APPROVED SUMMARY

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

Guests Present: Philip Austin, Brandi Avila, Simon Brown Thunder, Geoff Hurst, Cheryl Marshall, Mary Fola Odebunmi, JoAnna Schilling, Greg Schulz, Kai Sterns Moore, Richard Williams

Members Absent: Jennifer Oo

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:03.

1. **Summary:** The summary of the November 2, 2020, meeting was amended and approved.

2. **Budget Update**

    Evaluation of the new RAM – The new RAM was rolled-out with the 2020-21 Proposed Budget. District staff would like to evaluate the new RAM to make any necessary adjustments.   Input, suggestions, and recommendations were asked of the CBF Council.

    Question/Comments:
    1. *Christie Diep commented that after working with racial justice and equity committees, it was suggested that funding for diversity, equity, and inclusion should be a District-wide expense and should be reviewed in more detail to ensure equity is met across all sites.*
    2. *Craig Goralski suggested an assessment tool be created and used District-wide. The assessment tools could be used by the campus Planning Budget Committees (PBC), or respective committees, as these committees are familiar with the campus budgets and include all constituent groups, and findings would be reported back to CBF for comparisons.*
    3. *Fred Williams commented that if changes need to be made to the new RAM, they will need to be identified now, in order to incorporate them into the 2021-22 Budget. He also noted that COVID will most likely have a large impact on the data that is being reviewed. Mr. Williams shared that during the roll-out of the new RAM, staff ran into difficulties reconciling the budget, received comments about the District's allocation for District Services, and charge backs. A subcommittee was suggested to help identify key components and areas to be reviewed.*
    4. *Kashu Vyas clarified that there are two main components to evaluating the new RAM. One, compare the actuals to the proposed and second, incorporating elements that have been identified and need to be addressed at each of the centers. She also noted that members can make recommendations to fund new District-wide components, like the IT requests or equity and inclusion costs, however the proper guidelines and steps would need to be taken to make the recommendation to CBF. It was also noted that the District-wide expenses are funded proportionately by the Budget Centers.*

    Several discussions took place to identify what needed to be evaluated and how.   A recommendation was brought forth for the Budget Officers to discuss and identify components of

the new RAM that worked, did not work, and recommended changes that need to be made and brought back to the next CBF meeting.

3. **One-time Funding**

   One-Time Funding Overview
   An updated spreadsheet, as of December 11, 2020, of one-time funding was shared with the Committee. Updated amounts included the off-schedule salary increase offered to Faculty ($5,750,000) and the MOUs for the Spring Semester ($645,000). Also included was the HR Automated Processes (SIG) ($131,760), leaving a balance of $14.4 million of unallocated funds. It was noted that hold harmless dollars have not been included for subsequent years.

   HR Automated Processes
   There are three baseline projects (compatible with Banner) with Strata Information Group (vendor). The three projects include, Faculty load and compensation implementation (FLAC), Web Time Entry (including payroll), and employee profile.

   FLAC automates the calculation for compensation for faculty and adjunct assignments and provides a user-friendly dashboard and employee profile. FLAC also has the capability to process faculty contacts which allows deans, VPs, and admin a full view of the academic term assignments. Payroll, HR, and campus functions would be automated, and reports would be accessible online.

   Questions/Comments:

   1. *Is this part of the manual paperwork that is completed at the campuses?* Yes. These projects will eliminate paper processes.
   2. *Does this include staff assignment sheets?* Yes, these projects will assist with the admin entry process, but will require the same approval process.
   3. *Currently, changes are made, errors are made, etc. will that be accounted for in this program?* Yes. Faculty interactions are done electronically, but changes would not be made without the user's knowledge.
   4. H*as this been brought to the deans, etc. at the campuses? Do they agree with the assessment that it will help smooth processes and save time?* Not yet, but the intent is to share how FLAC will benefit them and save time. The automation process has been a long-awaited request from the campuses.
   5. *For Adjuncts, will there be a standardized assignment request form and offer form?* Yes. A template is typically created for each type of faculty member and standardized based on their role.
   6. *Is the total cost a one-time cost? Are there future costs involved?* Yes, that is the plan. They are self-contained, however, there are sometimes small fees that may arise that are unforeseen.

   Self Service Employee Profile and Web Entry – These components will allow staff to move paper functions into a sub service function. The Employee Profile is a large component which will provide employees the resources to view their personal information and not have to contact District staff to request information.

   Ultimately, these projects are intended to make it easier for District staff to present and collect employee information, streamline the processes.

   By consensus, the Committee recommended moving the request to fund the HR Automated Processes, in the amount of $131,760 forward to DCC for one-time funding.

4. District-wide Expenses

Funding District-wide IT Expenses – CBF previously approved one-time funding for the 2019-20 and 2020-21 District-wide IT expenses. This item has been brought forth to request permanent funding for subsequent years.

Questions/Comments:

1. *Is there a process in place to determine what projects will be taken on as a District-wide projects? What happens, for instance, if one budget center does not want to use a specific piece of software or an item on this list?* Moving forward, the District-wide IT governance and decision-making process is currently being reviewed and revised.   *A suggestion was made to include the campus Budget Officers in TCC (Technology Coordinating Council) to address any budgetary needs or requests.*
2. *Why is there a significant increase from 2020-21 to 2021-22?* The MODO Lab license was purchased for a three-year contract. In 2021-22 the contract will need to be renewed.
3. *If this is currently being funded by one-time funds, where will funding come from to institutionalize them now? Won't this mean the costs are absorbed by the funding centers under the new RAM?* If a cost is added to the District-wide bucket, then all four budget centers must cover the cost, based on their ratios of their revenues that were initially allocated to the budget centers. *Can this then be part of the evaluation?* Yes, if it moved in the District-wide bucket, then yes, it will be evaluated.

Discussion took place to address concerns regarding the governance structure and the oversight of taking on new projects. A majority expressed concern for funding the current list of expenses with little to no input from other campus constituents. It was also noted that the total annual amounts would be recalculated to provide a more accurate sum.   In conclusion, it was recommended that the list of items be reviewed at the campus level prior to CBF. This item will be brought forth to a future meeting for further discussion.

5. Strategic plan funding allocation –

The Strategic Plan Fund was set up over five years ago by the Board of Trustees to support projects that would contribute to strategic directions. The $1 million allocation has not been used in the past four years. With the new Educational and Facilities Master Plan and our renewed commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Anti-racism (DEIA), now is a good time to earmark a portion of these dollars to support campus and District-wide initiatives.

Based on a review of the campus reports, meetings with the DEI Faculty Fellows, Campus Task Forces, UF RJEC, and discussion in Chancellor's Staff, a list of recommended actions and initiatives that would need additional funding to address DEIA, Social Justice, and Anti-Blackness within the District were presented by Dr. Cheryl Marshall to propose moving forward, providing $400,000 in funding.

Questions/Comments:

1. *A request was made to ensure there is support at each campus at an equitable level and that a local process will be employed at each site to determine local priorities and specific expenditures.* Dr. Cheryl Marshall noted that her direction to the CEOs would be to see that the allocation work within the parameters listed in the recommendation and further reporting on how funds are being spent.

2. *I would assume we would contract for services and not duplicate efforts.* If and where possible, yes. For example, mental health, the campuses will need to review the details specific to their campus.
3. *Brandi Avila mentioned that there have been recommendations for student support as well as non-permanent staff and faculty support as it pertains to mental health and suggested this could possibly be housed at the District level. She also emphasized the importance of tracking the expenditures to ensure the proper use of the funds.*
4. *Craig Goralski commented on bridging the digital divide for the students, which disproportionately impacts students of color. Dr. Goralski hopes to have a consistent level of financial support at each of the learning centers. He also noted that he would like to see that hiring and recruitment processes are in place to ensure the District is receiving candidates that are as diverse as possible.*
5. *The funding request is $1 million, is there any way to increase this amount?* The $1 million is a starting point to get things up and running. Once we are able to assess things in more detail, we can evaluate the process and see what the other $600,000 can be spent on.

Members and non-members thanked Dr. Marshall and appreciated her consideration and efforts in moving this item forward.

By consensus, the recommendation to approve the $400,000 for DEIA was approved to move forward to DCC for further discussion.

6. **Facilities update**

Cypress College – Alex Porter provided an update for Cypress College.
- SEM Building – There is great progress. Painting on the 1st and 2nd floor is currently underway. The climate pressurizing is scheduled to be complete in February 2021. The scaffolding is still going up and Cypress is expecting substantial completion by May 2021
- VRC – Front counter and wall are currently being installed and final touches to the courtyard are being made. Is scheduled to be 100% complete by the end of December 2020, beginning of January 2021
- Pond – All fencing has been removed
- Cypress will be selling pavers as a fundraising effort. Additional information will be provided later
- Fine Arts Building - The preliminary phase is being worked on and will be submitted to the State Chancellor's Office
- Baseball Clubhouse – Is scheduled to be complete by the end of December 2020

Fullerton College – Rodrigo Garcia provided an update for Fullerton College.
- Instructional Building/Humanities – scaffolding is up, including the courtyard. Roofing has started, the framing is complete on the 1st -3rd floors, and the crews have starting on the infrastructure. This project is about 50% complete
- Central Plant Expansion – Is about 60% complete. This project is replacing the cooling towers and will also provide chilled water to the Instructional Building. The chilled water will be connected this month and is scheduled to be utilized in January or February of 2021
- 300/500 Renovation – This is a historical building and vendors must be prequalified for historical preservation. There were six pre-qualified contractors that all came to the mandatory walk through. The bid is currently out to the public and construction is expected to start in January 2022

- Performing Art Center – Fullerton received funding for the preliminary plans. Staff is in the process of creating a committee for architect selection and will be finalized this week. Expect to receive notice to proceed with the design phase no later than February 2021
- Sherbeck Field - Design/development phase has been completed and is scheduled to go to DSA mid to late December 2020. Completion is expected by early 2022

<u>Anaheim Campus</u> – Fred Williams provided an update for the Anaheim Campus.
- Staff met with a solar firm to create proposals for the patio solar panels
- The upper deck project was on the advanced list for the 2022-23 State Funding Projects. The goal is to move this project up a year

7. Other Items

- An agenda item will be brought back for future discuss regarding recruitments and advertisements for diverse candidates. Irma Ramos will coordinate with Craig Goralski to discuss specifics and timing with Arturo Ocampo before the item is brought back to CBF.

Future meetings: January 11, 2021 meeting TBD pending the release of the Governor's Proposed Budget.

Meeting adjourned at: 4:02 p.m.