

San Bernardino Community College District

Resource Allocation Committee

Meeting Notes – October 20, 2009

In Attendance: Bruce Baron, John Stankas, Aimee Marshall, Colleen Gamboa, Ben Gamboa, Penny Ongoco, Jim Hansen, Charlie Ng, Troy Sheffield, Cheryl Marshall, Matthew Isaac, Glen Kuck, Rick Hrdlicka, Renee Brunelle

Guest: Damon Bell.

The meeting opened with introductions.

Bruce Baron handed out information from the October 15, 2009 Accreditation Follow-Up Report that pertained to the requirement for the District to work on a District budget model and a Human Resources Plan.

Troy Sheffield expressed that there were other areas of the Accreditation Report that would overlap into the work of this committee. For example, the need for a technology plan would have an impact on the budget model. This was acknowledged.

There was general discussion about the timeline for the project and it was acknowledged that there was only four months to work on the development of the reports – between now and the end of February. In March, a final report would have to be written and shared for collegial consultation which needs to conclude by late April before final exams and the end of the spring 2010 semester.

Bruce suggested that we look at models from other Districts to see what we would want to adopt for our model.

John Stankas suggested that we need to understand our current model's strengths and weaknesses and be able to explain to our constituency groups why we needed to change the model.

Bruce asked Charlie Ng to describe his work with the model and how he tried to apply the model to the Crafton Hills 2008-2009 allocations. Charlie described a process where the numbers did not support the model as described and that the model was broken up into several pieces some allocated based on historical patterns, some allocated based on a 70%-30% split between the two colleges, some based on consensus and some based on other methods.

Jim Hansen agreed that it was important for him to understand where we were coming from in order to know where we needed to go.

Ben Gamboa and Troy agreed that it would be useful to understand the existing model.

John Stanskas stated and it was generally agreed to that one of our largest issues that caused us to be "dinged" by the accreditation visiting team was the lack of communication about the budget from the District Office to the campuses. Most people on the campuses have no idea that a budget model exists and how budget decisions are made. Communication will need to improve for this finding to improve.

Based on the desire of the group, Bruce asked Penny Ongoco to work with himself and the two Administrative Vice Presidents to provide an example of how the model worked so the group could determine what was good and not so good about the model going forward. This seemed like the best starting point given the tight timeline.

The group did some brainstorming on what criteria were important to include in a budget model. Some of the responses included: growth, FTES, facilities needs, productivity (WSCH/FTEF), equipment (technology and software), and multi-year stability. Charlie described some attributes of some other community college models.

It was difficult to find a time for the next meeting with so many meetings already scheduled. We finally agreed on Monday November 2 at 1pm. Bruce will send an email with a room.

The meeting was adjourned.