

Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

Meeting Minutes

September 29, 2017 // SJCC, T-112 // 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 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), Antoinette Herrera (Administrator – EVC); Jorge Escobar (Administrator - SJCC)

Members Absent: Jesus Covarrubias (Faculty – SJCC),

Alternates Present: Chris Frazier (Academic Senate - SJCC), Eugenio Canoy (Administrator - EVC), Phil Crawford (Academic Senate – 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),

1. Call to Order – 1:44 pm

Jesus Covarrubias was absent and alternate Chris Frazier sat in in his absence. Fabio Gonzalez was late, alternate Phil Crawford sat in until his arrival.

The Task Force agreed to proceed with the meeting without Mark Newton and Phil Crawford, who were both running late.

2. Approval of September 29, 2017 Meeting Agenda: M/S/P; Ayes-14, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-0. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Eric Narveson; seconded by Jorge Escobar.

The agenda was approved with the following change: Add item 4F – revisit item 6D from the September 15th minutes.

3. Approval of September 15, 2017 minutes: M/S/P; Ayes-12, Opposed-0, Abstentions-2, Absent-0. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Chris Frazier; seconded by Yesenia Ramirez. Mr. Hawkins and Mr. Escobar abstained from voting.

The minutes were approved with the following change:

Item 1a-“need for surgery” should read “personal circumstances”

Mr. Escobar would like to note that Ms. Morikang misspoke during the September 15th meeting when she stated that it is not the role of the Task Force to evaluate the services

provided by the District. Mr. Escobar feels that since Ms. Morikang has not attended all of the Task Force meetings she isn't aware of all the discussions that have been had. Mr. Escobar feels that the proposed model forces the Task Force to evaluate District Services.

Mr. Castilla would like clarification of item 6D from the minutes in regard to the "highest rated" criteria for the Innovation Allocation. It was agreed to add this to the September 29th agenda as item 4F.

4. Reaffirm Task Force Structure: The Chancellor held a meeting following Cabinet on September 20th that included the college presidents (Keith Aytch and Norma Ambriz-Galaviz), the Academic Senate Presidents (Jesus Covarrubias, Fabio Gonzalez and Eric Narveson), Vice Chancellor Smith and Chancellor Budd. The focus of the meeting was: How are we doing? Where have we been? Where are we going? It was a good, productive meeting. Chancellor Budd commented during the September 20th meeting that Mr. Stutzman has completed his work and presented his recommended model and now is the time to vote. Mr. Frazier notes for the record that the San Jose City College Academic Senate unanimously voted no on the proposed model.

a) Tent Cards: It was agreed by all that it would be a good idea that all voting members of the RAM Task Force have tent cards to identify the members, and that only voting members would be at the table. The meetings are open meetings for observation, the voting members are the leadership and the ones with a voice in the process. The goal is to tighten up the meetings and move the process forward.

b) Review Task Force Structure and Process; The resource allocation model was originally tasked to the District Budget Committee but quickly morphed into its own Task Force. The Chancellor held a summit meeting on October 6th, 2016 that was attended by the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Smith, and the Presidents from each college and the three Academic Senate Presidents. The handout showing the structure and process of the RAM Task Force reflects the agreement reached during that meeting. The blank box in the table at the top was subsequently filled with two CSEA representatives.

At the meeting held on September 20, 2017, Chancellor Budd asked the Academic Senates to refine the flow of process, which needs clarification. Mr. Smith has not seen anything yet. Mr. Narveson will ask Mr. Gonzalez to agendize this item at the next District Academic Senate meeting.

c) Review Membership: See notes above. The RAM Task Force membership is reflected in the handout that shows the structure and model of the Task Force.

d) Establish Ground Rules: It was suggested that we use some form of Roberts Rules which would help to keep some sort of order during our meetings. Mr. Castilla would like to see the group use Roberts Rules and parliamentary guidelines. Ms. Hanfling is not in support of Roberts Rules, she believes they are too restrictive and that we may end up spending more time discussing what is and what is not a part

of Roberts Rules, which will slow down our forward progress towards agreeing upon a recommended model, which is the charge of the RAM Task Force. Mr. Smith would like to suspend the discussion on Roberts Rules until later in the meeting.

In an effort to keep order and move things forward towards a recommended model:

- Voting members should be heard first
- There should be less free speaking

Mr. Narveson notes that there is a good chance we are not going to agree unanimously on a recommended model. In this case we will have to go with the majority. We will need to take a vote on some things and compromise on some things.

Ms. Ramirez questioned why we are not using the ground rules agreed upon last year at the formation of the Task Force? The list of ground rules provided by Ms. Ramirez was reviewed and a few edits and additions were made. They will be updated and presented for adoption at the next RAM meeting on October 13th.

- e) Utilize the 3T's Principles: Timeline, Transparency and Trust: Mr. Escobar recommends adding these to the Ground Rules. They will be added to the revised list of rules that will be presented at the next meeting for action.
 - f) "Highest Rated" criteria for the Innovation Allocation: Mr. Smith explained that the "Highest Rated" criteria came from the Administrator's Leadership Retreat held on June 21st. During the retreat, a list was made and the attendee's voted on what they felt were the most important performance incentives. The list presented in 6D of the notes from the September 15th RAM meeting were the incentives with the most votes. This is the hierarchy's priorities for funding Innovation. These become fund drivers to incentivize performance. These criteria need to be adapted to what the organization feels best meets the Boards End Policies and Strategic Priorities.
5. Co-Chairs of the Task Force: With input from the participants at the September 20th meeting, Chancellor Budd is recommending Co-Chairs for the RAM Task Force. The following is the agreed upon process for electing the Co-Chairs:
- Receive nominations
 - Each voting member will get two votes
 - Top two vote getters will be the Co-Chairs
 - Mr. Hawkins will call out the votes

<u>Nominees</u>	<u>Votes</u>
Eric Narveson	14
Doug Smith	10
Jorge Escobar	4

Mr. Narveson and Mr. Smith are elected as Co-Chairs. Mr. Narveson notes that the Co-Chairs get a vote as we are a Task Force.

6. Establish Timeline and Goals: There are three meetings left during the fall semester. Mr. Narveson asks if we want to assign goals to each meeting. What is the goal by December 15th? Mr. Smith would like to advance a recommendation from the RAM Task Force of a simulation to the Board of Trustees by December. The open items will take time to discuss and Mr. Smith's goal for those would be another series of meetings to discuss those.

Mr. Frazier's goal is to deal with the open items and feels that student success and efficiency should be goals for the group.

7. Review Proposed Allocation Model Handouts Listing Variables: At the September 20th meeting with the Chancellor, Mr. Gonzalez presented his Proposed Allocation Model handout, highlighting what he feels are items that require more study.

Mr. Fitzsimmons and Mr. Smith took the list of open items created at the last RAM meeting and referenced the page numbers in Mr. Stutzman's report that discuss those items.

The matrix is a merge of the two documents. Expense Management and Process are the only items on Mr. Gonzalez's handout that are not addressed on the open items list. Mr. Smith feels this is the road we need to go down for full closure of the model.

Mr. Crawford voiced his concern regarding the allocation for performance. He feels that District Services should have to go through a program review, similar to the program review the colleges must go through. He feels that it should be an overall check on efficiency, ensure District Services are not duplicating work being done at the campuses, i.e., a travel reimbursement is looked at by Business Services on the campus, then goes to the DO for review. It shouldn't need to go to both for approval.

Are the services provided by the District promoting student success? Mr. Frazier states that there were services the District was supposed to provide but wasn't that the colleges then had to fund out of their budgets. The colleges felt that what the District was doing was not effecting student success. Mr. Frazier feels that the focus should be on student success and efficiency.

Ms. Hanfling question if we are discussing and drilling into each item or are we simply reviewing what is on the list. Mr. Narveson states that since we are just seeing the list for the first time, all members should review the list prior to the October 13th meeting, formulate any questions and we can discuss on October 13th. Are these the items we want as our variables?

Ms. Hanfling would like to see us get the various items off the list. Once the list is empty, we are done, theoretically. We should look at what is there and does it cover everything and then we can start working on the list, maybe starting with the easiest.

Mr. Frazier would like to add "Evaluation of the Chancellor's Cabinet" to the list. Mr. Fitzsimmons recommends that we add it to the list of items and reference the page numbers.

Ms. Alexander notes that we need to leave space to be able to add to the list as things come up during discussion. Mr. Smith notes this is an open, ongoing list. If you have ideas that you would like to see added to the list, email Mr. Smith and he will forward on to Mr. Narveson. Mr. Fitzsimmons states that if an open item requires data, we need to identify the data needed and who is responsible for that data, prior to discussing, so we can have a productive discussion on those items.

Ms. Alexander points out that some of the open items have already been looked at with data. Let's not reinvent the wheel. A lot of these open items were answered and not everyone agreed with the data provided, some thought the data was not reliable. While some may not have liked the data presented and the results, these items were discussed and answered and Ms. Alexander does not want the group to neglect the data previously provided and spin on things that have already been discussed.

Mr. Gonzales would like to start creating the model. How do we add content? How do we build the document? Mr. Narveson states that we can discuss the variables at the next meeting, or break the variables up and discuss over the next few meetings. While we are trying to agree on the variables, are there any parts of the proposed model that we can agree to? While there are variables that still need to be discussed, there are things that we agree on, there are base allocations, costs that we can't fight over (i.e. payroll, utilities). If there are parts of the model that we can agree upon, that could become the skeleton of the model. Mr. Smith notes we can agree on the skeleton and then add to the skeleton as the variables are discussed and agreed upon.

Ms. Hanfling does not agree with Mr. Gonzalez that everyone disagreed with page 18. She feels it's a good start.

Mr. Escobar notes that there are compliance rules that are not highlighted in the model, such as 50% law and FON. Mr. Fitzsimmons points out that these are in the report on page 27. Mr. Escobar questions if a new threshold will be set up to keep the balance of these compliance issues. He would like a definition on how these should be handled through the model.

Mr. Escobar also feels that the group is confusing the structure of the model with the implementation. He agrees the skeleton may be there but that there is still a lot of work to be done on each of the components.

Mr. Smith notes that page 19 is really the model, in flow chart form. Page 18 is simply the numbers plugged in to show what the model would look like.

Ms. Alexander states that we need to agree on phase 1 before we can move on to phase 2, 3 and 4... She does not want us to minimize the work that has been done over the past year.

Mr. Narveson asks the group if he should place the skeleton of page 18 on the next agenda as an action item? Are there parts of the model that we can agree to that we do not have issues with? We have to start somewhere and acknowledges that while there are still variables to discuss, we need to vote on a starting point, or we will just keep talking around it.

Mr. Castilla points out that the model is simply a recommendation from the consultant, not consensus of the group. Mr. Narveson points out that the end product will be what the Task Force decides and may not represent a consensus of the group.

Mr. Gonzalez feels that we are putting a structure forward without a clear understanding of what the variables will represent. He isn't sure what he is voting for and how can he explain to his constituency what he doesn't understand himself? Mr. Gonzalez would like to look at each section of the proposed model and discuss, let's dive in and start working.

Ms. Alexander would like to vote on the model and then deal with the variables. We keep going round and round, she knows there are lots of variables but still believes we need the skeleton of a model and then we can work on the variables.

Mr. Narveson asks the group, are you a trustee or a delegate to your constituency group? Do you have to confer with your constituency over every item or are you here because you were chosen for your wisdom and intelligence to make decisions on behalf of your constituency.

Final Checkout- everyone at the table was given a chance for a last comment on the meeting.

8. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 3:42