

**Resource Allocation Committee
September 4, 2014
Minutes**

Meeting called to order at 2:35 p.m.

1. Welcome & Introductions

Roll Call:

Committee Members in Attendance:

Janice Noble	Diana Rodriguez	Jeff Kingston
Dyan Miller	Cindy Rosefield	Ashley McHale
Michael Schwarz	Gerry Gire	Heidi Ulrech
Jennifer Farber	Cindy Balero	

Committee Members Absent:

David Everett	Keller O'Rourke
---------------	-----------------

Guests:

Dr. Barry Russell	Don Miller	Natasha Lang
-------------------	------------	--------------

Minutes taken by Sheri Moore

2. New Business

a. Chairperson for the 2014-2015 Academic Year

Motion: Gerry Gire to be the Chairperson of the 2014-2015 Resource Allocation Committee.

Moved: Michael Schwarz/Second: Cindy Balero

Vote: Approved unanimously

(Attachment A indicates 2014-2015 RAC Membership)

b. Review the Charge of the Resource Allocation Committee

Since the governance version was outdated, the committee reviewed the charge currently documented on the web site. Gerry Gire asked the committee if the RAC web version was still the most accurate as considerable work had been done on it over a year ago. Most felt the web version was the current version.

Dr. Noble referenced the "Document the College allocation decisions" bullet and questioned whether this committee should be doing something more than just documenting these decisions in minutes while the other three bullet points seemed to be of greater importance. According to former President Dr. Lease, RAC was

to have input when the budget cycle was reviewed and make recommendations to the President and College Council.

Motion: Move the first bullet, “Document the College allocation decisions...” to be the last bullet.

Moved: Dr. Janice Noble/Second: Jennifer Farber

Vote: Approved unanimously.

The proposed charge of the committee is as follows:

Using the college mission statement, this committee will guide the institutional allocation processes of the College. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- *Identify, prioritize, and recommend expenditures and non-instructional hiring priorities;*
- *Develop, evaluate, and recommend budget related processes as needed;*
- *Review relevant plans for prioritizing allocations to new programs and facilities;*
- *Document the College allocation decisions in relation to the college goals **and are** implemented in accordance to the College’s Institutional Planning Documents.*

This committee will determine the processes for tangible resource allocation and make recommendations to the college president.

Sheri Moore will check with Sharon Gach to determine if there have been any updates submitted by RAC and reviewed by College Council. The College Governance Document will be submitted to request the above change to the Charge of the Committee.

The committee agreed that the web site needed to be formally renamed “Resource Allocation Committee” rather than the “Planning & Budget Committee.” Sheri Moore will update the web page to reflect the 2014-2015 committee members.

c. Review Timeline for 2014-2015

Last year’s timeline was presented as a working document for determining the 2014-2015 timeline.

Question- Instructional Equipment: Is there money for instructional equipment? State instructional equipment allocation is about \$85k. Previous funding from Measure B could be carried over from year to year but has now been exhausted. With state funding currently our main source, it, too, can be carried over but not for more than 3 years. The planning process is supposed to be an annual planning process. If instructional equipment is in a different timing, are we really doing annual planning?

Question- Instructional Equipment: should we plan IER reviews for once a year or twice a year? Significant discussion occurred, priorities could change, state mandates, etc.

Dr. Russell indicated that the College Council and the IPC set priorities at the end of the year. They will begin the priority process in January for the following year. This planning is supposed to inform the purchasing, allocation, and spending that goes on for the next year. We are having trouble syncing up everything with the new planning model and the RAC calendar. Everything is built from program review. This year's program review gets finished in October then goes to the Deans in November. It is finalized in December/January. Equipment requests should be coming from that review and should be prioritized by RAC in early spring semester such that requisitions can be lined up and ordered in spring. Then equipment arrives at the end of summer/early Fall and is integrated into the fall semester.

Question on Positions: What is the process for non-instructional positions? It is handled in the same manner according to Dr. Russell. Until the budget is finalized, positions cannot be posted.

Jeff Kingston proposed that perhaps we have a prioritized plan that rolls over year to year where we don't think about it from a funding standpoint. When that funding is available, then tackle the top 10-15 items. We create a running list that is annually prioritized and then funded by the budget. This body would then look at both running lists (Instructional Equipment and Non-Instructional Positions) and make a recommendation. You would apply the available funding to whatever you can.

Question: How do you get on the prioritized list if something is mandated, especially in EMT or Fire Science? Answer: Bring it to the RAC and address it. Faculty hiring does something similar when there is an emergency. In the budget, you could carry contingencies for unforeseen conditions that could address those things.

Question: Does program review specify a list of non-instructional positions, instructional positions, and equipment? Currently, Program Review is too vague to generate a list of these items. RAC has to bring program reviews together. Dr. Noble brought up the subject of program reviews containing vague language for equipment- "maintaining industry standard equipment." Further, she suggested that it's not beyond the expectation that instructional equipment isn't something we always know way ahead of time. There probably needs to be something more specific in program review that hasn't been done before.

Question- Instructional Equipment: Is there any value in distributing dollars by division with deans allocating dollars based on what is included in the program reviews? Would our committee then be prioritizing like the CEMC model? The

division could then prioritize based on stated needs. Each division could get a percentage. Our committee would be much more efficient. If this group allocates based on percentage, it eliminates the timeline crunch of rankings & presentations. Since this item is of significance to others and was not included on the agenda, can we even discuss/decide this issue at this time. Per Dr. Russell, RAC is not governed by the Brown Act which requires advanced notice of agenda items.

Motion: To allocate equipment funds based on a determined percentage for each of the divisions within the guidelines of the IER dollars and using program reviews.

Moved: Diana Rodriguez/Second: Dyan Miller

Discussion: There was significant discussion around what this model could or would look like.

Wait to see if there is a timeline for the funds before voting. The committee could still rank and prioritize. Committee charge could be assuring there is a prioritization in place. Divisions could save money over from one year to the next in order to fund more expensive items. Question: Within the divisions, how would you ensure a fair process that has 20 faculty from one department vs. 1 faculty from another. This is not a new issue, but it is an important discussion point. We might want to explore other funding, like CTG. Before voting, perhaps a task force of this committee could come up with options of how this might work and/or what issues it may bring. Would the % be evaluated each year?

Asked his thoughts, Dean Don Miller shared concerns that the committee not allow the entire division to vote on prioritizing needs. In some divisions, there are huge numbers of faculty in one area and then no full-time faculty in smaller departments. For example, in VCOM, equipment needs may be most important and expensive, yet there is no full-time faculty member to vote or speak on their behalf. Additionally, it could be difficult as Dean to choose one area over the other.

The group expressed concern over the size of departments with regard to voting. Call for a vote on the motion was made.

Vote: 4 ayes; 5 nays

The committee agreed this needs more discussion. A task force was established to create a proposal outlining how this model or another version might look. Task force members will be Diana Rodriguez, Gerry Gire, Cindy Rosefield, and Natasha Lang.

The committee continued discussion on the timeline for instructional equipment and positions.

Instructional Equipment requests (IER) from the deans are scheduled to come before the RAC October meeting.

Question- IER: Shall we have 2 IER processes this year in order to catch the IPB & President's proposal for next year's allocations?

Jeff Kingston indicated that December through January is when the budget work becomes final. It goes through this cycle: Program review in October, Deans approve December/January, equipment requests prioritized by RAC in February. Equipment is ordered in spring, arrives in summer, used in fall semester. Equipment being considered in October RAC is linked to last year's priorities. By March/April, RAC should know how much money is available for other unfunded initiatives. This year the Program Review update will also have more current information available in February.

Question- State instructional equipment – how is this allocated from the state?

It is based on FTES but could change as it has in the past. This is the first year there are no strings attached. We must still follow guidelines on instructional equipment. Over the last few years, it's the amount of money that has fluctuated. Once it gets allocated to the college, it belongs to the college.

Question- Non-instructional positions: should these be moved up earlier in the year to more effectively interface with establishing the budget?

Faculty prioritization process is going on right now with results expected to the President in November. President could be looking at faculty and classified at same time. The budget should be consideration of total need and put all budget blocks together in the same time frame. The hiring process can start earlier also.

Discussion centered on moving up the non-instructional position requests to division meetings on October 15 and if there was enough time, to notify everyone. The deans felt this would not be an issue.

Motion: Move the timing of non-instructional positions forward a month (to October division meetings and reviewed by RAC in November) with instructional equipment presented at RAC in October and March – twice this year in order to move onto the planning cycle for next year.

Moved: Jeff Kingston/Second: Cindy Rosefield

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

APPROVED

Question- Non-instructional positions. What is the status of the subgroup formed last spring to work on the creation of a non-instructional rubric?

Michael reported that since Todd has left the group, he needs a new classified volunteer. Cindy B volunteered to help. He does not anticipate having the rubric ready for this year's process now that we have moved the position prioritization earlier.

3. Good of the Order

4. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Next Meeting: October 2, 2014 Room 1687