DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE
OPEN FORUM
October 10, 2012 – 11:00 p.m.
OAB Room 114

Taskforce Chair Ed Eng opened the forum at 11:10 a.m.
The Districtwide Resource Allocation Model Taskforce PowerPoint was presented and the floor was opened for questions.

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

1. *FCC allocation decreased by over $2 million. In the past there was no allocation model in place. It appears FCC is being penalized. What are trustees doing to make a good model now and mitigate the past?*

Response: As the district moves forward in integrated planning we need to address several areas that will impact the resource allocation model. Standard III of the accreditation not only addresses fiscal resources, but also the human, physical, and technology resources. We are the first taskforce to complete our work. Unfortunately, the other taskforces are not done with theirs. Once all taskforces complete their work, we will have better understanding of each and how they interrelate to each other.

This model does not address all the issues in the process; this is just one piece of the process. The committee will continue to meet on a regular basis and review the model as it receives feedback and will modify the model based on feedback received. Once the final version is in place, the model will be reviewed on an annual basis.

2. *Slide 11: question on efficiency factor. San Diego defined efficiency factor as 35 FTES for each FTEF. Was that identical efficiency factor applied to this model?*

Response: The efficiency factor outlined by San Diego is not in this model. There were many things we looked at we did not have sufficient data on. When different models were reviewed we tried to understand what they were doing, how the funds were allocated, and if there was a correlation with our district. We looked for comparable concepts. What were presented in the PowerPoint are things we thought interesting and would add value to the model, but not all components were utilized. The model presented should be looked at as a rough draft and it will evolve over time.

3. *DRAMT phase 1 handout: Not much of what is in the DRAMT phase I narrative is in the model presented. It talks about different funding.*

Response: The DRAMT Phase I narrative walks you through the process of how resources are allocated. The narrative is an expanded explanation of the allocation model. The piece of the model we are referring to is unrestricted funds. We included restricted and unrestricted in the document to provide an explanation of the different funding received.

4. *The model seems to be entirely driven by SB 361. There doesn't seem to be much discretion for the district, or colleges.*

Response: Correct, it is primarily driven by SB361. Since SCCCD is funded indirectly according to SB361, it was determined the colleges be funded that way also.

5. *It shows many of the resources allocated are off SB361 and tie directly to size and FTES, but one thing I've noticed at FCC and RC is there needs to be a component to address certain colleges or facilities that have an aging factor; they require more resources. Some of our other campuses are state-of-the-art and require a lot less and are more self-sufficient and easier to maintain. I don't see that addressed in any of the models. It needs to be an added factor.*

Response: That subject was discussed when the taskforce addressed square footage allocation. It began a whole new dialogue of old vs. new buildings. How to incorporate it will be a little more difficult, but we did recognize FCC and RC are older facilities and there are costs associated with that fact. The old model before SB361 provided monies for deferred maintenance. It is still something on our taskforce radar.

6. *Why aren't the district office expenses moved to the "off the top" category? It would make more sense to move it there.*

Response: The costs noted at the bottom of the model map for the DO are variable costs. The "off the top" costs are fixed costs. Part of that was to have some accountability at the district office. If all the campuses are taking hits, the district office takes a hit too. If you move all the DO expenses to "off the top" there is no transparency as to what happens at the district office.

7. *Membership: Why is Janell listed under FCC and the centers? Was she wearing two hats at that time? It appears RC is missing a CSEA representative.*

Response: This taskforce has been meeting for over one year. Those listed represent who was on the committee since the first meeting as well as the current representation through Phase I. As taskforce members were replaced, their name remained to reflect their representation. In regards to CSEA representation, CSEA representation is not by site location. It is by who CSEA selected to serve on the taskforce.

DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE
WILLOW INTERNATIONAL OPEN FORUM
October 12, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.
AC1- 150

President Ikeda opened the forum at 2:05 p.m.
The Districtwide Resource Allocation Model Taskforce PowerPoint was presented and the floor was opened for questions.

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

1. *I understand the allocation model is a living model. However, I have one suggestion, since we are an up and coming campus, and this is such an efficient campus, shouldn't efficiency be used as a factor? Being based on efficiency rather than size is a great motivator. Efficiency should be rewarded.*

Response: This is one of the issues we looked at in the model. Keep in mind it is not possible to incorporate all the concepts we reviewed. We had a timeline to develop this model and needed have something in place for the accreditation team. There are number of things we wanted to look at, but did not have data on everything.

2. *Will efficiency be determined by the district office or the committee?*

Response: The taskforce looks at what is in the best interest of the district. When we look at efficiency factors, some will favor some site over others. This is our starting point, down the line it may change. When the taskforce discussed concepts, they were discussed before numbers were added, so we would not be influenced by numbers. Once the concepts were agreed on, numbers were added. We have to be equitable in how funds are distributed.

3. *It does not appear membership is represented fairly. There is CSEA but not AFT. Since North Centers no longer exists, it is important Willow has a fair faculty representation. Technically Jay now represents Reedley College.*

Response: This is the same format used for other district committees. This taskforce did not decide the membership. When the taskforce was established, we still had the North Centers. Furthermore, CSEA is represented separately, according to state law.

4. *(Referencing Allocation Slide) It doesn't appear this model takes into account signature programs. Could the model show how much money each site receives for their signature programs? This also doesn't show external funding received. Some programs have a pool of external money, but it is not reflected in the allocation model. We should know what campuses are getting external funds. When people ask for more money for signature programs they also need to look at all the external funds that come through categorical funding.*

Response: The new VC of Educational Services and Institutional Effectiveness is looking into signature programs. This taskforce's responsibility is to allocate the resources (money) to the college/campus/site. Once it is allocated, it is up the college/campus/site to allocate the funds to what programs they want to provide. How the money is spent is up the governance committees and various committees at the colleges/centers/sites. As for external funding, the external funding changes from year to year. Depending on how aggressive sites go after external funding can determine if you get funding. If you are referring to Perkins funding, that will be discussed in Phase II. This is only Phase I of the model HR, Technology, Enrollment Management, and Signature Programs. There are other taskforces that will impact this model. As soon as the other taskforces complete their work and provide their input, this model could change.

5. *(Comment on Efficiency) When it comes to the core function of the college that means students. That's what I mean by efficiency. I'm glad to see efficiency was rated high. It should be a big part of what you do. When you talk about efficiency it should be based on legitimate arguments of efficiency.*

6. *When do we start getting the $2.7 million more? Is it retroactive?*

Response: It is based on the other meetings and forums we will have and the information gathered that will then go back to the DRAMT. The taskforce will address concerns raised and, if the taskforce feels the model needs to be adjusted, then we will make an adjustment. It will then be presented to chancellor's cabinet for acceptance, and then we will move forward. We are still in the process.

7. *(Comment) The chancellor has continued to push for weekly student contact hours (WSCH) for FTES, so there should be some incentive in this model for achieving that. 525 is the magic number, so for every point above 525, you might want to give additional money. Then you incentivize reaching that number and encourage the other campuses to try and reach that number. If there is no monetary reward, you will not achieve that efficiency rating. In fact, we end up penalizing ourselves, we are so efficient, if forces me to offer fewer classes because we are able to hit our FTE target by offering larger classes. It is penalizing our students because the range of courses we have to offer ending up being last.*

8. *(Comment) When we are talking about efficiency, I wasn't thinking energy efficiency, I was thinking based on FTES. It seems like FTES is a number that is being used significantly with this whole thing. When we were looking at our program, the way the numbers were explained to me, is that our program is very efficient because of our FTES compared to our WSCHs. We are extremely efficient in that whole aspect and that is what is generating funds for the district. If we are showing efficiency over the 525, we should be rewarded. Especially because of that, we are subsidizing other sites.*

9. *In the model the FTES generated on site stays on site. How do FTES goals get calculated? How is the spread determined? Is there a thought process or is it historic.*

Response: Whatever money we receive from the state of California, less the base funding received for colleges/centers/site, and then divide that amount by $4,565. That is how much the state pays us. Each year we come up with a cap and a target. The target is how many students we want to serve above what the state pays us. As for the spread, it has been based on historical data in the past and we will be discussing those process. The presidents are involved in those discussions.

10. *If we go off of what is in the current model, it is actually advantageous to us. Are we getting the excess?*

Response: Once the money is allocated to you, you spend the money how the governance process at your college/center/site decides how you spend the money.

11. *How many other forums have you conducted and can you share what their concerns were? When FCC rehabilitated the library, didn't they raise money to do that? Could they do that with other expenses and raise money in these tough economic times rather than put the burden the rest of us?*

Response: Concerns of FCC included: (1) the age of the facility was not taken into consideration in the model; (2) a newer site would not have to spend the same amount of money for rehab or maintenance. Remember we are a district and are not going to separate everyone. We have capital project funding that provides deferred maintenance funds for facilities and we have Measure E bonds. If you recall, Willow was the benefactor of Measure E bonds. We anticipate another state bond measure. Bond measures are done in even years and 2014 doesn't look promising. If 2014 doesn't have a state bond measure we will need to look at 2016.

12. *I understand older facilities need to be rehabbed, but we have facilities we have here we can't use due to funding. I figure the more students we can bring in here, the more nursing students, and have them graduate they become higher members of the tax base that send money to Sacramento and have better lives for themselves. I worry about efficiency and they worry about older buildings. Efficiency should be big part of the value system. Getting students though the system should be the main goal. Efficiency should not be drowned out by arguments about old buildings.*

Response: Every site has issues. Students have the option of choosing the site they want to attend. Staff does not have that choice and are limited as to what they have at that site. The taskforce is trying to have a methodology equitable for everyone.

(Comment by Janell Mendoza) Having had the opportunity to work at FCC, you get a different perspective of their issues, problems, and what they are dealing with, so I understand why facility age is an issue for them. It is not just the capital projects they are referring to, but the day to day maintenance of the facilities and the operation. Willow has excellent facilities and is very fortunate they are new, but if you take a tour of FCC you will see they have many challenges they deal with on a daily basis and not just capital projects. It costs much more on everyday maintenance. Every campus is going to have their issues. As a taskforce we recognize that and are trying to develop a model that will work best for the district as a whole. Other colleges that we reviewed revisit their models every year as issues change. It will never be set in stone. As to signature programs, the taskforce also recognizes that you can take a program that generate very little FTE, and when you are generating very little FTE you are not getting funded a lot of money for a program that is extremely expensive to run. Colleges make a choice which signature programs they will offer. Sometimes it is a program you know you will not generate a lot of money from, but because of the good to the community as a whole, we have to try and offer it anyway.

13. *As a committee, you agreed this was the model you wanted? We are going to keep equal representation on each campus, right? This is what you wanted to put forward Do you still agree? You are standing behind it as a committee, correct?*

Response: The taskforce would have liked to have spent more time developing this model; this is what we developed during the time frame we were given. We can spend another year on this model and still not develop a model that everyone will be happy with.

14. *I suggest the taskforce revisit the value of efficiency.*

Response: We are just a taskforce. We have worked out the framework and will pass the framework on to the standing committee, which is the DBRAAC. The Districtwide Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) will be tasked with looking at this further. Our taskforce was only tasked with developing the frame, not all the details.

DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE
DISTRICT OFFICE OPEN FORUM
October 17, 2012 – 10:00 a.m.
District Board Room

Interim Associate Vice Chancellor Diane Clerou opened the forum at 10:00 a.m.

The Districtwide Resource Allocation Model was presented by the district office members of the taskforce then the floor was opened for questions.

The following is a summary of questions raised and responses:

1. *How did we get the $14M for the DO? How was the number generated?*

Response: The $14M for the DO was calculated for the model by taking the District's XX0 allocation for the 2011-12 fiscal year and backing out the estimated amounts for the Regulatory Costs and the Districtwide Fixed Costs. The balance was the $14M figure. That $14M was then divided by the total districtwide funds available for allocation to calculate the 10.599% figure that was put into the model. When the total available funds go up or down, the District Office's allocation will adjust up or down accordingly.

2. *Will the hits be taken before the allocation of excess resources?*

Response: It will be taken before the allocation.

3. *If the model is converse, the DO wouldn't receive excess allocation, or would that be funded through integrated planning?*

Response: This model will be a living document. This taskforce will evolve into a standing committee. The model will be evaluated by the standing committee annually. The model also addresses how excess funds will be allocated. Allocation percentages will change as FTES changes. This is just one of the many taskforces currently in place. Facilities and technology taskforce committees, and human resources is coordinating a staffing plan task force, which will begin meeting very soon. The HR taskforce will make recommendations to the chancellor, some of which may be negotiable. The DRAMT taskforce was the first model. Other taskforces will feed into this model.

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

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:*
   a. *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?*
   b. *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?*
   c. *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 FTESs 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] Is 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?

- 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

DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL TASKFORCE
OPEN FORUM
October 26, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.
Madera Center

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. SCCCD 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 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.