

Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

Meeting Minutes

February 2, 2018 // SJCC, T-415 // 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Members Present: Guillermo Castilla (Academic Senate – SJCC), Doug Smith (Administrator – District), Peter Fitzsimmons (Administrator – District), Andrea Alexander (Administrator – EVC); Yesenia Ramirez (CSEA – EVC), Eric Narveson (Academic Senate – EVC), Steven Graham (Academic Senate – EVC), Fabio Gonzalez, (Academic Senate – District), Jorge Escobar (Administrator - SJCC); Jose Luis Pacheco (CSEA-DS), Antoinette Herrera (Administrator – EVC)

Members Absent: Mark Newton (Administrator – SJCC), Paul Fong (AFT), Jesus Covarrubias (Academic Senate – SJCC)

Alternates Present: Eugenio Canoy (Administrator – EVC), Marilyn Morikang (Administrator – SJCC); Chris Frazier, Jennifer Bills (AFT)

Also Present: Carol Anderson (Recorder), Jonathan Camacho (WFI), Jennifer Le (District – Admin Services), Alex Lopez (SJCC), Ilder Bettencourt (SJCC)

1. Call to Order – 1:14 pm.
2. Approval of February 2, 2018 Meeting Agenda: M/S/P; Ayes-13, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-1. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Eric Narveson; seconded by Chris Frazier. Agenda is approved with the following addition:

An update on the State budget was added to the agenda as item 2.5

3. State Budget Update: Mr. Smith reviewed the Governor’s Proposed State Budget. The new funding model would fund colleges based on the following:
 - 50% FTES
 - 25% students receiving Pell/Promise Grants
 - 25% short and long term student success metrics\

As a Basic Aid District, not all of the proposed changes will affect us. There will be a hold harmless provision for the 2018/19 FY.

4. Approval of January 19, 2018 minutes: M/S/P; Ayes-11, Opposed-0, Abstentions-2, Absent-1. A motion to approve January 19, 2018 minutes was made by Fabio Gonzalez; seconded by Yesenia Ramirez. Motion carries with the following change:
 - It was agreed that Ms. Anderson would review the tape from the January 19th meeting to see if Dr. Breland stated anything regarding CTE in his comments

regarding RAM outcomes. If he did, the comment will be added to the minutes. If not, we will discuss again at the February 23rd meeting.

5. Review of Materials submitted by Vice President Escobar: VP Escobar reviewed the spreadsheets that he prepared with the Task Force. The first spreadsheet is an analysis of District Wide expenses and is meant to be used as a tool. This spreadsheet came about from the line by line review of DW expenses at the January 19th meeting. His thought process and his interest is in helping is to move faster towards adoption of a new Resource Allocation Model. The objective was to give the budget officers of the various expenses an opportunity to explain their costs. VP Escobar feels that this analysis is important because we are making decisions on the allocation.

Mr. Smith notes that the hope is to get a system in place so we can move forward through process and adoption knowing that there will need to be further discussion to strengthen the RAM but doesn't preclude the Task Force from getting it done.

Mr. Pacheco provided data on Reprographics that can be analyzed. He provided data on both print production and package distribution. The data was gathered from Sharepoint and is broken out by college. Ms. Ramirez points out that jobs for Workforce Institute, Milpitas and DS are not broken out. Mr. Pacheco states that these jobs default to SJCC. Mr. Fitzsimmons reminds the group to remember economies of scale and notes that SJCC produces most of the volume because they have the infrastructure to do so. EVC doesn't have the machines that are available at SJCC and it isn't cost effective to have two centers that have that infrastructure. Ms. Alexander also reminds the group that we are talking about a small amount of money, \$130K is not significant in the grand scale of our budget, we need to remember economies of scale. Mr. Castilla would like to know how we can incorporate into the RAM the ability to look more deeply at these items in the future via the RAM process. Mr. Narveson points out that we are still in the identifying stage.

Mr. Frazier feels that the power is at the DO and that the DO is anti-economies of scale. He would like to have a consultant come in and assess all services. Mr. Smith points out that we are not in the business of assessing how each department manages their money. The Chancellor has previously stated to Mr. Smith that if we assess District Services then we need to assess the entire District for efficiencies and economies.

Mr. Gonzalez made a motion to approve variables A-F in item 5 of the agenda as those variables that we will come back to and discuss. Others can be included in the future as conversations of A-F take place. In reviewing the recording, it is unclear who seconded this motion. The vote is as follows:

Ayes – 8
Against – 3
Abstentions – 2

The motion carries.

6. Milpitas: How do we, as a RAM Task Force want to look at Milpitas? Mr. Gonzalez feels that for the sake of the formula we should leave Milpitas under SJCC for now and when we get to the conversation that we are going to separate Milpitas, then that is when we should discuss it.

Mr. Fitzsimmons states that the challenge with Milpitas is that we have to be very careful from a funding perspective. It's a unique burden and does not generate enough FTES to allow FTES to absorb the costs. Mr. Fitzsimmons feels that maybe Milpitas should get a percent of the pie until they do generate enough FTES. We have to have a RAM that is all encompassing, including Milpitas.

Ms. Alexander feels that there is not enough information regarding Milpitas at this time to discuss. There are too many what-ifs.

Mr. Escobar feels the question is how do we improve Milpitas? As with any managing organization, there are people, processes, systems and budgets and if we don't get it right we will be stuck in the past, which can't continue if we want to grow.

7. Open Items: Mr. Narveson would like all members to review the open items list and ensure that all items are included in the list.
8. Organizational Vetting: Once a RAM is agreed upon, what is the vetting process? Mr. Smith reviewed the original routing matrix.

Mr. Pacheco and Ms. Ramirez questioned why CSEA is not included in the vetting process?

9. Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.