



Interim President Michael White opened the forum at 1:00 p.m.

The Districtwide Resource Allocation Model Taskforce was presented and the floor was opened for questions.

The following is a summary of questions raised and the responses:

**Note:** A handout of question and concerns was provided to the DRAMT Taskforce

- 1. Based on a FTES model, CTE education is at a disadvantage because we have limitation on our caps for a few reasons: A lot of our lab courses have limitation on caps because of safety reasons and in some cases because of industry accreditation reason. I want that to be something the committee notes and takes into consideration. We realize CTE programs are expensive and we have a lot of concerns. We have vacant faculty position due to retirement. Many of us need more faculty because of increased work load; some of us in single person programs carry a lot of responsibility such as programs review, maintenance work, etc. We rely heavily on student employees and adjunct faculty. Some of our facilities are aging and need improvement. I ask that the taskforce take that into consideration for our CTE areas.*

Response: As this group looks at the allocation model you kind of get into a gray area when you talk about programs and services. The funding model pays for the programs and services. But the programs and services is more of a campus decision through the governance process as to what programs and services you provide. Our responsibility is to allocate resources. Your feedback is needed as to what concepts should be used to allocate resources as opposed to which programs and services should be allocated resources. We are looking at concepts. We understand CTE generally does not lend itself to serving large numbers of students. There were many concepts we reviewed that did not get incorporated into this model at this particular phase.

- 2. I am a statistician and I work with number also, but I work with different numbers, a different component. When you said you looked at concepts, we are missing someone in the concept, you are missing the student. You are looking at overall FTES, but you not looking at some of the other factors. In Reedley, 51% of households earn less than \$35,000 a year, less than 10% have a bachelors degree, and less than 9% attend a UC or CSU. The median income for Clovis is \$71,000 a year, highest AP enrollment and passing rate, highest college enrollment, and a population with more than 25% with a bachelors degree. We are looking at a different concept; the needs of the student, remedial enrollment, where students are being placed through Accuplacer, college completion, families our students are coming with, the needs that RC has to provide, the amount of counseling, tutorial, and support services. It seems we are taking from the poorest students of our district and giving to the wealthiest. I was disappointed to see this model is the only way you looked at it. If this model is implemented, it will not go well. It does not look good for our district. I ask you take all this under consideration.*



Response: There were a lot of things we looked at that did not get incorporated into this model. We did think about the student's needs and the needs of the campuses. If you look at the last page of the written narrative handout you were provided about the model's process, you will see a list of concepts that ranked high, but were not incorporated in the model at this time. However, we do have alternate funding to supplement funding for some of the needs you discussed. We will consider student needs. Keep in mind that one of the items we have to balance is the 50% law that states 50% of what we spend has to be on direct instruction to the student. The way our funding and laws are doesn't allow us to fund those student success initiatives on the right side of the 50% law through the general fund unless there is alternate funding.

3. *Because it is based on FTES, who at the district office decides how it is allocated per location and how is it done?*

Response: We are working on enrollment management, which basically breaks down how much money we receive as a district and how we are going to allocate those target FTES numbers. We estimate how much we will get at the beginning of the year, subtract foundation grant money, and divide by how much we received for credit and non-credit FTES, that tells us how much we will get funded for. Traditionally, our district has served more students than what we receive funding for. The cap is what we will get paid for and target is what we will serve. In this year's budget, we said if the tax initiative fails, we will serve 3.88% more than what we are funded for. If it passes, we will serve 2% more than what we are funded for. We use a three year historical average of what the colleges/centers/sites generated FTES and that average to determine the number of FTES that college/center/site gets for the current fiscal year. This will be addressed by another committee. We will discuss for the 2013-14 year how those target allocations will be set. Remember for district purposes, Oakhurst, Madera, and Willow get funded under Reedley.

4. *I know state and federal government are encouraging junior colleges to be active in preparing people for direct employments. We have career technical programs that are signature programs that are not taught as well anywhere in the state of California. I have three questions:*
- Why is there no consideration for funding of signature programs? Were you directed not to deal with that, or did you decide not to deal with that?*
  - This model as we see it is going to make some of the CTE programs no longer viable. There will need to be a decision about whether to keep some signature programs. Does the district want to turn that over the college? Aren't these programs valuable to the district as a whole?*
  - If this district does value CTE and other expansive programs, why is it not reflected in the resource allocation model?*

Response: This is the first model or taskforce to come out from this process. There are other taskforces that feed into this: HR, technology, and facilities taskforces. As those taskforces meet



and generate information it will be fed into this model. We have to wait for those other taskforces and committees to conduct their work. The work they are doing will be taken into consideration and incorporated into this model. As we work on this integrated planning, keep in mind we cannot get everything done at once without the feedback from those other taskforces and committees. The first taskforce meeting for signature programs will take place next week. Keep in mind this model is a living document and is not final. The reality is we are not getting funded at the level we need to serve our students. We will have to make best with what money we have until we get a better funding stream from the state.

We were charged to develop a model, while taking into consideration SB361. We were not charged by the district to not include other revenue sources. Many components were recommended but not implemented.

We met as a district looking for what was in the best interest for the district, but also advocated for our campuses. We were given a timeline to develop the model of phase I and had less time to do more innovative things we would have liked to have incorporated into the model.

5. *What has the board said about this type of model? As a signature program we are required to have one instructor for every 6 students. Our students need to be trained. When will this model be presented to the board?*

Response: The model is still in a draft format. We are still receiving feedback from the various colleges/centers/sites. We will have follow up meetings for some of the more detailed information at each of the colleges. All the information will then be presented to the DRAMT taskforce who will then decide if modifications to the model are needed. It will then be presented to chancellor's cabinet then to the board.

6. *(Comment only) We have a lot of high cost programs at RC. We are a comprehensive college. The cut of \$2.6 M is going to hurt the college. I can't see that that this model will be productive. Funding should be allocated in such a way that can be equitable to all.*
7. *(Comment Only - Addressed PowerPoint slide 17) FCC and RC need to give up money. For FCC it is 3% and for RC it is 10% of what they were originally allocated. You increase Willow with 25% and increase Madera with 30%. Reedley College should not lose their programs based on increased funding of other centers.*
8. *What was the discussion of taking the centers and giving them an allocation and letting them figure out how to balance their efficiency vs. trying to balance efficiency across the entire district?*

Response: We are funded as a college/center/site. The centers and sites are part of the college and the college supports the centers and sites. The model, the way it is presented, the CTC is included in FCCs column. If we were to combine RC, Madera, and Oakhurst into one lump sum,



RC would be down much less and it allows us the ability to allocate the money to college/center/site as appropriate for what each of those entities hold.

The reason we broke out Madera, Willow, and Oakhurst and not CTC in this allocation model is, historically, we have always broken out the North Centers and have always had separate budgets for those centers and not a separate budget for CTC.

*9. What I see in the model is it does not take into consideration our full time faculty on this campus and FCC. Willow and Madera are mostly filled with adjunct faculty. Until that equity can be moved so they have as many full-time faculty by percentage as the colleges RC and FCC need to be given more equity for having full-time faculty.*

Response: This taskforce has discussed that issue. Unfortunately, this model is waiting for other committee work to be completed since we don't have all the resources to come up with all the data. As that information comes available we will look at that data to see how it will impact the model.

*10. Since the other parts of the model are not formulated yet, when will this model be implemented? Are we going to implement without all the other pieces, or wait?*

Response: It was originally set to implement for next fiscal year. It is not clear at this time when it will be implemented. As a taskforce, we will meet to address concerns raised and it will also be addressed at chancellor's cabinet.

*11. In regard to factor of need for some programs, some programs need more resources. What has been the discussion in respect to that? Also, in regards to Perkins, we have seen a variation of this model already applied to that money in terms of determining what the allocation is based off of FTEs and our college has seen a significant decrease of Perkins money available to us because of that while some of the other colleges/centers saw an increase. Is that the right formula to base that off of when the needs of our programs are greater?*

Response: Tomorrow at our DRAMT meeting we will discuss Perkins funds. We will have Robin Torres of institutional research who gets information from the state and disaggregates the numbers to explain the procedure. We will also have Shelly Conner speak to us about Perkins. What we try to do as a committee to provide the information so everyone understands how the process works.

*12. Of all models reviewed it seems Kern's would be closest to SCCCD. Is there a reason that model was not preferred?*

Response: [Donna] That is the district I came from and was familiar with the details as to how it was created. It was also based on SB361. Many of the models were SB361 driven, since that is



how we receive our funding. One of the goals of the taskforce was to develop a model that was easy to understand. Many other colleges were contacted, but we did not always receive a response within our timeframe for developing this model.

*13. Moving forward and looking at what kind of impact we can have, how do we make it so things get the attention we think they deserve? How do we get people to understand there isn't just one level of funding that will work with every college/center/site?*

Response: Educate faculty first then bring facts and data. Come to us proactively and provide suggestions as to how we can incorporate it into the model.

*14. You keep saying you ran out of time. If we are doing this on a time line, we are going to get hurt by it. It should be done correctly the first time.*

Response: We were given a deadline of when we needed to complete Phase I. As Part of the accreditation process we needed a model ready to show we are working on this process. The reality is we are not funded enough money to provide all services to students. We will take everything into consideration and discuss feedback from forums at our taskforce meetings.

*15. Is there anything specific to athletics that should be known or not known?*

Response: We have had discussions about athletics. If we go into athletics, more research needs to be done. We need facts and data we need committees and research. The athletics people need to be involved also. When RC gets their money, it will be a college decision as to how those funds will be allocated. There will be a lot more discussions then.

*16. Are you suggesting that if RC loses \$2.6 to Willow, we can take it back? Once it is gone, it is no longer available for discretionary purposes.*

Response: You are right. RC is taking the largest percentage of a hit. However, if you combine entities together, the hit is less of an impact for RC. The funding model we currently have funds position first then we look at the increases we have in benefit costs, utilities, etc. and then those things are added proportionately across it. At RC we have a higher cost of faculty and staff. When we do an FTES driven model, we are looking at the number of students we serve, not the staff we have, and then comes the discussion of balance.

*17. CTE instructors are concerned about quality of education we can give our students. We won't be able to offer as much.*

Response: We hope the quality doesn't drop. Once thing we need to look at the success rate of our students. We may need to narrow our focus. We need the data to support decisions we will be making. Regardless of what model we use, we will have less revenue next year.



18. *[Comment] If SCCCD is looking out for the best interest of all colleges and centers, this model is completely inadequate. You have to look at the numbers.*

19. *Why was there a change in the model initially? Why isn't the current model being used? Was there a way in the current model to forecast? Should the model be implemented so the impact is not so immediate and will have time to make the changes necessary?*

Response: the reason we decided to revamp the model is because there were a number of people who expresses that they didn't understand how the money was allocated. This model shows how you will get funded and then you can coordinate your programs and services accordingly. With the old model, it started as a model like this one and each year as money came in, we just added money; there was no formal integrated process. With this model you can see and predict where you will be in the future.

20. *[Comment] It seems this model has no incentive to have a CTE program. The model would have been good if we all started at day one with the model.*



- How was the percentage of funding for the district office determined? Will that percentage ever change, if so how?
- How does the District Office share in cost reductions?
- Will this allocation model be utilized in allocating resources for the 2013-14 fiscal year? If not, what will we be using, same as in the past? When will this model be completed to be implemented?
- Currently our campus is slowly strangling many programs by reducing sections across campus. Some programs cannot offer their entire curriculum for a certificate or degree to student on a fulltime basis. When will decisions be made so that some programs will be whole and others lost? Or will we continue to do it all, but poorly?
- How will faculty be reorganized, if at all?
- How/when will the DBRAC committee build the list of future consideration items into the model?
- Were there any other Community College District models that the committee reviewed, that were not driven by SB361?
- On page 18 of the PowerPoint, why does the district office have no increase (decrease) from the previous old allocation?
- On page 11 of the PowerPoint, some components for the model receiving 16 (all) votes did not get into the model, why?
- Why is there no consideration for funding of signature programs?
- This model will make some programs no longer viable. Is this the reason behind the new Signature Program taskforce?
- If the district values CTE and other “expensive” programs, why is this not reflected in the Resource Allocation Model?
- Will the Board allow colleges to eliminate signature programs and/or athletics and/or Child Development centers and/or Bookstore and /or Food services or any other non-self-sustaining programs? Who will make these decisions and how quickly will they be made?
- Why is there no consideration for the age of a campus? Maintenance and utilities are more expensive on an old campus.
- What has the Board said about this model?
- Why isn't CTC a cost center like Madera and Oakhurst?



**DRAMT OPEN FORUM**

Thursday, October 18, 2012  
Reedley College LRC 104

**CTE Background Information & Concerns:**

- We have several signature CTE programs on our campus and at FCC
  - They are very specialized and have unique needs. Therefore, they can be expensive to fund.
  - We are already “stretched”:
    - We have CTE instructional programs that ...
      - Need more Full Time Faculty (due to vacancies from retirements and/or increased workloads)
      - Need Instructional Technicians
      - Need improvements to aging instructional facilities
      - Rely heavily on Adjunct Teachers
      - Rely heavily on student employees
      - Rely heavily on grant funds (for equipment, supplies, facility improvements, student labor)
      - Perform most of their own
        - Maintenance Duties
        - Custodial Duties
        - Grounds Duties
      - Depend on one person for
        - Program Review
        - SLO’s
        - Curriculum Changes
        - Managing student employees
      - Manage Advisory Committees and Booster Groups
      - Conduct fundraisers for scholarships
      - Maintain professional affiliations important to their program areas (e.g. CATA, SAF).
      - Maintain strong relationships with industry, some involving Industry Accreditation (e.g. SAF, AED)
      - Supervise Student Internships (some of which are out-of-state)
      - Conduct numerous leadership programs, recruitment activities, and events for 4-H, FFA, and other youth groups
    - We have CTE Faculty who spend numerous hours above and beyond their normal contract load providing services to students and the campus.
    - We have departments that find it very difficult to get one person to serve as department chair (due to all of the above)!

**Questions:**

- What will be the impact of redistribution of funds on CTE Programs?





DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE  
REEDLEY COLLEGE OPEN FORUM  
October 18, 2012 – 1:00 p.m.  
LCR - 104

---

- Will the specialized needs & expenses related to CTE programs be considered in the decision-making process?
- Will there be a loss of CTE Programs? If so, how will cutting decisions be made?

Respectfully submitted by David M. Lopes, Chair of the AGNR Department