



**Modesto Junior College
Resource Allocation Council
Meeting Minutes
December 7, 2012**

Committee Member	Representing	Present	Absent
Michael Guerra	Chair, Vice President of College Administrative Services	X	
Jenni Abbott	Director Grants & Resource Development	X	
Kevin Alavezos	Academic Senate appointee	X	
Iris Carroll	Academic Senate appointee	X	
Paul Cripe	Academic Senate appointee	X	
Shayne Cooley	Student Senate Rep		X
Rosanne Faughn	CSEA appointee	X	
Susan Kincade	Vice President of Instruction		X
Rose LaMont	YFA Budget Analyst	X	
Maurice McKinnon	Instructional Dean		X
Martha Robles	Student Services Administrator		X
Mike Sharif	Student Senate Rep		X
Nancy Sill	YFA appointee	X	
Jill Stearns	MJC President		X
Brenda Thames	Vice President of Student Services	X	
Marla Uliana	CSEA appointee	X	
John Zamora	Academic Senate President	X	

Vacant position

Classified Staff Advisory Council
Dean (1)

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Kevin Alavezos stated that he did not move to approve the minutes at the last meeting.

Iris Carroll moved to approve the minutes of November 2, 2012 with the correction. Rosanne Faughn seconded.

The minutes of November 2, 2012 were approved as corrected.

2. Review of Agenda

Michael Guerra reviewed the agenda with members.

Iris Carroll asked what happened with the lab hours and positive attendance information that Martha Robles was going to send to the committee? Michael Guerra responded that he spoke with Martha who said the information is not ready at this time.

3. Reading Materials

Michael Guerra requested feedback from members regarding the information he sent out regarding other colleges. *Reading material description:* San Francisco City College (Fiscal crisis & management team fiscal review), San Jose Evergreen (Management assistance review), San Mateo Community College (Alleged financial impropriety, embezzlement), Southwestern College (Conflict of interest construction bids).

Iris Carroll responded that it was pretty apparent that oversight of the colleges was needed for the colleges that ended up in financial trouble.

Nancy Sill stated that in some of the information, interesting comparisons were done and there is a need to have some standard reporting. Nancy suggested that it would make sense if we used our cohorts consistently for comparison. She added that a lot of work went into finding a similar college for negotiations. Michael Guerra suggested identifying those colleges or districts. Nancy added that the information is broken down into staffing and the kind of staffing and gives a way to benchmark.

Michael Guerra suggested a sub group to work on gathering comparison data.

Sub Group: Nancy Sill, Rose LaMont, and Kevin Alavezos

4. Enrollment Update

Michael Guerra informed members that 160 FTES were added because of restoration. The college will hit a new target of 14,012 FTES and he will ask the district to fund because MJC does not have the money. Right now the college is at about 6,200 FTES with 477 more needed. Then we will have spring and we are looking at early summer if that is what we need to do. We are looking at a half million from the district. Michael will have Carolyn Hart send out the cleanup dates for the handout that erroneously stated 2011-2012 earlier.

Michael Guerra reported that schedules are being worked on among the deans. Most deans are generating classes that will generate the FTES needed.

In response to a request it was decided to agendize RAC's role in budget allocation.

5. Guiding Principles Review

Michael Guerra stated that he would like to go through the principles today. After a short discussion, it was determined that this body has spent a considerable amount of time creating the principles and approved them at the November 2, 2012 meeting.

Action Item

Rose LaMont moved to send the Guiding Principles document to College Council. Iris Carroll seconded.

Motion passed with aye vote.

Paul Cripe will present the Guiding Principles document at the next College Council meeting and field any questions.

6. Lottery Proposal

Michael Guerra referred to the spread sheet on screen, an extract from CurricuNet. He explained that some items did not meet the criteria or were funded from different areas and were removed from consideration. Areas that did meet the criteria came to a total amount of \$79,601.00, and they were able to fund these requests. To make everyone whole in supplies, divisions received what was expended last year in August to start the Fall 2012 semester. \$465,133 in lottery funding was allotted with \$80,000 withheld for Technology/Media.

Michael Guerra stated that carryover from 2007 on is being used for next year. He reminded members that next year is going to be a tight budget year.

Iris Carroll questioned the Library only requesting \$1.00 in lottery funds. Michael responded that he will hold up distribution until it is determined why that amount is listed, adding that it might be there as a place holder.

Kevin Alavezos brought up the rollover budget and pointed out that the zero based budget worked well the year it was implemented.

Parking Lot: Rollover budget and new Lottery money

Action Item

John Zamora moved to approve distribution of the Lottery funds with the caveat that the Library gets their money. Rose LaMont seconded.

Nancy Sill requested that the minutes reflect that lottery funds were discussed but that a formal vote not be taken given that we do not have enough information to fully assess the allocation. She added that the Library should be considered and felt it was all right to go ahead and move it forward. No one was upset by anything except possibly the Library and RAC can assess process of the Lottery in the future.

Michael Guerra stated that College Administrative Services will push this money out.

The motion was not voted on and there was no disagreement with Nancy Sill's statements.

Jenni Abbott suggested getting all the tools to look at making strategic recommendations. Jenni recommended the following strategic analysis elements.

- Cohort Colleges Budget Analysis (Examining expenditure priorities (i.e. rollover budgets)
- Enrollment Management Data Analysis (Leveraging personnel)
- Program Review (Coordinated technology purchases)
- Budget History
- Budget Projections

Iris Carroll requested for the next meeting to discuss how we put the pieces together, what we need to do and what information we need to work with to be able to get it done.

Action Item

Iris Carroll moved to agendaize Jenni's suggestions for tools for the next meeting.

Motion died for lack of a second.

7. Proof of Concept – Patterson site

Michael Guerra stated that property has already been acquired and now we are building it out. The handout indicated what the site is going to cost to build it out. He requested that John Zamora give a definition of proof of concept.

John Zamora explained that *proof of concept* is when you try to get together people of common interests, (i.e. stakeholders) and find a solution. You find out about things you do and do not know, who it is going to affect and that way you can come up with a trial pilot plan. This process requires a lot of getting folks together to see how to proceed.

Michael Guerra informed members that the project is going to cost \$5.5 million. He added that we need to look at it to determine if we really need to develop a site and if we can operationalize it. The projections on the document are for 24, 36, and 48 sections. Michael explained that he took information from others and built the document. He added that the person who is going to be at the site has to be a jack-of-all-trades and be able to answer all questions and be a source of information in order to fully serve students. The site will not be able to have a Library and will have to be online and perhaps reserve. As a site, you are not expected to provide all services. The property is expanding with infrastructure and is probably more valuable at this point. RAC would make a recommendation and an answer is not expected today. This document shows what it is expected to cost to operate this site.

Nancy Sill asked how many sections are currently being offered there, what is the potential demand, and has a site analysis been done? Michael Guerra responded that some compression research has been done which Jenni Abbot has. He clarified that these figures are estimates based on conversations with Tim Nesmith and Nadia Vartan regarding speculation on staffing need.

Nancy Sill asked what alternatives do we have? Marla Uliana added that if you don't give priority registration to those in Patterson, then you are probably getting students from other areas who register for classes in Patterson because they cannot get classes in Modesto.

This item will appear on a future agenda. Michael Guerra stated that he would like to focus on the site costs and how it is going to dilute us here. He informed members that we are currently paying \$8,000 a year for taxes on this site.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Future Agenda

1. Proof of Concept (re Patterson site)
2. Agenda Development
3. Recommendation for requests outside Program Review documents
4. Classification Review

5. RAC's role in budget allocation

Parking Lot:

1. Sub group to gather comparison data information
2. Rollover budget
3. New Lottery money

ADJOURNMENT