

## Contra Costa Community College District

Contra Costa College • Diablo Valley College • Los Medanos College • Brentwood Center • San Ramon Campus • Walnut Creek Center

# BOARDreport

The Governing Board believes in open lines of communication  
with employees and the community

Contra Costa  
Community  
College District

pathways to success

### BOARD MEMBERS

**Jo Ann Cookman, President (Ward V) • Tomi Van de Brooke, Vice President (Ward II) • Sheila A. Grilli, Secretary (Ward III)  
John T. Nejedly, (Ward IV) • Dr. Anthony T. Gordon (Ward I) • Pamela J. Hampton, Student Trustee**

*The Governing Board of the Contra Costa Community College District is comprised of five trustees elected from the individual wards and one student member with an advisory vote selected on a rotating basis from our colleges. The Governing Board typically meets on the last Wednesday of the month in the George R. Gordon Education Center, 500 Court Street, Martinez. Regular meetings/study sessions are also held three times a year at the colleges and centers. You can reach the Governing Board by calling (925) 229-1000, ext. 1204. Minutes of the meetings are available online at [www.4cd.net/governing\\_board/minutes07\\_08.asp](http://www.4cd.net/governing_board/minutes07_08.asp)*

## Governing Board Meeting of August 29, 2007

The Contra Costa Community College District (CCCCD) Governing Board met in the George R. Gordon Education Center on August 29, 2007. The regular meeting began with a closed session at 5:00 p.m., followed by an open session at 6:00 p.m. Highlights of the meeting follow:

### New Classification Descriptions

In **Board Report No. 14-B**, the Governing Board approved three new classification descriptions: Director of Communications and Community Relations (as recommended by the KH Consulting Group study); Accounting Operations Specialist (which will result from a reorganization of the finance department); and Information Security Officer (as recommended in the audit report prepared by Secure-20).

### Emergency Preparedness in the Contra Costa Community College District

Ted Terstegge, Emergency Services Coordinator, summarized the plans that the District has in place in the event of a serious emergency. A copy of his report is attached.

### New Allocation Guidelines for College Operations and Classified Staffing

Associate Vice Chancellor/Chief Financial Officer Doug Roberts explained the reasoning regarding changes in the attached allocation guidelines for college unit costs and "other than operational, classified staff."

### Update Report on DVC Grade Changes

Chancellor Helen Benjamin presented the attached status report on phases I and II concerning the unauthorized grade change issue. Additionally, Judy Vroman, Manager of Audit Services, updated the Board on this matter. Ms. Vroman reported that Los Medanos College convened a committee on August 1, 2007, to examine the evidence gathered related to eight students concerning 18 questionable grade changes. The committee determined that all of the grade changes were unauthorized. Subsequently, this information was turned over to the Detective in Police Services, and he is in the process of completing his investigation.

## **Board Meeting Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned in memory of Bob Alan Rowe, who taught architecture at Diablo Valley College for more than 25 years.

Upon approval at the next regular meeting, complete Governing Board minutes for this meeting will be posted at: [http://www.4cd.net/governing\\_board/minutes07\\_08.asp](http://www.4cd.net/governing_board/minutes07_08.asp).

**THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD  
WILL BE HELD ON SEPTEMBER 26, 2007, AT 6:00 P.M.  
IN THE GEORGE R. GORDON EDUCATION CENTER,  
500 COURT STREET, MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA**

CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE DISTRICT POLICE



**SPECIAL REPORT:  
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS IN THE  
CONTRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

August 29, 2007

# Emergency Preparedness in the Contra Costa Community College District

## Background

The Contra Costa Community College District is responsible for the safety of all assets within its jurisdiction--one that encompasses nearly an entire county and three sites, each with a population equal to that of a small city. With these unique communities, its three satellite centers, and a district facility to protect, one of our District's greatest challenges is to provide for the well-being of nearly 50,000 employees, students, and visitors.

Each time a local emergency or disaster occurs, the lives of this population and millions of dollars in assets may be adversely affected or placed in jeopardy. Experience has shown that preparedness reduces these risks. More importantly, *preparedness saves lives*.

## Analysis

Following a general review of District emergency plans, procedures, and general capabilities, it is clear that improvement is needed. While some elements of the District are clearly capable of managing day-to-day incidents, many members of the community (including faculty, staff, students, and visitors) remain much less prepared. If a large-scale incident or disaster were to occur, existing resources would be quickly overwhelmed. As a result, lives and property that might otherwise be saved could be easily lost.

A great deal of progress has been made in recent months and several key projects have either been completed or are near completion. Although many projects have been completed and fully implemented, continued attention and/or additional resources will be required to maintain their value and effectiveness.

If the District is to reach an acceptable level of readiness, emergency preparedness must become one of its highest priorities. Further, the District must continue to focus its efforts upon the following key areas:

- emergency operations plans and procedures;
- Disaster Service Worker orientation and training for all District employees;
- development of disaster supply caches and other emergency resources;
- continued development of the District's Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program;
- development of crisis management teams; and
- coordination of emergency preparedness efforts, both District and region-wide.

The following chart shows the current status of emergency preparedness-related projects within our District. Those items marked "Pending" are either already in development or slated for development in the near future:

PREPAREDNESS TASKS/PROJECTS	PENDING	IN PROGRESS	COMPLETED
Emergency Services Coordinator position			✓
District website emergency information section			✓
Police "Active Shooter" training update			✓
District employee emergency procedures orientation			✓
Mutual aid/regional committee representation			✓
Districtwide SEMS/NIMS training		✓	
Emergency Operations Plan Update		✓	
Emergency Alert System upgrade (warning sirens)		✓	
Emergency Public Information Officer (EPIO) team		✓	
District Emergency Preparedness Committee		✓	
Public education campaign		✓	
Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)		✓	
Disaster supply caches/trailers		✓	
Mobile Command Post		✓	
District disaster exercise/emergency drill program		✓	
District Police Special Event Team (SET)		✓	
Disaster Service Worker program	✓		
Emergency Operations Guide	✓		
Crisis Management Team program	✓		
Emergency Operations Center development	✓		

## **Conclusion**

Unfortunately, few people recognize the value of emergency preparedness until it is too late. When disaster strikes, communities do manage to struggle through, but without proper training, appropriate resources, or adequate support, the cost is all too often counted in human lives and suffering.

Recent tragedies have shown that preparedness is not the exclusive duty of either the individual citizen or government. It is, instead, a responsibility that must be shared by all. If we are to minimize the effects of an emergency or disaster, fully develop our response capabilities, recover from a critical incident, and provide for the safety of our District and members of our community, we must all work together. We must continue addressing these critical preparedness issues now. *Tomorrow may be too late.*

# New Allocation Guidelines for College Operation-Allocations and Classified Staffing

The Re-establishment of Allocation Equity  
and the Elimination of  
Budgetary “Disincentives” to FTES Growth

## Allocation Guidelines - Issues

- **Operations-Allocation - BP 18.01**

1. Current formula-details are not included in the procedure.
2. The current formula includes several “fixed” dollar-adjustments to the “variable” Dollars-per-FTES allocation. *(Mike Hill’s report recommended a formula recalibration to clean this up)*
3. The current Dollars-per-FTES, “scale-of-economy” factors create instances of “**growth-disincentive.**” *(This was identified in Mike Hill’s Report)*

- **Classified Staffing Guidelines – BP 18.03 (1)**

1. The formula allocates on a position-basis, not a dollar-basis.  
*(So, two Colleges could have the same number of staff but the total salary-costs could differ significantly!)*
2. Current staffing allocations continue to contain 2001-2004 staffing cuts which were not site-equitable (due to bumping).
3. Current staffing allocations include “added staff” funded by PFE funds. The total staff added, however, was not site-equitable.
4. The current Positions-per-FTES, “scale-of-economy” factors create instances of “**growth-disincentive.**”

# Operations Allocation

## Budgetary Disincentives to Growth

### Example of Economy of Scale Factor Disincentive

- At 6,121 FTES, a college would be allocated \$207 per FTES ... which would equal **\$1,267,047**.
- At 6,151 FTES, a college would be allocated \$204 per FTES ... which would equal **\$1,254,804**.
- In this example, growth of 0.5% (or 30 FTES) ... *which would add \$130,980 to the District's apportionment revenue ...* would **reduce** the college's budget by **\$12,243**.
- As shown, this model can create situations where a college's best interest is opposite to that of the District!

# Recalibrating the Allocation Model

- As recommended by Mike Hill, a formula recalibration could do two things:
  1. Eliminate the aforementioned growth disincentives, and,
  2. Eliminate all of the "fixed" adjustments that have been added to the "variable" allocation over the past 15 years:
    - 5% deficit factor - applied since 93/94
    - A fixed "block grant" (for marketing, schedules, etc.) - applied since 94/95
    - A fixed 1992/93 - 2001/02 COLA Catch-up
    - A Continuing "2003/04 allocations cut"
    - A fixed "addition" for each college's internal distribution of PFE funding \*

\* Note: In 2004-05, PFE funds were permanently rolled-into the District's apportionment funding. Each college received a \$/FTES pro-rata share.

However ... the additional amount (actually added to the allocation formula) varied between the colleges ... one put more of their money into staffing ... the others put more of their money into the operations-allocation.



## Recalibrating the Allocation Model

- In recalibrating the allocation formula, three goals need to be met:

1. **The formula must be simple.**
2. **It must include “economy-of-scale.”**
3. **In conjunction with the classified staffing allocation\*, the formula must provide the Colleges an amount roughly equal to their current funding-levels.**

\* The two allocations need to be viewed as subcomponents of a single allocation. This is necessary to address the variance in how PFE funding was applied by the Colleges ... some put more money into the staffing allocation than into the operations allocation. To re-establish overall, allocation-equity, recalibrations of the classified staffing and operations allocations need to be done in tandem.

## Recalibrating the Allocation Model

- Working with the College Business Directors, the following FTES-based formula was developed\*:
- For Colleges and Centers, an Operations-allocation would be made based on the following FTES-levels:
  1. **The first 5,000 FTES** would be funded at **\$210/FTES**
  2. **The next 5,000 FTES** would be funded at **\$190/FTES**
  3. **All FTES thereafter** would be funded at **\$160/ FTES**
- As a result of this new formula, the Colleges wound up with the following changes over the old formula:
  - CCC + \$166,445    DVC + \$85,643    LMC - \$48,430
- **Remember, (because of the PFE-issue) this change needs to be taken in conjunction with the proposed change in the Classified Staffing Allocation.**

\* As there is no BP 18.02, it is suggested that this formulaic guideline be inserted there.



## Classified Staffing Allocation Budgetary Disincentives to Growth

- The BP 18.03 – (1) details the staffing guidelines for each College's "*Other Than Operational Staff.*" This group includes all non-managerial, classified staff (except for) ...Custodians, Facilities & Grounds Staff, and Campus Police.
- The allocation for these employees is based upon FTES ... (the latter are allocated based upon square footage, campus acreage, and "as needed")
- Similarly to the College Operations-Allocation, this guideline incorporates "economy-of-scale" factors ... (referred to in the guideline as FTE-to-FTES Ratios)
- And similarly, the guideline's "fixed" staffing-per-FTES, structure, creates instances where incremental FTES-growth would actually **reduce** college staffing ... and therefore be a disincentive to growth.

## Classified Staffing Allocation Budgetary Disincentives to Growth

### Example of Economy of Scale Factor Disincentive

- At 5,981 FTES, a college would be allocated 1 classified FTE for every 115 FTES ... which would equal **52.0 FTE**.
- At 6,041 FTES, a college would be allocated 1 classified FTE for every 120 FTES ... which would equal **50.3 FTE**.
- In this example, growth of 1.0% (or 60 FTES)  
... which would add **\$261,960** to the District's apportionment revenue ...  
would **reduce** the college's classified staff by **1.7 FTE**.
  - A 1% increase in FTES would require a 3% reduction in staff !
- As shown, the current model definitely contains an element of growth disincentive!

## Recalibrating the Staffing Model

- In addition to eliminating the aforementioned growth-disincentives, a recalibration of the classified staffing model could also address:
  1. The continued staffing inequities due to:
    - the continued 2001-2004 District-wide staffing cuts, and
    - “added staff” related to PFE funding
  2. And, by switching the allocation model from one that allocates ...“positions” ... to one that allocates ... “dollars” ... (on a per FTES basis) ... a recalibrated staffing formula would:
    - Bring the District’s “*resource-distribution*” more in line with its “*acquisition*” ... (i.e., money that is earned on an FTES-basis, is disbursed on an FTES-basis)
    - Eliminate the current potential for “*funding-inequity*”  
...(i.e., two colleges with same FTES getting different amounts for their classified staffing budget)
    - Eliminate the problem of allocating a “fractional” FTE.
    - Eliminate the immediate need for a College to add (or delete) a position due to a temporary change in FTES.

## Recalibrating the Staffing Model

- Working with the College Business Directors, and keeping in mind the goals of simplicity, economy of scale, and maintenance of College funding-levels... the following FTES-based formula was developed ...
- For Colleges and Centers, a classified staffing \$-allocation would be made based on the following FTES-levels\*:
  1. **The first 5,000 FTES** would be funded at **\$560/FTES**
  2. **The next 5,000 FTES** would be funded at **\$380/FTES**
  3. **All FTES thereafter** would be funded at **\$220/ FTES**

\* These rates would increase by the %-increase that was negotiated for the up-coming budget year.
- As a result, the Colleges wound up with the following adjustments to their current classified staffing budgets:
  - CCC - **\$137,960**    DVC + **\$82,686**    LMC + **\$497,610**

Note: the size of the adjustment is directly related to each college’s current FTE staffing level as compared to the college’s FTE staffing allocation per 18.03-(1) ...  
CCC = 4.92 FTE **over**    DVC = 0.15 FTE **over**    LMC = 8.59 FTE **under**

## Recalibration Budget-Impact

- Each of the new formulas is a subcomponent of a new, ***single total-allocation***. Combined, the new allocations give each of the colleges the following budget-adjustment (over the old formulas):  
CCC + \$28,484    DVC + \$158,328    LMC + \$449,180
- The combined cost of recalibrating the College Allocations (for Operations and Classified Staffing) is \$635,992.
- Almost 30% of this cost, \$182,998, represents the amount just needed to restore staffing equity per BP 18.03 – (1).
- \$65,704 represents the amount needed to restore operation-allocations to the original calculated “base”.
- ... And, neither of these above restoration-costs include any of the previous augmentations\* given to the Colleges for block grant, COLA catch-up , or PFE funding.

\* All of which were essentially eliminated when the College allocations were hit with a \$1.6 million on-going “cut” beginning 2003-04.

## Recalibration Budget-Impact

- The budget “source” to fund the \$636,000 cost of the recalibrations comes from:
  1. Previously identified “available sources” that are in excess of the 5.75% salary increase (that is to be funded from 2007-08 ongoing revenues in excess of ongoing expenditures) = **\$460,000**.
  2. Reduction to the 2007-08 estimated increase in Healthnet premiums (increase will be 11.09% ... not 13.1% as originally projected). Savings = **\$143,000**.
  3. The remaining **\$33,000** is comprised of a series of small reductions, the largest component coming from 2006-07 health benefits budget (that was in excess of actual expenditures) that was carried forward into 2007-08.



## Summary

- In conjunction with the College Business Directors, the District has developed a new “combined” allocation-model for College operations and classified staffing that:
  1. Is simplified.
  2. Maintains economy-of-scale.
  3. Eliminates 15 year’s-worth of ad hoc changes.
  4. Restores funding-equity between the Colleges.
  5. Aligns funding distribution with acquisition.
  6. Eliminates FTES growth-disincentives.
  7. Is fundable within the 2007-08 budget.
  8. Meets the Board-goal of providing more funding to the Colleges.

**Report to the Governing Board on Diablo Valley College  
Unauthorized Grade Changes  
August 29, 2007**

Our efforts in Phase I of the Diablo Valley College (DVC) unauthorized grade change issue focused primarily on a thorough District internal investigation and a criminal investigation by our police department in cooperation with the District Attorney.

As a result, Phase I yielded disciplinary and legal action against fifty-four students. Although the District is satisfied with the disciplinary and legal actions against these students, this does not mean Phase I is over. The District plans to continue this phase while beginning Phase II, ensuring any suspect grade has been checked, rechecked and checked again as it is extremely important to verify the validity and quality of our newly implemented grade authorization/changing system, procedures and regular internal audits.

As the District and DVC begin Phase II of this multi-faceted process, we want to assure the Board, District employees, District students and our community that measures are currently being reviewed and developed to prevent this type of incident from happening again. These measures include the following:

1. developing and implementing new grade changing policies and procedures;
2. working continuously with the outside auditor (Vavrinek, Trine, and Day) in developing, reviewing and revising, if necessary, internal control procedures;
3. conducting an expanded Chancellor's Cabinet debriefing on District response;
4. convening a cross-constituency task force to review and recommend grade-changing processes and procedures;
5. continuing administrative review of data integrity;
6. strengthening the current ethics code; and
7. increasing internal audit resources.

While discussion and implementation of the above measures are an imperative part of Phase II, the District believes it is equally imperative to address the fundamental values and importance of ethics. Although we know that the majority of our District employees and students possess and practice good ethics, we believe establishing an ethics committee would be advantageous to the District, its campuses, its employees and students.

As we have done in the past, we will continue to keep you informed with reports and communication regarding each phase of this process.