

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Program Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related
Funding February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Budget and Resource Committee Membership 2020-21 | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------|
| Voting Members | | | |
| Faculty (9): | Constituency/Title | Name | Attended |
| 1 | Academic Senate President or designee | Andrea Horigan (Tri-Chair) | X |
| 2 | Career Education 1 | Stephanie Branca | |
| 3 | Career Education 1, Coordinator, Nursing | Sandra Melton | X |
| 4 | English, Math & Communications | Kelly Peinado | X |
| 5 | Health, Kinesiology, Athletics & Performing Arts | Ned Mircetic | |
| 6 | Library, Languages, Behavioral & Social Sciences, Visual Arts | Mark Pauley | X |
| 7 | Sciences & Distance Education | Steve Palladino (FOG Representative) | X |
| 8 | Student Services | Emily Bartel, Alternate-Vanessa Chacon | X |
| 9 | At Large | Maria Reyes-Sanchez | X |
| 10 | | | |
| Student (1): | ASVC – Treasurer | Athena Lazos/Marian | X |
| Classified (4) | | | |
| 1 | MESA-Coordinator | April Montes | X |
| 2 | Sciences/Administrative Assistant | Erin Askar | X |
| 3 | Sciences/Instructional Lab Tech II | Carol Smith | X |
| 4 | Sciences/Instructional Lab Tech II | Alan Wood | X |
| | | | |
| Classified Supervisors (2) | | | |
| 1 | VCBAS/College Services Supervisor | Susan Royer | X |
| 2 | VCBAS/College Fiscal Supervisor | Jeanine Day – Tri Chair | X |
| Administrators (2) | | | |
| 1 | Career Ed/Academic Dean | Felicia Dueñas | X |
| 2 | VCBAS/Director, College Information Technology | Grant Jones | X |
| Non-Voting Members | | | |
| 1 | VP-Business Services | Cathy Bojorquez – Tri Chair | X |
| 2 | Director, Facilities, M & O | Orlando De Leon | X |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm**

ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>

| | | | |
|----|--|------------------|----------|
| 3 | Recorder | Maureen Jacobs | X |
| 3 | Dean, Health, Kinesiology, Athletics & Perf. Arts. | Tim Harrison | X |
| 4 | Dean, Institutional Effectiveness | Phillip Briggs | X |
| 5. | Assistant Dean, VCEC & Student Engagement | Jesus Vega | |
| 6. | Faculty, History | Collen Coffey | |
| 7. | Biology, Faculty | Preston Pipal | |
| 8. | College I. T. Services, Director | Grant Jones | X |
| 9. | C. E. Administrative Asst. | Katheryn Solorio | X |

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|---|--|---------|
| 1. Welcome / Introductions | <u>Andrea</u> welcomed all. There were no new guests. | |
| 2. Public Comments | <u>Kelly</u> said we are so glad that people are being vaccinated and the process is smoother. | |
| 3. Action Items: A. Approval of Agenda B. Approval of Minutes C. Program Review Initiatives – Phil Briggs or designee (10 min.) Approval of Program Review Equipment ranking | <p>A. <u>Mark</u> moved and <u>Kelly</u> seconded to accept the Agenda. There was no discussion and there were none opposed to approving the Agenda.</p> <p>B. <u>Mark</u> moved and <u>Felicia</u> seconded to approve the January minutes. There was no discussion and there were none opposed to approving the Minutes.</p> <p>C. <u>Phil</u> reported that we left off with some Tech Requests mixed in to our equipment lists. These were transferred to Technology Requests and added to their spreadsheet. <u>Phil</u> explained the different columns. In the Committee column is the average rubric scores from members who completed it online. The requests are ranked high to low so the rankings remained in the same order. Once this committee approves, it goes to the Exec. Team and then the President. They will be posted on the Program Review webpage.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> reviewed the list for ties. There was one. The Committee discussed this and agreed by consensus to have the one for Tutoring above the other.</p> <p><u>Kelly</u> moved to approve the list and Susan seconded. There were no objections. The Committee approved the 2020-21 Program Review Equipment List.</p> | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|---|---|---------|
| <p>4. Discussion Items:</p> <p>A. Out of Cycle Requests</p> <p>B. Program Review Rubric Discussion (changes to our revised charge and considerations of equity)</p> | <p>A. <u>Cathy</u> said that we would have “<u>Out of Cycle Program Review Requests</u>” as a standing Agenda item. If we have one that comes in for this committee to review, we will move it up into an action item.</p> <p>B. Having changed our charge to considerations of equity, we want to change the equipment rubric to reflect this so that people know how the request is going to be evaluated. If we have any suggestions, we can discuss now and in March. This is so staff have it in the rubric for completing their requests for next year. <u>Cathy</u> displayed the current rubric and guidelines.</p> <p>Do we want to add a new area of equity focus to rank? Do we want to include/keep the age of the initiative? Does it matter that it is still needed after four years?</p> <p><u>Kelly</u> pointed out regarding the age of the initiative, that it is part of an automatic calculation.</p> <p><u>Phil</u> added that we auto calculate that for every requests. The bigger question, is it needed in general? <u>Cathy</u> said it might be nice to have that information but the question is should the age of the initiative be part of the calculation.</p> <p><u>Mark</u> said he thinks it’s important if they have been asking for it for 5 years because it is supposed to be helping this program....or is it something we throw out each year.</p> <p><u>Maria</u> and <u>Kelly</u> agreed.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> asked how we build equity into some of these categories.</p> <p><u>Steve</u> wondered about it being part of Criticality rather than its own category. He didn’t think all equipment requests would necessarily reflect equity. However, he felt it could be under the umbrella.</p> <p><u>Kelly</u> suggested putting it into the guide, explaining it in a couple of sentences. In criticality, an explanation of “how it will improve equity in the learning environment and specify how”. We would specify that they needed to answer this question. “How will this improve equity (or equity and learning?)?”</p> <p><u>Maria</u> added, “Enhance equity”. <u>Kelly</u> liked it. She also suggested, “affect equity.”</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> asked, “How does a backhoe help equity?”</p> <p><u>Orlando</u> suggested, “promote”. “Closing an equity gap means it is closed but we are always going to consider it important.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> agreed with “promote.”</p> | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm**

ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|-------------|--|---------|
| | <p><u>Andrea</u> said, "It's got to be measurable." <u>Cathy</u> commented that a backhoe doesn't have much to do with equity. <u>Andrea</u> replied that it "Just has to be on the rubric, right; If this is an equitable action. They shouldn't have to be penalized if there isn't. We need some sort of rationale as to how and what kind of data, something that we could rank it." <u>Felicia</u> asked if we are going to update the program review instructions so that people see it or will it be up to the requesters to check the rubric to make sure that their descriptions address this. <u>Cathy</u> confirmed that if people are hoping to get their items ranked high, they should know what they are being judged on and make sure that the put in the necessary information. <u>Phil</u> replied that the actual system doesn't have a whole lot of room for the text to put all this in there. We just say to go to this page and you can find the rubrics that describe how the committees are going to be ranking. We can send the rubrics out. They would have to read my email. We don't have a way to actually embed this in the online program review system. <u>Andrea</u> added that we are looking at total points and this would be a bonus on the plus side. <u>Phil</u> agreed that building this into criticality by putting some equity text into these rankings. It would be tough to assess the impact on equity on some equipment requests versus other. <u>Andrea</u> added that it would behoove us to have some record somewhere specifically for accreditation on how we are noting requests how we are noting for example that four of our items showed high equity. <u>Phil</u> discussed the difficulty assessing equity in equipment requests because of the wide range of equipment. An example is a spectroscopy for chemistry versus a backhoe or vacuum cleaner for FM&O. <u>Mark</u> suggested an extra credit for equity as we are encouraged it. <u>Cathy</u> replied if they market it as an equity improvement, they need to add an explanation of how. We would need that to be clear for accreditation. However, it is a worry that In adding an extra credit, does consider the other parts of criticality. <u>Mark</u> suggested making it a separate item. If it promotes equity, tell us how. When you rank it by that, it doesn't penalize other requests.</p> | |

Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)

Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm

ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|-------------|---|---------|
| | <p><u>Steve</u> replied that we can put something in where they can communicate outside of the criticality score, that it relates to equity but we don't use our own judgement to impact the criticality score. If we are helping the equity on campus, we want to report that out. We can scan our list and say for example, 20% of our equipment request improve equity. This way other requests wouldn't have lower points. <u>Kelly</u> agreed and added that the program's own ranking would be higher if it improved equity. <u>Phil</u> added that there are metrics that include equity components for instructional programs such as success rate by demographic groups, degrees and certificates and access to student services.</p> <p><u>Carol</u> returned to the problem of the rubric already being biased against FM&O in that they are not "innovative." However, they are important for maintaining the property and the buildings. Maintenance request go down to the bottom because we are looking at it as a program. What does it do to help students in the class and program? <u>Mark</u> added that in prior years we talked about separating out some of the Maintenance and other things that you shouldn't have to ask for so that they are not in program review. This is supposed to be about improving programs.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> agreed and said that <u>Orlando</u> would love to have that. When she first got here there used to be approximately \$150,000 set aside for furniture replacement and maybe FM&O equipment replacement. This was not for something new. This would need to go through program review. Yes, when something happens or breaks down with something the custodial team uses, FM&O buys it, and does not wait for Program Review. We have a lot to talk through over the next couple of months.</p> <p><u>Maria</u> added that we would like to see where FM&O has a pocket of money allocated for general maintenance equipment for them to tap into and utilize versus them having to request this through this process.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> replied that yes, it can be and again for smaller things, we often do use their budget. It depends on how many things go wrong. We probably want to discuss more big-ticket things. I think the backhoe or tractor we were approved was approximately \$90,000 and it was 18 years old. It makes more sense to every year set aside \$5,000-\$10,000 or more than that for those big-ticket items. On the custodians' golf cart rain coverings, it would make more sense, if when they were worn out, to buy those. It would help as far as that point, to pull them out of program review requests. As <u>Mark</u> pointed out, these requests are supposed to help improve or support programs.</p> | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|--|---|---------|
| | <p><u>Orlando</u> and <u>Mark</u> added that is what we talked about in past years, the total cost of ownership.</p> <p><u>Tim</u> added that these are good examples of things that come up in budget meetings. He has things that need replacing every 3 years. He also spoke about embedding as a reoccurring cost for new, innovative, high-ticket equipment in Program Review.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> would like to bring this back next month. This is a districtwide question with all the colleges. There is a fund for Tech Refresh in program review where we put approximately \$50,000 and wonders if there could be equipment refresh. Right now, we are limited to 2% carryover, although given the current world right now; the Board hasn't held us to the 2% carryover. We need to have a mechanism to set funds aside for equipment refresh. Furniture replacement could be part of it.</p> <p>We should return to talking about promoting equity, how to place it, and whether it should be scored or not.</p> <p><u>Andrea</u> would like the time to mull it over. The equity component would fit better overall if it were focused on the programs.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> agreed that we think about it and bring this topic back next month.</p> | |
| <p>4. Budget Report – Cathy Bojorquez or Jeanine Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. DCAS Report Out B. FY22 Budget Update | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. At the last meeting, there was a discussion on middle or small sized college. As our funding from the State is based on enrollment. VC is funded as a middle-sized college. The difference between a small and middle-sized college is \$600,000. This funding goes to the district and then it is a part of our revenue that goes through our allocation model. The State funded us as such through last year. We are able to shift Summer enrollment from one year to another in order the meet a 10,000 FTS obligation. When you fall out of middle size, you have three years to get it back to the middle size before it actually affects the revenue. In 2021, the middle college is technically going to fall down to a small college size. If we make some proposed changes to the allocation model, it will have an impact that will affect all the colleges, but it will have more impact on us. B. We have received additional Cares funding that we will be able to use until the following fiscal year 21-22 and/or we can ask for an extension. We have to report to the district how we are going to spend it for the March Board meeting. Once it is approved, we do have the option of shifting the funding around. We are going to use these funds for expenses associated with Covid; to defray costs carried out for student support activities. We are suggesting budgeting \$400,000 for faculty training and | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|--|--|---------|
| | <p>mentoring. Non-academic salary includes some professional experts for mental health care for students. Other items include supplies, possible facilities upgrades, and equipment, PE, technology. This time the grant does allow indirect costs so we have budgeted that as well. We have \$2.3 million to give to students directly. This grant also allows us to address lost revenue. We are not exactly sure how the auditors are going to expect us to justify that right now. This may include loss of parking permit fees, rental income (Civic Center), reduced bookstore income, child development fees, and ticket and event sales.</p> <p>C. Allocation Model and its differences. We are going to finalize it tomorrow and recommend this to the Chancellor for our 21-22 budget. The first part of our traditional model is a class schedule delivery allocation. We propose to leave that alone. This is to make sure that we have enough instructional staff to cover our class schedule. DCAS has been trying to align our allocation model to the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF). Under the new proposed model, VC would have gotten \$52.4 million. Under the current model, we received \$51.4 million. Under this new proposed model, VC would receive \$1 million more. It has to do with the number of students we have that are in need and some of our success factors compared to the other campuses. This change would be phased in over five years. The first year we would receive our current allocation. In the second year, we would receive 25% of the difference, 50% in the third year, 75% in fourth year, 100% in fifth. Each year during the phase in period, we would calculate the difference between the old and new allocation model and get the related percentage of the difference. This new change bodes well for our college. Here is the link that explains all the different components: https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/vcccd/Board.nsf/files/BYC24X006A30/\$file/2021-22%20%20allocation%20model.pdf</p> | |
| <p>5. Technology Advisory Group Report – Grant Jones or designee</p> | <p>Grant reported:</p> <p>A. They are still finalizing the Emergency Notification System (ENS) with one-step left to do, the standardized button format for all three colleges. Blackboard Connect will be gone.</p> <p>B. We are getting bids for our faculty training room that will included ceiling microphones, a green screen for lecture capture, new video cameras to enable multiple angles.</p> <p>C. We have diagnosed the problem with our marquee and it will be repaired.</p> <p>D. Financial Aid is checking out the Chromebooks to students.</p> | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|---|--|---------|
| | <p>E. The Cafeteria is being renovated with a new AV system</p> <p>F. We added a Yagi antennae for the Health Screeners in the East parking lots</p> <p>G. Upgraded 5 workstations with Tech Refresh funds</p> <p>H. Re-ranked the Program Review adding 5 that were included with Equipment. We spoke with Phil to try to come up with a method so it doesn't happen again.</p> | |
| 6. Facilities Oversight Advisory Group Report – Orlando De Leon and Steve Palladino or designee | <p>A. Steve let us know that we have selected a Facilities Master Plan consultant. It will go to the March Board. It is Steinberg Hart. It will be a 12-month process. We will start the first interactions with campus constituencies. They have many plans to engage a number of different groups on and off campus. The FOG group will be involved. We hope they will be wrapping up their work in the beginning of 2022.</p> <p>B. The Project Initiations Form is being studied by a workgroup. It will be for projects that don't fall under Program Review. The forms are optional and will be submitted to FOG for review. This is so <u>Orlando</u> reviews the details and costs.</p> <p>C. <u>Orlando</u> reported that the Solar project is continuing in the West lot. It is nearly complete.</p> <p>D. The Science HVAC project is progressing. The HVAC's will soon be installed on the rooftop. All the ductwork on the inside is done. The ceilings will be done in the next few week</p> <p>E. ASC 120 project is going on right now. It should be completed in time for Spring Break. We will be moving over the equipment.</p> | |
| 8. Items to report to CPC | Let CPC know of our conversation about splitting out some of the equipment and establishing an equipment replacement budget. | |
| 9. Future meeting agenda suggestions | <p>A. Change the equipment rubric to reflect an equity component.</p> <p>B. Allocation of funds for equipment replacement and included total cost of ownership.</p> <p>C. Include only new, innovative, high-ticket equipment in Program Review.</p> | |
| 10. Announcements: | <p><u>Erin</u> discussed Lisa Putnam's formation of a group to update and revise our Mission Statement in preparation for our upcoming accreditation visits. It should reflects our current commitments to social justice and equity. We are reaching out for others who would like to join. It would involve about a 2-hour meeting. The first would be to create a survey. Let me know if you would like to join.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> asked if she is giving us too much information. Sue said not. She thinks the information is a good education and that the campus needs to know they can come to BRC.</p> <p><u>Mark</u> agreed that this is the Budget Committee and we need to talk about budgets. We</p> | |

**Budget & Resources Committee
Minutes-Draft-(23 Attended)**

**Handouts: DCAS-Historical Trend of State Resident FTES, Rubric, Progra, Review Equipment-20-2021, Covid Related Funding
February 17, 2021, From 2:30pm to 4pm
ZOOM meeting; <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/93650453377>**

| Agenda Item | Discussion Notes | Action? |
|------------------------------|---|---------|
| | <p>need detail to know what we are speaking about. <u>Cathy</u> offered to meet with anyone with questions.</p> <p><u>Vanessa</u> asked her about the CARE spending for the institution. Vanessa mentioned specific items that may be needed for the Fall return. <u>Cathy</u> replied that each department has been working on a phase in plan for Fall and what is required regarding staff and supplies such as Plexiglas dividers and facemasks. These have been submitted. FM&O has hired someone to assess the air systems for all of our buildings.</p> <p><u>Orlando</u> said the engineers has already started. We are reviewing OSHA recommendations as well.</p> <p><u>Cathy</u> asked <u>Vanessa</u> to work with her department and the manager her area. Individual issues need to be brought to your supervisor.</p> | |
| 11. Adjournment/Next Meeting | The meeting adjourned at 3:57pm. The next meeting is March 17, 2021. | |

FY20-21Charge (Revised): The Budget and Resource Committee (BRC) is an operational committee responsible for making recommendations to the College Planning Committee and the Ventura College Executive Team. The faculty Co-Chair of the BRC or designee serves as a member of the Accreditation Steering Advisory Group and makes a budget report to the College Planning Committee about Ventura College budget and resource activities. The BRC meets regularly to consider and recommend program review resource requests that support the goals of Ventura College and the District Educational Master Plans, performs usage analysis of College resources to support a sustainable budget, considers strategic and budget planning, accountability issues, social justice and equity, and analyzes total cost of ownership issues for Ventura College. The subcommittees of the BRC are the Facilities Oversight Advisory Group and the Technology Advisory Group, which prepare reports and make recommendations to the BRC.