

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL
GENERAL FUND – UNRESTRICTED BUDGET

Fiscal Year 2017-18

I. Introduction

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model (Allocation Model) represents the methodology for distribution of Unrestricted General Fund revenues to the District's various operating units. The Allocation Model is complex enough to reflect the needs of a multi-college district and the unique characteristics of the colleges, yet simple enough to be readily understood, easily maintained, and transparent. The Model considers how the District is funded by the State and contains factors to help ensure accountability, predictability, and equity. Further, the elements of the Allocation Model are based on both resources and expenditures.

The Allocation Model addresses the distribution of resources, and is not prescriptive in how funds are to be spent at the various locations (colleges and district office). The District acknowledges differences between its colleges and recognizes the need to direct resources based on plans and objectives to meet the needs of each college's diverse populations and constituencies. The colleges have separate and specific budget development processes that are unique to each college and are reflective of the organizational culture and priorities. It is at this level that the budget must be tied to each college's strategic plans and address accreditation requirements.

Annually, the Allocation Model is reviewed by the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) and Cabinet. Modifications and/or revisions to the Allocation Model may be recommended for Board consideration as deemed appropriate for the maintenance of the model's equity and integrity.

II. Model

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model utilizes formulas and variables that have been meaningfully studied, readily defined, easily measured, and consistently reported. The following describes the elements of the Allocation Model:

A. Revenue

The Allocation Model is designed for the distribution of all General Fund unrestricted revenue, unless identified to be distributed in a different fashion (such as to fund structural deficits). At this time, only state apportionment, unrestricted lottery, a portion of non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits are included in the Allocation Model. Restoration and growth revenue is not included in the allocation model until the year after it is earned. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based

on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. Restricted revenue sources of funding are allocated by the state directly to a specific college or by a district agreed-upon distribution method.

B. Districtwide Support

Resources are allocated to a set of services and expenditure elements which are recognized as best administered in a centralized fashion.

1. Districtwide Services (DWS)

The Allocation Model provides a pool of resources, referred to as Districtwide Services (DWS), to support expenditures required to meet general districtwide obligations which support the district as a whole and cannot be conveniently or economically assigned to the other operating locations through a cost center. These expenditures include property and liability insurance, legal expenses, governing board expenses, financial and compliance audits, central technology hardware, software and management services, and other activities. These common costs benefit all operating units, but are not the direct result of any individual unit. Components and specific line item budgets will be considered each year by DCAS for inclusion in DWS or movement to another budget location.

2. Utilities

The district accounts for utilities in a central location, so as to mitigate the significant differences in utilization due to building size, construction, age, and climatic conditions affected by college locations. Expenditures represent the districtwide costs for electricity, water, gas, and land line telephone. The budget for utilities is based on historical and projected rates and usage, and presented to DCAS for review and concurrence.

3. District Administrative Center (DAC)

The district recognizes that it is fiscally prudent to provide certain services centrally through the operation of a district office (District Administrative Center – DAC). These services primarily represent those functions that can be most effectively and efficiently administered in a centralized fashion. Typical of such functions are the Chancellor's office, human resources, information technology oversight, payroll, purchasing, accounts payable, and so-forth. Currently, the DAC receives 6.98% of projected revenue. Each year, after review, if it is determined that specific budget items are to be reassigned between DWS and DAC or the colleges and DAC, the percentage of revenue will change accordingly, maintaining the same effective rate.

4. Major Initiatives

This element represents as “set aside” of available revenues to be solicited by the individual colleges for initiating new programs or activities that they otherwise may be unable to fund. This element has not been previously funded and is not currently funded. However, the element will be retained in the Allocation Model for future consideration of funding.

C. College Allocations

The Allocation Model is designed to provide fair and equitable allocations to the colleges by acknowledging areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities. The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities considered include, but are not limited to, areas such as classroom capacity, program mix, full time equivalent students (FTES), and ratio of full time to part time faculty. These elements are considered in one or more of the components of the Allocation Model to ensure an equitable allocation process. The three separate mechanisms below address different equity issues which have been recognized by the colleges.

1. Class Schedule Delivery Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses differences among the colleges related to instructional productivity which is dictated in part by facility limitations, program mix, student preparedness, full-time/part-time faculty ratios, internal organization, and faculty longevity. Using a productivity factor of 525 and actual FTES (resident, non-resident, credit, non-credit, and enhanced non-credit) produced by each college for the period of July 1 through June 30 of the prior year, a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) number for the budget year is calculated. The college receives an allocation for the actual cost (salary and benefits) for the full time classroom faculty currently employed. This allocation is adjusted to reflect non-teaching assignments, such as those on approved sabbaticals and load bank leaves, department chair, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and Academic Senate release time, and planned additional full-time faculty for the budget year. The balance of the allocation is then funded at the average hourly part-time salary and benefit rates for teaching the equivalent of a full-time load. The total of full-time faculty salary and benefit costs and the hourly FTEF is the total Class Schedule Delivery Allocation for each college.

2. Base Allocation (Fixed Allocation)

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the differences among the colleges relative to respective enrollment size. The Base Allocation recognizes that each college is required to provide core services and staff certain positions to support the operation of a comprehensive college. Thus, the Base Allocation represents an “economy of scale” factor and

provides differential benefit to the college as a result of their varying sizes. The base allocation is 15% of revenue available for distribution, divided equally among the colleges. Each college receives an equal allocation that recognizes the fixed expenses and core services associated with operating a college, regardless of the size of its enrollment.

3. FTES Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the method in which the District receives the bulk of its state apportionment through SB361, namely per FTES. The remainder of the available revenue is allocated to the colleges proportionate to the percentage of actual FTES earned in the prior year. Colleges are funded proportionate to their actual FTES (including growth) up to the maximum growth percentage the District was funded. Each college may then carry unfunded FTES (as does the District as a whole), and be entitled to use that excess if and when the District does. By using a blended average in the productivity factor as recommended above, colleges are not penalized for “overgrowth” if attained through efficiencies, i.e. because they experience less costs.

FTES generated through enhanced noncredit will be funded at 100%. Non-enhanced noncredit FTES is adjusted by the ratio of non-enhanced noncredit state funding rate to credit state funding rate (approximately 60%). Therefore, each college’s noncredit FTES will be reduced by approximately 40%. Not-for-credit classes (community education) are not included in the Allocation Model since these classes are self-supporting. A portion of the non-resident tuition that is equivalent to the FTES amount paid by the state will remain in the Allocation Model. The amount of international tuition that is in excess of the reimbursed rate will remain at the college that earned it.

The FTES Allocation to each college represents each college’s proportionate share of total FTES represented in this element of the Allocation Model.

D. Transition/Implementation Funding

Potential adjustments to the Allocation Model can result in a shift of resources between the colleges. The district recognizes the need to provide stability and may choose to phase-in the effects of these adjustments.

For the 2017-18 budget, there is an adjustment of \$166,668 from Moorpark College to Ventura College. This adjustment is related to the implementation of a productivity factor of 525 in 2014-2015 and represents the third year of a four year phase in plan. Additional information can be found in the Updates section.

E. Carry-over

The Allocation Model recognizes the incentive in allowing budget locations to maintain their unexpended funds for future needs. In addition to the allocation derived through the mechanism of the model, the colleges and district office are allowed to carry-over any unexpended funds as of June 30 into the new budget year, up to a maximum of 2% of their respective prior year's budget allocation. Any allowable carryover is then added to each college's total allocation to produce the college's budget allocation for development of their operating budgets.

III. **Background**

Effective in fiscal year 2003-04, the District set aside the then-existing budget allocation model, which had been used to distribute district resources for the prior six years.

The model was primarily revenue-driven while providing for college base allocations and other fixed costs which did not necessarily equate directly to FTES generation. As such, the model relied both on revenue (FTES) and expenditure elements (dual characteristics) to serve as the mechanisms to produce the colleges and district level budget allocations. The model was, however, primarily FTES driven, with no cap placed on the funding of growth at the colleges, although the district as a whole had a funding cap. As the colleges evolved over time, the shift of resources favored the college(s) growing most rapidly and disadvantaged the college(s) growing more slowly, and the movement happened in an uncontrolled fashion. As a result, the model had been adjusted several times during its six-year period, and was believed to no longer meet the needs of the district and its colleges.

In 2003-04 when the model was set aside, the District distributed resources using the fiscal year 2002-03 allocation as a base, increasing or decreasing it proportionately each subsequent year based on changes in additional available resources from that point forward. That process continued over the next four years. Although this method distributed funds, there was not an agreed-upon budget allocation model. Distribution of new resources did not consider how the colleges had evolved since 2003-04. Further, the allocation of funds did not reflect how funding from the state was received, the uniqueness of the colleges, nor the priorities of the District. In addition, the lack of an agreed-upon allocation model had been cited in the accreditation reports and would have been a major issue if not resolved.

During fiscal year 2006-07 the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS) and the Cabinet worked simultaneously toward identifying the features of a model that would reflect the unique characteristics of each college, while recognizing how the District is funded by the state, and be perceived as more equitable than the then existing arrangement.

In an attempt to develop a model that would be accepted as fair and equitable, areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities, were identified. A model that considers and reflects these differences would be consistent with the objective of equitability.

The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities identified included, but were not limited to, areas such as:

- Facility constraints/classroom capacity on each campus
How many rooms hold 25, 35, 100, etc. students?
How will capacity change over the new few years?
- Program Mix - mix of general education and vocational programs
Does each college have the same proportion of vocational/career tech to general education classes?
Does the difference in program costs impact the college's decision on what programs to maintain or develop?
- Students' level of educational preparedness
Does each college have the same proportion of students who are prepared to take college-level classes?
Are needs for basic skills classes the same? (Some of the additional requirements/services of these students are to be met through special funding, such as categorical, not necessarily general fund – unrestricted dollars distributed through this model)
- Does each college have the same proportion of senior faculty (salary schedule placement)?
- How do fulltime / part time ratios of faculty compare?
- Are the contractual obligations, such as reassigned time and leaves, disproportionately distributed?
- What are the similarities/differences in core services?
- How does the size of each student body compare? (FTES)

It was imperative that each of these elements were considered in one or more of the components of the budget allocation model to ensure an equitable allocation process.

The Allocation Model was adopted for use in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

IV. Updates

Since the adoption of the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and in accordance with the commitment to the Board to regularly review the model components to ensure a more sustainable model, the DCAS reviews the model annually.

In 2008-2009, DCAS recommended modifications to the Class Schedule Delivery Allocation and the FTES Allocation segments of the model. The Board of Trustees approved the recommended changes at its March 2009 Meeting.

In 2010-11, DCAS developed a plan to address the district's capital structural deficits and recommended that specific revenues (lottery, interest income and administration fee revenue) be removed over time from the general budget allocation model and allocated in a different method.

Through FY12, all general fund – unrestricted revenue was distributed through the model, including, but not limited to, state apportionment for FTES, local revenues such as lottery, non-resident tuition, interest income, and miscellaneous, unless agreed to be distributed through a separate allocation method. This aspect of the allocation model was changed with the adoption of the Infrastructure Funding Model, beginning in the 2012-13 fiscal year. At the end of the full transition of revenue to the Infrastructure Funding Model, only state apportionment, non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits were to remain in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model.

In 2014-2015 DCAS recommended the excess revenue related to FTES generation from international students be taken out of the Allocation Model and be placed in Fund 114. This incentivizes each campus to develop an international student program by allowing the excess revenue to be retained by the home campus. DCAS also recommended a productivity factor of 525 be used for each campus. This change caused a significant shift of \$500,000 from Ventura College to Moorpark College. To alleviate possible operational disruptions, the change in the productivity factor will be phased in over four years with all campuses being held harmless in the first year (FY 15-16). In the subsequent three years, Ventura College's allocation will be reduced by \$166,666 each year. Further, DCAS recommended the carryover percentage be changed from 1% to 2%. These changes were executed in the 2015-2016 adopted budget.

In 2015-16, a review of the components of the Infrastructure Funding Model resulted in a change in the treatment of unrestricted lottery revenue. Beginning with the 2016-17 fiscal year, unrestricted lottery will be removed from the Infrastructure Funding Model and included in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the distribution of General Fund unrestricted revenues. The percentage of revenues the District Administrative Center will receive will be adjusted accordingly to maintain the same effective rate prior to the change.

In 2015-16, the District did not fully achieve its FTES goal. However, State regulations provide the flexibility to shift qualifying class sections between fiscal years. The District utilized this option and shifted 685 FTES from 2016-17 to 2015-16. As a result of this transfer, the 2016-17 State reported FTES is 685 FTES less than the actual operational FTES. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. For the 2017-18 budget, state apportionment will be calculated assuming the 2017-18 base FTES is the same as the 2016-17 actual operational FTES, which excludes the impact of the shift of 685 FTES.

In the FY 17 Adoption Budget, the districtwide support in the Budget Allocation Model provided funding for the District Administrative Center (DAC) at 6.98% of Available Revenue. Within this allocation, \$420,000 was budgeted for the annual lease payment for the Stanley Avenue office. In November 2016, the District closed escrow on a property in Camarillo at Daily Drive for the DAC relocation. With the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, members of DCAS would like a model where the budget savings that result from the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would flow to the colleges and DAC over time. It was agreed that the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would bring the DAC share to 6.7%. DCAS agreed to hold the DAC harmless for FY18 and agreed, with the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, to recommend the phase-in of an adjustment over four years. Due to a lack of unanimity, DCAS will continue discussions toward a recommendation for the FY 19 budget. For the FY 18 budget, the percentage allocation to the DAC will remain at 6.98%.