



DISTRICT BUDGET AND RESOURCE
ALLOCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 10, 2013 – 2:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Clovis Center, Room 308- Approved Minutes

Call to Order:

Committee Chair Ed Eng called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. A quorum was established. Rebecca Gonzalez, recording.

Present: DO: Ed Eng, Rebecca Gonzalez, Wil Schofield, John Bengtson, Christine Miktarian
FCC: Jothany Blackwood, Robyn Hart, Bruce Hill, Miki Johnson
RC: Jim Gilmore, Melanie Highfill, Richardson Fleuridor, Donna Berry, Miguel Flores (for Viviana Acevedo)
NC: Karen Ainsworth, Anacelly Hernandez, Lorrie Hopper, Brian Shamp, Arla Hile, Joseph Libby

Absent: Michael Wolin, Michael Wilson, Viviana Acevedo, Diane Clerou

I. Welcome: Committee Chair Eng welcomed all new members of DBRAAC. Introductions were made around the table.

II. Review of April 26, 2013 meeting summaries

Discussion: Meeting summary was approved without corrections.

III. Review of DBRAAC Operating Agreement Scope

Scope: The District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) is the district's highest-level resource planning body. Its purpose is to recommend an allocation plan for the distribution of district resources and provide input into financial matters of the district. This includes, but is not limited to, cost savings strategies, revenue generation strategies, and resource allocation modifications.

Discussion: The scope of the DBRAAC Operating Agreement was read amongst the committee with no comments or questions. The meeting schedule for DBRAAC was discussed for next year. Chairman commented that 20% of the 2014-15 Model was complete and suggested meeting on the first and third Friday of the month. The meeting schedule was agreed upon and the first meeting will be on **Friday, August 23, 2013**, which is one week after the first week of instruction for the fall semester.

Discussion: Chairman Eng summarized the model building for 2014-15 for the benefit of the new members. He explained that the model was based on SB361 and the factors that were addressed from the forums were:

- CTE (High Cost Programs)
- FT Faculty
- Facilities
- Structure
- Transition Plan
- Representation

Current Model #5 – Off the top + F/T Faculty

| Transition Plan | Average F/T Faculty |
|----------------------|---|
| Yr. 1 @ 75% = 63,750 | \$ 92,000 - Salary |
| Yr. 2 @ 50% = 42,500 | <u>23,000 - Benefits</u> |
| Yr. 3 @ 25% = 21,250 | \$115,000 |
| | <u><30,000?> p/t faculty- 30LHE</u> |
| | \$ 85,000 |

Comments were made concerning the model impacting more p/t faculty and deleting f/t faculty. The discussion further ensued with difficulty getting consensus on the transition plan of percentages. After much discussion the following motion was made:

- 1) Motion made by Robyn Hart; no second; to tier the percentages to 75%, 70%, 65% for f/t faculty. Motion did not move forward.

Model #5 was discussed and percentages were added so that everyone could see how these percentages would affect the different sites. Comments were made that transition plan should be separate from f/t faculty. Further discussion on Model #5 ensued and the following motion was made:

- 2) Motion was made by Karen Ainsworth, second by Joseph Libby; to have a three-year transition plan at 75%, at 50%, at 25% in the model. The motion was opened for discussion and after discussion the motion and second were withdrawn.

Discussion: One percent of the allocation would go to the centers with a fixed allocation to each site; F/T Faculty + Base Allocation (Transition Plan). The base cost is to help colleges and centers open their doors. The impact that PERS & STRS would have to the model was explained. Comments were made that f/t faculty needs to be a factor. It was brought to the attention of the committee that the model is interchangeable and will get reviewed and if necessary be adjusted accordingly. The following motion was made:

- 3) Motion was made by Richardson Fleuridor; second by Lorrie Hopper; to take F/T Faculty out of the model as a factor.
 - a) In Favor: 8
 - b) Oppose: 5
 - c) Abstain: 1
 - d) Motion did not achieve qualified consensus (*did not pass*)

In order to change the voting consensus, there would have to be another factor so that the committee can move forward.

- 4) Motion was made by Karen Ainsworth; second by Joseph Libby; to put in FT/Faculty as a three-year transition plan at 75%, 50%, 25%.
 - a) In favor: 10
 - b) Oppose: 4
 - c) Abstain: 2
 - d) Motion did not achieve qualified consensus (*did not pass*)

- 5) Motion was made by Lorrie Hopper; second by Karen Ainsworth; to have a four-year transition plan with f/t faculty at 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%.

- a) In Favor: 14
- b) Oppose: 2
- c) Abstain: 0
- d) Motion achieved qualified consensus (*passed*)

- IV. Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 5:10p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 23, 2013, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.