



Vice President of Administrative Services Donna Berry opened the forum at 2:00 p.m.

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

The following is a summary of questions raised and responses:

1. Why is CTC under Fresno City College and not a separate center?

Response: When we generate the budget, it is placed under Fresno City College in order to match the budget book for transparency purposes. Willow International, Madera Center, and Oakhurst have traditionally been a separate budget whereas CTC's budget has always been incorporated in FCC's. For consistency purposes and to compare allocations to prior years this model follows that structure. It was suggested at one forum to break out CTC similar to the other centers and sites and suggested at another forum to incorporate Willow International, Madera Center, and Oakhurst in Reedley College's allocation.

2. Are the numbers in the model fixed and untouchable?

Response: No, the numbers are why we are holding these forums and discussion are taking place. Other sites have expressed they can't function with the cuts they will receive with this model. When the taskforce began this process of developing a model, we discussed what concepts we wanted included in the model. Once all the concepts were agreed on, we then calculated the impact. The impact to each college/center/site was unknown until the numbers were added into the model. Reedley and FCC stated if we implement the model next year, they will not be able to function.

We are aware there are issues with maintaining facilities, but deciding how to allocate for that is not easy. Please note a lot of factors were implemented into the model since there were not enough taskforce members in agreement. If you refer to the last page of the written narrative handout you were provided, you will find a list of things we did not have a chance to address fully. Furthermore, there are other taskforce committees: HR, technology, enrollment management, and a signature programs taskforce that will meet and develop concepts; and those concepts will be incorporated into this model. As for CTE programs, they have a lower student to teacher ratio, so those programs are more expensive to run.

Keep in mind this model is a starting point; it is a living document. The standing committees will continue to revise and update the model as situations arise.

3. Regarding the Willow candidacy and when we talk about sites and centers, just for clarification, with Willow becoming another college, obviously they will get more money, and with the way the budget is right now, how does the state feel about it? Doesn't the



State Chancellor's Office need to approve that? Have we seen where they may want to back off and not create any more colleges?

Response: The ACBO fall conference was held October 22 - 24 and that question was addressed. One of the charges the chancellor asked us to look at when building this model is that it would be a model that deals with the potential of the colleges or centers growing. In the long run, this model should address both growth and decline. We hope in the near future Willow becomes a college and will receive funding. Currently, a small college is considered by the state as having less than 9,236 FTES. My assumption is that Willow will be less than 9,236. In that case, Willow would receive \$3.3 million as a college. They would not receive the current \$1.1 million, since they will no longer be considered a center.

Your second question was regarding the funding of colleges and centers. In the past with program based funding, even with SB361 to a certain extent, there were separate buckets of money, but now that we are shrinking as a system there is less money to spread amongst the various districts throughout the state. One of the proposals currently on the table is that we no longer fund colleges and centers. The reason that is being proposed is because as a system, we are inadequately funded and if we start funding new colleges and new centers we are going to cannibalize ourselves. The problem is when you want to become a college or center it entails a lot of work to get to that stage. Since we have been in this process a long time, it hurts us that the local jurisdiction wants to create a college or center, but the state, which has state jurisdiction, doesn't want to fund it. I understand funding is tight for everyone. When a center wants to become a college, there are a lot of costs associated with the accreditation process. My question to the state is if they don't fund us, will they ease the accreditation rules to mitigate our costs? ACBO assured us their accreditation liaison person will address this concern.

Another issue is at what stage will the state fund the colleges/centers? If you recall, in 2009-10 there was a \$190 million statewide workload adjustment (decrease). The next year we received a statewide workload restoration (increase) of \$126 million. And last year we received another workload reduction (decrease) of \$385 million statewide. This year will not know what will happen until Prop. 30 is voted on. The concept is we will not, if this proposal passes, fund colleges or centers until we are fully back to where we were in 2009-10 when the state took the \$190 million reduction. If Prop. 30 doesn't pass, we will lose \$8 million; last year we lost roughly \$9.5 million. We don't know how long the downturn in the economy will last. Certain areas are picking up, but unemployment is still down. It is a complicated, long, and drawn out process. It may take another two the three years until we get out of a situation where there are insufficient funds from the state. Furthermore, the accreditation process required us to be in candidacy for two years and fund Willow as a college, but we are not getting funded from the state. Even after the two years, we don't know if we will receive funding from the state for Willow.

- 4. On the model, can you explain the number under variables, the non-credit allocation FTES? I don't understand where those numbers came from.*



Response: The model is based on 2011-12 numbers, but we did not have the numbers for 2011-12 because that is the year we were working on the model, so we looked at the previous year. In the previous year (2010-11), Madera Center generated 8 non-credit FTES and the district, as a whole, generated 489 non-credit FTES. So 8 divided by 489 is 1.64%. Each year we set a cap for credit and non-credit FTES. For 2011-12 our target was 378 non-credit FTES. I took the 378 non-credit FTES and multiplied it by 1.64% and that gave us the 6 projected non-credit FTES for 2011-12. Note that we get funded for non-credit FTES a lot lower than credit FTES. If we can convert our courses to credit courses, we can receive funding at a higher level. We need more data to drive our decisions.

- 5. Has there been discussion on the demographics between RC and MC, those students that need more tutorial services, and would those tutorial services fall under regulatory allocation? We want students to start college, but we also want them to complete college. In order for them to do that, they need the tutorial services. Can that allocation fit under regulatory?*

Response: That issue was also addressed at the RC forum since the composition of their students is different from Willow and MC. SCCCDC gets funding from a number of sources: restricted and unrestricted funding. There are funds all sites receive for basic skills and other related issues. However, we, as a taskforce, did not address that issue, but it was brought up at the forum. This taskforce looks at concepts of funding as opposed to what programs each site will provide. Our task is to allocate the money and the governance committee at each college/center/site decides how to spend it. As a taskforce, we don't dictate how it is spent. Each campus/center/site has governance processes that discuss what and who they will serve.

Within our taskforce we also discussed the size of facilities, size of classrooms, caps, student need, and equalization of full-time faculty, etc. How do we measure that and how can we quantify it to put it into the funding model? The needs for the students coming from a lower income household may need more resources from student services to complete college. We welcome suggestions and will address it with the taskforce. We also discussed other funding, such as grants, which will assist with those needs in other areas. Even if we want to fund something, there are different things we have to comply with, such as FON and 50% law. Another problem we are dealing with as a district is that now that the funding stream is less plentiful, how do we continue to offer all the programs of the past when funding was more plentiful?

- 6. Will there be consensus with all campuses and colleges that each campus is going to take the lead on a signature program so we are not competing against each other and everyone is sharing?*

Response: Dr. Railey, the new vice chancellor will head the taskforce that will address that issue. That committee is scheduled to begin shortly after his arrival. I don't know if there will be only



one of each signature program throughout the district. Signature programs are offered at a location normally because there is expertise on the campus, or because there is access to equipment, facilities, or partners. If we collapse the programs and only offer them at one site, it may pose a challenge for students to attend. The program also needs to be examined to see if there is a community need. For instance, there may be a local business that benefits from the students coming from the signature programs and, in turn, the business may agree to partner with the college to support the program. The committee will discuss and debate this issue. If you can suggest a model of how we can integrate it with what we have now, we can develop a formula so it can be inserted into the model.

7. *I understand the model will change and feedback is needed. I would like to see more faculty and students from Madera represented so you can get the information needed to allow you to make those decisions. Is there any possible way you can get more faculty and students from Madera? While it is possible the needs were represented, in the end it came down to a vote and those were not represented. Even if you thought of any other model, it would have been better than this.*

Response: This is the third forum where the question of representation was raised. One site said they want more representatives, one said it should be equal, and one said it should be proportional to the amount of FTES generated. These are great concepts, but each site has a different opinion on representation. When the taskforce was first established in May 2011 we had the North Centers. Chancellor's cabinet made sure the taskforce had the normal governance structure and North Centers, at that time, was looked at as a whole.

This membership represents everyone from day one; however since then some members have moved around. For instance, Janell Mendoza is shown at two sites because she was interim for a time at FCC when Michael Guerra left. When Cheryl Sullivan was hired, Janell returned to North Centers. Keep in mind that the taskforce did not create the composition. It was determined by chancellor's cabinet. They looked at the composition of other committees and followed that lead. Also keep in mind CSEA is not site specific. CSEA decides who they want and from which site. We can't tell CSEA they have to have a representative from each site. There were also students who were on the taskforce, but depending on their schedule, they were not always able to attend. Lastly, the taskforce was open to the whole district.

8. *If you are a college or center you receive a certain amount and if you are a site you don't receive anything? How many FTES does a site need to become a center? Would it be in our best interest to pull our FTES together?*

Response: The state does not pay us for a site. In order for a site to be considered a center, a site needs 250 FTES. There are also other requirements that need to be met. Even if, for instance, we decide to grow Oakhurst to be a center, the state may not fund it. In regards to if we should pull our FTES together, every year the FTES numbers are calculated to determine what would be the



DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE

OPEN FORUM

October 26, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.

Madera Center

optimum amount we could receive if we combine our FTES. Once Willow becomes a college, their FTES won't count with RC. It is hard to predict how the numbers are going to go.

It would be nice if the state would give us the money one year in advance so we can plan a full year. Right now we are planning our fall schedule for next year. We are trying to figure our targets and don't know what the state is going to pay us.. We don't know what the state is going to do this fiscal year let alone next year.

9. *How much did the taskforce look at the planning of the future and how we can grow our colleges in the midst of all of this going on? How much of your planning was to help our colleges continue to grow and keep our campuses where we are right now?*

Response: The reality is for the past three or four years, we have had dwindling resources. We are in more of a survival mode than a growth mode. We are fortunate to have reserves to balance some of those issues. Many districts in the state do not have reserves and will have significant problems. We don't know what will happen to some of our sister colleges and districts throughout the state. The state used to fund us for growth, but we haven't had funding from the state for cost of living adjustment (COLA) for a number of years. This model is a model that could grow if we get the funding.