

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS)

Thursday, December 18, 2014

NOTES

Attendees:

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

Guests:

Dr. Jamillah Moore (via Lync)

Absent:

Mike Bush, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College
Iris Ingram, Vice President, Business Services, Moorpark College
Darlene Melby, College Business Manager, Moorpark College
Lucia Marquez (ASVC student representative)

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. in the President's Conference Room at Moorpark College, with some members utilizing the District's Lync phone conferencing capability.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the November 20, 2014 meeting were approved by consensus with a minor change.

ENROLLMENT GROWTH AUGMENTATION

Mr. Fahnestock reviewed the Board of Trustees December 2014 action to designate reserves. The Board's action set aside \$2 million for Enrollment Growth. Mr. Fahnestock proposed that \$1 million distribution be proposed to the Board for allocation. The percentages of distribution would be consistent with the Allocation Model percentages of FTES (i.e., 42.7% to Moorpark College, 19.5% to Oxnard College, and 37.8% to Ventura College). There was a discussion regarding carryover and amounts that could potentially be put back into reserves due to growth funding received. This will be presented to the Board in February or March.

Dr. Kama'ila asked that the notes reflect that the money is being spent according to each college's plan. Although the extra funding will be helpful, we are on a tight enrollment timeline and it could be too little too late. This is to help stabilize expenditures related to enrollment growth. Mr. Fahnestock acknowledged that this is not a guarantee that the District will meet the FTES growth target. There is no justification for having large reserves without helping stressed colleges.

The proposal was agreed to unanimously and will be forwarded to the Board for consideration.

DAC ALLOCATION

Mr. Fahnestock, once again, presented the proposed DAC allocation increase. He explained that the proposed increase would be phased in over three years to fund Vice Chancellor of Student Learning. The increase is estimated to be \$220,000. Under the proposal, the first year would be funded 100% from reserves; the second year would be 50/50 (change allocation model) 50 reserves – 50 colleges; third year would be funded 100% through the model. There was a discussion about other potential positions associated with the vice chancellor position (i.e., administrative assistant). Mr. Fahnestock indicated any additional positions will be funded over time through existing allocation.

Ms. Rees expressed concern about the District's financial situation in future years. She expressed concerns on behalf of Moorpark College's Academic Senate.

Mr. Fahnestock indicated that the DAC is in need of several positions. He believes the program review will identify the need for such positions.

There was a discussion on whether the proposal should come after the program review or when the outside review is completed. Dr. Moore indicated the outside report is expected in January. This proposal is being moved forward prior to that report because of accreditation issues. When teams return, they will want to see what the District has done to address this.

Mr. Sezzi explained the Accreditation Report does not indicate the position is needed. There were discussions about the need for such positions. However, it is what the report says, not what the commission says. Mr. Sezzi further explained that current organization structure is a distributed model of leadership in the District. The colleges are independent and he believes this is a strength. He believes we are a minority in the way we do things, but this is not necessarily a bad thing. We've had this position before and it did not work well.

There were ongoing discussions about current workloads at the campuses as well as the District Administrative Center. The new grants, as well as SSSP and Student Equity mandates, have created a greater workload for everyone.

Mr. Casey expressed concern about sustainability if growth is not earned. That is very uncertain. He questioned whether the position could be a director level position as support to the campuses. Mr. Casey feels the position is vital and is a strong need for district, but not sure we can afford it at this point.

Mr. Hayashi questioned whether management has explored the possibility of an administrative reorganization.

Mr. Fahnestock explained it hasn't been discussed or dismissed. However, it could, obviously, be looked at.

Dr. Moore explained that the District is struggling. We have a real need for this position. Dr. Moore asked it be noted that Mr. Fahnestock has been open and forthcoming about the need for this position and an increase to the DAC. She further explained the District is not trying to pull something over on the colleges.

Mr. Fahnestock explained that this item will be returned in January and a formal vote will be taken at that time.

BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL CHANGE – INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Ms. La Teer explained proposed changes to the Allocation Model related to International Students, Productivity Factor, and Carryover Percentages.

For international students, beginning in fiscal year 2016, any amount above the state allocation per FTES will flow to the individual college who generated that FTES. The intent is to provide seed money to fund/start international student program.

The productivity factor will change effective fiscal year 2016. The change will be a 3-year phase-in to allow colleges to sustain the movement of resources from one college to another. All colleges will be held harmless for fiscal year 2016.

Ms. La Teer explained the last proposed change to the model: carryover percentage. The proposed change will increase the carryover amount to up to 2% (a change from up to 1%).

Mr. Fahnestock discussed the changes to model and suggested possibly using reserves to fund some of the central efforts such as international students. If so, it will be brought forward at a later date.

There was a discussion about the International Student Implementation Task Force recommendations. Information was shared at Cabinet and College Presidents were asked to share with campuses. There were no specifics on how to move forward. Ventura College will be working with the District on a marketing and growth program for the next three years.

Mr. Sezzi expressed objection to the productivity factor change. He explained he was not part of DCAS in September/October. He feels it is extremely unfair and further explained years ago when Ventura College was “most productive,” they were penalized. Now that they are “least productive,” they are being penalized again. He feels it’s very unfair.

Meeting adjourned 10:08 a.m.

Next Meeting – 9:00 a.m., January 15, 2015 – Ventura College