



College Budget Committee  
FY25-26 Supplemental Allocation Recommendation

Purpose

The purpose of the College Budget Committee (CBC) is to be an advisory body to the College President on process, procedures, and development of the college budget. Specifically, the committee is charged to make recommendations to the College Council for the allocation of funding and/or budget reductions.

College Resource Request Process

Program Review cycle - 4 year cycle per Department (IEC to CBC)  
Annual Resource Request - Yearly Department submittal if not submitting a Program Review (IEC to CBC)

Number of Submittals Reviewed in Spring 2025 for FY25-26

2 Program Reviews (PRs)
<u>13 Annual Resource Allocations AURRs</u>
<b>15 Total</b>

Budget Development

- Each Department within the Fund 10 will get a Base Allocation based on what they spent in FY24-25  
\$1.4Million in expected Base Allocation funds to the College out of \$1.9Million total Discretionary
- The Supplemental Allocation for FY25-26 will be based on discretionary allocations not increasing from the District and budget constraints - \$285,000

Expected Discretionary	\$1,900,000
Base Allocation	(\$1,400,000)
Fin Aid Match	(\$215,000)
CBC Supplemental Alloc	(\$285,000)
	<u>\$0</u>

CBC Notes and Considerations

- Due to budget constraints and the large amount of requests, the CBC could only consider the Manager's 1st priority and 2<sup>nd</sup> priority for the top 10 ranked departments.

AURRs total	\$590,051
PRs total	\$62,014
	<u>\$652,065</u>
- AURRs and/or PRs that solely asked for Faculty and/or Classified personnel were not reviewed by CBC
- AURRs and/or PRs that requested Faculty and/or Classified personnel, were only reviewed if they requested a supplemental discretionary allocation and the personnel request were not considered by the CBC
- Only AURRs and/or PRs that were accepted by IEC were considered and reviewed by the CBC and those AURRs and PRs had to be:
  - a. On time
  - b. Fully completed
  - c. Manager Prioritization and sign off
- A list of AURRs and/or PRs that had Faculty position requests were forwarded to the VP of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate President as the chairs of the Faculty Prioritization Committee on 4/25/25
- A list of AURRs and/or PRs that had Classified position requests were forwarded to the VP of Student Services and the Classified Senate President as the chairs of the Classified Prioritization Committee on 4/25/25
- AURRs and/or PRs that had Technology requests were forwarded to the College Technology Committee for compliance on new requests only - technology requests were only considered for funding by the CBC if they were listed as the Manager's 1st priority due to budget constraints or the 2<sup>nd</sup> priority for those who ranked in the top 10 per the CBC.
- There were not any AURRs and/or PRs that needed to go to the Safety & Facilities as none were new and Managers were asked to submit their input through the Facilities Master Plan process taking place from Fall 2024 – Summer 2025.
- The managers were asked throughout this process to prioritize their requests during the submittal process in November and December 2024 and again during the mission critical request from the CBC in March and April 2025
- The CBC and VP of Administrative Services worked with several managers throughout this process to get requested items onto other funding sources (Fund 17) in order to free up funds to allocate through the CBC Supplemental Allocation process
- Economics of scale were promoted and used when assessing requests that could go to other funding sources or be purchased in bulk to save resource
- CBC provided detailed feedback for each requested submittal regarding what they did well and ways to improve their request in order to get funding or get more funding on the next cycle (review pro and cons attachment)

College Budget Committee  
FY25 – 26 Supplemental Allocation Recommendation

Process & Timeline

Overview and Goals	}	November 2024 - Submission of Program Review (PR) by those departments due to provide for that cycle December 2025 - Submission of Annual Resource Request (AURR) by departments seeking supplemental allocations for FY25-26
		February 12, 2025 – Introducing Schedule for completion, training/guidelines for ranking rubric, and amount allocating February 26, 2025 – AURRs released to the committee to begin completion of individual rubrics on TEAM
Step-by-Step Process	}	March 5, 2025 – CBC submits AURR rubrics to Business Office  March 12, 2025 -Results of AURR discussed in CBC meeting and list of pros and cons made by CBC for AURR March 24, 2025 – VP Alexander sends email to Managers to list mission critical items per CBC request March 27, 2025 – First Batch PRs released to CBC on TEAMS for assessment
		April 3, 2025 – CBC submits first batch of PRs to Business Office  April 4, 2025 – Second Batch of PRs released to CBC on TEAMS for assessment April 9, 2025 – Results of PRs and AURRs discussed in CBC meeting and list of pros and cons made by CBC April 11, 2025 – CBC submits second batch of PRs to Business Office April 12, 2025 - VP Alexander sends email to Managers to list mission critical items per CBC for PRs April 21, 2025 – Final questions to Mangers for PR questions based on CBC request April 23, 2025 – Final recommendation and votes for supplemental allocation based on rubric, discussion, and amount to be allocated.
Recommendation		April 28, 2025 - Recommendation to College Council as an Information Item to go to Action Item May 14, 2025 – CBC Final Meeting - Evaluation of Process and Discussion on updates needed

Budget Committee Review Notes of Pros and Cons of AURRs and PRs  
March and April 2025 Meetings

AURR Review Notes  
March 2025

Astronomy

Pros:	Good goals for hands-on approach, comprehensive measurements of SLOs, community connections with internships.
Cons:	Be more specific on what is hands-on approach, <u>didn't</u> disclose what <u>is needed</u> for the spectrometer (piece of it, personnel need). No statement about any ongoing costs, and whether these costs were conditional upon needing a lab technician.

Athletics

Pros:	Better request than last year by mentioning specific courses where the funds will <u>be used</u> .
Cons:	Not enough assessment results, no details, just a short answer. They mentioned they did not get funds last year, but they did (they <u>were mistaken</u> and referred to 2023 monies). Did not explain the source of funds, including Fund 10 monies. Did not list a goal for equity.

Biology

Pros:	<u>Well written</u> , Biology seems to go above and beyond. This could <u>be used</u> as an example for future
Cons:	There should be a delineation between the different programs, specifically Biology, Health Science, and Natural Science. Vehicles cannot <u>be given</u> to an individual department, but instead a fleet assignment.

Chemistry

Pros:	The narrative mentioned a very pro-student program. They seemed to have used their funds very well. SLO assessments were great, with three-year history included.
Cons:	No information about previous use of funds. The funding sources <u>didn't</u> match the totals. They got money last year, but <u>didn't</u> state that they did receive funds. They put a narrative about needing personnel.

Drama

Pros:	<u>Very exciting</u> and impressive narrative of Theater activities, all coming from one full-time faculty position. Commitments to Actions and department goals were great.
Cons:	Asked for personnel, which drove their narrative. You <u>can't</u> ask for the discretionary funds and then not talk about the discretionary needs. The department seems to not be aware of alternative funding for the department. Student success rates <u>were not disaggregated</u> , not allowing for better assessment of the department's success.

Engineering

Pros:	Details about goals <u>are provided</u> . Curriculum updated with stackable certificates. Equity and Ed. Master Plan align. Explained in detail how their funds <u>were spent</u> from last year.
Cons:	Generic strategic goals, with no specificity or examples. For example, professional development was a non-specific statement.

English

Pros:	Provided success rates for 22/23 and 23/24 academic years. Outlined funding received from AB 928 and AB 1705. They had a summer academy for students last year.
Cons:	Response to viability of program <u>was listed</u> as N/A. The SLO assessment was not complete for all courses. This could be due to the nature of their request.

Health Science

Pros:	<u>Well written</u> , Health Science seems to go above and beyond. This could <u>be used</u> as an example for future applications.
Cons:	There should be a delineation between the different programs, specifically Biology, Health Science, and Natural Science. Vehicles cannot <u>be given</u> to an individual department, but instead a fleet assignment.

Music

Pros:	Monthly performances give students real performance experience.
-------	---

Cons:	Piano maintenance was tied to health and safety—how does this work? No mention of how many students the program is serving. No mention that stated sections are concurrent sections.
-------	--

Natural Science

Pros:	Well written, Natural Science seems to go above and beyond. This could be used as an example for future applications.
Cons:	There should be a delineation between the different programs, specifically Biology, Health Science, and Natural Science. Vehicles cannot be given to an individual department, but instead a fleet assignment.

Physics

Pros:	Good job on background of department. They are a growing program, adding sections over the last few years, leading to more graduations in Physics. Their SLO summary explains a problem they are trying to address.
Cons:	They did not provide three-year trend information. Asked for personnel, which drove their viability. You can't ask for the discretionary funds and then not talk about the discretionary needs.

Tutoring Center

Pros:	Provided good data with survey results, and success rates. This program is in sync with strategic enrollment management. Explained that their funding for NetTutor was altered after moving to a new division.
Cons:	Didn't take the data to be specific to their goals. Didn't explain that the data created can't be proved to be directly connected to student success in the classroom.

Visual Arts

Pros:	Program viability was done well, explaining very specific needs.
Cons:	Life models' costs are funded already. The safety issues stated (OSHA) do not exist as OSHA violations.

Program Review Notes  
9 April 2025

Library

Pros:	Well written. Data driven. Good intro and overview, with good depth of details and how they align to the purpose of the library.
Cons:	Too many acronyms.

Nursing

Pros:	Very informative and succinct. Impressed with their numbers and success rates.
Cons:	Stated self-identified ethnic groups were not as clear as typically stated across the college. Perhaps the program could be more specific to the groups typically used by the college/district to identify dis-proportional impact. They did not state how they used previous funds from this committee over past years.

College Budget Committee's  
AURRs and PRs Rubric Tally

	Department		Supplies	Equipment	Technology	Others	Total	Details of 1st Priority
1	Astronomy		1,800.00	-			1,800.00	- Smart Telescope - Center Balance Equatorial Mount with High-Resolution
2	Athletics		15,000.00	13,750.00	13,500.00	80,000.00	122,250.00	- Player training and travel supplies. This includes EVC branded tracksuit (jacket and pants), backpack, travel polo shirt, 3 training jersey and 2 training shorts. The cost with branding and shipping is \$250 per athlete and there are 60 athletes total in
3	Biology		34,000.00	-	-	1,200.00	35,200.00	Chemicals, reagents and other consumables such as blood, lancets, groceries for experiments (eggs, onions, strawberries, milk), DNA fragments, enzymes, sterilizer bags (total \$25,800) Microbiology media used to grow bacteria in lab prep room and all biology classes, (total \$6,000) Live specimens, examples live plants, water fleas, termites, small bugs, mushroom kits, expensive to ship (total \$3,500) Bacteria cultures for microbiology lab (total \$1,000) Lab gloves for 1,600 students
4	Chemistry		30,000.00	99,051.00	39,200.00	35,000.00	203,251.00	1) Lab glassware, \$12000 2) Lab chemicals, \$26000 3) Lab batteries, \$200 4) Lab helium gas and tanks lease, \$3300 5) Lab gloves and cleaning supplies, \$1500
5	Drama		6,100.00	1,000.00			7,100.00	Theater set construction materials, Props and scenic elements for productions, script royalties
6	Engineering		6,000.00		6,000.00		12,000.00	3 Dell Precision 7780 workstation laptops
7	English		1,400.00				1,400.00	Leaf by Leaf Digital Literary Magazine Green final exam booklets to support students
8	Health Science					10,750.00	10,750.00	Biohazard waste (\$650/yr) Sterilizer maintenance (\$6,500/yr) Glassware dishwasher maintenance (\$3,600/yr)
9	Music		-	15,000.00	49,000.00	4,000.00	68,000.00	Piano maintenance
10	Natural Science		3,470.00		14,220.00	2,260.00	19,950.00	Dissecting Microscopes with cameras so students can share observations of large items like mushrooms, moving insects and feathers, \$2,370 each x 7 (total \$16,590)
11	Physics		7,000.00	850.00			7,850.00	Classroom materials, sensor replacements, battries, repairs
12	Tutoring Center					19,100.00	19,100.00	Additional Student Tutors Online Tutoring Services via NetTutor Tutoring & Lab Learning resources and Tools Lab and Private group student room upgrades
13	Visual Arts		9,000.00	25,150.00	44,100.00	3,150.00	81,400.00	2D instructional supplies, 3D instructional supplies, metalsmithing kits, sandblasting media, stock 3d filament for 3d printers, paper, scantrons and other office supplies, hand
			113,770.00	154,801.00	166,020.00	155,460.00	590,051.00	
14	Library		53,000.00				53,000.00	1. Continuation of online author series. 2. ebooks and print books for the library's collection 3. Renew the following library databases
15	Nursing				1,000.00	8,014.00	9,014.00	Memberships
			53,000.00	-	1,000.00	8,014.00	62,014.00	
							-	
						MISSION CRITICAL	213,584.00	
						TOTAL REQUESTED	652,065.00	

## College Budget Committee's AURRs and PRs Rubric Tally

### CBC Supplemental Allocation FY25-26

[illegible]