcare costs out of the new, restricted Resource;

6. Annually, consider transferring additional amounts for future retiree healthcare costs, if available (from any allowable source), unless such transfer will result in a reserve balance in the Unrestricted General Fund that is below 5%;
7. Periodically assess the feasibility of transferring accumulated funds in the new, restricted Resource to an Irrevocable Retiree Healthcare Trust Account;

8. Restrict use of the funds in the new, restricted Resource to payment of retiree healthcare costs, with the exception that accumulated funds may be used for cash flow or other purposes, if necessary, but only with the express approval of the Board of Trustees.

This proposal was discussed with and affirmed by the District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) on **January 23, 2015**. District Strategic Planning Committee reviewed the proposal and recommended its adoption on **January 30, 2015**. Additionally, the Chancellor’s Cabinet consisting of the three college presidents, the chancellor’s chief of staff and the vice chancellors discussed the final proposal and recommended forwarding it to the Board of Trustees. The proposal was presented and discussed at the **March 3, 2015** Resource Committee meeting. The Board approved the proposal at their **March 17, 2015** meeting.

**Evidence**
BP/AP 7380  Retiree Health Benefits
Actuarial Study 2014

- DBAC minutes of January 23, 2015
- DSPC minutes of January 30, 2015
- Chancellor’s Cabinet notes of February 17, 2015
- Resources Committee minutes of March 3, 2015
- Board of Trustees minutes of March 17, 2015
The Governor released his FY 2015-16 Budget Proposal on January 9th. I will go into more specifics at the March Resources Committee meeting but, on the whole and in contrast to recent past, it is a very good budget for the community colleges. It reflects an improved economy and state revenues resulting from the passage of Proposition 30 that directly improved the Proposition 98 guarantee by some $4.8 billion between the current year and next year and, therefore, K-14 education budgets. For community colleges, it provides:

- 1.58% COLA ($92 million)
- 2% Growth ($107 million)
- An increase to the Base Allocations for each community college ($125 million)
- Significant One-Time money for State Mandate Cost Reimbursement ($351 million)
- Another substantial infusion of Student Success funds ($200 million)
- Elimination of the remaining apportionment deferrals ($94 million)
- Continuation of the Prop 39 Energy Efficiency funds ($39 million)

In addition, it provides funding for:

- Career Tech Funding ($48 million)
- Apprenticeship Funding ($29 million)
- CDCP Non-Credit Rate Equalization ($49 million)
- Adult Education ($500 million)
December 2, 2014

Ruth W. Adams
General Counsel
Riverside Community College District
4800 Magnolia Ave.
Riverside, CA 92506

RE: Request for Legal Opinion – Technology fee

Dear Ms. Adams:

We have reviewed your request for a legal opinion on whether “Instruction Equipment money would be considered as state funds used to cover the purchase/maintenance of computers, etc.,” such that a district could not charge an optional technology fee for computers and related equipment, and provide the following response.

As referenced in your request, the Student Fee Handbook addresses whether a district can charge an optional technology fee (Legal Opinion 12-09, Student Fee Handbook, pg. 41.) “The fee would be a permissible optional fee with respect to students who were not in courses where technology was required.” (ibid.) The Handbook does caution that “a district may not use funds that are required or expressly authorized for a specific purpose and also charge students a fee to cover the same costs, even if the fee is optional.” (ibid.)

Instructional Equipment money is funds provided in the 2014-15 Budget Act, through the Physical Plant and Instruction Support Block Grant, to “assist districts with their ever growing need for instructional equipment, library material, and technology on community college campuses...” (Physical Plant and Instructional Support Guidelines, August 2014, pg. 35.) Districts have flexibility in choosing how to spend their Physical Plant and Instruction Support Block Grant allocations, within certain parameters, as set forth in the Guidelines, and districts are required to certify their expenditures for the 2014-15 Block Grant allocation. (id. at pp. 4, 45.) Allowable items under the Instructional Support expenditure category include information technology equipment. (id. at p. 36.) However, computers and related technological equipment are not the only permitted equipment. (id.) Further, there is no requirement that this money be spend on computers.
For Fiscal Year 2014-15, Riverside CCD was allocated $3,498,047, and provided a proposed spending plan to the Chancellor’s office, on September 15, 2014. The proposed spending plan indicates that $1.3 million of their Block Grant will be spent on Instructional Equipment. Therefore, the determination as to whether the Instructional Equipment money is being spent on equipment that would be covered by the optional technology fee is one that the district will need to determine. So long as the district does not use those funds for the equipment proposed to be covered by the optional student technology fee, the fee would be permissible.

Should the district chose to charge the optional student technology fee, we would remind the district that even where fees are authorized, any exemptions from the payment of the fees should be clearly communicated to the students. (Legal Opinion 12-09, Student Fee Handbook, pg. 19.) Similarly, optional fees should be clearly identified as optional. (id. at p. 2.) A reasonable student reviewing district information or undergoing through the registration or enrollment process should be able to understand that he or she may be eligible for an exemption from a particular fee, or that a particular fee is optional. (id. at p. 19.)

Please contact me if your office has any further questions.

Sincerely,

Julia E. Blair
Senior Attorney
Legal Affairs Division

cc: Erik Skinner
Deputy Chancellor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Organization:</th>
<th>Implementation Issues/Open Items</th>
<th>Open/Resolved</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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>
<tr>
<td>Implementation:</td>
<td>I. Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a.) Faculty</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b.) Classified</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c.) Administrators</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Personnel - Budget Adjustments (positive and negative) associated with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a.) Reclassifications</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached on 05/25/14 to reverse the original agreement that the costs associated with personnel reclassifications, both employee initiated and management initiated, should be the responsibility of the respective college/district office. Consensus for FY 14-15 is that District will be responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b.) Reorganizations</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with department reorganizations should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c.) Vacancy Rehires</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with position vacancy rehires should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d.) Professional Growth</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached that the costs associated with professional growth should be the responsibility of the respective individual college/district office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.) Step and Column (mid-year)</td>
<td>R</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f.) Health and Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Issues/Open Items</td>
<td>Open/Resolved</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Open Enrollment/Budget Adjustment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Consensus reached that the cost will be a District expense for FY 14-15 and members will discuss a methodology for FY15/16. Expenses will need to be reviewed the next year as the costs may increase due to the Health Care Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PARS to PERS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached to use salary savings from each college and/or district office for part-time hourly employees who work more than 1000 hours and change from PARS to PERS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health Insurance - New Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached for the entity to be responsible for the total cost of (new) positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Health Insurance - Permanent Part-time Positions</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Consensus reached for the district to be responsible for changes to permanent part-time positions not having coverage to having coverage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Contracts/Agreements</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>The District will continue the same process and allocate by FTES. The exact dollar amount will be decided at a later date by consulting with the colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Utilities</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Consensus reached for FY14/15 to be centralized and for a different methodology to be discussed and implemented for FY 15/16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. New Facilities Operating Costs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations Standards need to be updated by FPD. Once completed members can discuss a methodology for this item. (New facilities will not be coming online until FY 14/15.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Capital Equipment (Furniture, Equipment, Computers)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Legal Counsel to continue research ground rules of the student technology fees. Once DBAC receives more information then a recommendation can be provided to the DSPC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Common/Shared Expenditures (Basis of Allocation):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a.) Student Systems (Ellucian)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) Financial/Budget System (Galaxy)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C.) Network Infrastructure (Hardware/Maintenance Agreements)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.) La Sierra Loan Repayment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Entity Budget Alignment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Motion to recommend to the DSPC a one-time allocation of $708k be allocated for FY 201-15 as a good faith effort towards entity budget alignment for NC. VC and VP’s will diligently and expeditiously analyze the cost of common core courses and Career Technical Education courses, along with other cost factors that may be appropriate, to determine of any BAM adjustments that may be deemed necessary to achieve entity budget alignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implementation Issues/Open Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open/Resolved</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Motion to recommend to the DSPC to proceed with all account categories, except for utilities and the Barnes and Nobel one-time allocation, and any remaining unspent funds will rollover for the benefit of each entity. For FY 2014-15, $1.2 million will be placed into a holding account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>O</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>