Board of Trustees Special Meeting

Agenda

June 8, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Deedy Staff Lounge, Kentfield Campus
Web Address: http://www.justin.tv/comtrustees

Trustee Namnath will participate by telephone from 2121 Second St., B107 in Davis, California.

The Board shall act on posted items and shall not deliberate items that are not on the posted agenda.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to access the Board meeting room or to otherwise participate at this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact Bob Balestreri at 485-9414. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the District to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the Board meeting.

If you wish to speak, complete card available at entrance, give card to recording secretary, get recognition from the Chair. Persons desiring to address the Board on items not on the agenda may speak under item number “A.2” on the agenda. Public comment presentations will be limited to no more than 3 minutes each.

Government Code §54957.5 states that public records which relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting should be made available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members of the Board. The Board has designated the Office of the Superintendent/President at 835 College Avenue, Administrative Center 123, Kentfield for the purpose of making those public records available for inspection.
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA
6:30 p.m. – Deedy Staff Lounge, Student Services Building
Kentfield Campus

A. Special Meeting

1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Adoption of Agenda

2. Citizens’ Requests to Address the Board on Non-Agenda Items

3. Chief Executive Officer’s Report
   a) Staff Reports
      1. WASC Update (Fran White) - BP1.4a (Review institutional needs and assess institutional effectiveness, using Program Review, Administrative Planning and Assessment, the Strategic Plan and the Educational Master Plan)

4. Update on COM Superintendent/President Search (Eva Long)
   a) Date Change for Interviews: August 30 – September 3, 2010, 4:00 p.m.

5. Board Study Session
   a) Budget Workshop (Al Harrison)
   b) Review Board Priorities 2009/10 (Fran White)
   c) Timeline for Board Priorities 2010/2011 (Fran White)

6. Recess to Closed Session
B. Closed Session – 8:30 p.m. in Deedy Staff Lounge, Student Services Building, Kentfield Campus

1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Adoption of Agenda
   (a) Request for Public Comment on Closed Session Agenda

2. Closed Session: To consider and/or take action upon any of the following items:
   (a) Under Government Code, Section 54957:
       PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
       Title: Superintendent/President
   (b) Under Government Code, Section 54947:
       PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT
       Interim Superintendent/President

C. Reconvene to Open Session

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Report of Closed Session for June 8, 2010

3. Adjournment
BUDGET WORKSHOP
STUDY SESSION
06/08/10
ISSUES FACING THE DISTRICT

➢ NEGATIVE CPI INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FOR SECURED PROPERTY.

➢ SMALLER INCREASE IN SUPPLEMENTAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE.

➢ ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS IN CATEGORICAL FUNDS FROM THE STATE.

➢ MAJOR INCREASES IN EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, INCLUDING STRS & PERS RATES.
ISSUES FACING THE DISTRICT

➢ 2009/10 DEFICIT

➢ ELIMINATING 2010/11 BUDGET DEFICIT

➢ IMPLICATIONS OF CONTINUING NEED TO ELIMINATE BUDGET DEFICITS

➢ EVALUATING SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS TO ELIMINATE BUDGET DEFICITS
REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS SUMMARY

1. COMMUNITY SERVICES BUDGET SHOULD REMAIN STABLE IN WHICH REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES ARE EQUAL.

2. RESTRICTED GENERAL FUND BUDGETS FOR 2010/11 AND 2011/12 MAY BE LOWER THAN THE 2009/10 STATE FUNDING LEVELS. BUDGET AT 85% OF 2009/10 STATE ALLOCATION.
3. FOR 2010/11, NEGATIVE CPI INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FOR SECURED PROPERTY TAXES WILL RESULT IN A DECLINE IN ANTICIPATED SECURED PROPERTY TAXES.

4. SUPPLEMENTAL PROPERTY TAXES WILL CONTINUE AT THE SAME FUNDING LEVELS AS WAS COLLECTED FOR THE 2009/10 FISCAL YEAR.
REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS SUMMARY

5. ENROLLMENT FEES ARE PROJECTED TO REMAIN CONSTANT PENDING LEGISLATION THAT MAY RESULT IN A FEE INCREASE.

6. STATE REVENUE IS BUDGETED AT 85% OF THE 2009/10 FUNDING LEVEL.

7. LOCAL REVENUE TO REMAIN CONSTANT.
# SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM-BASED FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE SUBVENTIONS</strong></td>
<td>$285,240</td>
<td>$285,416</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>$285,865</td>
<td>$285,685</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURED</td>
<td>35,766,616</td>
<td>37,713,652</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>37,781,783</td>
<td>37,543,962</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL</td>
<td>1,174,183</td>
<td>751,877</td>
<td>-36.6%</td>
<td>789,380</td>
<td>356,850</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSECURED</td>
<td>777,303</td>
<td>768,923</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>850,212</td>
<td>850,212</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR-YEAR</td>
<td>114,687</td>
<td>103,002</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>80,492</td>
<td>80,492</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES</strong></td>
<td>37,832,677</td>
<td>39,356,314</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>39,099,267</td>
<td>39,891,549</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENROLLMENT FEES</strong></td>
<td>1,429,455</td>
<td>1,398,455</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM-BASED</strong></td>
<td>39,262,132</td>
<td>40,754,769</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>41,117,262</td>
<td>40,873,541</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23,078</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERSHIP FOR EXCEL</td>
<td>1,697,129</td>
<td>1,742,873</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1,515,040</td>
<td>1,515,040</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATE</td>
<td>1,123,719</td>
<td>941,969</td>
<td>-18.9%</td>
<td>676,052</td>
<td>737,056</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STATE</strong></td>
<td>2,820,848</td>
<td>2,684,842</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>1,821,092</td>
<td>1,852,096</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST</td>
<td>22,533</td>
<td>97,271</td>
<td>331.8%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-RESIDENCE FEES</td>
<td>493,335</td>
<td>889,285</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STUDENT CHARGES</td>
<td>97,166</td>
<td>86,838</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-RESIDENCE INSURANCE</td>
<td>39,593</td>
<td>35,103</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
<td>35,560</td>
<td>35,560</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>287,999</td>
<td>236,712</td>
<td>-19.9%</td>
<td>234,039</td>
<td>234,039</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$43,261,067</td>
<td>$44,602,922</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>$44,179,332</td>
<td>$43,878,077</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPENSE ASSUMPTIONS SUMMARY

1. ANNUAL STEP AND COLUMN SALARY INCREASES WILL CONTINUE.

2. BENEFITS COSTS WILL CONTINUE TO RISE.

3. HOLD OTHER COSTS FLAT.

4. CATEGORICAL AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE SELF-FUNDED.
# USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>$28,907,717</td>
<td>$27,859,435</td>
<td>$28,622,886</td>
<td>$28,762,767</td>
<td>$134,481</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFITS</td>
<td>2,222,333</td>
<td>2,537,656</td>
<td>9,717,673</td>
<td>10,609,700</td>
<td>992,027</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>31,130,050</td>
<td>30,397,091</td>
<td>38,340,559</td>
<td>39,372,467</td>
<td>1,152,907</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIXED EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,854,892</td>
<td>1,850,347</td>
<td>1,804,362</td>
<td>1,840,000</td>
<td>35,638</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER OPERATING</td>
<td>3,111,731</td>
<td>3,514,111</td>
<td>3,445,626</td>
<td>3,211,572</td>
<td>(235,000)</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY</td>
<td>330,670</td>
<td>211,918</td>
<td>210,350</td>
<td>114,427</td>
<td>(95,955)</td>
<td>-45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER OUTGO</td>
<td>609,955</td>
<td>1,313,095</td>
<td>815,267</td>
<td>271,663</td>
<td>(543,644)</td>
<td>-65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC. EXCELLENCE RESERVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES</td>
<td>5,446,649</td>
<td>6,510,472</td>
<td>6,372,786</td>
<td>5,637,852</td>
<td>(674,930)</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USES</strong></td>
<td>$24,686,699</td>
<td>$24,356,562</td>
<td>$24,725,345</td>
<td>$24,670,599</td>
<td>($27,510)</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ESTIMATED</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
<th>DOLLAR $</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SOURCES</td>
<td>43,251,057</td>
<td>44,802,522</td>
<td>44,179,532</td>
<td>43,878,077</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USE OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>38,140,490</td>
<td>37,437,099</td>
<td>38,245,259</td>
<td>39,152,467</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIXED EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,200,000)</td>
<td>1,080,347</td>
<td>1,090,362</td>
<td>1,040,020</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER OPERATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,111,161</td>
<td>3,514,111</td>
<td>3,446,838</td>
<td>3,351,572</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL OUTLAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,100,000</td>
<td>10,200,000</td>
<td>10,300,000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER OUTGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,946,649</td>
<td>6,119,472</td>
<td>6,379,783</td>
<td>5,537,652</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44,096,099</td>
<td>44,254,542</td>
<td>44,425,041</td>
<td>44,710,129</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES OVER (UNDER) USES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2,048,042)</td>
<td>2,048,042</td>
<td>2,048,042</td>
<td>2,048,042</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFER IN (OUT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(25,756)</td>
<td>(148,519)</td>
<td>(132,203)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BEGINNING FUND BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,469,895</td>
<td>4,618,497</td>
<td>4,915,938</td>
<td>3,647,822</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENDING FUND BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,618,497</td>
<td>4,915,938</td>
<td>3,647,822</td>
<td>(175,839)</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESERVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS FOR ELIMINATING A DEFICIT

- % REDUCTION ACROSS THE BOARD
- STOP SUBSIDIZING CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS
- REDUCE INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS IN ALL SEMESTERS
- FREEZE VACANT POSITIONS

SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS ARE NOT SUSTAINABLE YEAR OVER YEAR
IMPLICATIONS OF SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS

1. BUDGET CUTS MAY OR MAY NOT BE STRATEGIC.

2. POTENTIAL DECLINE IN ENROLLMENT.

3. PERMANENT FORCE REDUCTIONS IN CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS.

4. NOT VAILABLE IN THE LONG-TERM.
OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

1. UNCERTAIN PROPERTY TAX REVENUES - ANTICIPATE A SLOW RECOVERY.

2. INCREASING SALARIES AND BENEFITS.

3. CONTINUED REDUCTION IN STATE FUNDING OF CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS.

NEED RESERVE LEVELS THAT CAN WITHSTAND ECONOMIC DOWNTURNS.
# Property Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program-Based Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subventions</td>
<td>$296,608</td>
<td>$262,028</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>$287,620</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>$289,249</td>
<td>-0.62%</td>
<td>$287,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$296,608</td>
<td>$262,028</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>$287,620</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>$289,249</td>
<td>-0.62%</td>
<td>$287,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>$25,108,910</td>
<td>$23,616,880</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>$32,438,097</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$33,755,952</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>$33,755,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>$1,466,253</td>
<td>$1,611,002</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$1,247,583</td>
<td>-22.5%</td>
<td>$1,174,063</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
<td>$1,174,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecured</td>
<td>$613,648</td>
<td>$446,442</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>$727,135</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>$771,342</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>$771,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior-Year</td>
<td>$33,181</td>
<td>$29,309</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
<td>$133,711</td>
<td>113.2%</td>
<td>$114,687</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>$114,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxes</strong></td>
<td>$26,413,939</td>
<td>$22,461,835</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>$27,845,817</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>$28,893,415</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$28,893,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$28,720,408</td>
<td>$24,943,481</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>$28,467,406</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$29,449,720</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>$29,449,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Taxes Have Declined For Three Years**
LABOR-RELATED COSTS ARE THE DISTRICT'S LARGEST EXPENSE

› DISTRICT PAID PENSION COSTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERS</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>16.709%, 17.879%, 26.338%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRS</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

› DISTRICT PAID HEALTH CAP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>$7,247</td>
<td>$14,375 AND $15,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL/VISION</td>
<td>$1,308</td>
<td>$1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8,555</td>
<td>$16,103 AND $16,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

› THESE COSTS WILL CONTINUE TO RISE

› NEED TO FIND WAYS TO CONTROL BENEFITS COSTS
# SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Based Funding</td>
<td>40,985,225</td>
<td>41,117,052</td>
<td>40,879,331</td>
<td>41,379,004</td>
<td>41,882,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>23,278</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State</td>
<td>2,684,842</td>
<td>1,831,102</td>
<td>1,890,086</td>
<td>1,766,437</td>
<td>1,682,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local</td>
<td>1,157,210</td>
<td>1,088,500</td>
<td>1,238,520</td>
<td>1,212,128</td>
<td>1,215,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>44,802,522</td>
<td>44,137,653</td>
<td>43,970,457</td>
<td>44,367,169</td>
<td>44,780,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>27,019,435</td>
<td>28,022,286</td>
<td>28,752,767</td>
<td>29,662,767</td>
<td>29,703,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>9,517,656</td>
<td>9,717,622</td>
<td>10,399,700</td>
<td>10,589,700</td>
<td>10,705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>36,537,091</td>
<td>37,740,098</td>
<td>39,152,467</td>
<td>40,252,467</td>
<td>40,408,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,800,247</td>
<td>1,954,262</td>
<td>1,934,000</td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Operating</strong></td>
<td>3,514,111</td>
<td>3,499,836</td>
<td>3,211,572</td>
<td>3,211,572</td>
<td>3,211,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>211,918</td>
<td>210,380</td>
<td>114,627</td>
<td>114,627</td>
<td>114,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outgo</td>
<td>1,313,606</td>
<td>416,207</td>
<td>271,603</td>
<td>271,603</td>
<td>271,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Expenses</strong></td>
<td>6,919,422</td>
<td>6,379,755</td>
<td>5,537,602</td>
<td>5,537,602</td>
<td>5,537,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td>44,456,512</td>
<td>44,720,053</td>
<td>44,282,069</td>
<td>45,189,129</td>
<td>45,703,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources Over (Under) Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In (Out)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>4,618,407</td>
<td>4,615,938</td>
<td>4,247,027</td>
<td>3,575,571</td>
<td>3,283,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>4,615,530</td>
<td>4,615,027</td>
<td>4,247,027</td>
<td>3,583,153</td>
<td>3,283,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS FOR ELIMINATING A DEFICIT

- PRIORITIZE RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS
- BENCHMARK AGAINST OTHER DISTRICTS
- CONTROL BENEFIT COSTS

TOUGH DECISIONS WILL NEED TO BE MADE
RESOURCE ALLOCATION

› REVIEW CURRENT RESOURCE ALLOCATION:
  › OVERALL STUDENT INSTRUCTION/ADMINISTRATION
  › ADMINISTRATION
  › FUNDING OTHER PROGRAMS FROM UNRESTRICTED FUND

› EVALUATE PROGRAM OFFERINGS:
  › TRANSFER EDUCATION
  › CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION
  › BASIC SKILLS

› OTHER BOARD PRIORITIES:
  › RESERVE LEVEL
  › UNFUNDED LIABILITIES
  › EMPLOYEE EQUITY STUDY
  › CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS
  › FACILITIES MAINTENANCE

PRIORITIZE LIMITED RESOURCES
## RESOURCE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>Actual Budget</th>
<th>07/11X YTD</th>
<th>2009/10 Annualized</th>
<th>% of 2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Skills Department - DW</td>
<td>$2,025,100</td>
<td>$2,213,948</td>
<td>$2,621,322</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Visual Arts</td>
<td>1,233,200</td>
<td>1,272,930</td>
<td>1,971,970</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1,532,522</td>
<td>1,729,954</td>
<td>1,925,519</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1,324,200</td>
<td>1,607,719</td>
<td>1,821,279</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Earth Sciences</td>
<td>1,418,625</td>
<td>1,606,266</td>
<td>1,721,269</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education - DW</td>
<td>1,318,571</td>
<td>1,513,365</td>
<td>1,714,402</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>1,216,664</td>
<td>1,469,700</td>
<td>1,684,234</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1,151,777</td>
<td>1,305,847</td>
<td>1,537,090</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Information Systems - DIW</td>
<td>1,002,481</td>
<td>1,121,505</td>
<td>1,278,352</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>1,050,184</td>
<td>1,180,240</td>
<td>1,307,146</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Humanities</td>
<td>892,811</td>
<td>1,014,089</td>
<td>1,149,819</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>745,250</td>
<td>825,061</td>
<td>951,924</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>631,837</td>
<td>784,507</td>
<td>945,362</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>749,417</td>
<td>838,221</td>
<td>915,585</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>745,743</td>
<td>705,122</td>
<td>850,242</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>122,350</td>
<td>137,375</td>
<td>155,511</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Activities</td>
<td>$1,492,612</td>
<td>$20,064,244</td>
<td>$22,723,240</td>
<td>50.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDED TOWARD STUDENTS                          | $4,758,315    | $6,843,436| $6,229,827        | 14.55%       |

| EXPENDED TOWARD STUDENTS                          | $22,166,267   | $25,744,470| $25,166,807       | 56.64%       |
## RESOURCE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>Adoption Budget</th>
<th>5/31/10 YTD</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$389,687</td>
<td>$397,043</td>
<td>$449,787</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>114,809</td>
<td>148,964</td>
<td>241,721</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP - Student Learning</td>
<td>466,211</td>
<td>394,097</td>
<td>446,438</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>126,248</td>
<td>116,823</td>
<td>132,342</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP College Operations</td>
<td>254,972</td>
<td>233,927</td>
<td>271,799</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>526,946</td>
<td>643,602</td>
<td>729,096</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>1,244,970</td>
<td>1,537,030</td>
<td>1,741,209</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Services</td>
<td>795,837</td>
<td>833,976</td>
<td>944,783</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3,503,204</td>
<td>3,326,789</td>
<td>3,786,454</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districtwide Expenses</td>
<td>12,032,732</td>
<td>1,976,088</td>
<td>2,238,750</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,628,200</td>
<td>1,168,115</td>
<td>1,321,021</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>658,658</td>
<td>750,978</td>
<td>861,953</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Research &amp; Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>336,481</td>
<td>382,182</td>
<td>432,952</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication; Comm Relations</td>
<td>513,834</td>
<td>479,229</td>
<td>542,866</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>514,952</td>
<td>671,955</td>
<td>761,217</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$22,137,261</td>
<td>$13,110,616</td>
<td>$14,821,350</td>
<td>33.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categorical Programs Funded with Unrestricted Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Adoption Budget</th>
<th>5/31/10 YTD</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSIS</td>
<td>$233,974</td>
<td>$233,974</td>
<td>$233,974</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Workforce Development</td>
<td>231,003</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Fund</td>
<td>$92,503</td>
<td>$92,503</td>
<td>$92,503</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFAPS</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstudy</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation-Noncredit</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>122,200</td>
<td>122,203</td>
<td>122,203</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>$92,503</td>
<td>$626,961</td>
<td>$820,961</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Funding Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Adoption Budget</th>
<th>5/31/10 YTD</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$44,425,156</td>
<td>$39,420,469</td>
<td>$44,818,248</td>
<td>108.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BENCHMARK AGAINST OTHER DISTRICTS

REVIEW BEST PRACTICES AT OTHER DISTRICTS

› EVALUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT
› EVALUATE ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE
› EVALUATE STAFFING NEEDS
› IMPLEMENT BENEFITS FROM BANNER INTEGRATION
› EVALUATE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR STREAMLINING

"RIGHT-SIZE" THE DISTRICT
CONTROL BENEFITS COSTS

EMPLOYER PORTION OF BENEFITS FOR SOME STAFF IS > 74% OF SALARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>% OF SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$35,700</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$29,600</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPECT 30% INCREASE IN PERS OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS

HEALTH BENEFITS WILL CONTINUE TO INCREASE

MAY NEED TO RE-EVALUATE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS
IMPLICATIONS OF LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS

1. RENEWED FOCUS ON THE DISTRICT’S MISSION AND PURPOSE.

2. POTENTIAL DECLINE IN ENROLLMENT.

3. PERMANENT FORCE REDUCTIONS.

4. CREATING A Viable ENTITY THAT CAN WITHSTAND ECONOMIC DOWNTURNS.
BOARD (BUDGET) PRIORITIES 2009/2010
APPROVED AT MARCH 17, 2009 BOARD MEETING

BP1: Fiscal Accountability

1.1 Set appropriate reserve levels.

1.1a Establish a prudent reserve level range.

1.2 Unfunded Liability

1.2a Continue to fund the unfunded liability.

1.3 Equity Study

1.3a Determine strategy to fund the Equity Study.

Timeline: Fall 2009 and review annually

1.4 Improve coordination and balance of institutional and program needs for proper use of basic aid funds.

1.4a Review institutional needs and assess institutional effectiveness, using Program Review, Administrative Planning and Assessment, and the Educational Master Plan.

Timeline: Begin Fall 2009

1.5 Implement asset management for long-term fiscal health.

1.5a Identify resource models for consideration and planning.

Timeline: Begin 2009/2010

BP2: Improve Student Access and Success in Instruction and Student Services

2.1 Review and evaluate the current EMP on an annual basis.

Timeline: Ongoing

2.2 Continue to improve enrollments, retention, transfer, completion rates in credit and non-credit.
Timeline: Ongoing

2.3  *Continue efforts in marketing and outreach.*

Timeline: On-going

**BP3:** Facilities

3.1  *Keep modernization program on track.*

3.1a  *Comply with timelines, schedules, budgets, and reporting.*

Timeline: Ongoing

**BP4:** College Development to Open Doors for Academic and Student Success

4.1  *Implement the Strategic Plan for College Development.*

Timeline: Spring 2009
TO: Board of Trustees, COM
FROM: Fran White, Supt/President
DATE: June 8, 2010
SUBJT: Recommendations for Board Priorities

There are unmet needs and challenges at the College of Marin. Difficult decisions and sacrifices have been made, but more difficult decisions need to be made to achieve the goals of the Strategic Plan and the Educational Master Plan.

It's a choice between learning from the mistakes of the past versus letting it happen again! There needs to be strong board leadership to accomplish remaining issues.

Fiscal Solvency:

Reserves must be higher (there is data to support this) to maintain adequate rainy day funds.

Generation of income required (e.g., asset management, fundraising, bonds) to support people, programs and facilities. For example, how will the district fund the Ewing Study? How will the district fund upkeep of aging facilities (see IVC) long term?

Educational and Academic Relevancy:

It's all about student completion and success, program quality and relevancy.

Institutional data is available to make data driven decisions.

Program Review and Program Discontinuance (where warranted) are tools to ensure educational quality, accountability and relevancy***.

Facilities Maintenance and Upkeep:

Approximately $150 million in maintenance and upkeep needs exist at KTD and IVC that were not addressed in the current bond spending plan. As you know, this has been brought to the board's attention before (Board Retreat, 9/17/08). Maintenance and Operations budgets are slim (inadequate state funding due to basic aid status) affecting levels of maintenance and upkeep to buildings and grounds. As new buildings come online, more dollars are needed for maintenance and repairs of college facilities.

***may provide potential savings that could be used to grow other “high demand” courses, programs and services.
TO: Fran White, Ph.D. Superintendent/President
FROM: Planning and Resource Allocation Committee
REGARDING: Recommendations for Programs, Restricted Funds, Unrestricted Funds, and Planning Process

After assessment of the 2009-2010 program reviews for instructional programs, student services, and administrative units, the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee is making recommendations in four areas as listed below:

1) Programmatic Recommendations

1. To hire a Transcript Evaluator for Admissions and Records
   This request was made and approved last year but has not been advertised. It remains the top priority for PRAC.

2. To increase 80% position to 100% for Media Services.
   This request was made and approved last year but has not been fulfilled. This remains the second priority for PRAC.

3. To hire a full time lab technician for Biology
   This request is new this year and is the third priority for PRAC.

4. To hire a full time Administrative Assistant to be shared by Nursing, Dental, MEDA and EMT for the IVC campus
   This request was made and approved last year but has not been fulfilled and is the fourth priority for PRAC.

5. To defer until completions of the museum, the hiring of a Museum Tech for the geology/geography program.
   This request was made and approved last year but has not been fulfilled.

6. To recommend continued review of the Instructional Assistant program
   Both anonymous student and faculty surveys should be conducted to examine how the resource of Instructional Assistants can be utilized to best support students. The survey is to be completed by the end of spring semester 2010. A report and recommendations will be completed and presented to PRAC by December 2010.

7. To recommend program revitalization be initiated for the Auto Tech program, Court Reporting program, Film Studies program, and the Journalism program.

8. Review of program review requests and data for faculty hires will be conducted this summer by a sub-committee of PRAC.
2) **Recommendations for Restricted Funds**
   1. To hire a Counselor with grant funding for BSI/Puente. Recruitment process is in progress.
   2. To recommend approval of the *Technology Plan* with the understanding that the first priority is staffing necessary to implement the plan.

3) **Unrestricted Funds**
   1. **Instructional Equipment**
      2009-2010 instructional equipment requests recommended in the amount of $25,621.38 with a strong recommendation that these equipment items be funded out of the general fund. Items not funded via the *Technology Plan* or *Modernization* should come back to the Instructional Equipment Committee for reconsideration.
   2. **Instructional Supplies**
      Recommend that the supplies budget totals remain the same as last year but PRAC will reallocate funds within the supplies budget to adjust unevenness of supplies budgets in some areas.

4) **Planning Process**
   1. That Fiscal Services provide a read only report or budget view similar to the former Legacy budget view and that the report be made available to the campus. PRAC is further asking for a timeline as to when such a report function will be completed and available for use.
   2. Planning Process recommendations based upon an evaluation of the integrated planning process will be forthcoming in a separate document.
Thank you for your recent memorandum outlining recommendations for programs, restricted funds, unrestricted funds, and planning process. The PRAC assessed the 2009/2010 program reviews for instructional programs, student services, and administrative units to derive the recommendations forwarded on May 11, 2010.

Please note my response to the recommendations below:

Programmatic Recommendations

Due to the district's projected budget ($1.1 million) shortfall for 2010-2011, all staffing position requests are being reviewed on a case-by-case basis. That said, the district does recognize the need for a Transcript Evaluator and will identify resources to comply with this recommendation. Recommendations #2-4 remain status quo at this time.

Recommendations #5-8 are accepted.

Recommendations for Restricted Funds

The district is in the process of hiring a counselor for BSI/Puente. This recommendation is accepted.

The district agrees that additional staffing is necessary to implement the Technology Plan. The division of College Operations has identified resources within its current general fund budget to fund 1 FTE. The district agrees this is a priority. The administration will continue to review IT staffing to comply with this recommendation. However, it will be up to the district to identify the best source of funding, which may or may not fall under the Restricted Funds category. The recommendation is accepted.

Unrestricted Funds

Instructional Equipment
The district supports instructional equipment with dollars from state (categorical) funding, certain restricted funds and Measure C dollars identified for technology/equipment. In recent years, state funding for instructional equipment has dwindled, leaving the district to identify other sources to fund instructional equipment needs. To the extent possible and there is state funding, the district will use those dollars to fund equipment requests. Other funding sources such as Measure C, require specific
criteria and requirements for funding authorization, and may not be the best source for equipment funding requests. Additionally, the recommendation $25,621 be funded out of the general fund will be a function of appropriateness and the availability of funds.

**Instructional Supplies**

The district accepts this recommendation.

**Planning Process**

The district acknowledges PRAC's request for a read only or budget review that can be made available to the campus. The timeline will be during fall 2010. The district accepts this recommendation.

Cc: Board of Trustees  
Sara McKinnon, AS President
Introduction

This manual has been developed to guide integrated, institutional planning at the College of Marin. The processes describe the ways that the college’s constituent groups participate in and contribute to college planning.

This document begins with a description of the integrated planning model and the planning documents that are key to that model, and then outlines the following:

- Specific tasks to be accomplished,
- Processes by which decisions/recommendations will be developed,
- Timeline for each task,
- Individuals or groups responsible for completing the tasks, and
- Individuals or groups that will receive the recommendations and render final decisions.

The undersigned faculty, classified staff, and administrative representatives of the College of Marin have agreed upon the planning process structure and procedures described in this manual.

Frances E. White,  
Superintendent/President

Y visitor Smith,  
Academic Senate President


al CONNECTION  
Associated Students President

Kathleen Kuleba  
Classified Senate President

Co-Chair, Institutional Planning Committee

Co-Chair, Institutional Planning Committee

Co-Chair, Resource Allocation Committee

Co-Chair, Resource Allocation Committee
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Integrated Planning

In an integrated planning process, all college planning is part of a functional system unified by a common set of assumptions and well-defined procedures, and is dedicated to the improvement of institutional effectiveness. The driving force for all college efforts is student learning. Assessments focus on how well students are learning and based on those assessments, changes are made to improve student learning and success.

The College of Marin’s planning policies and practices both direct and demonstrate strategies for institutional effectiveness. Dialogue regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness occurs in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. These practices and policies are summarized in this planning manual.

To summarize the planning model:

The college’s **Mission** describes the college’s intended student population and the services the college promises to provide to the community. As such, this statement is the touchstone for the entire planning process.

The college uses this statement, as well as the goals developed by the Board of Trustees, to assess its current status and anticipate future challenges in a long-term **Educational Master Plan**.

This long-term plan is then the driver of the college’s three-year **Strategic Plans** and its annual **Program Reviews**. The program reviews include a thorough analysis of each academic and student services program and administrative function, as well as programmatic planning at the unit level. The strategic objectives in the Strategic Plan and the unit plans in the Program Reviews also inform the subsequent editions of the Educational Master Plan; the long-term and short-terms plans reciprocally inform one another.

**Resources** are allocated based on college-wide strategic plans and unit-level plans, thereby ensuring the college’s forward movement on the college’s strategic objectives that were drawn from the recommendations in the Educational Master Plan and articulated in the Strategic Plan.

Following the allocation of resources, the college mobilizes its resources to **implement its plans**.
The college assesses progress on the strategic objectives and makes adjustments in action steps as needed to continue the college's forward movement in fulfilling its mission. Assessment of the outcomes as well as assessment of the planning processes itself is embedded throughout the planning efforts.
Marin Community College District
Integrated Planning
Mission

The college mission statement is the touchstone for the entire planning process in that it describes the college’s intended student population and the services the college promises to provide to the community.

The college’s schedule for reviewing the mission statement is every three years in a cycle that sequences this review during the year prior to the development of the next strategic plan. In keeping with the schedule identified later in this Manual, the college’s mission will be reviewed in 2011, 2014, and 2018.

The current college mission statement is:

The College of Marin’s commitment to educational excellence is rooted in our mission to provide excellent educational opportunities for all members of our diverse community by offering:
- preparation for transfer to four-year schools and universities;
- workforce education;
- basic skills improvement;
- intellectual and physical development and lifelong learning; and
- cultural enrichment.

The College of Marin is committed to responding to community needs by offering student-centered programs and services in a supportive, innovative learning environment with a strong foundation of sustainability, which will instill environmental sensitivity in our students.

(Mission approved by the Marin Community College District Board of Trustees on April 17, 2007)

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges standard most relevant to the development and review of college missions is:

I.A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.
2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.
3. Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.
4. The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.
Timeline and Process for Review of the Mission

September 2011, 2014, 2018
IPC forms a task force to review the college mission.
Mission Review Task Force develops a review process to ensure college-wide feedback.

October 2011, 2014, 2018
The Mission Review Task Force submits the process plan to the College Council for feedback.
Mission Review Task Force modifies the review process as appropriate.

November 2011, 2014, 2018
Mission Review Task Force conducts the review so that input from the college community is solicited regarding potential modifications to the college mission.

December 2011, 2014, 2018
Mission Review Task Force modifies the mission as appropriate and submits to the college’s three Senates and College Council for review and recommendations.
The College Council ensures college-wide review of the proposed revision to the college mission prior to approval.

January 2012, 2015, 2019
College Council revises the mission if appropriate and recommends forwarding the mission to the Board.
The Superintendent/President submits the revised mission statement to the Board of Trustees for approval. Following this approval, the revised mission statement is circulated college-wide for use in all publications.
Educational Master Plan

The Educational Master Plan projects the future of College of Marin for the coming decade, and makes general recommendations that address current and foreseeable challenges.

The plan’s analysis of internal and external data and the resulting recommendations provide a common foundation for the dialogue about the college’s effectiveness in fulfilling its mission. These recommendations are intended to serve as the basis for the college’s three-year Strategic Plans and to inform annual unit plans. In this manner a direction is established for the college under changing conditions and for the long-term development of programs and services.

The current Education Master Plan spans from 2009 to 2019. Subsequent iterations of the Educational Master Plan will be developed when the term of this plan expires. An update of this Educational Master Plan may be warranted if there is a major change of internal or external conditions.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges standard most relevant to the development and implementation of the all processes described in the remainder of this College of Marin Integrated Planning Manual 2009 is:

I. B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness
The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation,
implementation, and reevaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.
Timeline and Process for the Educational Master Plan

September 2018
Institutional Planning Committee calls for the development of *College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2019 – 2029* by assigning this task to the Educational Planning Committee.

September – December 2018- 2019
Drawing on resources in the college and in the community, the Educational Planning Committee prepares a draft *College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2019 – 2029* that includes the key internal and external measurable performance indicators; presents programmatic projections for instruction, student services, and support of learning areas; and identifies challenges that the college is facing or is likely to face in the coming decade.

Once each chapter is completed, it is distributed for college-wide review.

January 2019
The Educational Planning Committee integrates the college-wide feedback as appropriate and distributes the complete draft for a final college-wide review and feedback.

February 2019
The Educational Planning Committee incorporates feedback received from the college wide review and prepares a final document which is distributed to IPC, the Senates, and College Council for recommendations.

The Superintendent/President presents the *College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2019- 2029* to the Board of Trustees for their approval.
Strategic Plan

The Strategic Plan is the college’s short-term plan. This plan identifies the specific actions that the college must take to implement the recommendations identified in the Educational Master Plan.

This planning process is initiated by reviewing the Educational Master Plan recommendations and determining which will serve as the college’s top priorities for the next three-four years. From these college priorities, a number of specific strategic objectives are identified. In turn each strategic objective is translated into a number of concrete, measurable action steps to be used to achieve the strategic objectives. Each action step includes a timeline for completion, a description of indicators of success, and the assignment of parties responsible for implementing the action.

The Strategic Plan promotes continual improvement over time because the process calls for the prioritization of a reasonable number of strategic objectives for college wide concentration each year. Each year the college produces an annual institutional effectiveness report that documents progress on the strategic objectives to reinforce and sustain the college dialogue on the college’s long-term and short-term goals. See the section in this document titled “Timeline and Process for Assessing Progress on College Goals/Plans.”

The Institutional Planning Committee calls for the subsequent strategic plan when the term of the current strategic plan expires or when all strategic objectives have been achieved. The schedule for the coming decade is:

**Strategic Plan 2009-2012** (spring 2009 through spring 2012)
Annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports in spring 2010 and spring 2011
Final Institutional Effectiveness Report of SP 2009-2012 in spring 2012

**Strategic Plan 2012 - 2015** (fall 2012 through spring 2015)
Annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports in spring 2013 and spring 2014

**Strategic Plan 2015 - 2019** (fall 2015 through spring 2019)
Annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports in spring 2016 and spring 2017
Final Institutional Effectiveness Report of SP 2015-2019 in spring 2019 --> these final strategic plan progress reports feed into the Educational Master Plan to be developed in the 2018 – 2019 academic year.
Timeline and Process for the Developing Strategic Plans


The Institutional Planning Committee analyzes the recommendations in the College of Marin Educational Master Plan 2009- 2019 and sets the college priorities for the next three- four years.


The Institutional Planning Committee develops a draft Strategic Plan 2009-2012 comprised of a reasonable number of strategic objectives and action steps for each college priority. The action steps identify specific tactics, a timeline for completion, and the party/parties responsible for completing each task.

The draft Strategic Plan 2009- 2012 is distributed college wide for feedback.


The Institutional Planning Committee incorporates the feedback from the college wide review and prepares the final strategic plan.

The strategic plan is presented to the Superintendent/President and College Council for review and approval.

Annually in late spring, IPC prepares an Institutional Effectiveness Report which documents and quantifies the progress on each of the college’s strategic objectives and the unit plans presented in program reviews. Refer to “Timeline and Process for Assessing Progress on College Goals/Plans” in this manual for details on this annual assessment of progress.
Program Review

Program review is a systematic process involving the collection, analysis, and evaluation of quantitative and qualitative data about an academic program, student service or program, or an administrative work plan. Program review is an essential component of the college’s dynamic cycle of planning $\rightarrow$ evaluation $\rightarrow$ improvement.

The process is designed to identify strengths and weaknesses as a foundational step in developing plans for improvement. It is a means for determining the effectiveness of the units and the administration of the academic and non-academic functions, including, but not limited to: instruction, student services, and administrative support of learning activities.

As a way to integrate planning, program review queries each component of the college as to its contributions to achieving the strategic objectives identified in the *College of Marin Strategic Plan 2009-2012*. This annual data-driven process includes both qualitative and quantitative outcomes.

The college launched program reviews for instructional programs in 2005 and for student services programs in the following year. In fall 2009, the college will develop and implement program reviews processes for all administrative services.
Timeline and Process for Program Review

August 2009

The Data Advisory Group provides data packets to programs under review.

September 2009

An Academic Senate Committee, the Program Review Committee, sets the template for the program reviews to be completed in 2009.

This group and the Data Advisory Group meet the instructional department/discipline, student service, or administrative service scheduled to complete a program review.

October 2009

Those identified to complete a program review submit all responses electronically to the Program Review Committee.

November 2009

The program reviews are evaluated for completeness and initial assessment; interviews are conducted if further information or clarification is needed. Sections of the completed program reviews are distributed to appropriate committees. Committees make initial assessments and begin ranking the requests in the program reviews according to rubrics.

The Data Advisory Group and the SLO Coordinator assess the data packets and refine the assessment tools as needed.
Resource Allocation

The resource allocation processes link program reviews and strategic planning to the resources needed to accomplish the college goals.

The guiding principles for all resource allocation processes are as follows:

1. Resources include all assets of the college including its fiscal resources, facilities, equipment, and the time and talents of its faculty and staff.

2. The processes for allocating resources are transparent. All members of the college community are informed about the routines and components of planning that lead to resource allocations.

3. The resource allocation processes begin in August of each year with the development of budget assumptions that forecast the available discretionary general fund resources for the coming fiscal year and thereby set the parameters for program reviews and work plans.

4. Priority will be given to resource requests that support
   - achievement of college strategic objectives and
   - health, safety, and accessibility.

5. To the extent that it is fiscally possible, the college will sustain an innovations fund to support faculty/staff ideas through a competitive mini-grant process.

The chart on the accompanying page presents the timeline and processes for allocating general fund resources that are used to directly support the college’s strategic planning objectives. These funds include discretionary funds (funds beyond fixed costs) as well as reallocated funds from vacant positions or discontinued programs.

The chart on the accompanying page does not represent the timeline and processes for allocating other resources that will also be contingent on support for the college’s strategic objectives, such as staffing, equipment, and facilities. Similar charts are being developed to describe these resource allocation processes and will be included in subsequent editions of this Integrated Planning Manual.
Timeline and Process for Resource Allocations for Funds in Support of Strategic Planning Objectives

**August, 2009**

The VP of College Operations and the Resource Allocation Committee review prior year budget and develop budget assumptions for the coming fiscal year. These assumptions forecast the available discretionary general fund resources for the coming fiscal year and thereby set the parameters for program reviews and work plans.

The VP of College Operations communicates these assumptions college-wide.

**September - October, 2009**

Program reviews are completed by the units scheduled for program review.

**November, 2009**

VP of Student Learning + VP of College Operations review the discretionary general fund requests presented in the program reviews.

IPC reviews these requests from the program reviews with consideration of the recommendations of the Vice Presidents' review.

IPC submits recommendations to the Resource Allocation Committee.

**March, 2010**

Resource Allocation Committee makes recommendations for the tentative budget with special consideration of the IPC and VPs' recommendations.

**May- June, 2010**

The Resource Allocation Committee forwards the tentative budget to the Superintendent/President for review and changes.

The Superintendent/President approves the recommendations for inclusion in the tentative budgets.

The Board of Trustees approves the tentative budget.

Plan Implementation

Because the institutional plans in this manual include both program review activities and strategic plan action steps, plan implementation will vary significantly. Therefore, no single timeline and process is described here.

The individual(s) responsible for implementing plans are identified in the source documents, and they are charged with:
- developing appropriate timelines and processes;
- assessing success after the plans are implemented; and
- reporting the activities and results to IPC each February (refer to “Timeline and Process for Assessment of College Goals/Plans,” the next section in this Manual).

The college community has access to information on the progress of plan implementation through TracDat, the college’s intranet tracking system.
Assessment of Progress on College Goals/Plans

The annual Institutional Effectiveness report, a widely distributed report of the college’s progress on its goals and plans, is the key benchmark of accountability in this integrated planning process.
Timeline and Process for Assessing Progress on College Priorities & Objectives

**August - February 2010**

Those identified as responsible for completing action steps complete their work and provide evidence/results to the champion for each strategic objective.

**February 2010**

IPC calls for progress reports on the action steps and these progress reports are documented in the IPC minutes.

**March 2010**

IPC reviews and validates the progress reports, comparing the reported achievements against the goals set forth in program reviews and the *Strategic Plan 2009-2012*.

IPC identifies specific barriers to success for unmet goals/plans. The Vice President of Instruction works with the Superintendent/President's Cabinet to remove barriers where possible.

**April 2010**

IPC prepares the 2009-2010 annual report on Institutional Effectiveness to document and quantify the progress on each of the college's strategic objectives and the unit plans presented in program reviews.

**May 2010**

IPC distributes the report on Institutional Effectiveness college-wide and presents the report to the Board of Trustees.
Assessment of the Planning Process

In keeping with the accreditation standard on institutional effectiveness (see previously in this Manual), the college routinely assesses its planning process.

The Institutional Planning Committee plans to create and publicize an ongoing, informal venue for providing feedback on any aspect of the college’s integrated planning process.

In addition, each year the Institutional Planning Committee dedicates one meeting to an informal review of the posted comments and a celebration of the college’s planning process. Members of the college community are invited to share comments on any aspect of the process; these comments will result in revisions of processes if appropriate.

A formal review of the components of the integrated planning process will take place during the year prior to the development of the next strategic plan, parallel to the schedule for the review of the college mission. In keeping with the schedule identified earlier in this Manual, the college’s planning process will be formally reviewed and revised as needed in 2011, 2014, and 2018.
Timeline and Process for Assessing the Planning Process

April 2011, 2014, 2018
IPC creates a venue for dialog among appropriate groups and individuals to provide feedback on the integrated planning process.

May 2011, 2014, 2018
IPC consolidates the feedback on the planning process and distributes this feedback college-wide.

September 2011, 2014, 2018
IPC recommends changes as needed in the planning processes and distributes its recommendations college-wide for comment.

October, 2011, 2014, 2018
IPC updates the College of Marin Integrated Planning Manual as needed for use in the planning cycle that begins the following year.
Annual Research Agenda

Research is the centerpiece of the College of Marin Integrated Planning Model. As depicted in the graphic in the first chapter of this Manual, data drives the key components of the process: the mission, the educational master plan, the strategic plans, program reviews, and the outcome assessments, both of the progress on the college goals as well as of the planning process itself.

Given this central role, it is essential for the college to establish an annual research agenda that is focused on student learning and supports the various components of integrated planning.
Timeline and Process for Establishing the Research Agenda

August 2009

A Data Advisory Group is established, made up of faculty, administrators, and research staff, and is charged with collecting, evaluating, and prioritizing research requests.

The Data Advisory Group (DAG) begins monthly meetings.

September 2009

In its first meeting the DAG establishes
- Standardized definitions of key terms, such as retention;
- A process for members of the college community to submit research requests; and
- Guidelines for setting research priorities.

September - May 2010

DAG meets monthly to set the priority ranking for requests received, and coordinates the achievement of those requests with ongoing requirements for data reports, such as program review and the basic skills initiative.

DAG prepares a monthly research calendar of the tasks and makes the calendar available college-wide.

As reports are produced, DAG posts these reports online and alerts the college community of the location and content of each report.

May 2010

DAG summarizes the year's work in a report to College Council.