

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS)

Thursday, November 15, 2012

NOTES

Attendees: Blanca Barrios, Dana Boynton, Mike Bush, Dominga Chavez, Riley Dwyer, Erika Endrijonas, Steve Hall, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Linda Kamaila, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Mary Anne McNeil, Peter Sezzi

Absent: Darlene Melby

The meeting was called to order by Co-chair Sezzi at 8:35 a.m. in the Thomas G. Lakin Board Room at VCCCD.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the October 18, 2012 meeting were approved by consensus.

Review of (continued from 9/20/12 and 10/18/12):

Allocation Model

The discussion from the September 20, 2012 and October 18, 2012 meetings regarding consideration of an increase to the DAC allocation percentage continued. Sue distributed a revised Comparison of FY13 District office/District Wide Services schedule (dated 11/15/12). The schedule compared other multi-college districts' allocations for District Office and DWS as a percent of General Fund Unrestricted Budget.

Sue reminded the committee how the current DAC allocation was initially determined. The proposal would increase the DAC allocation by .5% (6.64% to 7.14%). The impact to the rest of the model would be a proportionate reduction to each college.

The Vice Presidents indicated support to the increase, as they had in the past. Steve Hall, representing AFT, opposed the increase in allocation for DAC

Erika Endrijonas inquired whether or not the increase would allow the DAC to avoid reductions. Sue said she was hopeful that would be the case. Erika expressed support of the increase and specifically an addition of a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs position.

Riley Dwyer questioned if there were plans to reorganize the DAC. She said Moorpark wholeheartedly supports the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs position, but MC Senate would not likely support increasing the DAC allocation.

Linda Kamaila expressed support of an Academic Affairs position but said she could not guarantee the position of Oxnard College's Academic Senate.

Dominga Chavez and Blanca Barrios also indicated support of the DAC allocation increase. Dana Boynton was opposed. Peter Sezzi invited Sue to an Academic Senate meeting at Ventura College to present on this subject.

Dominga asked whether lack of a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs position could be detrimental to the accreditation process. Sue explained that it was not a finding but it could definitely be considered a weakness and in fact had been brought up in conversations but not as a recommendation yet.

Sue again clarified that the issue was one regarding the allocation model and that an increase in the DAC allocation doesn't guarantee anything, as the hiring of a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs position as one of the strengths of the allocation model is that budget decisions are handled by each site. She reminded DCAS that their responsibility is to review and evaluate the model for effectiveness not to direct the expenditure of funds.

Other (under Review of Allocation Model)

Riley raised the issue of the Base Allocation for consideration. She explained that MC Fiscal Committee was interested in reviewing this element for possible change to the amounts provided from the State for base allocation.

Sue provided some historical information on the Base Allocation and how the number was agreed-upon. The total of 15% of revenue was fairly arbitrary. At the time the Model was developed, it was the line item that warranted the most discussion. It was referred to informally as the "small college factor" as each college would get the same amount regardless of size (FTES) because there were fundamental costs at a college regardless of size. The amount was not tied to any list of specific costs. At the time the Model was adopted it was agreed that the amount of 15% split equally caused the least immediate impact to each college. The balance of the Model used FTES in a significant way and this line was used to address things (not specifically identified) that were not impacted by FTES.

MC Fiscal Committee's initial proposal was to change the Base Allocation from a rate of 15% (split equally) to an amount the State currently uses for small/medium/large colleges (\$3.2 million small; \$3.8 million medium) and the difference would run through the Model. The change could be included in one year, or perhaps phased in over a period of time.

There was a discussion about the fairness of the Model. Overall, there was a consensus that the Model is adequate. The Model is complex, yet simple. There was also a discussion about how such a change would affect the stability of the Model. Sue restated DCAS's responsibility to review and evaluate each and every line item of the Model and to determine whether to recommend modifications. Discussions on the topic of Base Allocation will continue in December.

Sue explained the components of Prop 30 and how it affects VCCCD and the system as a whole. She explained the uncertainty of the Personal Income Tax (PIT) piece and the potential deficit factor associated with such. On or about June 20 of each year, the Department of Finance will "true up" with cash collected. That could result in a deficit factor or surplus. It is expected that in the first year any variance would impact the proposed deferrals.

FON

The District's Full-time Obligation Number (FON) report was recently submitted. The District's obligation is 378 but reported 391; a difference of 13. Sue explained that the District no longer uses "free passes" to reach the FON, in order to ensure stability. "Free passes" are late notices for which we have a year to fill the vacated position. The obligation number is frozen so the District's number remains 378. The overall impact is that each faculty position that is vacated this year must be filled – no net increase or decrease.

2012-13 BOARD OF TRUSTEES GOALS AND OBJECTIVES – ACTION STEPS

The Ventura County Community College District Strategic Plan – Annual Implementation Plan 2012-2013 template was distributed. Sue explained that DCAS must create action steps pursuant to the Board of Trustee Goals & Objectives. Objectives 3-B, 3-D, and 3-F are the responsibility of DCAS. Sue asked that DCAS members give the document/goals some thought and submit ideas to our office before the next meeting. This item will return to DCAS in December.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:58 a.m.

Next meeting topics:

- 2012-13 Board of Trustees Goals and Objectives – Action Steps
- Allocation Model Review (Continued)
 - Base Allocation