

Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

Meeting Minutes

October 13, 2017 // EVC, Mishra // 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), Andrea Alexander (Administrator – EVC); Yesenia Ramirez (CSEA – EVC), Eric Narveson (Academic Senate – EVC), Steven Graham (Academic Senate – EVC), Mark Newton (Administrator – SJCC), Antoinette Herrera (Administrator – EVC)

Members Absent: Jesus Covarrubias (Academic Senate – SJCC), Dan Hawkins (CSEA – District), Fabio Gonzalez, (Academic Senate – District), Jorge Escobar (Administrator - SJCC)

Alternates Present: Chris Frazier (Academic Senate - SJCC), Phil Crawford, Paul Fong – AFT)

Also Present: Carol Anderson (Recorder), Jonathan Camacho (WFI), Kathy Tran (EVC-Admin Svcs.), Jennifer Le (District – Admin Services),

1. Call to Order – 1:40 pm

Chris Frazier sat in for Jesus Covarrubias, representing the SJCC Academic Senate

2. Approval of October 13, 2017 Meeting Agenda: M/S/P; Ayes-8, Opposed-1, Abstentions-1, Absent-4. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Barbara Hanfling; seconded by Chris Frazier.

The agenda was approved with the option to make item #6 a non-action item, once the open items list is discussed. Mr. Castilla arrived to the meeting following the approval of the agenda.

3. Approval of September 29, 2017 minutes: M/S/P; Ayes-10, Opposed-0, Abstentions-0, Absent-4. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Barbara Hanfling; seconded by Yesenia Ramirez. Motion carries. Mr. Castilla arrived to the meeting following the approval of the minutes.

4. Approval of RAM Task Force Ground Rules: Mr. Smith motioned to approve the Ground Rules, Ms. Herrera seconded. All approved the Ground rules with the following changes:

- Enhance the phrase “Ask Questions” to include “to seek clarity and a better understanding”
- Change the phrase “Do not take things personal” to read “Do not take things personally”

5. Approval of RAM Task Force Open Items List: In looking at the Open Items list we are pulling things out from the model that we agree need to be examined in further detail, and perhaps in the future we can come up with ways of measuring or evaluating the items.
- Ms. Hanfling would like to spend this meeting coming to an understanding of the variables before we can vote on a skeleton. Once we have discussed and come to some kind of clarity, then we could possibly vote.
  - Mr. Castilla would like to dig further into the variables. We have program reviews that can be looked at for the variables. Mr. Fitzsimmons isn't sure how a specific program review will inform a District resource allocation model. Mr. Fitzsimmons does not recall either college receiving a recommendation from the Commission that spoke to recommending a resource allocation model.
  - Ms. Hanfling notes that in the educational world, funding is based on ADA/FTES and believes that we have to consider FTES. Ms. Hanfling also feels that there are certain variables that we can look at and discuss again, she didn't agree with the data the first time around. She states that not all CTE programs carry the same costs (i.e. legal studies does not have the same costs as nursing). Ms. Hanfling proposes we start with a zero sum and that nobody be harmed for the first few years, we need to protect the current funding and again states that we have to consider FTES.
  - Mr. Fitzsimmons points out that what Ms. Hanfling is referring to is referred to in the open items list as Bridge Funding. He also reminds the group that it was agreed early on, that the model not be made so complicated that it loses transparency and ease of understanding for the general population as well as the handful of people who have to do the budget every year.
  - Mr. Castilla believes that there is a recommendation in the report from the visiting team regarding a resource allocation model. Mr. Fitzsimmons pointed out that the mention was made by the accreditation team but was not in the letter from the Commission.
  - Mr. Narveson clarified that although the various CTE programs may have different costs and look different in the classrooms, the end game is that students can complete the program in two years and be employable.
  - Mr. Smith reiterates that the open items list is a compilation of the open items proposed by Mr. Gonzalez and the list created by Mr. Fitzsimmons and himself. It is intended to characterize the variables that need further definition before we are completely ready to implement the model. The flow chart that was distributed was intended to be the "buggy", with the thinking that it doesn't have any numbers associated with it, it doesn't talk about carry over, doesn't say how much CTE is, talks about 3 year average. Let's talk about the list and see what we can agree on and look at in an organized way.
  - Ms. Alexander doesn't want the District and the colleges to struggle to get along but is concerned that we discuss items, we come to consensus, but if it is not in someone's favor we go back to it and discuss again. Let's look at the open items and discuss, if decisions are made let's stick to them.

- Mr. Fitzsimmons reminds us, the pie is the pie, you can't make it bigger. If something grows, something else has to shrink. The point of agenda item #5 is have we identified all the "bugaboos" that need to be worked out?
- Ms. Hanfling would like us to agree on the list and discuss in the future. Mr. Smith would like to look at the list in a linear way.
- Chancellor Budd, at a previous District as a Dean, did a complete study of their CTE costs and has asked Mr. Smith to distribute the report to the college presidents so they can see what CTE analysis looks like and that they could lead that particular element of the discussion to create a distinction of their CTE analysis.
- Mr. Smith feels that this list is a living document, he doesn't want to put a lid on it. Our goal is to make progress. As we see things that need to be defined, we add them to the list.
- Mr. Narveson points out that one of the ground rules states that we will not revisit items due to members being absent. We need to point out.
- Mr. Narveson makes a motion to review the open items list box by box, Ms. Hanfling seconded. One abstention, all others agree to review the list box by box. We don't have the information to discuss in detail but we can agree if the items should be on the list.
  - a) Mr. Frazier would like to see a definition on District Wide at the next meeting and would like to move on to discuss District Services at this time. Mr. Fitzsimmons states we don't have the level of detail needed to discuss in detail DW/DS.
  - b) Mr. Frazier would like to define a process for evaluating the District. Mr. Narveson states we are simply agreeing on items that require discussion in the future and moving forward to the next item.
  - c) Mr. Smith notes that District Wide is utilities, insurance, legal, etc.. it does not serve the District Office only, it serves the entire District. We will bring a detailed list of what is in District Wide and we can have a discussion on what should or should not be included in DW – centralized, or should it be de-centralized. All agree that District Wide should remain on the list.
  - d) District Services are the "people" at the District Office who serve the organization – payroll, HR, purchasing, etc. and their operating budgets.
  - e) The question was raised as to the role of the Task Force in evaluating District Services budget. Mr. Fitzsimmons stated that while he does not believe that the Task Force should have a say regarding DS budget, they should have a say in how much of the pie DS gets, whether it be a % of the pie or \$ per FTES. DS and DW are two different discussions. He also notes the Board has priorities that we should be taking into consideration.
  - f) Mr. Frazier believes that all the entities should be scrutinized, DS as well as the colleges. He would like to see a college level evaluation of DS and believes the colleges should be involved in the review of DS.
  - g) Ms. Hanfling does not want to drill into DS and how they spend their budget, nor does she want to be involved in a program review of DS any more than she feels DS should be involved in the college program reviews, she does however feel that DS should be able to justify their new positions.

- h) Ms. Hanfling also notes that she does receive surveys regarding DS on a regular basis.
- i) Mr. Newton wonders how we determine if the colleges are getting their best bang for their buck from DS.
- j) It is agreed that DW and DS will have two different evaluation processes.
- k) It is agreed that box 1 is a variable that remains on the list.
- l) It is agreed that box 2 is a variable that remains on the list:
  - i. All agree that programs have different costs.
  - ii. Mr. Smith notes that the CTE differential needs to be a study that is presidential centered, can they find the difference? It is up to the presidents to make the case.\
  - iii. The amount that goes to incentive vs. CTE could be different. You could further load incentive by unloading CTE. The 4.5M in CTE could shrink and the amount in incentive can grow.
  - iv. Community is added to the center column.
- m) It is agreed that box 3 is a variable that remains on the list:
  - i. Mr. Castilla states that innovation is different than performance and incentives. It is agreed to change box 3 to only “Innovation Fund.”
  - ii. Ms. Hanfling feels that innovation should be a college level decision.
  - iii. In order to fund an innovation fund, the money has to come from the same “pie”. To allow for an innovation fund, Consultant Stutzman had to take 1M from the program allocation to create an innovation fund.
  - iv. Mr. Frazier agrees that this is a very good skeleton for making decisions but wonders who interprets the needs? Possibly a separate body?
  - v. Innovation is something new.
- n) It is agreed that box 4 is a variable that remains on the list. Mr. Smith explained the following to the group:
  - i. Contingencies: The colleges and the District should have a \$200K contingency embedded in their budget to handle unforeseen things that may come up.
  - ii. Carry-over: This is unspent money from your budget. One percent of total college or District allocation can be carried over.
  - iii. Deficits: If you overspend your budget, it needs to be made up.
- o) Mr. Fitzsimmons stated that in order to implement the new model for the FY18/19, we must agree to a skeleton by March. Ms. Alexander does not feel that is realistic and that March is too late.

6. Meeting adjourned @ 3:43 PM.