

KERN CAD

Allocation Model Guiding Principles

- Three comprehensive Colleges with multiple centers serving students over 24,000 square miles
- Some services centralized at District Office
- Maintain autonomous decision making at local level
- Simple and easy to understand
- Consistent with SB 361 Model

Allocation Model Guiding Principles

(continued)

- Provide financial stability
- Utilize conservative revenue projections
- Provide for reserves in accordance with Board policy and direction
- Be incentive-based and allow carryover of ending balances
- Allow colleges to initiate, implement and be responsible for new program initiatives
- Provides clear accountability
- Provide for periodic review and revision

The following evaluation tool was developed to apply to the new KCCD allocation model which will be evaluated annually using the following priorities and values, then specific criteria, and finally actual benchmarks.

Guiding Principles

- Planning should drive budgeting, never the reverse;
- Planning should always be for the first-rate, even in the face of second- or third-rate budget allocations;
- Planning, coupled with a critical assessment of successes and failures, is a means of taking conscious control of the process of serving students, and enables the emergence and elaboration of best practices;
- Planning, in an academic context, should be a bottom-up process, that trusts to the expertise of faculty to determine what is needed to serve students most effectively;
- Budget requests should be evaluated in accordance with explicit, detailed criteria that have been agreed to in advance by the affected constituencies;
- Among the criteria for evaluating requests, the requesting department's priority ranking of the activity for which the request is being made should be given special, positive, consideration;
- The evaluation of budget requests must be perceived as fair and impartial in order to encourage the expression of real needs in the planning process;
- The bulk of the work of planning and budgeting should be done by small, efficient subcommittees. One or two larger "shared governance committees" (either a single planning and budget committee, or two committees, one for planning and one for budgeting) should exist only at the top of the process, and should perform the function of synthesizing the input from the smaller subcommittees;
- The workload of planning and budgeting should be distributed among all committees and subcommittees such that each group has a manageable share of the total work to be done;
- Proposed changes to the institutional master plan should be the result of observing trends and problems reflected in the annual plans of departments;
- The allocation models used in the distribution of general funds and in the funding of augmentation requests should be specified in the written budget processes developed by the governing board in collegial consultation with the academic senate. Variations on the adopted models, when introduced, should be the product of collegial consultation between the academic senate and the board;
- Standards for establishing base budgets of departments should be specified in written budget policy, and should be employed in periodic reviews of base budgets;
- Final recommendations of the planning and budget committee(s) should be reviewed by the academic senate, as well as by other campus constituencies;
- If the academic senate finds that existing planning and budget processes are not issuing in recommendations that result in serving students with an education of the highest possible quality, the academic senate should initiate appropriate changes to existing planning and budget processes;
- Written policy should specify that revision of the planning and budget processes can be initiated by either the governing board or the academic senate;
- Written policy should specify that the college president shall bring back to the planning and budget committee(s) for further discussion any recommendations the president does not intend to pursue;
- Academic senates in multi-college districts should specify in written policy that the district budget allocation formula shall be equitable with respect to each college in the district;
- Multi-college districts should take a "students first" approach to budgeting, such that, when revenues are less than anticipated, the class schedules of the colleges are the last to suffer cuts;

- Centralized services offered by district offices in multi-college districts should be subject to regular review and evaluation by the colleges;
- District-level planning committees should be constrained to initiate only such projects as are of service to, and are desired by, all of the colleges in the district.
- District master plans in multi-college districts should be composed of the master plans of the individual colleges, plus the products of district-level planning;
- Are college wide priorities and programs (such as general education as well as new programs) are addressed in the planning and budget processes?

In addition to the above guiding principles, the following specific criteria need to be addressed.

Criteria

- Small college factor review- is the base amount adequate
- Strategic Initiative
- 50% law
- 75:25 ratio
- Full time faculty obligation
- Over cap funding process
- Inability for the district to carry-over funds – is this fair and working
- Stabilization mechanism
- Basic skills over cap funding
- Non-credit funding
- College carry-over
- Mechanism for adding COLA
- Review of the District Office, District wide and Regulatory costs
- District Charge Back mechanism
- Enrollment Management committee outcomes
- Stabilization beyond one year
- Payback to district reserves if utilized by an entity
- Budget reporting process
- A comparison of outcomes of budgeted amounts versus actuals

And finally the following evidence will be used with reference to benchmarks in order to assure that the guiding principles, specific concerns and actual budget amounts are somewhat comparable to like colleges and districts. In other words, an assessment of ourselves with ourselves is not adequate. While finding comparable institutions is difficult, due to unique qualities and factors, this is true in every evaluative process. Benchmarks are simply used to ask better questions.

Benchmarks

- District Operations costs compared to other similar district's operations costs
- Productivity compared between colleges
- District Operations costs compared to other similar district's operations costs
- Productivity compared with other similar colleges
- Overall funding for each campus compared to overall funding for similar campuses
- Overall administrative costs for the district compared with overall administrative costs for similar districts

- Overall Faculty costs for the district
- 75:25 comparisons for each college with a base amount represented by this year
- 50% law calculations for each college with a base comparison represented by this year
- Full time faculty obligation numbers compared with that of other similar districts
- Full time faculty obligation numbers for each college (as we are presently) compared with that of other similarly sized colleges