RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Budget Advisory Council Meeting
Friday, October 30, 2015 - RCC DL 409
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes
   A. September 18, 2015

III. BAM/DBAC Survey Results with guest David Torres
    A. Analysis of final results

IV. Other
    A. Coordination with District Strategic Planning
    B. DBAC Purpose/Membership
    C. Budget/Issues - Update
    D. Part-time Faculty and Overload Budget Allocation Methodology
    E. TAF – Items funded “off the top”

V. Next Meeting(s)
   – Friday, November 20, 2015 – 9am (Holiday 11/26)
   – December – Dark
   – Friday, January 29, 2016 – 1pm
   – Friday, February 26, 2016 – 1pm
   – Friday, March 25, 2016 – 1pm
   – Friday, April 29, 2016 – 1pm
   – Friday, May 20, 2016 – 1pm (Holiday 05/30)
   – June, July and August - Dark
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
District Budget Advisory Council Meeting

September 18, 2015
RCC – DL 409
8:00 a.m. - 10:00 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)
Mazie L. Brewington, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside)
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley)
Nate Finney, Classified Representative (Moreno Valley)
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco)
Diann Thursby, Classified Representative (Norco)
Mary Legner, Professor, Mathematics (Riverside)
Tim Ragusa, Classified Representative (District)
Rachelle Arispe, Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (Recorder)

GUEST
Michael Burke, Chancellor
Wolde-Ab Isaac, President (Riverside)
Majd Askar, Director, Business Services (District)

ABSENT
Mark Sellick, Associate Professor, Politics (Riverside)
Jennifer Lawson, Classified Representative (Riverside)
Arturo Quiroz, Student Representative (Riverside)

I. MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER

   A. By Aaron Brown

II. MINUTES

   A. Once a quorum was achieved, Legner moved, and Gomez seconded, approval of the
      minutes for May 29, 2015.

III. DBAC FY 2015-16 AGENDA

   A. Coordination with DSPC
1. Brown indicated that there was a discussion at DSPC about the process of approvals. He suggests that DBAC address and clarify the process and the functions. Having some clarity in the process and purpose, could greatly improve the outcomes. Decisions could then occur in a timely manner. DBAC can engage in the shared governance process by modifying our timelines.

2. Burke responded that he heard that DSPC was to be part of the budget development process and it was expected that the board report, “Increasing the Fund Balance Reserve Target”, was supposed to be approved at DSPC before being submitted to the Board of Trustees. Burke reviewed the DSPC minutes from the past few years and he could not find evidence that approval of a Board report at DSPC was part of the process. He said that DSPC should be the nexus for planning.

3. Gomez responded that DBAC was formerly approved in September to be a subcommittee for DSPC.

4. Brewington commented that DSPC does not mirror a shared governance body that is seen at the colleges. The colleges need district representation at their college Resources Committee and Board Advisory groups. District input should be included in the shared governance at the colleges that way it can be carried to DPSC.

5. Burke noticed that DSPC includes 27 members, 19 of which are administrators. There needs to be more faculty and staff. The membership will need to be adjusted.

6. Brown commented that we need to incorporate the district’s budget development calendar with the college’s finance planning calendar. There is a challenge with making the timeframe work with multiple deadlines such as: the starting point for budget development; Chancellor’s Cabinet; Resources Committee; the State adopting the budget; year-end closing; DBAC meeting schedules; DSPC meeting schedules; and college meeting schedules. DSPC needs to create a game plan. The District is committed and needs to be a part of the shared governance process.

7. DBAC will play an integral part in fundamentally changing the way we develop the budget. The timelines need to align with the colleges’ so timelines so budget development goes through the shared governance process. DBAC will need to devote a lot of time to get this done. We will likely need to form a subgroup. A subgroup with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Brown, Presidents, and VP’s of Business can do some overarching work. It could then be returned to DBAC for discussion. After DBAC, it could then be funneled back to the college’s shared governance groups.

8. Burke commented on Enrollment Management. He wants to push the responsibility more towards the colleges since the district does not have any students. He sees that there are some mechanical problems and there are some
system issues that are driving down our efficiencies and fill ratios. Burke wants to provide information and data so the colleges can make the best decisions. He also wants to bring some forecasting forward. Burke is developing a framework for the committees and it will be brought forward this fall to DSPC to be reviewed and discussed.

9. Brown wants to wait for a charge from DSPC that way it could be reviewed and DBAC can provide a purpose and see what our organizational structure would look like and how we will operate. DBAC will have a lot of work to do this fiscal year.

B. Budget Allocation Model

1. Brown suggested that there be an in depth discussion this year regarding the BAM. Members need to figure out where we go now to fix the budget shortfall. In FY 2015-16, DBAC made some adjustments relative to historical cost associated with FTES. With a DBAC goal of trying to transition the BAM, the model still left us with an entity shortfall -$1.4 million differential between budgeted revenues and expenditures at MVC and surpluses at NC and RCC. The BAM is not driving the allocation of resources like it should. We should be using the BAM to inform us as we make decisions. The current BAM shows approximately $14 million of funding distributed to the colleges in the form of contract adjustments, health and welfare increases, PERS/STRs increases, etc. (MVC $3 million, NC $4 million NC, RCC $6+ million). There is still a $1.4 million BAM disconnect and an ongoing budget shortfall of approximately $4.2 million. If we funded the differential surplus for NC and RCC, we would have had to add another $1.4 million to the base without doing anything for MVC. Not doing anything for MVC would be detrimental to that college and would have increased the budget shortfall by $1.4 million.

2. Gomez indicated that the NC has some questions in regards to the BAM. She agrees with Brown and believes that the BAM has some flaws and the historical costs does not give a clear representation since a significant amount of costs at NC are paid from grants.

3. Wagner commented that faculty wages are different between colleges and he does not feel that is appropriate.

4. Godin responded to Wagner’s comment and indicated that NC has higher efficiency and less classes available.

5. Isaac commented that proper planning drives resource allocations. The colleges should exercise their own autonomy and manage their budget themselves. The colleges cannot keep falling back on the district. Any savings that the colleges generate should be kept at the colleges. Isaac does not believe in the fixed rates for each college. Isaac wants the colleges to address equity and efficiency.
6. Burke suggests that the structural deficit needs to be dealt with, although it will be a painful conversation. The shortfall needs to be addressed and we need to ensure that salaries are funded for the year.

7. Brown commented that 86% of the budget is salaries and benefits, 8-9% utilities/other operating costs. The remaining funds are discretionary which is very small.

8. Brown suggests a subgroup be established first to design a model and a framework, then return to DBAC for recommendation to DSPC.

9. VP’s of Business shared a concern regarding operational structure. Colleges are being told that some technology charges (i.e. Adobe, Acorn & Copiers) are being shifted from the district to the colleges and now the colleges are trying to find the funds to cover the charges. The colleges do not agree with this process.

10. Brown responded that he was not aware of this issue and it should not be occurring. There should be a clear pathway and he will be discussing the recent issue with Rick Herman.

11. Brown commented that there has been a discussion to move the District Administrative Program Review process back three or four months to better align that part of the budget development process with the shared governance process.

C. Part-Time Faculty and Overload Budget Allocation Methodology

1. VP’s of Business suggest Academic Affairs assess the work that has been done, so a fully vetted methodology could be completed.

2. A subgroup with Brown, Askar, VP’s of Business and VP’s of Academic Affairs will be established.

D. Other Budget Issues/Processes

1. Brewington asked if the upcoming Enrollment Management Committee meeting was going to have a better strategy.

2. Burke responded that he will be chairing the Enrollment Management Committee. He indicated that since Enrollment Management ultimately affects our funding, he wants the committee to be experts on how to calculate FTES; understand how it is generated; and assist with the decisions on the calendar.

3. Gomez expressed her appreciation for the Dashboard which was a byproduct of Enrollment Management. Although the current data is only providing headcount, it does benefit Student Services on a daily basis. Gomez would like the Dashboard to provide FTES and section counts.

4. Brown pledged to provide the DBAC meeting minutes sooner so members have time to review. An email will also be sent to members earlier to request items to be added to the agenda.

5. Brown requested that the VP’s of Business email him their master calendars (related to finance). The college calendars will be incorporated into the Master Budget Development Calendar.
6. Gomez inquired about the willingness to add co-chairs for DBAC that way if Brown is not available, DBAC meetings could continue.

7. Godin does not believe that it is practical not having DBAC meetings in June, July and August. Gomez disagreed. Faculty does not have shared governance meetings during the same months; however, they do meet a week after they return.

8. Brown agreed that the summer months are crucial; however, a week after faculty returns is too late as it is after the final budget deadline. Between the tentative and final budgets there was a lot of activity and a lot of changes such as: general operating base increase, mandate changes, faculty hiring changes, etc. There was also contract negotiations – a lot of moving parts.


10. Godin suggested maybe we agree philosophically to help make the tentative budget tighter.

11. Gomez suggested that maybe a mid-year budget revision should occur. She also suggested maybe having the BAM be a standing item and model the assumptions to see where the structural deficits are. This will help the colleges to visually see where they are at. Gomez said it would be helpful to see it. Then it could be narrowed and tightened near the end.

12. Brown agreed to bring some information on a monthly basis.

13. Brewington suggests that another conversation that needs to be discussed is the yearly Fiscal Report to the Accrediting Commission. It currently shows how much our salary and benefits percentage results are at, our District is at a moderate percentile. Brewington suggests establishment of staffing principles for the district and colleges. That way we can be at a certain percentile of discretionary resources to do everything we are supposed to.

14. Brown indicated that the primary driver of the moderate percentile is the salary and benefit structure (contractual issues).

15. Gomez and Wagner commented that the BAM does not go over well with the NC and community. The community saw the disparity between the colleges. The huge difference should not be presented. It should be presented by equal amounts per FTES, plus special programs.

16. Brewington commented that she developed a financial plan that is going to be submitted through RCC’s committees. She used the lower rate and the outcome was horrific. The variable cost for the instructional piece of the classroom cost compared to the model, shows that the majority are not paying for themselves.

IV. OTHER

A. Survey Results – Torres will attend the October meeting to provide a full assessment of the survey results.
V. NEXT MEETING

A. Next meeting scheduled for Friday, October 30, 2015, 1pm to 3pm at RCC’s DL 409.

1. Brown indicated that subgroups will meet more often in between the monthly DBAC meetings, then return with updates/recommendations. Gomez and Godin suggest that Friday mornings are best for the subgroups since there is no shared governance meetings.
DBAC / BAM SURVEY
2015 RESULTS:

ITEM BY ITEM ANALYSIS

PRESENTED TO THE DISTRICT BUDGET ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 30, 2015

DAVID TORRES
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT – INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & STRATEGIC PLANNING
PURPOSE / METHODOLOGY

• The following survey was part of the District Budget Advisory Council's ongoing assessment effort and thus is related to accreditation.

• The survey focuses on districtwide budget processes and the District's Budget Allocation Model.

• This presentation illustrates the item by item analysis.

• Spoiler alert: there were no significant differences for any survey items between 2012 and 2015.
KNOWLEDGE OF DISTRICT AND COLLEGE BUDGETARY POLICIES

Indicate your knowledge about
DISTRICT level budgetary processes

2012 Mean: 3.16
2015 Mean: 3.18

Indicate your knowledge about
COLLEGE level budgetary processes

2012 Mean: 3.49
2015 Mean: 3.74

2012 Mean  2015 Mean
What has been your involvement in budgetary processes at the DISTRICT level?

What has been your involvement in budgetary processes at the COLLEGE level?
BUDGET ALLOCATION PROCESSES

A) The district budget allocation process has been student centered.

B) The district budget allocation process has been collegial.

C) The district budget allocation process supports long-range planning.

D) The district budget allocation process has encouraged participation and input from the lowest applicable level (the office where the money is...)

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
E) The district budget allocation process has encouraged input from all levels of the college/district community including students.

F) During discussion of how the district budget allocation process might be made, I was made aware of both the short and long term impacts of various budgetary decisions.

G) During the past year my college had significant responsibility for its own budget processes (if you are a district employee please select N/A).

H) I am aware of major regulatory and legal constraints that impact our budget.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
Knowledge and Involvement with District and College Budgetary Policies

BUDGET ALLOCATION PROCESSES (CONT.)

1) I believe the district-wide budget allocation processes are data driven.

2) The district allocation process provides for funding district/college improvements.

3) The district allocation process is based on institutional planning documents.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
A) The district BAM has been broadly communicated.

B) The district BAM is easy to understand.

C) The district BAM supports strategic planning.

D) The district BAM supports operational planning.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL (CONT.)

E) The district BAM allows the college/district to respond to immediate crisis.

F) The district BAM provides for multi-year planning.

G) The district BAM is regularly evaluated and assessed.

H) The district BAM promotes efficiency and rational decision-making.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree, * indicates statistically significant difference)
I) The district BAM provides a sense of stability and financial predictability.

J) The district BAM effectively supports the district/college mission and goals.

K) The district BAM provides for long-range liabilities and obligations.

L) The district BAM allows for financial stability in times of state budget difficulties.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
M) The district BAM insures a contingency reserve of at least 5% of total available funds.

N) My entity (district/college) has received its fair share of the operating budget.

O) The BAM takes into consideration new programs and initiatives.

P) The district BAM takes into consideration operating costs for new facilities.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree)
Q) The district BAM takes into consideration funding for new positions necessary for program growth.

R) The district BAM takes into consideration the impact of base budget adjustments such as the COLA, step/grade increases, utility cost increases and other fixed cost changes.

S) The district BAM encourages enrollment efficiencies through incentives.

T) I believe the district BAM will change as needed to meet strategic goals and economic realities.

(1=Strongly Disagree, 4=Strongly Agree.)
OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

- Two open-ended questions needed analysis:
  - How can the BAM *process* be improved?
  - How can the BAM be improved?

- Recoded into broad themes of:
  - Allocation-based
  - Autonomy-based
  - Communication / Transparency-based
  - Implementation-based
  - Other

- 42 open-ended responses for both survey years.
EXAMPLES OF RECODED THEMES

ALLOCATION-BASED

• Decrease in District budget in proportion to cuts at the colleges.

• Base at least partially on state funding mechanism.

• The district BAM strongly favors the Riverside campus (and always has).

• The current state of each college, their facilities, technology etc. should be taken into account as well as any high cost programs.

• Except for some multi-college services, most of the resources need to be moved to the colleges.

AUTONOMY-BASED

• Allow colleges to realize and keep their own savings.

• Allow/encourage equal involvement from all constituency groups.

• Colleges need to be given autonomy in terms of their budget and not be directed by the district in terms of what positions and projects they need to fund.
EXAMPLES OF RECODED THEMES (CONT.)

COMMUNICATION / TRANSPARENCY

• The BAM process needs to be more transparent.

• If there is information available on our district website, I am just not savvy enough to find it.

• By communicating the outcomes fairly to the college financial resources committees and making adjustments to acknowledge new initiatives and needs at the smaller colleges.

• Send a "BAM 101" out to all employees and the student government so everyone understands the process.

IMPLEMENTATION

• Begin actual implementation of BAM as it has not yet occurred.

• It needs to include features that support strategic planning.

• Regular assessment of how well it is working and serving the equitable needs of both the colleges and the district.

• There should be an allowance for new programs and facilities built into the BAM.
EXAMPLES OF RECODED THEMES (CONT.)

OTHER

• Some are concerned about the lack of focus for leadership of the VP, Business Services, with the split assignment.

• What is the point of improving the model if it’s not going to be used as it was intended to be?

• Remove the influence of Rotella’s "hand picked" administrators.

• Eliminate the budget item for the school for the arts. How much has been spent on that item?
RECODED THEMES FOR "HOW CAN BAM PROCESS BE IMPROVED"

Allocation  Autonomy  Communication / Transparency  Implementation  Other

2012  3  14  4  6  3
2015  2  1  4  4  1

Legend:  
- Red: 2012  
- Gray: 2015  

Bar graph showing the recoded themes for how BAM process can be improved.
RECODED THEMES FOR "HOW CAN BAM BE IMPROVED"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Transparency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 2012 - 2015
NEXT STEPS

• Deliver an Excel copy of the dataset to DBAC for records and further analysis.

• Plan for survey administration in 2018.
DBAC / BAM SURVEY
2015 RESULTS:
ITEM BY ITEM ANALYSIS

END OF SLIDE SHOW
Operating Guidelines (Current)*

1. Meetings are held once every semester (month) or as needed.
3. Recommendations are made by a (majority) vote of those in attendance.
4. All action items brought before the DSPC are decided openly at its meetings.
5. All action items (approved by the majority vote) are considered recommendations (through the Chancellor's Cabinet) to the Chancellor.
6. The Chancellor will report the recommendations of the DSPC to the Board where appropriate.
7. Items which require "beyond the base" budget allocation necessitate a favorable DSPC recommendation. This includes but not limited to: new programs or initiatives which require start-up funding and new operational base funding, or additional costs associated with the opening of new and/or remodel facilities.
8. The committee shall publish and disseminate its agenda and minutes via the DSPC website.
9. Agenda items should be submitted eight working days (five) prior to the scheduled meeting.

* Possible changes in parentheses.
New Model

- Information Technology Strategic Council
- College Planning Committees
- Facilities Working Group
- Budget Allocation
- Student Success & Equity
- Enrollment Management
- Grants Working Group

DPC
District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC) 10/09/15

Purpose
Through the DSPC, it is the intent of the RCCD:

- To foster intentionality across key strategic functions of:
  - Student success and student equity
  - Enrollment management
  - Resource allocation
  - Facilities development
  - Information technology
  - Grants development
- To use data and trend forecasting in our region to better serve the educational needs of our communities
- To ensure strategic planning drives resource allocation
- To communicate with our stakeholders to improve student success and student equity.

The DSPC exists to also facilitate collegial consultation, resulting in a planning process based on trust and open dialogue.

Role And Scope
The DSPC will serve as the RCCD’s primary shared governance group engaged in comprehensive, integrated strategic planning. It will also serve as a vehicle to communicate with college planning councils, the Academic Senates, the constituent groups, and the various district-wide planning and work groups.

The DSPC will serve to integrate college planning across the District to achieve the RCCD’s Strategic Planning Goals and will be responsible for creating, monitoring, revising, and renewing the RCCD’s Strategic Plan. It will also periodically review the RCCD Mission and Vision statements and will monitor metrics associated with the goals of the RCCD Strategic Plan.

The DSPC will routinely receive reports, trend analysis, forecasts, and recommendations from the district-wide councils and planning groups. Upon evaluation of these recommendations, it will choose to endorse recommendations to the Chancellor’s Cabinet for consideration. Upon approval by the Chancellor’s Cabinet, such recommendations will be implemented or forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval/consideration.

The scope of the committee is limited the activities of the District and does not extend to the colleges’ strategic planning committees.
Membership (Proposed)

Moreno Valley
• President (Sandra Mayo)
• Strategic Planning Committee Co-Chairs (Robin Steinback, Ree Amezquita, Leslie Salas)
• Academic Senate President (LaTonya Parker)

Norco College
• President (Paul Parnell)
• Strategic Planning Co-Chairs (Diane Dieckmeyer, Melissa Bader, Ruth Leal)
• Academic Senate President (Peggy Campo, District Senate Chair)

Riverside City College
• President (Wolde-Ab Isaac)
• VP Academic Affairs (Virginia McKee-Leone)
• Strategic Planning Committee Co-Chairs (Cecilia Alvarado, Tom Allen)
• Academic Senate President (Mark Sellick)

Constituent Groups Representatives
CSEA Representative (Eric Muehlbach)
Student Representative (Ryan Rudolph), Student Trustee
Confidential Representative (Michelle Davila)

District Work Groups Representatives
VC, Business Services, Aaron Brown for District Budget Advisory Committee
VC, Ed Services, assigned to S.Thomas for Enrollment Management Committee
Dean, Grants, Richard Keeler for Grants Council
Chief of Staff/Facilities, Chris Carlson for Facilities Council
AVC, IT, Rick Herman for Information Technology Strategic Council
TBD, for Student Success and Student Equity

CHAIR (ex officio)
Chancellor (Michael Burke)

Ex Officio Members
David Torres (IR and SP)
John Tillquist (Economic Development)
Peggy Cartwright (Strategic Communications)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Name</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Tentative Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's May Revision Released</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Budget Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Final Budget Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year End Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norco College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside City College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report(s) Due - Chancellor's Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report(s) Due - BOT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report(s) Due - BOT Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important Dates - State/Internal Colleges**
- ITSC
- DBAC
- DSPC
- Report(s) Due - Chancellor's Cabinet
- Chancellor's Cabinet
- Report(s) Due - BOT Meetings
- BOT Meetings

DBAC 10-30-2015
College Master Calendar’s for DBAC
(Related to Finance)

MVC – Resource Subcommittee Meeting Dates (1:30-3pm/SAS101 & HUM234)
- September 16, 2015
- October 21, 2015
- November 18, 2015
- December 9, 2015
- January – Dark
- February 17, 2016
- March 16, 2016
- April 20, 2016
- May 18, 2016

NC – Business & Facilities Planning Council Meeting Schedule (9-11am/ST107)
- September 8, 2015
- October 13, 2015
- November 10, 2015
- December 8, 2015
- January 12, 2016
- February 9, 2016
- March 8, 2016
- April 5, 2016
- May 10, 2016
- June – Meeting if necessary
- July & August – Dark

RCC – Resource Development & Administrative Services Leadership Council (12:30-2pm/DL409)
- September 17, 2015
- October 15, 2015
- November 19, 2015
- December 10, 2015
- February 18, 2016
- March 17, 2016
- April 21, 2016
- May 19, 2016
## Budget Development Timeline

### FY 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Task/Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td>Begin Tentative Budget Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-May</td>
<td>Governor's May Revision is Released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-May</td>
<td>Tentative Budget Due for Chancellor's Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-May</td>
<td>Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-May</td>
<td>Tentative Budget Due for June Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Jun</td>
<td>Tentative Budget Due for June Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug</td>
<td>Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug</td>
<td>Final Budget Due for Sept. Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>September Resources Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Sep</td>
<td>Final Budget Due for September Regular Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>September Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Budget Advisory Council

Reporting to the District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC), the District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) provides a collaborative forum for the dual exchange of information necessary to inform strategic decisions regarding budget and fiscal policies, procedures, planning, and resource allocations within the Riverside Community College District (RCCD) and its three colleges: Moreno Valley, Norco, and Riverside. DBAC works towards continuous quality improvement of the budget allocation process by assessing the effectiveness of resource allocation methodologies within approved principles and guidelines to advance the mission and institutional goals of RCCD and its three colleges.

Members:
Aaron Brown, Vice Chancellor, Business and Financial Services (District)
Mark Sellick, Associate Professor, Politics (Riverside)
Mary Legner, Professor, Mathematics (Riverside)
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley)
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco)
Arturo Quiroz, Student (Riverside)
Diane Thursby, Classified Representative (Norco)
Jennifer Lawson, Classified Representative (Riverside)
Nate Finney, Classified Representative (Moreno Valley)
Tim Ragusa, Classified Representative (District)
Beth Gomez, Vice President, Business Services (Norco)
Mazie L. Brewington, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside)
Norm Godin, Vice President Business Services (Moreno Valley)
Rachelle Arispe, Recorder/Executive Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor (District)

Functions/Activities:
### 15/16 Budget - Reassigned Time Adjusted and Pending Issues Added October 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target FTES per Semester</th>
<th>Col C/Col D</th>
<th>FTEF From EMD</th>
<th>Total Full Time Faculty* From 14-15 Assignments Plus 24</th>
<th>PT &amp; OL FTEF Needed to Teach WSCH</th>
<th>WSCH Covered by FT</th>
<th>FTES Covered by FT</th>
<th>Historical Cost Per FTES</th>
<th>15/16 Budget With 5.0% Increase</th>
<th>14/15 PT &amp; OL Budget</th>
<th>14/15 PT &amp; OL Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget Increase (Salaries Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside City College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Summer</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>41,671</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>78.89</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>2,276,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fall</td>
<td>6,509</td>
<td>208,357</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>221.87</td>
<td>91,875</td>
<td>2,707.39</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>4,305,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Winter</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>41,671</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>74.73</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,762,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spring</td>
<td>9,202</td>
<td>198,552</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>170.20</td>
<td>207.99</td>
<td>85,355</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4,225,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ANNUAL</td>
<td>215,315</td>
<td>490,251</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>350.32</td>
<td>583.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>138,518</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td>9,569</td>
<td>12,570,588</td>
<td>13,201,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twenty-four new FT Faculty added to 14/15 # of faculty. Riverside (12), Moreno Valley and Norco (6 each).

**Norco College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15/16</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Summer</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>546,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fall</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>94,724</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>124.78</td>
<td>29,216</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>2,081,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Winter</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>499,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spring</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>90,514</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>54.61</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>28,655</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,929,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ANNUAL</td>
<td>6,576</td>
<td>210,498</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>112.06</td>
<td>288.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,832</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>4,738</td>
<td>5,057,103</td>
<td>5,310,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twenty-four new FT Faculty added to 14/15 # of faculty. Riverside (12), Moreno Valley and Norco (6 each).

**Moreno Valley College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15/16</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Summer</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>20,232</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>632</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,233,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fall</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>90,595</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>56.30</td>
<td>116.26</td>
<td>29,558</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>2,770,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Winter</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>14,502</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>932,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spring</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>85,152</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>53.97</td>
<td>108.23</td>
<td>28,334</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>2,486,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ANNUAL</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>210,480</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>110.54</td>
<td>290.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,034</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>7,425,457</td>
<td>7,798,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Twenty-four new FT Faculty added to 14/15 # of faculty. Riverside (12), Moreno Valley and Norco (6 each).

**Total**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28,465</td>
<td>911,229</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>286.163</td>
<td>150,392</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>19,069</td>
<td>25,033,149</td>
<td>26,310,817</td>
<td>24,110,317</td>
<td>26,243,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2015-2016 Tentative Budget Objects 1330-1339

Salary Budget to Add to FY 2015-2016 Final Budget

Fixed Charges to Add to FY 2015-2016 Final Budget @ 17.28%

Total

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall + Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum + Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PENDING RESOLUTION

NEW CONTRACTUAL REASSIGNED TIME NOT FACTORED IN - It’s now factored in - FTE split between Fall/Spring

NEW REASSIGNED TIME WAS INCLUDED FOR 1 SEMESTER ONLY (CORRECTED ABOVE)

BUDGET NEEDS ARE ACTUALLY ~ 1/2 OF SUMMER 15 AND 1/2 OF SUM 16, THIS CALCULATES 1ST SUM ONLY

GEN CLARK TIMESHEET HOURS ARE INCLUDED, BUT ARE BASED ON WHAT HOURS ARE ON THE TA

DISTRICT SUMMARY

Fall + Spring

Sum + Winter

TOTAL