

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS)

Thursday, October 16, 2014

NOTES

Attendees:

Mike Bush, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College (via Lync)
Dan Casey, Classified representative, Ventura College
Emily Day, Director, Fiscal Services
Brian Fahnestock, Vice Chancellor Business Services
Alan Hayashi, AFT Representative
Iris Ingram, Vice President, Business Services, Moorpark College
Patrick Jefferson, Executive Vice President, Ventura College (via Lync)
Linda Kama'ila, Academic Senate President, Oxnard College
Dave Keebler, Vice President, Business Services, Ventura College (via Lync)
Deborah La Teer, Budget Director
Darlene Melby, College Business Manager, Moorpark College (via Lync)
Mary Rees, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College
Felicia Torres, Classified representative, Moorpark College (via Lync)

Guests:

Dr. Jamillah Moore (via Lync)

Absent:

Peter Sezzi, (Interim) Academic Senate President, Ventura College
Lucia Marquez (ASVC student representative)

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. in the Thomas Lakin Board Room at the District Administrative Center, with some members utilizing the district's Lync phone conferencing capability.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the September 18, 2014 meeting were approved by consensus.

UNALLOCATED RESERVE ANALYSIS

Vice Chancellor Fahnestock explained this item has been presented at previous DCAS meetings. It is being brought back again for final review and explanation. It is the intent to present it to the Board in November. More importantly, the use of reserves in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 for marketing purposes will be presented to the Board. Vice Chancellor Fahnestock explained the schedule of proposed designated reserves.

Ms. Rees acknowledged the need to designate some of the reserves. However, she expressed concerns about asking for "board approval." Ms. Rees further stated that the proposed list should not be construed as final. It should be explicitly stated this list is partial and does not meet the needs of the district 100%.

Mr. Keebler explained the designations are recognition of future liabilities for the District. These liabilities cannot be handled by the current operating budgets.

Mr. Hayashi asked for clarification regarding the District's Revenue Shortfall Contingency. He further stated that the proposed list of designations can be construed as a wish list for the district. Mr. Hayashi questioned when the designations are done whether items can be added in the future. If so, what is the mechanism for adding items?

Mr. Fahnestock explained that all designations require Board action. Further, it would take Board action to undo the designations.

Mr. Casey explained he sees the list beyond just a designation. He expressed the importance of spending the funds instead of merely putting it aside.

Mr. Fahnestock explained that some of the designations will be spent this fiscal year. For example, if the Board approves it, the transfer to the Irrevocable Trust will take place before the fiscal year ends. The District is beginning the process of the required Actuarial Study. We will have an updated liability amount once that is finalized, but an additional infusion into the trust will help alleviate the liability.

There was a discussion about enrollment growth. Campuses are using some one-time funds (bookstore fund balance) to grow enrollment for FY15. Spring is around the corner so it's crucial to get the campaign started.

DCAS members gave consensus to move forward with suggested explanations.

DAC ALLOCATION

Vice Chancellor Fahnestock explained the need for a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs: a Districtwide position. This is a recurring discussion, but has resurfaced because of the new student success requirements as well as enrollment management issues. One position is being proposed.

Ms. Rees explained there are approximately 110 requests for new positions on the (MC) campus. They are included in the program plans; integrated planning. If more funds are allocated to the DAC, it takes funds away from the college and that is going to be extremely difficult. Ms. Rees stated she agrees with the position conceptually and understands why it's needed. Further, it is a good long-term goal, but could add work to campuses instead of reducing work. SSSP and enrollment management is campus related, not necessarily done at the district level. Not sure this is going to help accomplish short term goals. It is fantastic for long-term goals.

Ms. Kama'ila explained it could be easier at Oxnard College. Much of the past SSSP work was borne by Oxnard College and took the president away from his own duties.

Ms. Rees added that she has concerns about adding a Vice Chancellor position without an administrative assistant. She felt this wasn't realistic. It couldn't be done with only one person.

Mr. Fahnestock indicated that if the district did grow then maybe the DAC could fund the administrative assistant. That could be done over a couple of years.

Mr. Keebler agrees with Ms. Rees as far as timing. This is coming at a horrible time. The long-term plan is great to relieve presidents of these duties. The DAC should complete a program review and add the position to the list of priorities. Dr. Jefferson concurred with Mr. Keebler. The position is needed, but the timing is terrible.

Dr. Bush supports the position and added percentage to the DAC allocation and feels the cost seems to be low.

Ms. Torres questioned why the position has to be at the Vice Chancellor level. She explained each campus deals with different issues because of populations.

Dr. Moore explained that it is an accreditation issue. The ACCJC suggested this position 3 years ago. It's something that the Board can decide; whether it's a Vice Chancellor or Associate Vice Chancellor. We have a set of recommendations from ACCJC. Currently, the responsibilities that would be assigned to that position fall to herself and Clare. Next time the accreditation team comes around, it will be noted.

Ms. Kama'ila stated we are missing the piece that defines us. We are an academic institution. She explained it's clear we need it, but doesn't know if this is the time.

Mr. Hayashi made a suggestion. Maybe it's not a matter of a new position, but possibly a reorg at the District. Mr. Hayashi provided a historical perspective indicating there used to be a 3 person team structure.

Mr. Fahnestock discussed the possibility of a phased in percentage increase. For example, use reserves to backfill the first year entirely. That would result in no net effect to the colleges. For the second year we would transition to 50% reserves and 50% DAC increase and then the final (3rd) year 100% DAC increase. It could take 3 years for colleges to fully absorb position. It would be a transition of funding.

Ms. Rees said she was surprised the District isn't asking for additional HR positions. The need for HR staff is a big discussion on the (MC) campus. Ms. Rees feels that before additional positions at DAC can be discussed, an entire plan needs to be developed.

Vice Chancellor Fahnestock explained that there is an ongoing study of District staff. He speculated that the findings will reveal the need for several positions equally approximately \$1.7 million. Such positions will probably include an internal auditor, HR, facilities, etc. Vice Chancellor Fahnestock explained the need to fill the top priority position, which in his opinion, is the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

There was a discussion about sustainability. Mr. Casey conveyed his opinion that managers aren't necessarily the answer to sustainability.

Ms. Rees suggested representatives take this back to their campuses for discussion and report back in November. This item will return to DCAS in November.

10:16 a.m. break for Great Shake Out

10:30 a.m. Reconvene

BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL

The Budget Allocation Model was brought back from the September DCAS meeting. There was a discussion about the productivity factor of 525 and confirmation that it is used for the Model calculation purposes only. Vice Chancellor Fahnestock confirmed that the 525 number is strictly for calculation purposes in the Model.

Vice Chancellor Fahnestock reviewed the two proposed changes to the Model: productivity and carryover amount.

There was a brief discussion about international student piece of Model. The proposal is for each campus to keep the international student revenue above \$4,676 (cost of education).

Ms. La Teer will bring scenarios reflecting this change next month. The Budget Allocation model discussion will continue in November.

STUDENT EQUITY ALLOCATION

Ms. Day explained the allocation method for of Student Equity funds for FY15. The Student Equity Funding Model (dated 10/16/14) schedule was distributed. The formula tries to mirror how the state allocated funds.

There was a discussion about how the numbers included in the model were derived. The model will be brought back if there are significant changes on the way the state allocates funding. If no changes, this formula will be used to develop the FY16 Tentative Budget.

Meeting adjourned 10:59 a.m.

Next Meeting: November 20, 2014

- DAC Allocation
- Allocation Model