

Meeting Agenda

April 16, 2015, 2 pm, PDC 104

- I. Welcome & Introductions
- II. Approve February 19, 2015 Meeting Minutes
- III. Approval of Revised RAM Guidelines for FY 2014-15 and 2015-16 as Recommended by the Enrollment Management Plan Task Force 1
- IV. 2015-16 Budget Development Tasks March-May

March
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 16: Prior and current year line budgets, instruction packet, and due dates are forwarded to Campus Presidents and Chancellor for distribution to responsibility centers. • Mar 17 - Apr 8: Campus budget processes determine priorities and reallocation of funds; responsibility center managers prepare budget forms for submittal to District.
April
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apr 9: Development Budget reports to establish Preliminary Budget due at District. • April 16 May 7: District Budget Committee reviews Preliminary Budget and develops recommended adjustments, if any, for Chancellor's Cabinet. • April 29: Chancellor's Cabinet is updated on status of Preliminary Budget. Reviews recommended adjustments as necessary.
May
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 21: Tentative Budget is presented to the District Budget Committee. • May 28: Board is updated on status of budget process and receives Preliminary Budget (no formal action required).

- V. Adjournment & Next Meeting
 - A special meeting of the District Budget Committee to review the 2015-16 Preliminary Budget is being scheduled for May 7, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in PDC 104.
 - The next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee remains May 21, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in PDC 104.



BUDGET COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
2/19/2015, 2:30 pm, PDC 104

Attendance

Members Present – Walt Chatfield, Rhonda Prater, Matthew Isaac, Miriam Fadel, Rosemarie Hansen, Jeremy Sims (for Glen Kuck), Jose Torres, Ruby Zuniga, Girija Raghavan, Mike Strong

Members Absent – Stacy Meyer, Vanessa Osorio, James Dulgeroff, Jack Miyamoto, Steve Sutorus, Cheryl Marshall, Denise Allen-Hoyt, Yendis Battle, Gloria Fisher, Scott Stark, Larry Strong

Guests Present – Greg Allred

Welcome/Introductions

Jose Torres called the meeting to order. Welcome and introductions were made for the new student rep from Crafton, Miriam Fadel.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Matthew Isaac made a motion, which Rosemarie Hansen seconded, to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2015 meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

DBC Recommendation 2015-04 to Revise 2015-16 Budget Directives

Jose reported back to the committee on DBC recommendation 2015-04. The chancellor's response with an explanation that addresses Gloria's concern that COLA get spent automatically on salaries. There were no further comments. *(Addendum to minutes – the Board of Trustees, at its 2/19/2015 meeting, did NOT approve the revised Budget Directives for 2015-16 for lack of a second to the motion.)*

Review of BP/AP 6200 Budget Preparation for District Assembly

Mike Strong submitted feedback on BP/AP 6200 Budget Preparation, which was prepared by the CHC Budget Committee. Jose will forward this onto Stacey Nikac to review the District Assembly Work Group. Rosemarie asked why the following statement appeared to be stricken from BP 6200: "Unrestricted general reserves shall be no less than the prudent reserve defined by the State Chancellor's Office and Board Budget Priorities 5%." It was noted that this statement was not stricken but instead moved to BP 6250 on Budget Management. Jose advised that Kelly would verify this. *(Addendum to minutes – the statement in question does appear in the draft version of BP 6250.)*

Review of Accreditation Results

Jose reviewed the recent accreditation report results as they related to the Resource Allocation Model. The committee discussed the resource allocation model and felt that much progress had been made toward transparency. The suggestion was made that a quarterly newsletter might be helpful, or getting the word out that District Budget Committees are open for all to attend. Jose talked about forming a DBC subcommittee to present the new RAM policy to the college budget committees, once it is finalized.

2015/16 Budget Development Tasks

Jose advised that due to the implementation of Questica, some of the budget development dates were being changed:

- February 24 distribution of budget to the campus presidents is being delayed to March 9.
- The March 27 due date from the campus will be changed to April 2.

Adjournment & Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Budget Committee is scheduled for March 19, 2015 2:00 p.m. in PDC 104.

Not Yet Approved



MEMO

To: Bruce Baron, Chancellor

From: Tim Oliver, District Budget Committee Chairperson

Re: District Budget Committee Recommendations –
Resource Allocation Model (RAM) Guidelines

Date: 4/28/2014

The District Budget Committee (DBC) recommends that the following guidelines be adopted for the FY 2014-15 Resource Allocation Model and incorporated into the FY 2014-15 Budget Document.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL GUIDELINES
Fiscal Years 2014-2015 & 2015-2016

Adopted by the District Budget Committee: 4/24/2014

Revenues shall be divided between the two colleges of the District, San Bernardino Valley College and Crafton Hills College, in accordance with the following principles.

- (1) The SB361 State Base Allocation revenue for each college shall be passed directly on to the college concerned.
- (2) The District's State Credit/Noncredit FTES Allocation revenue shall be divided between the two colleges in accordance with the relative FTES numbers achieved by the colleges in the latest available State Chancellor's Principal Apportionment report, i.e. Period 1 (P1), Period 2 (P2), Recalculation, or Advance Apportionment.
- (3) Other eligible revenues received by the District shall be divided between the two colleges in accordance with the relative FTES numbers achieved by the colleges as in item (2) above.
- (4) Site-specific revenues will remain with the college concerned.
- (5) District growth levels/targets may be recommended by District Budget Committee and approved/modified by the Chancellor's Cabinet.
- (6) Districtwide assessments shall be divided between the two colleges in accordance with the relative FTES numbers achieved by the colleges as in item (2) above.

These guidelines accord best with the desired objectives of transparency, fairness, and ease of understanding; and have the flexibility to adjust to changing circumstances, without the need for extensive debate and readjustment every fiscal year.