

**COUNCIL ON BUDGET AND FACILITIES**  
**March 8, 2021**

**APPROVED SUMMARY**

**Members Present:** Tonya Cobb, Terry Cox, Christie Diep, Temperence Dowdle, Rodrigo Garcia, Craig Goralski, Cherry Li-Bugg, Melisa McLellan, Kim Orlijan, Alex Porter, Irma Ramos, Leslie Tsubaki, Ty Volcy, Kashu Vyas, and Fred Williams

**Guests Present:** Morgan Beck, Damon De La Cruz, Co Ho, Geoff Hurst, Fola Odebunmi, JoAnna Schilling, and Richard Williams

**Members Absent:** Jennifer Oo

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:01.

1. **Summary:** The summary of the February 8, 2021 meeting was approved.
2. **P-1 Report** – A copy of the 2020-21 First Principal Apportionment Report was shared with the Committee. The Research Office was asked to investigate the increased earned revenues and decreased hold harmless numbers. The report also shows a 2.38% revenue deficit, roughly \$5 million. Staff expects the deficit to be reduced.

The 2019-20 P-2 numbers were received. The hold harmless numbers matched what had been booked at year-end, however, the deficit was reduced from \$2 million to a little less than \$1 million. Full reports can be found on the State Chancellor's website at <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/College-Finance-and-Facilities-Planning/Appportionment-Reports>

3. **RAM Handbook Overview/update** – Kashu Vyas provided the Committee with a first draft of the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) Handbook. Much of the information included in the handbook is modeled in the Budget Book and in prior handbooks with modifications to pieces related to personnel.

A CBF Group will be created using Microsoft Teams to allow members to make edits, comments, and recommendations to the RAM Handbook. All recommendations will be summarized and brought back to the next meeting for further discussion.

4. **One-time Funding** – At the February 8, 2021 meeting, CBF approved moving the fall and spring campus backfills from one-time funding to CRRSSA funds. Prior to DCC, staff discovered that the Fall 2020 semester backfills could not be funded with CRRSSA funds and was added back to one-time funding. Currently, there is a total of \$19,398,620 unallocated one-time funds (does not include the \$5 million deficit).

**Questions/Comments**

1. *Could the deficit be covered with the allocated RAM dollars?* We would not want to use these dollars; we would reduce the \$19 million total to cover any deficit. Staff is still anticipating that the deficit will decrease, but not disappear.

2. *When would we be able to see the decrease?* Around May or June, when the P-2 calculations are available. An accurate number would be available in February 2022, after any adjustments are made in November. While there is a deficit, staff also expects additional hold harmless dollars in 2021-22.
3. *Can you please clarify/remind us what the highlighted numbers in the April chart represent?* There is no significance. The highlights would not alter any calculations, the highlights were more of a reference point.
4. *Under the Allocation Method column, what is "base" defined as?* Proportionate amounts based on the allocations to each of the campuses, an apportionment allocation methodology.
5. *Does the SERP dollar amount only reflect the Board approved SERP offered to the faculty?* No this was the previous SERP. We have not included any costs for the current SERP. We do not know what the impact will be at this time.
6. *Kashu – with regards to the idea of the resource allocation and student centered funding formula, is there a component that the Committee feels the CBOs are missing? Specific categories from the allocation (i.e. Guided pathways)?* There were no suggestions made at this time.
7. *Additional discussions were had on funding additional areas such as:*
  - *Guided Pathways* – CC is supported by grant money that was not received by FC. This may be something FC may want to look into.
  - *Distance Education Support* – There are significant funding/resources from CRRSSA and CARES money that can be used for Distance Education. Cherry's team will work with the campus distance education coordinators to see what the campus needs are.
  - *Sustainability*

It was suggested that campuses provide formal requests to identify funding needs, similar to the CBO facilities funding requests and campuses made accountable for spending dollars appropriately. Concerns were addressed related to campuses requesting significantly different amounts, not having a budget to work within, and new areas requesting funding that were not previously discussed at CBF. After further discussion, the following recommendation was made:

**Recommendation** – Campus CBOs will initiate conversations at their local Planning & Budget Committees for funding requests using the following budget parameters:

- Cypress - \$2,640,000
- Fullerton - \$3,760,000
- NOCE - \$960,000
- District Services \$640,000
- TOTAL - \$8,000,000

Amounts were calculated using permanent employee counts and will be used as an initial starting point for campus discussions. Campus CBOs will bring back recommendations/requests at the next meeting.

**Facilities Scheduled Maintenance Updated and Funding Request** – All three campuses provided a list of current projects, anticipated completion dates, balances, and a list of future items for additional funding (thru 2022-23).

Terry Cox provided an update for NOCE/Anaheim Campus –Most of the current projects will be completed within the next two years, at which time funds will be depleted. An additional \$1.75 million is being request for NOCE/Anaheim Campus. The largest and most critical project is the ADA Improved Access Project, which would impact students and is estimated at \$1.7 million.

Rodrigo Garcia provided an update for Fullerton College – A list of future projects was listed based on campus priority. Fullerton College is requesting \$9.5 million for future projects.

Alex Porter provided an update for Cypress College – Cypress is understaffed and currently has a significant balance remaining. However, once fully staffed, funds will move out quickly as projects begin. Cypress is requesting \$9.1 million for future projects.

Questions/Comments:

1. *There is an NOCE roofing overlay project listed on Fullerton's list and a roofing project listed on NOCE's list, are these different projects?* Yes. For facilities, we generally look at each project by campus. Buildings occupied by NOCE located at Fullerton are usually covered by Fullerton.
2. *What is the total request for all three campuses?* \$20+ million
3. *Are these requests/amounts above what is regularly budgeted for facilities and maintenance?* In past years, campuses would receive an on-going State budget for deferred maintenance and the District would match those funds, however, the campuses have not received any ADA funds for the past 5-6 years. If funds were received, it was very minimal and was used for instructional equipment.
4. *A concern was addressed that the dollars for other groups/areas that do not have their proposals ready do not get funding. Other entities should have an opportunity to address their needs before allocating large sums of money to scheduled maintenance and facilities projects.*

It was noted that these items are only a portion of the requests that have been sent to the State Chancellor's Office for approval. While many of these projects are not Bond funded, as issues arise, campus staff have been very diligent in using Bond funds when applicable and appropriate, to reduce the impact. CBOs are also taking into consideration that the hold harmless dollars will increase the one-time funding amount.

**Recommendation** – CBOs to prioritize their list of items and list projects/items that could be completed in 2021-22. This item will be brought back for further discussion.

NOCE's list has already been adjusted. Projects were prioritized and some were removed from the list to minimize the request as much as possible. NOCE's request of \$1.75 million will remain the same.

**Microsoft 365 Collaboration Migration** – Morgan Beck presented on the one-time funding request. The District is comprised of multiple components and operates as a single entity; however, our systems work in isolation from one another with the support of additional efforts by the IT teams. The District Technology Round Table, comprised of District-wide IT managers, has been working to find a better solution to remedy the current inefficiencies and frustrations. The solution would be to migrate the entities into a single M365 collaboration environment. Microsoft requires that a Microsoft Partner do the

migration and requires certain programs that cannot be housed inhouse. Therefore, the District Technology Round Table is requesting \$250,000 for tools and professional services.

Question/Comments:

1. *Did this proposal to migrate our systems go through the IT Teams/governance process? There have been some concerns about the migration among faculty.* In 2007-08 the discussion had started among the campuses. The proposal was vetted through TCC, as well as other management groups.
2. *Will there be any cost savings? What about the on-going fees?* There are no changes to the licensing portion of the project. From a cost perspective, the efficiency that people will gain by utilizing a single tenant and really leveraging some of the features, especially across different entities, the Return on Investment (ROI) will be much quicker.
3. *Training and orientation piece, what is the plan moving forward?* The initial migration will be rolled out by the campus IT managers and team. This will allow the campus specific IT staff to support their respective personnel. A representative from each campus will oversee campus-wide communication. On-going support will be more campus specific towards their specific needs.
4. *What are the possible negative implications of rolling this out? There was talk about data being lost, a negative impact on faculty being able to communicate or support their students, and privacy settings, the District would have all viewing rights to faculty online searches and emails.* There are those who are privy to some information, that will not change, but when a Public Records Request is made, by law we must provide the requested information. Data would not be lost. During the migration some files may not automatically transfer over and may need to be manually moved, but no data would be lost. The biggest impact of the migration would be the level of effort required by the IT teams to roll the project out.
5. *That is a huge concern allowing management viewing rights. The proposal should be taken to the constituent groups for discussion and comments brought back for review and consideration.* Policies for viewing rights will remain the same; you must have a certain level of authorization to view records.
6. *Is the merge primarily aimed at consolidating the four entities into one, but still allowing them to retain their individuality?* Yes, we want to be able to provide the infrastructure, so everyone has the ability to utilize the tools to their maximum capacity. For example, having the ability to collaboratively work on a single document between campuses using an inhouse platform like Teams. This would prevent personnel having to use third party websites or applications that pose a higher risk for cyber threats.
7. *With technology, glitches are inevitable. If there are issues, would that be local or District-wide problem? How is that solved with the migration?* The migration is a cloud-based program, so it will not impact the faculty or staff. This is a backend project where the end user will not be impacted and should have a smooth transition. By having a cloud-based program, the IT teams are able to address cyber threats much quicker, as staff are not required to be on-site to address any attacks.
8. *What about the impact on students? Are there any negative repercussions?* The two migrations (students and staff) have been separated into two separate projects.

After opinions and concerns were vetted, the following recommendation was made:

**Recommendation** – *This item will be taken back to the campus constituency groups and brought back for further discussion.*

**5. District-wide Expenses IT Request** – Requesting a permanent funding source for District-wide expenses.

Questions/Comments:

1. *It was requested that a representative from each of the collective bargaining groups be included in TCC.*

Questions and/or comments related to the funding request should be sent to Dr. Cherry Li-Bugg.

Quorum was lost at 4:15 p.m. Remaining items on the agenda would be brought back to the April meeting for further discussion and/or action.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.**