

Crafton Hills College Budget Committee Agenda

Date: October 17, 2017
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Location: CCR 247

Members (Absent*):

Mike Strong (Chair)
Rebecca Warren-Marlatt
Kathy Bakhit
Tina Marie Gimple

Stephen Ramirez
Daniel Sullivan
Scott Rippey
Kathy Crow

Brandi Mello
Jose Murguia (student)
Kirsten Colvey
Kevin Palkki (CSEA)

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Introductions		
Approve Minutes from Sept. 19 th , 2017	Approved	
Review revised charge and membership	Don't remove makeup to remove "grants manager" per Crafton Council	Send out to Rebecca for handbook.
Basic RAM Review	General funds only. Revenues are gf based on FTES. Assessments are related to services provided by district. We have some other models from similar districts in the CCC system. Expense side is our campus expenses.	Mike offered to go over anything else on the RAM individually if people needed.
Review CBT Reports for recommendations on "fixed cost" and on the RAM	<p>Observances: Mike stated that he noted many recommendations to Crafton. Cost per FTES at chc is GF only is 5500. 5104 is our revenue from state. We are negative 400 per FTES. Valley is over 104 per FTES. Economy of scale. Crafton has some of the same fiscal challenges as rural colleges. Scott: problem district has no oversight over their costs. Mike: RAM (see page 9) there is not a perfect model, but there are basic principles. Kathy: It may be fair that we are assessed 30% but do we receive 30%. Planning process for district needs to be linked to goals and strategic directions.</p> <p>Kathy: Reorg HR, wasn't supposed to cost any more, now that has changed to hiring an HR Vice Chancellor without any input from Chc. Doesn't work in good or bad times? No. No incentive for district to contain costs. Induces the colleges to compete with each other. We could use</p>	<p>Ideas: establish criteria for funding district based on FTES.</p> <p>Is our model fair: No, it's not working for Crafton. Is the model perceived to be equitable. Or fair?</p> <p>District should contain costs.</p> <p>Geographical differences are effecting our growth?</p> <p>Recommend to the district that the guiding principles are followed, how and colleges need evidence to show how or how not.</p>

incentives with savings to encourage efficiency in departments directly.

Flexible in the rate of FTES. Is it linked to planning processes? Keith did some planning work with district but it wasn't implemented as far as we know. A new committee for planning is convening.

Flexible and responsive: Kathy what things should be changing and how can the RAM be responsive. It's the structure is flawed. Service areas for the colleges are different.

Geographical area for us is thinner population and valley has a denser population. Demographics? We are serving 48% and Valley is serving 78% in serving our communities. How much of our service area are we serving between the two of us. The geographic proximity to the college is more remote here. Could be perception that Chc is removed from Redlands. Explore and determined gap perceptions.

Mariana: District has incorporated some of the guiding principles stated in the RAM.

Brain Trust Recommendations:

Word doc. #1 How Chc will grow from the 13/14 FY?
Cabinet response:

Cabinet supported the funding all FTES is funded as a base, all revenue will be assessed.... We are not supporting effective services. We added courses and suffered productivity but were funded for 18%.

#3 we need subsidy to reach FTES sustainability, like the rural college state subsidy.

District should subsidize based on chc's plan to grow. Plan needs to include some subsidies. Since May we've cut 926000 expenditures. This is not sustainable for us.

Mike: We don't rely on FCC funds for ongoing expenses. Use funds for creating pathways etc.

Kathy: Malstructure of the RAM that did not allow services to grow with growth in FTES, example STEM center. The model is not supporting us.

Mike: In the report it is stated that we will Grow to balance budget or subsidize Crafton to balance the budget.

Compare other college districts assessments if they are comparable.

Come back and have themes to address and consider our recommendation to the district for the RAM.

B1: revise the RAM by our recommendations on methodology on how to do this based on research data gathered by other similar multi-campus districts in California. Will the district be open to consideration?

Mike contends that yes, and using data and examples to show. Multi campus districts data and results to come up with strategies.

Where is the connection between district funding themselves and growing and the student growth? If we aren't growing why is the district growing?

Kathy: How is the current situation effecting Valley? The current climate and how are they doing with energy generated about Chc not growing. If one of us are sick we are all sick. Mike: Productivity to show that we are increasing productivity and cuts. How is this affecting the classroom.

Scott: Will the RAM take into consideration the fixed costs issue. Fund fixed costs first or a hybrid model.

Kathy: Address how we can be a better district. We need a model that addresses the needs of students when either campus cannot accommodate the students that can't get classes. Students are not served. It hurts us all. Focus: To become better we need to...

Kathy: Collective bargaining agreements that we live by need to be addressed. Our work is not flexible, we cannot be reactive when an agreement impacts the budgets as far as increasing the budget.

--

--

--

--

--

--

Closing Next Meeting: 11/21/17 @ 1:00-2:30pm, CCR 247	Thanksgiving Week? Reschedule?	