

*RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT*

*Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force*

*Tuesday – April 8, 2008*

*9:00 - 11:00 a.m.*

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Call to Order
- II. Budget Allocation Model Design
  - BAM Development Input from Strategic Planning Committees
  - BAM Sketch Review and Discussion with Dr. Buysse
- III. Other
  - Timelines and Open Issues
  - Assignments
- IV. Next Meeting
  - April 18, 2008
- V. Adjournment

*RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT*

*Budget Allocation Model Development Task Force  
Meeting of April 8, 2008*

MINUTES

**Task Force Members**

Aaron Brown, Interim Vice Chancellor, Administration & Finance - Present  
Patti Braymer, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance - Present  
Becky Elam, Vice President, Business Services (Riverside) - Present  
Norm Godin, Vice President, Business Services (Norco) - Present  
Michael McQuead, Associate Professor, CIS (Moreno Valley) - Present  
Bill Orr, Vice President, Business Services (Moreno Valley) - Present  
Cindy Taylor, Outreach/Passport to College Coordinator (Riverside) - Absent  
Tom Wagner, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Norco) - Absent  
Ajene Wilcoxson, Associate Professor, Business Administration (Riverside) – Present  
Vickie Vega – (Recorder)

**Resources/Guests**

Dr. James Buysse, Interim Chancellor – (Guest)

**I. Meeting was called to order**

**II. Input from Strategic Planning Committees (SPC)**

Bill and Michael presented the BAM Option E to the Moreno Valley Academic Senate. It was received well with positive feedback.

**III Budget Allocation Model Design**

Dr. Buysse presented his thoughts, and perspective on key issues and theories to consider/incorporate in a budget allocation model:

Expectations

- There is no “perfect model”. A goal should be to create a model that works but recognize that it will evolve over time.
- Keep it as simple as possible.
- Educate everyone that it is not the “be all, end all”, but is a good-faith effort to start moving the institution forward.
- There will be significant constraints on the District as a whole (Collective Bargaining, 75/25 Faculty Obligation, 50% Law).
- Charge to the BAM Task Force – “Manage Expectations”.
- Still considers the Tentative Budget be a “Continuing Resolution Budget” since there are so many unknowns with the State budget.
- Tentative Budget
- 5% Ending Balance Target – It is a concept that has served the District well over time. It is calculated based on the sum of the Beginning Balance + Revenues, which is a more constructive approach than the State prescribes.
- Each campus has to achieve their own enrollment targets:
  - FTES
  - Formulas for variable expenses
    - ❖ Unused would go into a “President’s Venture Fund”
    - ❖ Eliminates end of year spend down madness
    - ❖ “Program Review Fund” which can be used to rectify certain program problems
- Key Pieces of the BAM:
  - Needs to provide for Incentives/Disincentives
  - How will the model address if a campus goes into a deficit situation?

- ❖ Short-term loan?
- ❖ How will it be paid back?
- ❖ Who will pay it?
- WSCH per FTEF need to be developed for every discipline. Enrollment targets will then need to be considered which will then help to determine faculty ratios.
  - ❖ Look to hiring outside help to assist us in sorting this out (BAM Phase II).
  - ❖ Support staff and management positions will need to be dealt with separately (may need to develop standards).
- Consider an advance on the additional funding we'll receive for Moreno Valley and Norco college status (Small College Factor meets this objective). Will attempt to make the case with the State that additional funding should begin this year.
- Positions – In general, each entity will retain their existing positions. The planning process should drive this. New programs that have been approved will need to be financially supported by District and the other three campuses.
- Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratios – This needs to be looked at on a District-wide basis. There's no empirical evidence regarding the perfect ratio. A ratio is not specified in the accreditation standards.
- High Cost Programs – We cannot shy away from these programs. We need to be a comprehensive Community College so we have to have a mix of programs. Planning will drive what new courses will be developed and added.
- Past decisions – We will not be able to change FTES growth allocation for a number of years because of decisions made in the past (Nursing/Sciences, RSA).
- Budget Savings

- Define Variable vs. Fixed Costs
- The Part-Time Faculty Budget is really District responsibility in the near term
- Full-Time Position Vacancy Savings – Can't fund new positions (needs further discussion)
- Unspent Remodel budgets may not be rolled over automatically. This will be a District-wide decision based on the availability of funds.
- We need to have contingency plans in place if the State situation continues to deteriorate.

#### **VI. Next Meeting**

- Next BAM Meeting is tentative scheduled for Friday, April 18, 2008. Vickie will send out an email to see if this date will work or possibly Tuesday, April 22, 2008.

DRAFT

### Riverside Community College District Budget Allocation Model PHASE ONE

DRAFT

