Peralta Community College District

BAM Task Force

4-26-2016

Present: Luther Aaberge, MaryBeth Benevenutti, Phyllis Carter, Ron Little, Annette Ambrosio

Absent: Mario Rivas, Tim Brice, BCC President

Guests:

ACCJC District Recommendation

Annette Ambrosio shared the status of District Recommendation from the ACCJC report. Specifically, she discussed Recommendation #8 regarding the district has to systematically evaluate district allocation of resources and are they effective in supporting the Peralta colleges. She believes the work of the committee is to support addressing this ACCJC recommendation.

The committee members discussed presenting any improvements at the August 2016 Board Summit Meeting. If the BAM is part of the integrated planning and central to proper functioning of the district. The Peralta college staffs are concerned that BAM includes representative college voices.

The more dialogue that you put a timeline when things will have happen...continuous evaluation of performance. The committee should consider reissuing the district wide evaluation survey this year as well.

Report of BAM Task Force Recommendation

Committee members discussed how best to document the work of the committee and where the committee expects to direct the attention of the PBC regarding findings and how to reintegrate this findings into the BAM model.

Committee members discussed the August Professional Days and first draft of the accreditation report response which must presented to the Board at the 9-13-16 Board Meeting. At at minimum, the BAM Task Force Committee should plan to complete its efforts before this date.

Committee members should consider linking it's work to the accreditation standards. Annette is offering her help to the committee. Committee identify progress from the committee, announce items in May Districtwide and list the areas the committee is working on and which are still in progress.

This report should include a roadmap, of where the committee is going. It will give the colleges lead time in preparing their response to the ACCJC Recommendations.

The existing BAM model needs to be reviewed once again by the committee.

The question was raised whether we can implement proposed recommendations today? What do you define the equitable distribution of resources? Annette's recommendation is to create a definition that is not so restrictive.

Allocation of Resources (Classified Staffing)

The committee discussed how Today's Meeting Agenda Item # 4 will be implemented to determine how classified will be allocated to colleges.

The Committee members asked the questions what methods are the District and college using for allocating resources today? Is there a direct link between program reviews and allocation of resources? What methods are being used to allocate resources to innovative programs?

The committee should consider the process used by the Engineering department and the quantity of thresholds based on square footage or other variables. In addition, these factors will impact Custodial and Grounds.

For their reference, committee members can refer back to the January Minutes regarding the CAP limits on classes.

Phyllis agreed to provide draft language to request the District to consider initiating plans for the replacement of the Parcel Tax replacement. There is an 18 month to 2 year cycle that exists in issuing a parcel tax initiative. The committee will make a recommendation to address the Parcel Tax replacement.

Next Steps for the Committee

The committee discussed continuing to meet in the summer and finish the committee's work.

The committee has to consider how to building accountability in the model.

The committee needs to decide and when and how to report out the results of all recommendaitons by the committee.

The committee agreed to identify 4 districts that are similar to Peralta and conduct a comparison of the features of their BAM model.

'The next meeting of the BAM Task Force is scheduled for May 17.

BAM Task Force

Meeting Minutes

April 5, 2016

In attendance:

Aaberge, Luther; Benevenutti, MaryBeth; Brice, Tim; Carter, Phyllis; Little, Ron; Rivas, Mario.

- Called to Order: 10:35 am.
- Minutes from March 15, 2016 meeting approved.
- TF discussed the incremental approach to current BAM model refinements versus consideration of other budget models. Agreed that we want to continue to do both. Finish with incremental recommendations then circle back to review other models. The goal is report back to the PBC in early fall with final recommendations.
- A suggestion was made to report out progress and any existing TF recommendations at the PBC Summit in August. We will plan to continue to meet through the summer.
- Reviewed the Planning Guide for Maintaining School Facilities published by XXXXX and DeAnza College's Custodial Program Review.
- Custodial formulas are based on cleanliness levels: 1 being pristine (e.g.- hospital) and 5 being filthy. Most schools are at Level 3, but many aspire to Level 2. Schools can have a combination, i.e. some buildings may have rooms at Level 3 cleanliness and other buildings/rooms at Level 2.
 - o Standards:
 - Level 2 = 20,000 square feet assigned per custodian
 - Level 3 = 30,000 square feet assigned per custodian
 - Tim will analyze what college and district office custodial assignments (FTE #s) would look like for both Level 2 and Level 3. To be shared at next meeting.
 - Luther will verify the number of current custodians at each college and district office
 - Phyllis will share APPA standards with TF members
- Grounds Workers:
 - o Standards:
 - Acceptable range is 20 acres per grounds worker
 - Standard range is 18 acres per grounds worker
 - Tim will analyze what college and district grounds worker assignments (FTE #s) would look like for both Acceptable and Standard. To be shared at next meeting.
 - Luther will verify the number of current grounds workers at each college and district office

- Discussion around standards for other classified staff, such as A&R, Financial Aid, human resources, etc. Mario agreed to research standards and best practices in these areas. To be shared at next meeting.
- Discussion around District Office service levels and costs. Service agreements with the colleges would help delineate support services that the District provides and what it does not. Need to consider effectiveness and efficiencies of D.O. operations. Ron agreed to conduct a survey of other multi college districts to assess cost of D.O services as % of total GF Budget. To be shared at next meeting.
- TF Recommendation: *PBC should form a separate Task Force to review service levels, effectiveness and reasonableness of costs of all District Office support services.*
- Next meeting: April 19, 10:30am to 12noon.
- Adjourned at 11:35 am.

BAM Task Force

Meeting Minutes

March 15, 2016

In attendance:

Aaberge, Luther; Bourgoin, Fred; Brice, Tim; Little, Ron; Rivas, Marion; and, Smith, Cleavon.

- Called to Order: 10:32 am.
- Minutes from March 1, 2016 meeting approved.
- TF reviewed CTE data provided by colleges. Inconsistencies were noted and a few challenges were identified: 0-capped courses; the fact that caps can arbitrarily be changed; etc.
- After reviewing the CTE data across all colleges, considering capped and non-capped courses, and assessing CTE as a % of total FTES at each college, **TF concluded that CTE courses have no significant disproportionate impact on college productivity levels.**
- Discussion about classified staffing:
 - Tim will provide data/ information for next meeting with respect to custodial and grounds ratios
 - District Office service levels and costs should be reviewed and considered
 - A&R remains an open question: are there perceived inequities there?
- Reviewed LACCD's Allocation Model
 - Base Allocation per college
 - + augmentation for senior leadership based on size
 - + augmentation for M&O staff based on formulas
 - + share of Growth funds
 - + incentive for productivity
- Discussion around a transition plan once TF recommendations are made to PBC, assuming changes are made to the current model
- Adjourned at 11:50 am.