

Minutes

District Committee on Budget & Finance

December 18, 2012
2 p.m.

College of San Mateo, Bldg 10 Room 468

Attendees:

Kathy Blackwood, Eloisa Briones, Raymond Chow, David Clay, Laura Demsetz, Maggie Garcia (absent), Robert Hood, Maggie Ko (absent), Barbara Lamson, Vickie Nunes, Molly Prado (absent), Alex Shkurko (absent), Masao Suzuki, Jozsef Veres, Henry Villareal, Linda Whitten

Guest/s:

Agenda topics

Budget Update/Accreditation/Audit Update

Blackwood/All

Kathy announced that the District continues to receive redevelopment money and should Measure G not renew for some reason, we would have funds from redevelopment to help offset the loss.

Kathy was appointed to the Matriculation committee at the State level to work on implementation of SB1486 of the student success bill which would repurpose matriculation funds to meet student success goals. Matriculation funds would now be limited to certain activities such as counseling, orientation and student educational planning. The committee is extensively looking at each of the matriculation data elements to see whether or not continue and keep them as is or change them including how funding is used. Data will be collected beginning with Spring 2013 and recommendations made to the Board of Governors (BOG). Based on the data collected, it would be used to drive funding in 2014-15. Currently, matriculation is a 3 to 1 match which means we spend \$3 of Fund 1 dollars for every \$1 spent on matriculation. Since the definition has been limited, Kathy will push for lowering the level of match.

Masao wanted to clarify a standard definition of “matriculation.” Kathy’s understanding is that it is the process by which we help students achieve their goals whether it is getting them registered in classes, advising them on their program of study, helping them build a student educational plan and any intervention we might do to help the student reach their goal. In our case, the goal may not necessarily be graduation. This categorical (SB1486) does not include assessment and is now being repurposed and requires that the every student have a student educational plan.

All Colleges are in the process of the second or third accreditation draft and Kathy believes they will be out for public viewing in mid to late January. Kathy mentioned that there will be regular meetings about accreditation at Chancellor’s Council that includes the researchers and College Accreditation Liaison Officers (ALOs). There was also a push to hire permanent staff for accreditation and there would be more discussion at the board retreat scheduled for February.

Laura and Linda shared the amount of work required by the standards and that they have both been extremely busy. David mentioned the need to consolidate as there is too much redundancy. Kathy said that we would like to make it easy for the visiting teams to cut and paste directly from the College reports. She also heard that perhaps Shirley Kelly would be able to assist in reviewing the self-studies at the final stages for phrasing and consistency.

The District audit was completed and Ray stated that the final report will be coming out very soon. Most of the findings were mainly compliance related student issues. Kathy and Ray met with the College Vice Presidents recently and the current plan would be to create student instructional and student services sub groups similar to the finance group for internal control.

The main issues that arose during the audit include keeping student records updated, having the appropriate back up for positive attendance, having the correct information for TBA hours, etc... The goal is to have the Colleges document procedures and adhere to more accurate record keeping. The one issue Kathy decided on was not to report TBA on the 320 report as we are not receiving apportionment anyway.

The audit proved more challenging this year than in past years due to more and more compliance issues. The auditors will return in February to meet with the business officers to debrief.

The faculty (Linda, Laura, Masao) shared their recent experience with enrollment numbers. Robert reported it was too early for spring numbers but that current numbers indicate between 3 to 4% decline.

	District and College Calendars	Blackwood/CBOs
--	---------------------------------------	-----------------------

The goal is to coordinate the District budget calendar to the Colleges budget calendars for accreditation. In the past, we've done a Districtwide budget calendar only. Since the last meeting, the three Colleges submitted their calendars. Eloisa and Kathy reviewed them. Kathy has sent them out to the Presidents to assess and review. Kathy has asked that the calendar be approved at the next Chancellor's Council accreditation meeting in January.

She will share and email the final calendar to the group as soon as she receives them.

	Resource Allocation continued	Blackwood/ALL
--	--------------------------------------	----------------------

Based on discussions from the last meeting, Kathy distributed and discussed the handout titled "Selected Inputs and Outputs from Colleges." The top table displays numbers and the bottom portion has percentages showing fall headcount. The ratio of headcount to FTES is not the same at the three Colleges. The data shows years 2009 and 2010.

The report gives all the inputs which show students receiving BOG awards as well as any type of financial aid. It also includes a count of the ESL students. Kathy started working on outputs showing the number of degrees and certificates which are not evenly distributed among the Colleges. Kathy is waiting for another report from Bart Scott that will be needed for the Accountability Report required by the State showing cohorts wherein a student who was enrolled in an basic skills course in 2006 successfully completing a college level English or Math course.

Having seen the data just presented, how would we tie in funding?

Linda shared a resolution from the Skyline College budget committee as follows:

The Skyline College Budget Committee recognizes that the DCBF is considering local allocation model adjustments that will justly allocate district resources. Skyline College CBC is committed to constructive engagement in the modification of the local allocation model. Because program-based funding has been proven to be detrimental to educational institutions in every state that it has been implemented, on

principle, the Skyline College CBC strongly opposes the use of student outcomes measures and the initiatives as factors in the allocation of local resources.

Kathy expressed concern why we would throw out all incentives for outcomes. Linda commented that she is not aware of the research and would refer questions back to Skyline President Stroud. Kathy proposed to collectively come up with proposals.

Kathy is looking to the members of DCBF for direction on what to do with inputs and outputs, staffing, and others. If not outputs, do we look at inputs, use a base, have increments for financial aid or ESL students, or what makes the most sense?

As a basic aid district, it appears that growth is no longer what drives the existing funding model. There was discussion on what is a reasonable “base.” The 80% base seems to be more or less fair but issues revolve around on how to allocate the remaining 20%.

David proposed to establish benchmarks, perhaps move more to acceptable standards such as considering counselor to student ratios. Eloisa noted that based on what Kathy has previously expressed, it is important to not get into telling how the Colleges use their allocations.

Jozsef asked about how the Colleges are responding the federal government’s push to encourage community colleges to train and prepare students to learn trades and vocational careers. Robert and Vickie replied that Cañada has been awarded several types of grants to address this need.

Kathy mentioned that presently, there is much more cooperation and collaboration among the Colleges and Laura agreed that there is a lot more “co-doing.”

If a College identifies a need such as a grant writer, how do we weigh it against another need? How do we structure the new model?

In the past, the group had talked about funding high cost programs. For example, CSM tried to launch the Dental Hygiene program but that was put on hiatus due to the cutbacks in 2009-10. Masao thought this could possibly be back for consideration in the future and that he would be interested to see more details on the program. Laura may still have some information on it.

Discussions will be continuing as more reports are forthcoming and surveys are completed.

	Next Meeting	Committee
--	---------------------	------------------

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 15th at 2pm, District Board Room.