**Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC)**
April 22, 2015
1:00-3:00    (ST 107)

**Attendees:**

- **Attendees:**

  **Ruth Leal (Staff-Instructional Production Specialist\*ISPC Chair\*)**
  **Melissa Bader (Faculty Rep to District EMTF \*ISPC Chair\*)**
  **Diane Dieckmeyer (VP Academic Affairs\*ISPC Chair\*)**

  Beth Gomez (VP Business Services)
  Barbara Moore (Transfer Faculty)
  Natalie Aceves (Staff-Educational Advisor)
  Peggy Campo (Academic Senate President)
  David Mills (Basic Skills Faculty)
  Jason Parks (Chair of Chairs – APC)
  Diann Thursby (Staff-Grants Administrative Specialist)
  Greg Aycock (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness)
  Jim Thomas (CTE Faculty)
  Celia Brockenbrough (Library Faculty)
  Deborah Tompsett-Makin (At-Large)
  Ruth Jones-Santos (Staff-Administrative Assistant II)
  Mark DeAsis (Dean of Admissions and Records)
  Damon Nance (Dean, Technology and Learning Resources)
  Koji Uesugi (Dean, Student Services)
  Ana Molina (Staff-Administrative Assistant II)
  John Coverdale (CTE & Grants Advisory Rep)
  Collin Pacillo (ASNC-President)
  Ruth Smith (Recorder)

- **Absentees:**

  Carol Farrar, (Dean of Instruction)
  Vanessa Acosta (Staff-Admissions and Records)
  Emile Bradshaw (Tutorial Services Technician)
  Monica Green (VP Student Services)
  Andres Elizalde, Associate Professor, English

- **Guests:** Paul Parnell, Eric Betancourt, Arend Flick

**Approval of Minutes:**
  Approval of Minutes for April 1, 2015.

> **Motion by David Mills, second by Jason Parks to approve the minutes from the April 1, 2015 meeting. Motion approved with one abstention.**

**\*\*Melissa introduced the new ASNC President – Collin Pacillo**

## I.  Information Items:

### A.  Recommendation 1 Follow-up Discussion (continued) – (Diane Dieckmeyer)

- Dr. Dieckmeyer reminded everyone that the Strategic Planning Timeline is available on our website.  You can see all the items that the college is responsible for and when we are required to do them.

- **Today's discussion will focus on item #7 - Annual Open Dialogue Session:**

  - Reviewed the minutes from last year's dialogue session.  Suggestion that items discussed at open dialogue need to be better identified when addressed during a regular ISPC meeting.  Items discussed could be used as feedback into the ISPC meetings for the next year.
  - When discussed at COTW this time could be used to direct the items to the appropriate committee for discussion.
  - Discussed the value of having a separate meeting for dialogue or including it as part of the COTW meeting.  Comment that all items are already being discussed in other venues.
  - Discussed the dialogue session as an evaluation mechanism and whether it is valuable enough to be one of the eight evaluation procedures.
  - Concern that the dialogue session should be housed somewhere in order to be available as evidence.  Suggestion that the session would be listed on the Strategic Planning Timeline, included as part of Goal #6 (Demonstrate Effective Planning Processes) and the session would be part of the COTW.
  - Suggestion to stop the separate dialogue meetings and have them become a part of the COTW where it is open to everyone and you can share any comments.  There are always a good number of staff, faculty, and administration at that meeting.  Suggestion to use comment cards for people that are not comfortable speaking to a large group.
  - Concerned about stopping the open forum/open voice.
  - Need to try to "fix" the current process before completely stopping the dialogue sessions.

- **Recap/Summary:**

  - Dialogue session is not contributing to the evaluation process, need to remove it from the list, but not delete the democratic process of participation from everyone.
  - The dialogue session does not have any value as a driving force for resources or the college future.

**Motion by David Mills, second by Peggy Campo to strike the Open Dialogue Session from list of evaluative tools. Retain the idea of the Open Dialogue Session and fold it into the COTW.  The issue of how the Open Dialogue Sessions will be handled for next year (15/16) will be brought back to the ISPC for further discussion.  Motion approved with one abstention.**

## B. Budget Report/Update – BAM Entity Budget Alignment Proposal - (Beth Gomez)

- DBAC (District Budget Advisory Council) At the last DBAC meeting a motion was approved that gives some movement in the budget allocation model. In the beginning, all three colleges were getting the same funding percentage. Now, for this year, the DBAC is recognizing that the colleges are still not aligned. Even with this year's analysis Norco is still being underfunded. Spending will be tracked for 15/16 and Norco will continue to advocate for additional funding.
- District services are being looked at for realigning. The Chancellor's Cabinet has decided to decentralize the Information Services area and move them to the individual colleges. Norco will receive a manager through this process. The change will occur on July 1.
- The budget numbers will be different after the May revise. Beth will give another update after May.
- Beth will present a full detailed budget review for ISPC after May revise.

## C. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Goals and Indicator Report - (Greg Aycock)

- Initiative has three parts. State Chancellor's office is putting forward a framework of indicators that all colleges will be required to report on. However, for this year we only need to report on five of the 18 indicators and some of the five indicators will be answered by the District. (see attached)
- There are 18 total indicators that will eventually need to have input. Input covers a 6 year period. Some areas will not be able to be completed since Norco College does not have six years of data available.

## D. District Strategic Planning Committee (DSPC) Report

- Majority of the meeting time was used to discuss the BAM Entity Budget Alignment from the DBAC that was approved.
- Enrollment Management Committee will be meeting again to look at target FTES and ranges.
- Discussed District Strategic Planning Committee management and process. Working on clarifying the mission of District Strategic Planning and its relationship with the other colleges.
- Moreno Valley strategic planning process was received and sent to the Chancellor's Office.
- Discussed participatory governance and shared governance.

## E. Standing Committee Reports

> **Legacy Committee (see attached)**

- The committee shared their new mission statement.
- There will be a diversity event on April 30 called Day of Inclusiveness from 11:00-2:00 on the student services walkway. Please plan to attend.
- The strategic goals and objects that apply to the committee were shared.

- The future plans of the committee were indicated.
- The Legacy Committee asked the ISPC for help filling the vacant faculty co-chair position and they would like to have help with funding.
- There was discussion about possible funding utilizing college equity funds. Julie Mendez is working to see if this is a possibility.
- The committee discussed funding received from ASNC for various Legacy events.

> ### Technology Committee (see attached)

- The committee reaffirmed their Statement of Purpose to make sure that it is aligned with the college.
- Currently working on Goal #5 – working with the Professional Development Committee by presenting Lynda.com workshops. Also holding face-to-face faculty workshops for blackboard and how to make a welcome video.
- The committee has completed the Norco technology plan and they have collaborated with ITSC on the District Technology Plan.
- Norco College is represented on ITSC by both Technology Committee co-chairs. They are making sure that Norco's voice is being heard.
- The Technology Committee meets on the 3rd Thursday of each month during college hour.

## II. Open Hearing

- Dr. Parnell thanked everyone on the ISPC for their preparation and hard work on this and other committees.
- A concern was shared that Legacy is being partially funded by ASNC. The administration is in the process of addressing funding for Legacy.

**Adjourned** – 3:08 pm

## Background

The current construct of the Budget Allocation Model is based on a FTES model and reflects, for the most part, how resources are allocated from the State. The State model does not differentiate, and makes no provision for, high cost programs versus any other program offered at a college/district. In other words, there is one credit FTES rate applied against all earned credit FTES, regardless of the cost to produce the FTES. The same is true for the current BAM. The previous model "worked" for the Riverside Community College District until we became three colleges since all resources generated (apportionment, lottery, non-resident fees, etc., etc.) were used to pay all expenditures at all three colleges and the District, irrespective of where the resources were generated. To reflect a three college environment, a new Budget Allocation Model was developed. The first attempt in FY 2008-2009 was essentially an expenditure based incremental growth model. This model did not allocate resources based on decisions made by the colleges, but rather, it reflected collective districtwide decision-making (positions, COLA, step and column, utilities, new facilities, growth, etc.) with some slight modifications for any remaining funds.

As we matured in a three college environment, a need was expressed to allocate resources to the colleges to provide more budget autonomy. Thus, the current credit FTES based model was developed and was implemented (albeit with the substantial issue of entity budget alignment still left unresolved) in FY 2013-14. The BAM calculates a "one size fits all" rate that is applied to the FTES generated by each college (similar to the state model). Inequities between the revenues generated by each college versus the expenditures incurred by each college emerged. This basic stumbling block issue has remained since implementation (and actually has been the same unresolved issue since implementation of the first BAM in FY 2008-2009), despite the numerous discussions and analytical attempts that have been made to resolve it.

Countless decisions have been made over the years relative to the instructional programs started and conducted at each college, staffing levels, service levels, etc. In addition, each college is unique as it relates to the age of its workforce; the mix of benefits selected by staff; the age of its facilities; its geographic footprint; use of facilities by the community, etc., etc.

These are our "realities" and, practically speaking, they aren't going to change. For the most part, we aren't going to realign programs between colleges; reassign staff between colleges; cancel or eliminate programs; or create the perfect mix of high volume, low cost FTES producing programs to support the low volume, high cost FTES producing programs...at least not in the short term.

A number of BAM Principles (see attached) have not been implemented because the basic entity budget alignment issue has not been resolved. A collective decision needs to be made on changes to the BAM to recognize our "realities" so that we have a starting point to move forward.

In consultation with Chancellor Burke, he indicated that we know what it costs to produce FTES, by college, and we know how much FTES we produce, by college. The unknown is the rate per FTES, which

can be derived by a simple equation of FTES Rate = Cost to Produce FTES / FTES. These discussions centered around discipline costs; however, the same principles can be applied on an aggregate basis. He asked the Vice Chancellor of Business and Financial Services to develop a methodology to revise the Budget Allocation Model to reflect this basic premise and then meet with him and the three college Presidents to discuss the conceptual framework.

The results of those meetings was support for the concept and a recommendation for DBAC to consider realignment of the Budget Allocation Model using a historical average of expenditures per credit FTES and application of the resulting ratios to the BAM "Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES" beginning with FY 2015-16.

The following assumptions/observations were noted and are listed here for DBAC's consideration:

- Historical Expenditures per FTES using a six (6) year average to smooth-out year-over-year anomalies (increases/decreases) (see attached)
    - Goal would be to have a ten (10) year rolling average
    - Arguments can be made about efficiencies and inefficiencies at the program level, in administration, etc., etc., and what impact this may or may not have on the model; however, a multi-year average can smooth out year-to-year anomalies.
    - Note – Application of the ratios results in a remainder that has been allocated on an FTES percentage basis in order to balance the example
- Takes into consideration our realities...the hundreds of decisions made regarding program placement at each college, staffing, program cost, high cost and low cost programs, cost effective/ineffective delivery of instruction, effective/ineffective budget oversight/decision-making, staff seniority, etc.
- Uses only fiscal year actual costs incurred
- Total expenditures per FTES takes into consideration ALL costs (support, administration, instruction, facilities) to produce the FTES.
- Historical expenditure information was used starting with FY 2008-09 since this is when three college status started.
- Adheres to the following BAM Principles:
    - #3 – Equitable Allocation of Resources
    - #4 – Enrollment Management Decisions Drive the Allocation of Resources
    - #5 – Simple, Readily Communicable and Understood, and as Easy to Administer as Possible
    - #6 – Defined in Measurable Terms to Maintain Objectivity and Predictability and the Outcome is Independently Verifiable
    - #7 – Driven by Verifiable Data
- Results in a revision to the Budget Allocation Model itself, not a realignment or reduction of resources
- Provides a starting point, or baseline, to begin moving forward on other BAM revision items as well as a basis for closing the remaining gap in future years

**Next Steps**

DBAC is to review the information distributed at the January 23, 2015 meeting and be prepared to discuss at the February 2015 DBAC meeting. The goal is to reach consensus and to make a recommendation to DSPC.

# BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL

## BAM Principles

1. Equilibrium in the operating budget structural balance is maintained through assurance that ongoing expenditures do not exceed ongoing revenues and that compliance with State and District reserve requirements is maintained.
2. The BAM recognizes that resource allocation is linked to District-wide strategic planning.
3. The BAM provides for the equitable allocation of available resources to the three (3) colleges and the District Office, while ensuring compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.
4. Enrollment management decisions drive the allocation of operational resources.
5. The BAM is simple, readily communicable and understood, and as easy to administer as possible.
6. The BAM is defined in measurable terms to maintain objectivity and predictability and so that the outcome is independently verifiable.
7. The BAM is driven by verifiable data.

## Policy/Organizational Considerations

1. Defining the roles of the District vis-à-vis the District's four major entities in the budget development and execution processes.
2. Defining the way in which compliance with statutory, regulatory and policy requirements shall be assured (e.g. FON, 50% Law, categorical match).
3. Defining self-insurance funding.
4. Defining DSPS services and funding levels.

## BAM Revision Components

1. RCCD's BAM will mirror the State funding model for the California Community Colleges for the basic allocation, full-time-equivalent student (FTES) apportionment, one-time funding, and one-time funding on an annual basis (e.g. Prop 30). The model will comply with budget-related statutory and regulatory requirements (e.g. 50% Law, FON, etc.).
2. The minimum 5% required level of District reserves and funding for the district office will be the first allocations of the District's "Total Available Funds" in the Unrestricted General Fund.
3. In recognition that it may be necessary to transition over time to a point whereby each of the colleges achieve equilibrium between allocated revenues and the expenditures needed to support instructional service levels to students, a separate allocation may be provided.
4. Non-State apportionment, one-time funds, ongoing funds and entrepreneurial revenues (e.g. Norco College Trading Post, Riverside City College Splash, Nonresident tuition, indirect cost reimbursements, lease/rental income, etc.) that are specific to a particular entity will be retained by the respective college that generates the revenue.
5. Revenue sources that are not specifically identifiable to a particular entity will be allocated based on the same methodology used to allocate apportionment revenues unless otherwise specified by the funding source.
6. A minimum of 1% of total available funds will be allocated for contingency at the entity level.

**Riverside Community College District**
**Historical Expenditures Per Credit FTES**
**FY 2008-2009 Through FY 2013-2014**

| | FY 2008-09 | FY 2009-10 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | Six Year Avg | % | Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RCC** | | | | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | $ 69,330,166 | $ 66,314,950 | $ 66,321,879 | $ 63,403,355 | $ 60,722,428 | $ 65,713,997 | $ 65,301,129 | 57.37% | **1.06:1** |
| Credit FTES | 16,738.00 | 17,063.00 | 15,470.68 | 13,894.46 | 13,478.92 | 13,997.65 | 15,107.12 | 54.06% | |
| Expenditures per FTES | 4,142.08 | 3,886.48 | 4,286.94 | 4,563.21 | 4,504.99 | 4,694.64 | 4,322.54 | | |
| **NC** | | | | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | $ 21,200,922 | $ 20,842,574 | $ 21,241,620 | $ 21,113,218 | $ 21,705,417 | $ 23,662,428 | $ 21,627,697 | 19.00% | **0.83:1** |
| Credit FTES | 6,788.00 | 6,973.00 | 6,748.35 | 5,921.04 | 5,804.79 | 6,153.71 | 6,398.15 | 22.89% | |
| Expenditures per FTES | 3,123.29 | 2,989.04 | 3,147.68 | 3,565.80 | 3,739.23 | 3,845.23 | 3,380.31 | | |
| **MVC** | | | | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | $ 27,348,012 | $ 26,037,540 | $ 27,649,063 | $ 26,559,941 | $ 25,397,862 | $ 28,333,110 | $ 26,887,588 | 23.62% | **1.02:1** |
| Credit FTES | 7,144.00 | 6,929.00 | 6,814.03 | 5,905.02 | 5,768.48 | 6,088.16 | 6,441.45 | 23.05% | |
| Expenditures per FTES | 3,828.11 | 3,757.76 | 4,057.67 | 4,497.86 | 4,402.87 | 4,653.81 | 4,174.15 | | |
| **Combined** | | | | | | | | | |
| Expenditures | $ 117,879,100 | $ 113,195,064 | $ 115,212,562 | $ 111,076,514 | $ 107,825,707 | $ 117,709,535 | $ 113,816,414 | 100.00% | **1:1** |
| Credit FTES | 30,670.00 | 30,965.00 | 29,033.06 | 25,720.52 | 25,052.19 | 26,239.52 | 27,946.72 | 100.00% | |
| Expenditures per FTES | 3,843.47 | 3,655.58 | 3,968.32 | 4,318.60 | 4,304.04 | 4,485.96 | 4,072.62 | | |

# Riverside Community College District
## Budget Allocation Model - REVISION PROFORMA
### FY 2014-2015

| | Total |
|---|---:|
| Contingency Budget from FY 2013-2014 | $ 6,358,532 |
| **Apportionment** | |
| Basic Allocation | $ 10,683,362 |
| Cr FTES (MVC - 5,935.13; NC - 5,935.13; RCC - 13,822.95 (25,693.21)) | 119,126,422 |
| COLA at 85% | 1,107,007 |
| Growth at 3.43% (MVC - 203.80; NC - 203.80; RCC - 474.65 (882.25)) | 4,125,287 |
| Total Gross Apportionment | $ 135,042,078 |
| Less, Property Taxes | (28,791,147) |
| Less, Enrollment Fees | (8,813,935) |
| Less, Estimated Deficit Factor | (751,397) |
| Total Net Apportionment | $ 96,685,599 |
| **Total Beginning Balance and Apportionment** | $ 103,044,131 |
| Less, Contingency Reserve (Board Adopted at 4.28% or more) | (7,801,811) |
| Less, DO Allocation | (3,387,198) |
| Less, DSS Allocation | (16,993,707) |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for Self-Insured Liability (Resource 6100) | - |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for CSJCL (Resource 1120) | (110,900) |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for DSPS Match and FWS Support | (997,493) |
| Total Funds for Per Credit FTES Calculation | $ 73,753,022 |
| Target Credit FTES Target | 27,545.18 |
| Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES | $ 2,677.5291 |

| | Total | Moreno Valley | Norco | Riverside | DSS | DO |
|---|---:|---:|---:|---:|---:|---:|
| Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES (Adjusted per Entity) | $ 2,677.5291 | $ 2,677.5291 | $ 2,222.3725 | $ 2,841.8381 | | |
| Target Credit FTES Target | 27,545.18 | 6,362.94 | 6,362.94 | 14,819.31 | | |
| **Total Funds for Per Credit FTES Calculation** | | $ 17,470,370 | $ 14,147,854 | $ 42,134,799 | | |
| FY 2013-14 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Revenues | | 1,493,768 | 971,335 | (56,591) | | (40,136) |
| FY 2013-14 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Expenditures | | 3,198,754 | 431,678 | 1,966,333 | 857,450 | 875,168 |
| Non-Credit FTES | | 442,474 | - | 165,746 | - | - |
| Federal Revenues | | 188,321 | 51,220 | 78,363 | - | - |
| Other State Revenues | | 58,738 | 1,564,481 | 3,643,681 | - | - |
| Local Revenues | 41,915,826 | 9,300,155 | 9,424,395 | 23,191,276 | 264,384 | - |
| Incoming Transfer from Customized Solutions (Resource 1170) | 53,283 | - | 53,283 | - | | |
| Incoming Transfer from Bookstore (Resource 1110) | 429,923 | 54,800 | 240,423 | 134,700 | | |
| **Total Available Funds** | $ 128,248,014 | $ 30,105,039 | $ 26,884,669 | $ 71,258,307 | $ 1,121,834 | $ 835,032 |
| **Base Expenditures for FY 2014-2015** | | | | | | |
| FY 2014-2015 | (128,248,014) | (30,676,951) | (26,228,136) | (71,342,927) | (18,115,541) | (4,222,230) |
| **Budget (Shortfall) or Excess** | $ 0 | $ (571,912) | $ 656,533 | $ (84,620) | $ (16,993,707) | $ (3,387,198) |

Riverside Community College District
Budget Allocation Model - Final Budget
FY 2014-2015

| | Total |
|---|---|
| **Contingency Budget from FY 2013-2014** | $ 6,358,532 |
| **Apportionment** | |
| Basic Allocation | $ 10,683,362 |
| Cr FTES (MVC - 5,935.13; NC - 5,935.13; RCC - 13,822.95 (25,693.21)) | 119,126,422 |
| COLA at .85% | 1,107,007 |
| Growth at 3.43% (MVC - 203.80; NC - 203.80; RCC - 474.65 (882.25)) | 4,125,287 |
| Total Gross Apportionment | $ 135,042,078 |
| Less, Property Taxes | (28,791,147) |
| Less, Enrollment Fees | (8,813,935) |
| Less, Estimated Deficit Factor | (751,397) |
| Total Net Apportionment | $ 96,685,599 |
| **Total Beginning Balance and Apportionment** | $ 103,044,131 |
| Less, Contingency Reserve (Board Adopted at 4.28% or more) | (7,801,811) |
| Less, DO Allocation | (3,387,198) |
| Less, DSS Allocation | (16,993,707) |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for Self-Insured Liability (Resource 6100) | - |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for CSJCL (Resource 1120) | (110,900) |
| Less, Outgoing Transfer for DSPS Match and FWS Support | (997,493) |
| Total Funds for Per Credit FTES Calculation | $ 73,753,022 |
| Total Target Credit FTES | 27,545.18 |
| BAM Funding Rate Per Credit FTES | $ 2,677.5291 |

| | Total | Moreno Valley | Norco | Riverside | DSS | DO |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Funding Rate Per Target Credit FTES | $ 2,677.5291 | $ 2,677.5291 | $ 2,677.5291 | $ 2,677.5291 | | |
| Target Credit FTES Target | 27,545.18 | 6,362.94 | 6,362.94 | 14,819.30 | | |
| Total Allocated Beginning Balance and Apportionment | $ 73,753,022 | $ 17,036,957 | $ 17,036,957 | $ 39,679,108 | | |
| FY 2013-14 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Revenues | 1,493,768 | 579,024 | 971,335 | (56,591) | | |
| FY 2013-14 Excess (Shortfall) of Budgeted Expenditures | 3,198,754 | 800,743 | 431,678 | 1,966,333 | 857,450 | (40,136) |
| Non-Credit FTES | 442,474 | 276,728 | - | 165,746 | - | 875,168 |
| Federal Revenues | 188,321 | 58,738 | 51,220 | 78,363 | - | - |
| Other State Revenues | 6,772,643 | 1,564,481 | 1,564,481 | 3,643,681 | - | - |
| Local Revenues | 41,915,826 | 9,300,155 | 9,424,395 | 23,191,276 | 264,384 | - |
| Incoming Transfer from Customized Solutions (Resource 1170) | 53,283 | - | 53,283 | - | | |
| Incoming Transfer from Bookstore (Resource 1110) | 429,923 | 54,800 | 240,423 | 134,700 | - | |
| **Total Available Funds** | $ 128,248,014 | $ 29,671,626 | $ 29,773,772 | $ 68,802,616 | $ 1,121,834 | $ 835,032 |
| Base Expenditures for FY 2014-2015 | | | | | | |
| FY 2014-2015 | (128,248,014) | (30,676,951) | (26,228,136) | (71,342,927) | (18,115,541) | (4,222,230) |
| **Budget (Shortfall) or Excess** | $ (0) | $ (1,005,325) | $ 3,545,636 | $ (2,540,311) | $ (16,993,707) | $ (3,387,198) |

Riverside Community College District
Historical Information - Fill Ratios
FY 2008-09 Through FY 2013-14

| Year | MVC Fill Ratio | NC Fill Ratio | RCC Fill Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2008 | 74.99% | 75.80% | 80.87% |
| 2009 | 93.87% | 98.25% | 95.09% |
| 2010 | 94.02% | 101.40% | 92.71% |
| 2011 | 92.64% | 100.39% | 93.09% |
| 2012 | 86.86% | 97.29% | 89.58% |
| 2013 | 84.13% | 94.62% | 87.08% |
| 6 Yr Avg | 87.75% | 94.63% | 89.74% |

Compiled by Raj: Ext 8979
November, 2014

Riverside Community College District
Historical Information - FTES/FTEF
FY 2008-09 Through FY 2013-14

| Year | MVC FTES/FTEF | NC FTES/FTEF | RCC FTES/FTEF |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2008 | 14.02 | 18.77 | 15.71 |
| 2009 | 14.97 | 21.92 | 17.86 |
| 2010 | 14.16 | 20.72 | 16.52 |
| 2011 | 14.05 | 20.03 | 16.32 |
| 2012 | 14.08 | 19.72 | 16.32 |
| 2013 | 14.13 | 19.05 | 16.07 |

| | MVC | NC | RCC | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 Yr Avg | 14.23 | 20.03 | 16.47 | 50.73 |
| Percentage | 28.06% | 39.49% | 32.45% | |

Compiled by Raj: Ext 8979
November, 2014

Riverside Community College District
Historical Information - WSCH/FTES
FY 2008-09 Through FY 2013-14

| Year | MVC WSCH/FTEF | NC WSCH/FTEF | RCC WSCH/FTEF |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2008 | 451.63 | 604.55 | 505.99 |
| 2009 | 482.11 | 706.02 | 575.26 |
| 2010 | 456.14 | 667.20 | 531.93 |
| 2011 | 452.47 | 645.17 | 525.60 |
| 2012 | 453.37 | 635.19 | 525.62 |
| 2013 | 452.24 | 609.89 | 514.34 |
| 6 Yr Avg | 457.99 | 644.67 | 529.79 |
| Percentage | 28.06% | 39.49% | 32.45% |

1,632.45

Compiled by Raj: Ext 8979
November, 2014

| Credit Resident FTES | 2008-2009 | % Distribution | 2009-2010 | % Distribution | 2010-2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MOV | 7144 | 23.29% | 6929 | 22.38% | 6814.03 |
| NOR | 6788 | 22.13% | 6973 | 22.52% | 6748.34 |
| RIV | 16738 | 54.57% | 17063 | 55.10% | 15470.43 |
| District | 30670 | 100.00% | 30965 | 100.00% | 29032.8 |

| Credit Resident FTES | 2011-2012 | % Distribution | *2012-2013 | % Distribution | 2013-2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MOV | 5905.02 | 22.96% | 5768.63 | 23.03% | 6089.31 |
| NOR | 5921.04 | 23.02% | 5804.79 | 23.17% | 6153.68 |
| RIV | 13894.46 | 54.02% | 13478.92 | 53.80% | 13997.65 |
| District | 25720.52 | 100.00% | 25052.34 | 100.00% | 26240.64 |

| Target 2014-2015 | Base Funding | | Unfunded | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Credit Resident FTES | 2014-2015 | % Distribution | 2014-2015 | % Distribution | |
| MOV | 6362.94 | | | | |
| NOR | 6362.94 | | | | |
| RIV | 14819.3 | | | | |
| District | 27545.18 | | 1055 | | |

*Includes Borrowing

Raj: Ext 8979

# Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee

## Framework of Indicators

| INDICATOR | BRIEF DEFINITION | College/District Indicator | Required in 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Completion Rate (Scorecard): | Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2008-09 tracked for six years through 2013-14 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer- | | |
| College-Prepared | Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level | College | |
| Unprepared for College | Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level | College | |
| Overall | Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years | College | |
| Remedial rate (Scorecard): | Percentage of credit students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 below transfer level in English, mathematics, and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline | | |
| Math | See above | College | |
| English | See above | College | |
| ESL | See above | College | |
| Career Technical Education Rate (Scorecard) | Percentage of students tracked for six years through 2013-14 who started first time in 2008-09 and completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or | College | |
| Successful course completion (Datamart) | Percentage of students who earn a grade of "C" or better or "credit" in 2013-14. | College | X |
| Completion of degrees | Number of associate degrees completed in 2013-14 | College | |
| Completion of certificates | Number of Chancellor's Office-approved certificates completed | College | |
| Number of students who transfer to 4-year institutions | Number of students who transfer to a four-year institution, including CSU, UC, or private university in 2013-14. (1) | College | |
| Accreditation Status | | College | |
| Accreditation status | Latest ACCJC action: Reaffirmed,Warning, Probation, Show Cause, Restoration | College | X |
| Date of next visit | Informational item – no target collected. | College | X |

# Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Advisory Committee

## Framework of Indicators

| INDICATOR | BRIEF DEFINITION | College/District Indicator | Required in 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Fiscal viability and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines** | | | |
| **Salary and Benefits** | **Salaries and benefits as a percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures, excluding other outgoing expenditures** | District | |
| **Full-Time Equivalent Students** | **Annual number of full-time equivalent students** | District | |
| **Annual Operating Excess/(Deficiency)** | **Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance** | District | |
| **Fund Balance** | **Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a percentage of total expenditures** | District | X |
| **Cash Balance** | **Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investments** | District | |
| **Audit Findings** | **Modified opinion, material weaknesses, or significant deficiencies as identified in an annual independent audited** | District | X |

1. Metric dependent upon external variables (UC and CSU transfer admission policy) and therefore collected as information. Colleges would NOT be expected to identify a goal.

In year one, three years of baseline trend data would be prepopulated and sent to each college by the Chancellor's Office. Each college would use a collegial consultation process to set goals (short-term and long-term) for the subsequent year and return a spreadsheet to the Chancellor's Office with the goals in June.

# LEGACY COMMITTEE

▶ Mission Statement

- Norco Legacy is a mindful group of colleagues that proudly represents the diverse Norco College community.
- We listen and respond to the concerns and needs of our community.
- We advocate and facilitate respectful interactions with an appreciation for diversity.
- We build a culture of practices to promote inclusiveness, dialog, and harmony.

---

# STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES THAT APPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE

▶ GOAL 2: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE

- Objective 5: Decrease the percentage of students who experience unfair treatment based on diversity-related characteristics.

  - • Legacy members will continue working on this objective by promoting inclusiveness and advocating for those who feel they are experiencing unfair treatment. For instance Legacy advocated for unisex restrooms earlier this year. As a result, Norco College agreed to make the restrooms in the faculty lounge unisex as well as one bathroom in the upstairs floor of the Student Services Building.

---

LEGACY
COMMITTEE

NORCO COLLEGE

---

# STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES THAT APPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE

▶ GOAL 2: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE

- Objective 4: Increase the percentage of students who consider the college environment to be inclusiveness.

  - Legacy contributes to achieving this objective by identifying the ways in which it can help students feel that our college is inclusive. The upcoming "Day of Inclusiveness" is one of the ways in which the committee will promote inclusion of all students.

## STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES THAT APPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE

▶ GOAL 7: STRENGTHEN OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR EMPLOYEES

▶ Objective 3: Decrease the percentage of employees who experience unfair treatment based on diversity –related characteristics.

- • Legacy will monitor the progress on this objective by creating a survey and encouraging employees to complete it. We also plan to add information about the diversity of the college on the Norco College website by the end of the academic year.

## STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES THAT APPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE

▶ GOAL 7: STRENGTHEN OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR EMPLOYEES

▶ Objective 2: Increase the percentage of employees who consider the college environment to be inclusive.

- • Legacy will develop an annual inclusion event. This year we are promoting the "Circle of Inclusion Campaign" during the event "Day of Inclusiveness." The Circle of Inclusion represents the acceptance and inclusion of all people with intellectual disabilities. At the event we will have staff take a photos with co-workers within the circle of inclusion. We will also have them sign that lets them know that by taking a photo they are spreading a message of acceptance, and declaring that all people deserved to be included and respected for who they are. These pictures will then be included in the Norco College website.

## ACTION PLANS

▶ In order to accomplish the objectives set forth the Legacy committee members has done or will do the following:

1. Establish unisex/single-stall restroom(s) on campus.
2. Create a "Best Practices" list of inclusiveness activities/actions.
3. Ask all faculty Allies to display their buttons, placards and info on their syllabus and e-mail signature.
4. Develop an annual inclusion event that addresses student-to-student interactions.
5. Create and post information about discrimination/harassment.
6. Have a section on the NC website that reflects the diversity of the college.
7. T-shirt or button booth at inclusion event that allows people to publicly identify their diversity. "I bet you didn't know I...." and display it in their offices after event.
8. Create, promote and deliver diversity climate survey participation.

## STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES THAT APPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE

▶ GOAL 7: STRENGTHEN OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR EMPLOYEES

▶ Objective 4: Increase participation in events and celebrations related to inclusiveness.

- • Legacy will work on increasing participation in events related to inclusiveness hosting events during college hour and by advertising events on a timely manner.

## CHANGES

▶ All college constituencies are well represented on the committee. The current membership structure includes 5 faculty, 3 classified members, 3 administrators and 0 students.

## 2014-2015 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Julie Mendez (Co-Chair), Director, Upward Bound Program- Centennial HS
- Eric Betancourt (Co-Chair), Veterans Services Technician, Veterans Services
- Associated Students, Norco College representative (VACANT)
- Monica Green, Vice President, Student Services
- Patricia Gill, STEM Services Developer, Title III STEM Grant
- Bernice Delgado, Upward Bound Grants Administrative Assistant
- Damon Nance, Dean, Technology & Learning Resources
- Lisa Nelson, Associate Professor, English
- Ana-Marie Olaerts, Associate Professor, Communication Studies
- Hetal Patel, Human Resources Specialist III
- Stan Tyler, Associate Professor, Chemistry
- Patricia Worsham, Associate Professor, Business Administration
- Dorothy Reina, Associate Faculty, History

## HOW DOES THE COMMITTEE ALIGN WITH NORCO'S COLLEGE MISSION?

▶ The work done by the Legacy committee is directly related to the mission, which states that, "Norco College serves our students, our community, and its workforce by providing educational opportunities, celebrating diversity, and promoting collaboration." Legacy develops events that promote inclusiveness and diversity such as the "Day of Inclusiveness."

## ASSISTANCE NEEDED FROM ISPC:

▶ Need assistance with filling faculty co-chair vacancy and getting at least one more classified staff member to be involved in Legacy.

▶ $$$-Budget-$$$

# LEGACY COMMITTEE REPORT
## SPRING 2015

**COMMITTEE STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

- Norco Legacy is a mindful group of colleagues that proudly represents the diverse Norco College community. We listen and respond to the concerns and needs of our community. We advocate and facilitate respectful interactions with an appreciation for diversity. We build a culture of practices to promote inclusiveness, dialog, and harmony.

**STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES THAT APPPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE:**

*GOAL 2: IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE*

   **Objective 4: Increase the percentage of students who consider the college environment to be inclusive.**

- The Legacy Committee contributes to achieving this objective by identifying the ways in which it can help students feel that our college is inclusive. The upcoming "Day of Inclusiveness" is one of the ways in which the committee will promote inclusion of all students.

   **Objective 5: Decrease the percentage of students who experience unfair treatment based on diversity-related characteristics.**

- Legacy committee members will continue working on this objective by promoting inclusiveness and advocating for those who feel they are experiencing unfair treatment. For instance Legacy advocated for unisex restrooms earlier this year. As a result, Norco College agreed to make the restrooms in the faculty lounge unisex as well as one bathroom in the upstairs floor of the Student Services Building.

*GOAL 7: STRENGTHEN OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR EMPLOYEES*

   **Objective 2: Increase the percentage of employees who consider the college environment to be inclusive.**

- Legacy will develop an annual inclusion event. This year we are promoting the "Circle of Inclusion Campaign" during the event "Day of Inclusiveness." The Circle of Inclusion represents the acceptance and inclusion of all people with intellectual disabilities. At the event we will have staff take a photos with co-workers within the circle of inclusion. We will also have them sign that lets them know that by taking a photo they are spreading a message of acceptance, and declaring that all people deserved to be included and respected for who they are. These pictures will then be included in the Norco College website.

   **Objective 3: Decrease the percentage of employees who experience unfair treatment based on diversity –related characteristics.**
- Legacy will monitor the progress on this objective by creating a survey and encouraging employees to complete it. We also plan to add information about the diversity of the college on the Norco College website by the end of the academic year.

   **Objective 4: Increase participation in events and celebrations related to inclusiveness.**

- Legacy will work on increasing participation in events related to inclusiveness hosting events during college hour and by advertising events on a timely manner.

**ACTION PLANS**

In order to accomplish the objectives set forth the Legacy committee members has done or will do the following:

1. Establish unisex/single-stall restroom(s) on campus.
2. Create a "Best Practices" list of inclusiveness activities/actions.
3. Ask all faculty Allies to display their buttons, placards and info on their syllabus and e-mail signature.
4. Develop an annual inclusion event that addresses student-to-student interactions.
5. Create and post information about discrimination/harassment.
6. Have a section on the NC website that reflects the diversity of the college.
7. T-shirt or button booth at inclusion event that allows people to publicly identify their diversity. "I bet you didn't know I...." and display it in their offices after event.
8. Create, promote and deliver diversity climate survey participation.

**HOW DOES THE COMMITTEE ALIGN WITH NORCO'S COLLEGE MISSION?**

- The work done by the Legacy committee is directly related to the mission, which states that, "Norco College serves our students, our community, and its workforce by providing educational opportunities, celebrating diversity, and promoting collaboration." Legacy develops events that promote inclusiveness and diversity such as the "Day of Inclusiveness."

**CHANGES**

- All college constituencies are well represented on the committee. The current membership structure includes 5 faculty, 3 classified members, 3 administrators and 0 students.

**ASSISTANCE NEEDED FROM ISPC:**

- Need assistance with filling faculty co-chair vacancy and getting at least one more classified staff member to be involved in Legacy.

**2014-2015 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**
- **Julie Mendez (Co-Chair), Director, Upward Bound Program- Centennial HS**
- **Eric Betancourt (Co-Chair), Veterans Services Technician, Veterans Services**
- Associated Students, Norco College representative (VACANT)
- Monica Green, Vice President, Student Services
- Patricia Gill, STEM Services Developer, Title III STEM Grant
- Bernice Delgado, Upward Bound Grants Administrative Assistant
- Damon Nance, Dean, Technology & Learning Resources
- Lisa Nelson, Associate Professor, English
- Ana-Marie Olaerts, Associate Professor, Communication Studies
- Hetal Patel, Human Resources Specialist III
- Stan Tyler, Associate Professor, Chemistry
- Patricia Worsham, Associate Professor, Business Administration
- Dorothy Reina, Associate Faculty, History

April 20, 2015

# TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT
# SPRING 2015

## COMMITTEE STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

*The Norco College Technology Committee provides recommendations for the strategic direction, implementation and sustainability of technology resources throughout the college used to support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness consistent with the college's mission.*

## STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES THAT APPPLY TO THIS COMMITTEE:

### GOAL 5: STRENGTHEN STUDENT LEARNING

**Objective 5: Increase the number of faculty development workshops focusing on pedagogy each academic year. (Professional Development Committee & Technology Committee)**

**ACTION PLANS**

**1. Lynda.com Technology Training Tutorials**
**2. Blackboard for Faculty Workshops**
**3. Faculty Workshop: How to Make a Welcome Video**

- The committee recommended Lynda.com as a technology training resource for employees. It provides tutorials on the latest release of technology software and hardware as well as professional skills that faculty may utilize in the classroom.
- The committee holds two "Blackboard for Faculty" workshops per academic year, once in fall and spring. This workshop provides an opportunity for custom Blackboard mentoring. Over 15 faculty members attended this workshop in 2014-2015.

### GOAL 6: DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE PLANNING PROCESSES

**Objective 4: Institutionalize the current Technology Plan.**

**ACTION PLANS**

**1. Lynda.com approved through Strategic Planning Process 2014/2015.**
**2. Conduct Annual Technology Survey in spring.**
**3. Collaboration with Strategic Planning Councils/Committees**

- A discussion on Lynda.com is currently being conducted as to put forth another recommendation for funding.
- The annual Technology Survey in spring provides an assessment of technology resources and is used as an evaluation tool for technology recommendations for improvement.
- The committee collaborates with ITSC for the District Tech Plan and other recommendations and BFPC for total cost of ownership worksheet and program review technology recommendations.

## GOAL 7: STRENGTHEN OUR COMMITMENT TO OUR EMPLOYEES

**Objective 1: Provide professional development activities for all employees. (Professional Development Committee & Technology Committee)**

**ACTION PLANS**

**1. Lynda.com Technology Training Tutorials**
**2. "Technology and You" Workshops**

- Lynda.com provides technology training for all employees to enhance their professional skills in technology software and hardware.
- The committee holds technology workshops throughout the year for faculty and staff such as *Lynda.com Day, Blackboard, Lynda.com for Faculty, Improving Your Presentation Skills,* and *Wordpress.*

## HOW DOES THE COMMITTEE ALIGN WITH NORCO'S COLLEGE MISSION?

- The committee provides educational opportunities for faculty, staff, and students through Lynda.com online technology training and employees through face to face technology workshops.
- The committee continues to research and discuss the creative application of emerging technologies for the college.
- The committee systematically assesses technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis of recommendations for technology to support student learning.

## ITSC
- The Technology Committee continues to be represented on the district's Information Technology Strategy Council with both co-chairs as members and discussing adding a student representative from each college.
- The Technology Committee representatives continue to advocate for a change in the process in how ITSC decisions are made in that they must come to the college technology committees for input and approval prior to a vote at ITSC.

## WHAT WE ARE WORKING ON:

- College Recommendation 4 – "In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College systematically plan for the replacement of technology infrastructure and equipment, reflect projections of total cost of ownership for new equipment, systematically assess the effective use of technology resources, and use the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement."
  - The committee is working on putting forth a recommendation of 25% of computer inventory, as designated by the annual inventory based on age, per the replacement plan to be placed on Business Services program review and forwarded as a recommendation to BFPC.
  - Reassignment of Equipment – annually, as part of program review tech requests recommendation process, obtain report from Micro as to what is in inventory and their recommendation to reassign equipment.
  - Annual Inventory – combine office and lab inventory to create one master inventory and cross-check with tag numbers.

- Technology Total Cost of Ownership - the committee is currently revising the Tech Request Form for program review and plans to discuss with Program Review Committee and APC on the process.

## 2014-2015 COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Christian Castillo, ASNC student
Zermeen Vakil, ASNC student
Cathy Brotherton
Janet Frewing
Keith Coleman
Daniel Lambros
Ladylyn Dominguez
Sandra Martinez
James Finley
Jefferson Tiangco

Kim Kamerin
Deborah Tompsett-Makin
Victor Goldbaum
Mark DeAsis
Emile Bradshaw
Ruth Leal (Co-Chair)
Damon Nance (Co-Chair)
Ana Molina (Secretary)
(1 faculty seat is currently vacant)