

- F. Affordable Care Act Diane Clerou  
Gina Cuttone
- G. EEO Plan Changes Diane Clerou
- IX. REPORTS OF BOARD MEMBERS
- X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
- XI. CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA [14-01HR through 14-02HR]  
[14-01G through 14-04G]
- XII. GENERAL
  - A. **Second Reading and Approval of SCCCD Resource Allocation Model** [14-03] Ed Eng
  - B. Consideration of Bids, Chiller Replacement, Gymnasium, Fresno City College [14-04] Brian Speece
  - C. Consideration to Approve Topic for Strategic Conversation #3 [14-05] George Railey
- XIII. HUMAN RESOURCES
  - A. Consideration to Reduce Vacant Office Assistant III Position #4022, Oakhurst Center, from 12 Months to 10 Months [14-06] Diane Clerou
  - B. Consideration to Approve Title Change of Vacant Dean of Instruction, Health Sciences Division, to Dean of Instruction, Allied Health, Physical Education and Athletics [14-07] Diane Clerou
  - C. Consideration to Approve Revised Duties for Buyer Position [14-08] Diane Clerou
  - D. Consideration to Approve Revised Duties for Vacant HR/MIS Data Researcher Position [14-09] Diane Clerou
  - E. Consideration to Approve Duties for New Classification Specification for Equal Employment Opportunity, Diversity and Staff Development Manager [14-10] Diane Clerou





# **STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

## **Districtwide Resource Allocation Model**

### **General Fund Unrestricted Budget**

**Fresno • Reedley • Madera • Oakhurst • Willow International**

---

# Table of Contents

Background .....	3
Elements of the Resource Allocation Model .....	4
Revenue .....	4
Allocation Units .....	4
ALLOCATIONS-OFF-THE-TOP .....	5
Basic Allocation .....	6
Basic Allocation Transition .....	7
Allocation Adjustment for Full-Time Faculty .....	7
Variable FTES Allocation .....	8
Final Allocation.....	9
Summary .....	9
Glossary.....	10
Appendix A: SCCCD Resource Allocation Model.....	13
Appendix B: District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (RAMT)/Committee Membership .....	15
Appendix C: Timeline for DBRAAC’s Revised Resource Allocation Model (RAM).....	17

## Background

---

The resource allocation model was developed to improve the district's resource allocation process, incorporate districtwide integrated planning and fulfill the district's goals and objectives set forth by the State Center Community College District Board of Trustees. The model outlines the process for allocating resources to the various allocation units of the district and focuses on the long-range goal of addressing all resources including human, physical and technology.

Historically, the district has utilized an incremental budget approach for the allocation process. Each year, the allocation process began with rolling forward the prior year's adjusted base allocation. Permanent adjustments were made for new positions, COLA, growth, step and column, payroll tax and benefit rate changes, utility and insurance changes and other permanent or annual adjustments as necessary. In recent years, adjustments for workload (funding) reductions have been allocated to the various allocation units as well.

On May 13, 2011, the first District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (DRAMT) meeting was held to begin the development of a districtwide resource allocation model. In order to ensure broad representation in the development of the resource allocation model, the taskforce's composition was consciously established and included the following constituency representation: State Center Federation of Teachers (SCFT), academic senates, classified senates, California School Employees Association (CSEA), students, campus administration, the director of finance, a human resources management representative, and the vice chancellor of finance and administration. In May 2012, DRAMT approved a draft resource allocation model which was based primarily on full-time equivalent students (FTES) and a basic allocation (Senate Bill (SB) 361). Open forums were held in Fall 2012 to receive input from all constituent groups. Several concerns were raised and the taskforce continued modifying the original draft resource allocation model. Based on feedback from the open forums, the DRAMT modified their voting process from a majority vote to a qualified consensus model.

In Spring 2013, the DRAMT transitioned into a standing committee – the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC). The committee is composed of seven faculty, six classified staff, three students and six administrators. The DBRAAC's primary purpose is to recommend a districtwide allocation model for the distribution of district resources and to provide input into financial matters of the district including, but not limited to, cost savings and revenue generation strategies and to annually evaluate the effectiveness of the model by October 31<sup>st</sup>.

In Fall 2013, the DBRAAC finalized a revised districtwide resource allocation model which incorporated concerns raised at the forums in Fall of 2012. The model will be forwarded to Chancellor's Cabinet for final review in Fall 2013. A recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees in January 2014. It is recommended that implementation of the model will begin in the 2014-15 fiscal year.

Created by DRAMT: May 11, 2012

Revised by DBRAAC: September 20, 2013

Revised by DBRAAC: October 4, 2013

Reviewed by Chancellor's Cabinet: October 16, 2013

Sent to Constituent Groups: October 18, 2013

Reviewed by Communications Council: October 29, 2013

Reviewed by Chancellor's Cabinet: December 2, 2013

First Reading of Board of Trustees: December 10, 2013

## Elements of the Resource Allocation Model

---

The districtwide resource allocation model is designed to be formula-driven, easily understood, flexible and responsive, adequately documented and communicated, and equitable. The formula will accommodate both growth and reduction in funds and allocation units. The allocation model addresses the distribution of resources at a districtwide level, and is not prescriptive in how funds are to be spent at the various allocation units. The district acknowledges differences between its colleges and recognizes the colleges' need to direct their resources based on their own strategic plans, visions, missions and goals in meeting the needs of their diverse populations and constituencies. The colleges have separate and specific budget development processes unique to each site, reflecting their organizational culture and priorities. It is at this level that the college's budget must be integrated to the district's strategic plan, mission and goals.

### **Revenue**

The budget allocation model is designed solely for the distribution of unrestricted general fund revenue, and takes into consideration how the district is currently funded by the state (SB-361). Unrestricted general fund revenue will be distributed through this allocation model. Lottery revenue, student health fees, and other restricted sources of funding are allocated either by the state directly to a specific college or to the district to distribute using a separate allocation method. The primary sources of unrestricted general fund revenue include, but are not limited to, state apportionment for FTES, property taxes, enrollment fees, non-resident tuition, interest income, and other miscellaneous revenues. The 2013-14 funded amount per FTES is presented below:

<b>FTES Type</b>	<b>Funded Amount per FTES</b>
Credit	\$4,636
Non-Credit	\$2,788
Non-Credit (CDCP)	\$3,283

### **Allocation Units**

The districtwide resource allocation model is composed of columns and rows of information (Attachment A). The columns in the model represent who receives the resources. The recipients of resources are also known as allocation units. The committee has identified the district has five allocation units. These allocations units are Fresno City College (FCC), Reedley College (RC), Willow International Community College Center/Clovis Community College (WICCC/CCC), District Office/Operations (DO/Operations), and Integrated Planning, Regulatory and Fixed Costs (IP/Reg./Fixed). The first four allocation units represent distinct organizational units within the SCCCD and are fairly self-explanatory. The last allocation unit represents costs or initiatives which are mandatory, regulatory, and beneficial to our whole district or initiatives from other taskforces/committees that have a high priority to be addressed in the allocation model.

The rows in the districtwide resource allocation model represent the types of resource allocations and/or costs to the district that are to be distributed to the allocation units as follows:

- 1) allocations off-the-top;
- 2) basic allocation;
- 3) basic allocation transition;
- 4) allocation adjustment for full-time faculty (transition); and
- 5) variable FTES allocation.

Unrestricted general fund revenues will be estimated by the district office finance department, based on information made available by the State Chancellor's Office, the governor's proposed budget, and any other financial sources. Once the available revenue has been determined, the allocation model will provide the mechanism for allocating the resources to the various allocation units.

### **ALLOCATIONS OFF-THE-TOP**

Allocations off-the-top represent the first four allocations of funds for costs incurred that benefit the entire district which these costs include integrated planning initiatives; mandatory/regulatory costs; districtwide fixed costs; and district office/operations.

**Integrated planning initiatives** are resources allocated that address needs from the various planning taskforces/committees that have been recommended by Chancellor's Cabinet and approved by the Board of Trustees. These resources are used to address the highest priority needs of the district and concerns raised by a taskforce/committee that is/are in alignment with the overall mission, values, and goals of the district. These allocations can be one-time in nature or over several years depending on the extent of the needs and resources available.

**Mandatory/regulatory costs** are those costs incurred by the district which are required by law, code or contract. These costs include the annual financial audit, governmental mandated costs, retiree health benefits (GASB 45-Other Post-Employment Benefits), board election costs, parity pay, and bond oversight.

**Districtwide fixed costs** represent operational costs incurred which are necessary and/or fixed in nature. These costs include the enterprise-wide resource planning systems (Datatel/Ellucian\*), base line Blackboard\*software, utilities (gas & electric), property and liability insurance, Microsoft license agreements\*, antivirus software\*, Adobe software\*, Singularity software\*, SARS software\*, courier service, banking fees and charges, and legal consulting. (\*asterisk items are currently paid with lottery funds and may need to be in the lottery allocation process to address the 50% law).

**District office/operations** support districtwide services. They include the chancellor’s office, legal counsel, human resources, personnel commission, information systems, public and legislative relations, accounting, finance and administration, payroll, purchasing, operations and maintenance, grounds, construction services, police and safety, environmental health and safety, educational services and institutional effectiveness, admissions and records, Center for International Trade Development (CITD), State Center Consortium, grants and external funding, foundation, and other centralized activities which support the district as a whole and cannot be conveniently or economically assigned to a college/center/site.

**Basic Allocation**

Basic allocations represent resources allocated to community college districts per Senate Bill (SB) 361. In this component of apportionment funding from the state, resources are distributed to districts based on the number of colleges and centers at a district and the tiered number of FTES the college or center serves (see chart below). The rationale for this apportionment allocation is to address the base costs associated with running a college or center.

<b>2013-14</b>		
<b>Multi-College Funding Levels (FTES)*</b>	<b>Basic Allocation Amount**</b>	<b>SCCCD #</b>
Colleges > 18,754	\$4,498,258	0
Colleges > 9,377	\$3,935,976	2
Colleges <= 9,377	\$3,373,693	0
State Approved Center > 938	\$1,124,544	3
State Approved Center > 704	\$843,423	0
State Approved Center > 469	\$562,282	0
State Approved Center > 235	\$281,141	0
State Approved Center <= 235	\$140,571	0

<b>2012-13</b>		
<b>Multi-College Funding Levels (FTES)*</b>	<b>Basic Allocation Amount**</b>	<b>SCCCD #</b>
Colleges > 18,472	\$4,428,727	0
Colleges > 9,236	\$3,875,136	2
Colleges <= 9,236	\$3,321,545	0
State Approved Center > 924	\$1,107,182	3
State Approved Center > 693	\$830,386	0
State Approved Center > 462	\$553,591	0
State Approved Center > 231	\$276,795	0
State Approved Center <= 231	\$138,398	0

\*FTES funding levels are subject to workload adjustments as denoted in the tables above. \*\*The annual basic allocation may be adjusted each year by a state-funded cost-of-living adjustment (COLA).



### **Basic Allocation Transition**

In the first year of the implementation of the allocation model it is estimated FCC will be allocated approximately \$1,500,000 less in resources than under the old resource allocation model. In order to partially mitigate this reduction in funding, the committee developed a four-year transition plan that manages this reduction in funding. This will give FCC four years to adjust to the allocation model.

- In the first year of the implementation of the new resource allocation model, FCC would receive an additional \$750,000 (estimated loss in funding \$1,500,000 times 50%) and RC and WICCC/CCC will have a reduction of \$375,000 in funding (equal share in the additional allocation to FCC).
- In year two, FCC would receive an additional \$562,500 (estimated loss in funding \$1,500,000 times 37.5%) and RC and WICCC/CCC would have a reduction of \$281,250 in funding (equal share in the additional funding to FCC).
- In year three, FCC would receive an additional \$375,000 (estimated loss in funding \$1,500,000 times 25%) and RC and WICCC/CCC would have a reduction of \$187,500 in funding (equal share in the additional funding to FCC).
- In year four, the last year of this transitional plan, FCC would receive an additional \$187,500 (estimated loss in funding \$1,500,000 times 12.5%) and RC and WICCC/CCC would have a reduction of \$93,750 in funding (equal share in the additional funding to FCC).
- In year five, FCC will not receive additional basic allocation transition funds.

**Estimated Transition Amount (\$1.5 m)**

	FCC		RC		WICCC/CCC	
	Adjustment	Amount	Adjustment	Amount	Adjustment	Amount
2014-15	50%	\$750,000	-25%	(\$375,000)	-25%	(\$375,000)
2015-16	37.5%	\$562,500	-18.75%	(\$281,250)	-18.75%	(\$281,250)
2016-17	25%	\$375,000	-12.5%	(\$187,500)	-12.5%	(\$187,500)
2017-18	12.5%	\$187,500	-6.25%	(\$93,750)	-6.25%	(\$93,750)

### **Allocation Adjustment for Full-Time Faculty**

Full-time and part-time employees' salary and benefits are addressed with the funds in the new allocation process. In reviewing the work force of the district (the largest expenditure category for the district) the taskforce/committee struggled with how to address the issue of full-time employees and part-time employees and their current proportionate composition at the various locations throughout the district and decided to only address faculty costs. It was determined the average full-time faculty cost districtwide is approximately \$85,000 more than an equivalent (instructional load) part-time faculty. Based on this analysis, the committee developed a four-year transition plan to help mitigate additional costs incurred by Reedley College due to a disproportionately higher percentage of full-time equivalent faculty. This will give Reedley College four years to adjust to the new allocation model.

- In year one, each allocation unit would receive \$85,000 for each full-time faculty paid by the unrestricted general fund.
- In year two, each allocation unit would receive \$63,750 (\$85,000 times 75%) for each full-time equivalent faculty paid by the unrestricted general fund.
- In year three, each allocation unit would receive \$42,500 (\$85,000 times 50%) for each full-time equivalent faculty paid by the unrestricted general fund.
- In year four, the last year of this transition plan, each allocation unit would receive \$21,250 (\$85,000 times 25%) for each full-time equivalent faculty paid by the unrestricted general fund.
- In year five, full-time faculty will be paid by the funds received through the allocation process.

<b>Full -Time Faculty Transition</b>		
<u>Year</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2014-15	100%	\$85,000/FTEF
2015-16	75%	\$63,750/FTEF
2016-17	50%	\$42,000/FTEF
2017-18	25%	\$21,250/FTEF

### **Variable FTES Allocation**

The last component in the resource allocation model addresses students served at each allocation unit. Much like the state apportionment funding formula (SB 361) this resource allocation model provides resources based on students served. The calculation looks at the remaining funds to be distributed in the model and allocates those funds proportionately based on the number of students served by each allocation unit. The variable FTES allocation averages both the actual credit FTES served (not to exceed the enrollment target credit FTES) in the prior year\* plus the target credit FTES for the budget year plus 50% of the noncredit FTES served for the last fiscal year (final CCFS 320 report). This calculation is done for each allocation unit and then the allocation unit is allocated whatever its percentage of total students served multiplied by the remaining funds in the allocation model. (\*prior year is used since these numbers are available-final CCFS 320 report.)

**Formula:       Average of (Target FTES 2014-15 + actual FTES up to Target 2012-13) + (Non-CR FTES @ 50% FY 2012-13)**

This distribution in funding for variable FTES allocation gives each allocation unit credit for what they served in the past and takes into consideration what they are going to serve in the future thereby allocating resources from both a historical and forward looking (future) perspective.

## **Final Allocation**

The final allocation to each unit is the sum of the resources in each of the five major resource allocation areas:

- 1) allocations off-the-top;
- 2) basic allocation;
- 3) basic allocation transition;
- 4) allocation adjustment for full-time faculty (transition); and
- 5) variable FTES allocation.

## **Summary**

---

This allocation model addresses the basic principles for a budget funding allocation as prescribed in the accreditation process. It utilizes formulas and variables that have been meaningfully studied, readily defined, easily measured and consistently reported. The model shall be reviewed and evaluated annually by October 31 by the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) and revised accordingly as acknowledged in the operational agreement.

## Glossary

---

**Allocation:** Division or distribution of resources according to a predetermined plan.

**Apportionment:** Federal, state or local monies distributed to college districts or other governmental units according to legislative and regulatory formulas.

**Budget Document:** A written statement translating the educational plan or programs into costs, usually for one future fiscal year, and estimating income by sources to meet these costs.

**Budget Act:** The legislative vehicle for the State's appropriations. The Constitution requires it be passed by a two-thirds vote of each house and sent to the Governor by June 15 each year. The governor may reduce or delete, but not increase, individual items.

**Categorical Funds:** Also called restricted funds, these are monies that can only be spent for the designated purpose. Examples: funding to serve students with disabilities (DSPS) or the economically disadvantaged, low income (EOPS), scheduled maintenance, and instructional equipment.

**Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA):** An increase in funding for revenue limits or categorical programs tied to increases in the cost of living. Current law ties COLAs to indices of inflation, although different amounts may be appropriated by the legislature.

**Deficit:** The excess of liabilities over assets or the excess of expenditures or expenses over revenues during an accounting period.

**Enrollment Cap:** A limit on the number of students (FTES) for which the state will provide funding.

**Expenditures:** Amounts disbursed for all purposes. Accounts kept on an accrual basis include all charges whether paid or not. Accounts kept on a cash basis include only actual cash disbursements.

**Faculty Obligation Number (FON):** The annual figure provided to each district by the Chancellor's Office for the number of full-time credit faculty positions required to comply with 75/25 goals.

**Fifty-Percent Law:** Requires that fifty percent of district expenditures in certain categories are spent for classroom instruction. The intent of the statute is to limit class size and contain the relative growth of administrative and non-instructional costs.

**Final Budget:** The district budget that is approved by the board in September, after the state allocation is determined.

**Fiscal Year:** Twelve calendar months; for governmental agencies in California, it begins July 1 and ends June 30. Some special projects have a fiscal year beginning October 1 and ending September 30, which is consistent with the federal government's fiscal year.

**Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES):** An FTES represents 525 class (contact) hours of student instruction/activity in credit and noncredit courses, generally 15 semester credit hours. Full-time equivalent student (FTES) is the workload measure used to compute state funding for California Community Colleges.

**General Fund:** The fund used to account for the ordinary operations of the district. It is available for any legally authorized purpose not specified for payment by other funds.

**Governor's Budget:** The Governor proposes a budget for the state each January, which is revised in May (the May Revise) in accordance with updated revenue projections.

**Lottery Funds:** The share of income from the State Lottery, which has added about 1-3 percent to community college funding. A minimum of 34 percent of state lottery revenues must be used for "education of pupils."

**Mandated Costs:** Expenditures that occur as a result of (or are mandated by) federal or state law, court decisions, administrative regulations, or initiative measures.

**May Revise:** The Governor revises his or her budget proposal in May in accordance with updated projections in revenues and expenses.

**Noncredit:** Courses taught for which no college credit is given. Adult education and basic English as a Second Language are two examples. The state reimbursement for noncredit education is less than for credit courses.

**OPEB:** Other Post Employment Benefits include postemployment healthcare benefits, and all Post Employment Benefits provided separately from a pension plan, excluding benefits defined as termination offers and benefits.

**Proposition 13:** An initiative passed in June 1978 adding Article XIII A to the California Constitution. It provided that tax rates on secure property were restricted to no more than 1 percent of full cash value. Proposition 13 also defined assessed value and required a two-thirds vote to change existing or levy new taxes.

**Proposition 98:** An initiative passed in November 1988, guaranteeing at least 40 percent of the state's budget for K-12 and the community colleges. The split was proposed to be 89 percent (K-12) and 11 percent (CCC), although the split has not been maintained.

**Reserves:** Funds set aside in the college district budget to provide for future expenditures or to offset future losses, for working capital, or for other purposes. There are different categories of reserves, including contingency, general, restricted and reserves for long-term liabilities.

**Restricted Funds:** Money that must be spent for a specific purpose either by law or by local board action. Revenue and expenditures are recorded in separate funds. Funds restricted by board action may be called “designated” or “committed” to differentiate them from those restricted by external agencies. Examples of restricted funds include the federal vocational education act and other federal program funds; state “categorical” programs such as those for disabled and disadvantaged students’ state monies targeted for specific purposes, such as instructional equipment replacement; grants for specific programs; and locally generated revenues such as the health and parking fees.

**Retiree Health Benefits:** Benefits provided to retirees provide health insurance, negotiated through collective bargaining. Also called “Other Post Employment Benefits.”

**Revenue:** Income from all sources.

**Shortfall:** An insufficient allocation of money, which will require additional appropriations, reduction in expenditures, and/or will result in deficits.

**State Apportionment:** An allocation of state money paid to a district on a monthly basis once the state budget is enacted.

**Sustainability:** Utilization of available resources (revenues) to address the obligations or needs (expenditures) of the organization for the current and future periods (multi-year).

**Target FTES:** Desired district goal number of full time equivalent students (FTES) to serve. SCCC has historically exceeded the FTES cap funded by the state.

**Tentative Budget:** The budget approved by the board in June, prior to when state allocations have been finalized.

**Title 5, California Code of Regulations:** The section of the California Administrative Code that regulates community college. The Board of Governors adopts Title 5 regulations.

**Unfunded FTES:** FTES generated in excess of the enrollment/FTES cap.

**Unrestricted Funds:** Generally those monies of the General Fund not designated by law or a donor agency for a specific purpose. They are legally regarded as unrestricted since their use is at the Board’s discretion.

# Appendix A: SCCCD Resource Allocation Model

## SCCCD Resource Allocation Model - Simulated for 2013-14 9-20-13 Approved Model

Unrestricted Gen Fund Resources Available	\$ 137,773,749	FCC	RC	WICCC/CCC	DO / Operations	IP/Reg./Fixed	Total Allocation
<b>Working Copy</b>							
<b>Allocations Off-The-Top</b>							
Integrated Planning Initiatives	\$ -					-	\$ -
Mandatory/Regulatory Costs	(3,900,122)					3,900,122	3,900,122
Districtwide Fixed Costs	(5,850,000)					5,850,000	5,850,000
District Office/Operations ( 0.1075 )	(14,810,678)				14,810,678		14,810,678
<b>Total Allocation Off-The-Top</b>	<b>\$ (24,560,800)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 14,810,678</b>	<b>\$ 9,750,122</b>	<b>\$ 24,560,800</b>
<b>Basic Allocation</b>							
College > 10K (>9,377)	\$ (7,871,951)	\$ 3,935,976	\$ 3,935,976	\$ -			\$ 7,871,951
College < 10K (<9,377)	-						-
State Approved Centers	(3,373,694)	1,124,565	1,124,565	1,124,565			3,373,694
Basic Allocation Transition (@ 100%)*	-	750,000	(375,000)	(375,000)			-
<b>Total Basic Allocation</b>	<b>\$ (11,245,646)</b>	<b>\$ 5,810,540</b>	<b>\$ 4,685,540</b>	<b>\$ 749,565</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 11,245,646</b>
<b>Allocation Adjustment per Full-Time Faculty</b>		62.90%	28.37%	8.73%			
# Full-Time Instructional Faculty		317	143	44			504
Adjustment per FTF of (\$85000 )	\$ (42,840,000)	\$ 26,945,000	\$ 12,155,000	\$ 3,740,000			\$ 42,840,000
<b>Total FT Faculty Adjustment</b>	<b>\$ (42,840,000)</b>	<b>\$ 26,945,000</b>	<b>\$ 12,155,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,740,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 42,840,000</b>
<b>Variable FTES Allocation</b>		63.12%	24.95%	11.93%			
FTES Allocation (13-14 & 11-12 Average)	\$ 59,127,303	\$ 37,321,154	\$ 14,752,262	\$ 7,053,887			\$ 59,127,303
<b>Total Variable Allocation</b>	<b>\$ 59,127,303</b>	<b>\$ 37,321,154</b>	<b>\$ 14,752,262</b>	<b>\$ 7,053,887</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 59,127,303</b>
<b>Final Allocation</b>		<b>\$ 70,076,694</b>	<b>\$ 31,592,803</b>	<b>\$ 11,543,452</b>	<b>\$ 14,810,678</b>	<b>\$ 9,750,122</b>	<b>\$ 137,773,749</b>
<i>Percentage of Allocation</i>		50.864%	22.931%	8.379%	10.750%	7.077%	100.00%
		Fresno City	Reedley	Willow	DO / Operations	Reg/Fixed	Total Allocation
Allocation per New Resource Allocation Model	\$ 70,076,694	\$ 31,592,803	\$ 11,543,452	\$ 14,810,678	\$ 9,750,122	\$ 137,773,749	
2013-14 Revised Allocation (Current Model)	\$ 70,793,956	\$ 31,773,190	\$ 10,658,803	\$ 14,797,678	\$ 9,750,122	\$ 137,773,749	
Increase (Decrease) generated by New Model	\$ (717,262)	\$ (180,387)	\$ 884,649	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ -	
		-1.0%	-0.6%	8.3%	0.1%	0.0%	

\*Transition Adjustment - Calc'd at approx half of FCC's Decrease in Year 1 (Approx \$750K) - (Yr1=100% / Yr2=75% / Yr3=50% / Yr4=25% / Yr5=0%)

## DATA ELEMENTS

	FTES as %	Fresno City	Reedley	Willow	
Average FTES 13-14 & 12-13 + (Non-Cr @50%)		63.12%	24.95%	11.93%	100.000%
District Office Operational - Percentage	10.75%	Increased .15% to offset transfer of staff to DON			
Full-time Faculty Adjustment	\$ 85,000	\$85,000 (Yr1=100% / Yr2=75% / Yr3=50% / Yr4=25% / Yr5=0%)			

	Estimated Costs
<b>Regulatory/Manadatory Costs</b>	
Audit	100,000
Mandated Costs	20,000
Bond Oversight Committee	5,000
Retiree Health - Pay as you Go	1,200,000
Retiree Health - Balance to cover ARC	-
Elections (Every Other Year)	-
Parity Pay	581,380
COLA - Contingency	1,993,742
	<u>3,900,122</u>
<b>Fixed Districtwide Services</b>	
Utilities	4,100,000
Insurance	1,000,000
Legal Consulting	450,000
Bank/Card Merchant Service Fees	240,000
Districtwide Courier Service	60,000
	<u>5,850,000</u>
<b>Total Committed Costs</b>	<u><u>9,750,122</u></u>

900K starting 15-16

The counts would remain static at point they are set for the 5yr Transition Period

	Full-Time Faculty Headcount	
FCC	317	62.90%
RC	113	22.42%
WI	44	8.73%
MC	29	5.75%
OC	1	0.20%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>504</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Includes Counselor/Library		
Source: HR Sept 2013		



## Appendix B: District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (RAMT)/Committee Membership

### District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (DRAMT) /Committee Membership

	DRAMT* Membership August 2011	DRAMT* Membership May 2012	DBRAAC** Membership May 2013	DBRAAC** Membership October 2013
<b>Fresno City College</b>	Faculty: Claudia Habib and Rick Santos Classified Senate: Harry Zahlis CSEA: Mikki Johnson Student: Tony Capetillo Administration: Michael Guerra	Faculty: Claudia Habib and Bridget Heyne Classified Senate: Harry Zahlis CSEA: Mikki Johnson Student: Christopher Coronado Administration: Janell Mendoza	Faculty: Robyn Hart and Bruce Hill Classified Senate: Harry Zahlis CSEA: Mikki Johnson Student: Michael Wilson Administration: Cheryl Sullivan	Faculty: Robyn Hart and Bruce Hill Classified Senate: Harry Zahlis CSEA: Mikki Johnson Student: Ben Andersen Administration: Cheryl Sullivan
<b>Reedley College</b>	Faculty: Jim Gilmore and Jeff Ragan Classified Senate: Melanie Highfill CSEA: Kasey Oliver Student: Sukhman Sekhon Administration: Donna Berry	Faculty: Jim Gilmore, Lacy Barnes and Richardson Fleuridor Classified Senate: Melanie Highfill CSEA: Larry Dickson Student: Jacob Alvarado Administration: Donna Berry	Faculty: Jim Gilmore, Lacy Barnes and Richardson Fleuridor Classified Senate: Melanie Highfill CSEA: Jason Meyers Student: Viviana Acevedo Administration: Donna Berry	Faculty: Jim Gilmore (Co-Chair), Richardson Fleuridor and Lacy Barnes Classified Senate: Peggy Marks CSEA: Melanie Highfill Student: Viviana Acevedo Administration: Donna Berry
<b>North Centers</b>	Faculty: Ray Tjahjadi, WI and Stephen (Jay) Leech, MC Classified Senate: Karen Ainsworth, WI CSEA: Kathleen Swan Student: Hayden Lollis Administration: Janell Mendoza	Faculty: Stephen (Jay) Leech, MC Classified Senate: Karen Ainsworth, WI CSEA: Kathleen Swan Student: Michael Wolin Administration: Lorrie Hopper		

\*District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

\*\*District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee

## District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (DRAMT) /Committee Membership

	DRAMT* Membership	DRAMT* Membership	DBRAAC** Membership	DBRAAC** Membership
	August 2011	May 2012	May 2013	October 2013
<b>Other</b>	Observer: Shelly Conner	Observer: Shelly Conner		
<b>Willow International</b>			Faculty: Arla Hile and Joseph Libby Classified Senate: Brian Shamp CSEA: Karen Ainsworth Student: Anacelly Hernandez Administration: Lorrie Hopper	Faculty: Arla Hile and Joseph Libby Classified Senate: Brian Shamp CSEA: Karen Ainsworth Student: Colin Van Loon Administration: Lorrie Hopper
<b>District Office</b>	Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration: Ed Eng, Chair Resource to Chair: Jothany Blackwood Interim Director of Finance: Wil Schofield Human Resources: Diane Clerou Facilities: Christine Miktarian Information Technology: John Bengtson Recorder: Vicki Bustos	Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration: Ed Eng, Chair Resource to Chair: Jothany Blackwood Director of Finance: Wil Schofield Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources: Diane Clerou Facilities: Christine Miktarian Information Technology: John Bengtson Recorder: Vicki Taylor	Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration: Ed Eng, Chair Resource to Chair: Jothany Blackwood Director of Finance: Wil Schofield Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources: Diane Clerou Recorder: Rebecca Gonzalez	Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration: Ed Eng, Chair Resource to Chair: Jothany Blackwood Director of Finance: Wil Schofield Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources: Diane Clerou Recorder: Patricia Gonzalez

\*District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce

\*\*District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee

2

16

## Appendix C: Timeline for DBRAAC's Revised Resource Allocation Model (RAM)

<b>Date</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Task</b>
August 23, 2013	DBRAAC meeting	Discuss final factor for RAM
Sept.6, 2013	DBRAAC meeting	Finalize final factor for RAM
Sept. 20, 2013	DBRAAC meeting	Review 1 <sup>st</sup> draft for narrative of revised RAM and provide revisions.
Oct. 4, 2013	DBRAAC meeting	Final discussion on narrative with revisions.
Oct. 16, 2013	Chancellor's Cabinet	Review and edit narrative on revised RAM.
October, 2013	All constituent groups at colleges and centers	Make narrative and RAM available for constituents to begin 1 <sup>st</sup> readings.
Oct.29, 2013	Communications Council	Revised narrative presented to group to discuss with constituent groups, although sent 2 weeks in advance to allow for time to review.
Nov. 7, 2013	Board of Trustees Meeting	Status Update on RAM.
November, 2013	All constituent groups at colleges and centers	Complete 1st and 2nd readings and provide recommendations.
Nov. 26, 2013	Communications Council	Constituents submit recommendations on revised RAM.
Dec. 2, 2013	Chancellor's Cabinet	Discussion of constituent recommendations.
Dec. 10, 2013	Board of Trustees Meeting	1 <sup>st</sup> reading of revised RAM
January 2014	Board of Trustees Meeting	2 <sup>nd</sup> review and recommend action on revised RAM
January-February, 2014	Office of Vice Chancellor of Finance & Administration	Recommend implementation of a revised RAM into budget development for the 2014-15 fiscal year.

Created by DRAMT: May 11, 2012

Revised by DBRAAC: September 20, 2013

Revised by DBRAAC: October 4, 2013

Revised by Chancellor's Cabinet: October 16, 2013

Sent to Constituent Groups: October 18, 2013

Reviewed by Communications Council: October 29, 2013

Reviewed by Chancellor's Cabinet: December 2, 2013

First Reading of Board of Trustees: December 10, 2013

17

Consideration to Authorize Agreement with California Department of Food and Agriculture for the Specialty Crop Block Grant, Center for International Trade Development [14-03G]

Action

- a) Authorize the district, on behalf of the Center for International Trade Development to enter into an agreement with the California Department of Food and Agriculture for the Specialty Crop Block Grant for the period October 1, 2013, through June 30, 2015, with funding in the amount of \$111,458;
- b) Authorize renewal of the agreement with similar terms and conditions; and
- c) Authorize the Chancellor or vice chancellor of finance and administration to sign the agreement on behalf of the district

Consideration to Authorize Agreement with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office for Deputy Sector Navigator Global Trade and Logistics Grant, Center for International Trade Development [14-04G]

No Action

This item was pulled from the agenda. No action was taken.

\*\*\*\*\*End of Consent Agenda\*\*\*\*\*

Second Reading and Approval of the SCCCDC Resource Allocation Model [14-03]

Action

Ed Eng presented the revised Resource Allocation Model for the board's approval. The first reading was presented at the December 2013 board meeting.

All constituency groups have been consulted. Next DBRAC meeting will review and consider allocation for vocational classes potential additions to the model.

Trustee Nishinaka expressed concerns regarding smaller allocation for vocational classes? Was there going to be a bottom line change on staffing at the colleges as a result of implementation of this model? Could Reedley lose staff positions? Mr. Eng and Dr. Caldwell noted these concerns will be addressed by the committee and board recommendations will be taken into consideration. Dr. Caldwell assured the trustees that the budget committees on the campuses

Second Reading and  
Approval of the  
SCCCD Resource  
Allocation Model  
[14-03]  
Action (continued)

are fiercely protective and making sure they serve their community base.

A motion was made by Trustee Leal and seconded by Trustee Barreras that the Board of Trustees approve the proposed State Center Community College District Resource Allocation Model. The motion passed without dissent.

Consideration of Bids,  
Chiller Replacement,  
Gymnasium, Fresno  
City College  
[14-04]  
Action

Mr. Brian Speece presented information concerning bids received for the project for chiller replacement in the Fresno City College gymnasium.

Trustee Caglia asked why some of the bids were so high.

A motion was made by Trustee Nishinaka and seconded by Trustee Smith that the Board of Trustees award Bid #1314-04 in the amount of \$107,993 to Lawson Mechanical Contractors, the lowest responsible bidder for the chiller replacement at the gymnasium on the Fresno City College campus; and authorize the chancellor or vice chancellor of finance and administration to sign an agreement on behalf of the district. The motion passed without dissent.

Consideration to  
Approve Topic for  
Strategic  
Conversation #3  
[14-05]  
Action

Dr. George Railey shared that the board will hold another strategic conversation on March 4, 2014, prior to the board meeting in Reedley and asked that the board approve the topic of Strategic Conversation #3: Inclusion, Respect and Equity.

Trustee Payne asked if this opportunity made available to all board members. Dr. Blue said usually there are two board members participating and if Trustee Payne would like to, he can be the second member.

Trustee Barreras wants to be sure the ad hoc committee reflects the campus population.

A motion was made by Trustee Payne and seconded by Trustee Leal that the Board of Trustees approve the topic of Strategic Conversation #3: Inclusion, Respect and Equity. The motion passed without dissent. The motion passed without dissent.