



---

## SPRING 2010 RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL SURVEY

---

**Overview:** The 2008 Accreditation Evaluation Report stated that “Employees should be provided with adequate financial information...” As a result, the District is in the process of developing a Resource Allocation Model that is transparent and easily understood. In April of 2010, Crafton Hills College (CHC) was introduced to a draft of the new Resource Allocation Model. Managers, Faculty, and Staff were given the opportunity to review the new model during regularly scheduled management team, Academic Senate, and Classified Senate meetings. Charlie Ng, Vice President of Administrative Services introduced the new Resource Allocation Model by presenting the draft and providing a handout with the new model to all attendees at the meetings. Further, Charlie was available to provide explanation, clarification, answer questions and promote discussion of the draft Resource Allocation Model.

**Methodology:** In an effort to obtain feedback on the model, a short survey was administered by email to the CHC Management, Faculty, and Staff participants at the meetings where the Resource Allocation Model was presented. The survey included two questions using a four-point likert scale with choices ranging from *Strongly Agree* to *Strongly Disagree*. These questions asked respondents to rate their agreement with the ease of understanding and transparency of the model. In addition, there was one open ended question requesting suggestions and comments on the draft of the new resource allocation model.

**Sample:** Sixteen respondents chose to participate in the Resource Allocation Model Survey from April 12<sup>th</sup> to April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

---

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

---

Overall, respondents were satisfied with the ease of understanding and the transparency of the resource allocation model. Specifically, in Table 1, respondents were more likely to *agree* or *strongly agree* (94%) that the model was easy to understand. In addition, Table 2 illustrates that respondents were more likely to *agree* or *strongly agree* (82%) that the model was transparent.

Table 1		
<i>The Model is easy to understand</i>	N	%
Strongly Agree	3	19%
Agree	12	75%
Disagree	1	6%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
Total	16	100%

Table 2		
<i>The Model is transparent</i>	N	%
Strongly Agree	3	19%
Agree	10	63%
Disagree	2	12%
Strongly Disagree	1	6%
Total	16	100%

When respondents were asked to provide additional suggestions and comments about the draft Resource Allocation Model, 11 respondents (69%) chose to do so. The suggestions and comments are shown below:

- PDC should be moved to column J- auxiliary.
- Column J includes a description with the title "trust funds", I would like clarification on what those are.
- Do the salaries include the new director of marketing?
- Shouldn't the estimate include at least a portion of the SERP salaries because it is unrealistic that none of the positions will be filled?
- PDC should be moved to Assessment for Auxiliary Operations (Column J).
- When can the campus expect updates- continued communication as these forecasted numbers change? (i.e. May update, July Legislation)
- PDC should be moved to the "Assessment for Auxiliary Operations" column. District Budget Committee should review and approve proposed District services and budget for "Assessment for District Office." Plans to reduce the amount of "Assessment for Auxiliary Operations" should be presented to the District Budget Committee. How are General Fund, Unrestricted Federal Revenues allocated?
- Please increase transparency by including the 11 page "CHC Annual Planning Priorities 2010-2011" at each meeting, showing what the actual priorities are and how much is going to each "Theme" and "Area". I feel this is a very big part of the Resource Allocation Model that should not be left out. The model made references to the CHC Annual Planning Priorities 2010-2011, leaving many questions unanswered. There were

no copies of the CHC Annual Planning Priorities 2010-2011 at the Resource Allocation Model meeting to review. I could not find the CHC Annual Planning Priorities on any e-mails sent to me. I was told that it was at the bottom of an e-mail sent to the campus but found it very difficult to find it. As it turned out, I gave up and asked Research and Planning for their copy to get the information.

- It will be important to see how the model is implemented. a model is one thing whereas actual use is another
- I think the model is a great beginning; however, when we begin to use percentages as a basis for allocating dollars, we (Crafton Hills College) lose in the process. A straight percentage allocation assumption assumes all costs and dollars are viable, and this is not the case. A certain portion of any allocation method has to recognize and acknowledge some of the costs are fixed. Once fixed costs are recognized and allocated on a 100% basis, then those dollars left over after the fixed costs have been allocated can be allocated on a Disagree0/70 split. Secondly, I am not in favor of the District taking their piece of the pie from each campus after the split between the campuses is made. This permits them to have 100% funding and not have to share the pain of the over budget shortfall.
- Some gaps need to be attended to. Showing the formula/s for how money is disbursed between campuses would be appreciative.

Any questions regarding this report can be directed to the ORP at: (909) 389-3391 or you may send an e-mail request to [mriggs@craftonhills.edu](mailto:mriggs@craftonhills.edu).