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

Thursday, December 13, 2012

NOTES

Attendees: 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, Darlene Melby, Peter Sezzi

Absent: Blanca Barrios

The meeting was called to order by Sue Johnson at 8:38 a.m. in the Thomas G. Lakin Board Room at VCCCD.

APPROVAL OF NOTES
With suggested changes, the notes from the November 15, 2012 meeting were approved by consensus.

There was a brief discussion regarding the membership and who each individual on DCAS represents. All were in agreement of their understanding (e.g. each VP represents the fiscal administration/management perspective of the college; the EVP representative carries forward the perspective of student services/instruction; each academic senate president, their college's academic senate's perspective, etc.) The colleges' fiscal planning committees are a part of the colleges' participatory governance process and not the district-wide participatory governance process.

Review of (continued from 9/20/12, 10/18/12 and 11/15/12):

Allocation Model

DAC Allocation
The discussion from the three previous DCAS meetings regarding consideration of an increase to the DAC allocation percentage continued.   The FY13 Adoption Budget Allocation (from the FY13 Adoption Budget book) was distributed. A mock-up of the FY13 Adoption Budget Allocation using a proposed .5% increase to DAC was also distributed. There was discussion regarding the fact that that should be "an increase up to .5%" or a phased increase of .25% per year over two years, based on any significant movement in DAC expenditures for FY 13.

Ms. Johnson told the group that she had been invited to meetings of both the OC and VC Academic Senates to discuss this need for modification to the model. She then solicited input from members of the committee regarding their current position regarding the increase. The VPs and EVP were supportive of the increase because of the need for basic services. All three academic senate representatives, the AFT representative, and the two classified senate representatives present indicated they did not support the increase. Ms. Johnson explained that the Chancellor will now need to determine whether to move a recommendation forward to the Board with split support from DCAS. If so, both a position of support and one of opposition will be drafted.

Base Allocation

At the last DCAS meeting, there was a discussion regarding the Base Allocation in the Model. Specifically, MC Academic Senate proposed realigning the district's current Base Allocation of 15% split equally to the three colleges to a base allocation tied to the base used in SB361 (the State allocation method to multi-college districts). That amount is currently $3.2 million for a small college and; $3.8 million medium for each medium college within a multi-college district. Presently, there are two medium sized (MC and VC) and one small sized (OC) college within the VCCCD. In November, a request was made to distribute an allocation simulation using these numbers. Ms. Johnson distributed that previously electronically distributed simulation to the entire group.

The MC Academic Senate President explained that their senate still felt strongly for moving in that direction. A vote indicated the majority of members were opposed to changing the base allocation.

Ms. Johnson explained the Model was developed under the premise that all components of the Model are interrelated and represented various elements of the philosophy and principles at that time. She indicated that she believed that one component cannot be looked at without looking at them all, particularly the three major sections below the "available for distribution" line.

MC's Academic Senate President clarified that the intent of MC Academic Senate was, in fact, to evaluate every line of the model, not just the Base Allocation.

Annually DCAS reviews the model to consider recommendations for modifications but basically these have been minor in nature and considered "tweaks". After a lengthy discussion, it was the consensus of the group that it was appropriate to thoroughly review the entire Model including consideration of an entirely different Model. The committee will start with discussing the budget principles. Because of the amount of time this process is expected to take, it was agreed the current Model would be used for the FY14 budget cycle. The goal will be to have a new model in place effective for the FY15 or FY16 budget year.

2012-13 BOARD OF TRUSTEES GOALS AND OBJECTIVES – ACTION STEPS
This is an item returned from the November DCAS meeting. Suggested action steps were put into each Board Objective identified as the responsibility of DCAS. There was a discussion and additions and clarifications were made to the action steps. The document will move on through the process.

AP3900 – SPEECH: TIME, PLACE AND MANNER
A draft copy of AP3900 – Speech: Time, Place and Manner (dated 12/12/12) was distributed. Ms. Johnson provided background and a general overview of the right to free speech on our campuses. She added that this procedure in no way interferes with faculty's right to academic freedom. This is meant to control public use of our campuses to areas that are least disruptive while at the same time supporting the right of free speech.

Academic Senate presidents, as well as AFT, indicated the document will go through their process in January. This item will be brought back to the February DCAS meeting. Ms. Johnson asked that any changes be sent to us early for inclusion into a revised document.

OTHER BUSINESS

FTES – Ms. Johnson distributed the current FTES Comparison report dated 12/10/2012. She explained that the campuses are currently within their target. The unfunded FTES was reduced due to the $1 million in growth dollars contained in the FY13 Budget.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:26 a.m.

Next meeting topics: