

Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

Meeting Minutes

September 15, 2017 // SJCC, T-112 // 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Members Present: Guillermo Castilla (Academic Senate – SJCC), Barbara Hanfling (AFT 6157), Doug Smith (Administrator – District), Peter Fitzsimmons (Administrator – District), Dan Hawkins (CSEA – District), Andrea Alexander (Administrator – EVC); Yesenia Ramirez (CSEA – EVC), Eric Narveson (Academic Senate – EVC), Jesus Covarrubias (Faculty – SJCC), Fabio Gonzalez, (Academic Senate – District), Steven Graham (Academic Senate – EVC), Mark Newton (Administrator – SJCC),

Members Absent: Dan Hawkins (CSEA-District), Antoinette Herrera (Administrator – EVC)

Alternates Present: Chris Frazier (Academic Senate - SJCC), Eugenio Canoy (Administrator - EVC), Paul Fong (Faculty-AFT), Marilyn Morikang (Administrator – SJCC)

Also Present: Carol Anderson (Recorder), Jonathan Camacho (WFI), Kathy Tran (EVC-Admin Svcs.), Norma Ambriz-Galaviz (Interim President, SJCC), Jennifer Le (District – Admin Services), Mark Gonzales (Administrator-EVC), Chancellor Budd

1) Call to Order – 1:14 pm

- a) Mr. Covarrubias voiced his concern that there has been a lack of transparency from Mr. Smith. He felt that at the last meeting it was understood that the Task Force would meet during the summer break. And there was no explanation as to why there were no meetings. Mr. Smith responded that he expected the final report from Mr. Stutzman by the end of June, but with Mr. Stutzman's personal circumstances, the report was delayed and was not received until the end of August.

Mr. Covarrubias again voiced his concern that the group should have received an email with an explanation as to why there were no meetings in the summer and the delay in the report. The lack of information, in his opinion, leads to a feeling of mistrust. The sense was that Mr. Smith was trying to pull the plug on the Task Force and ramming through to get the recommendation approved.

- b) Mr. Smith was asked by Chancellor Budd to distribute the RAM report and get it out there to the various groups. Mr. Smith asked both Mr. Narveson and Mr. Covarrubias if he could meet with the Senates.
- c) Mr. Frazier feels that the Academic Senates should have been a part of the process of creating the contract with Mr. Stutzman, not brought in after the fact as the body responsible for contributing to the RAM recommendation.

- d) Mr. Covarrubias would like to know what the go forward plan is. What is the process? Mr. Gonzalez understood the process to be that once the Academic Senates approve the recommended model, it goes straight to the Board of Trustees for final approval. Mr. Smith reiterates that we need confirmation of the road ahead.
 - e) Mr. Fong believes that there is a process issue and it seems as if someone is circumventing our process from the top down and that the message needs to be that we get back to our process and move on from there. By circumventing the process you are destroying the democratic process.
 - f) Mr. Narveson believes this is truly a recommendation and did not undermine the work of the Task Force. The concern that Mr. Smith wanted to address the Senate's was voiced again. Mr. Narveson explained that he told Mr. Smith that he could not address the Senate as the recommendation is not ready. No harm was done.
- 2) Approval of 9/15/17 Meeting Agenda – M/S/P; Ayes- 11, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-2, A Motion to approve was made by Eric Narveson; seconded by Paul Fong. The agenda was approved with the following change: move item #7 to follow #2.
 - 3) Vacant Positions: Mark Newton has been appointed by Acting President Norma Ambriz-Galaviz to serve as an Administrator for SJCC (succeeds Keiko Kimura). Antoinette Herrera has been appointed by Interim President Aytch to serve as an Administrator for EVC (succeeds Lauren McKee).
 - 4) Approval of 05/12/17 Meeting Minutes- M/S/P; Ayes- 11, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-2, A Motion to approve was made by Mark Newton; seconded by Fabio Gonzalez. The 5/12/17 minutes were approved as presented.
 - 5) Approval of 05/18/17 Meeting Minutes- M/S/P; Ayes- 11, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-2, A Motion to approve was made by Fabio Gonzalez; seconded by Yesenia Ramirez. The 5/18/17 minutes were approved with the following change:

Page 2 of 8, 3rd paragraph: add “to determine” after 6 years.

A discussion was had regarding what the group expects in the minutes. The general consensus is to capture the main ideas. Bring the notes from a level 10 to a level 6.

- 6) Review Report: Consultant Stutzman's Resource Allocation Model recommendation:
 - a) Ms. Hanfling would like to see the group focus on what the key issues are with the hope that we may be able to come to agreement on these and move forward with the recommendation. The key issues Ms. Hanfling sites are:
 - 1. DW/DS Costs
 - 2. Allocation variables – FTES, degrees, certificates, CTE, Performance Based Funding
 - 3. Carryover

4. Resources for raises

- b) Ms. Alexander feels that some of the variables listed here have already been addressed and discussed and agreed that they do not belong in the recommendation. Ms. Hanfling does not believe that everything was agreed upon. The 3-year average was agreed upon but not all variables were agreed upon.
- c) Mr. Fitzsimmons points out that the recommendation presented on page 18 of the report allocates approximately 2/3 of the budget based on FTES. The Performance allocation is currently \$9M and is split equally between the campuses with the though being that once we determine what that is, it should ebb and flow. An additional \$1M was created for Innovation.
- d) Mr. Smith points out that currently the Innovation allocation is being split equally among the colleges. Following the John Morton presentation the following seven criteria were identified as the “highest rated” at the June 21st Leadership Retreat:
 - 1. Increase in numbers and/or rates of transfer
 - 2. Increase the rate of degree and certificate completions
 - 3. Institute/expand Guided Pathways
 - 4. Expand student internships and career/employment services
 - 5. Reduce time to completion for students
 - 6. Increase/measure moving from basic skills to college level courses reducing the time needed to do so
 - 7. Engage in continuous, regular professional developmentThese criteria need to be adapted to what the organization feels best meets our Board Ends Policies and strategic priorities. These become fund drivers to incentivize performance.
- e) Mr. Gonzalez states that we have a template of a model that we can move ahead with. He agrees with Ms. Hanfling regarding creating a list of items that are important to the model.
- f) Chancellor Budd thanked the group for all their hours of hard work. We have a great framework to start with. This is the time to fine tune the recommendation, not unwind it and it’s not an easy task. It is this committee’s job to tweak the recommendation and present it when we are ready to DBC and District Council. You have a starting point, look at the criteria over the next year.
- g) Mr. Narveson points out that the items still being questioned are the College Performance and Innovation Allocation and the College Program Allocation. He hasn’t heard any other controversy over the rest of the model. Can we accept the

parts that are not controversial and vote on that part of the model and move forward from there? We can agree on the parts we are certain of.

- h) Mr. Newton reminds the group that we need to be able to measure the data being used so that we can constantly be honing and improving the simulation and making it better.
- i) Mr. Frazier voiced his concern regarding the oversight of District Services and District Wide and determining how it is efficient for student success. Organizationally, Mr. Frazier feels that we have so many Vice Chancellors and that is what has caused our organization to be so top down. Would like to see authority de-centralized.
- j) Mr. Smith notes that the recommended model gives more empowerment to the colleges, which is decentralization. The model on page 18 of the report is a formula that can be implemented as is and as a committee we continue to work on the remaining issues. The model is the adopted budget translated into the recommended model. Mr. Smith feels that the model on page 18 is good to go and we can still spend as much time as we need to work on the enhancements, the fine tuning.
- k) Mr. Narveson clarified that Mr. Smith is suggesting that we adopt page 18 until we can work out the two parts that are in question: the College Program Allocation and the College Performance and Innovation Allocation. The default is what is written in the recommended model until the Task Force works out the differences. Mr. Smith notes that the charge to this group was to come up with a formula and he believes it is in the best interest of the District to get a formula in place for accreditation purposes. The model on the table is hold harmless.
- l) Mr. Gonzalez made a motion to take a vote on the model presented. Ms. Hanfling notes that the vote needs to be made with the understanding that there are still parts of the proposed model that need to be worked out. Mr. Narveson called out that only those listed in blue on the membership list are able to vote. Mr. Newton says this is not the way to go.
- m) Mr. Smith states that he did not come in to the meeting today looking for a vote. The charge he has been given by Chancellor Budd and the Board of Trustees is to lead the process that leads to a new allocation model. His concern is that going down the DS/DW road, or the carryover road, etc.... will lead to so much baggage that we will never reach our goal. He is simply suggesting we move forward with the proposed model and spend time refining it over the next year.

- n) Mr. Graham asked Mr. Fitzsimmons how realistic it is to transition to this model if it adopted. Is Fiscal Services ready to adopt. Mr. Fitzsimmons thinks we will be ok.
- o) Mr. Gonzalez withdrew his motion to vote on the proposed model. Mr. Narveson then made a motion to adopt the model with the exception of the College Performance and Innovation allocation and the College Program Allocation to be discussed later. Mr. Frazier wants to know what happens if we vote and it is voted down? Can we vote again later? Mr. Frazier would like procedural clarification before we dive in and vote.
- p) Mr. Fong does not believe we are ready for a vote, most people would vote no. If that no vote affects a future vote why take the risk? It could be detrimental to the whole committee.
- q) Ms. Morikang does not feel that it is the Task Force's right to evaluate District Services and District Wide and determine if they are performing their services. The goal of the Task Force is to agree on a funding formula.
- r) Ms. Alexander feels that we need to either go with the base and tweak from there or we need to start over. The group has dissected it and she feels there is nothing left. We need to decide if we are going to use this model to work from.
- s) Ms. Hanfling suggests that for the next meeting, Mr. Smith and Mr. Fitzsimmons provide the Task Force with a proposal on how to move forward. The left side listing has accuracy and validity and is hold harmless. It is ok to advance to the Board as long as it is understood that the Task Force will continue to work on and possibly amend the formula.
- t) Interim President Ambriz-Galaviz suggests that we need to identify what we want to accomplish at the next meeting so that we can be more productive. What needs to be done to get to the end? Identify the work that needs to get done before getting to your ultimate objective.
- u) Mr. Fitzsimmons points out that most of the issues discussed today are contained in pages 20-32 of the report. We need to focus our attention on these pages as we move forward.
- v) Mr. Smith's hope is that we can adopt the model as presented and then work to amend, revise, tune-up the document. His concern is that we go down these roads discussed today (CTE, etc....) which may lead to an inability to advance a formula to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Budd.

7) Next Meetings: The meetings for the Fall semester will be held from 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm on the following dates:

- September 29th
- October 13th
- December 1st
- December 15th

Meeting adjourned: 3:10 pm