

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

Thursday, May 16, 2013

NOTES

Attendees: Mike Bush, Dominga Chavez, Riley Dwyer, Erika Endrijonas, Alan Hayashi, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Linda Kamaila, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Mary Anne McNeil, Darlene Melby, Peter Sezzi

Guest: Art Sandford

Absent: Dana Boynton

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

Art Sandford was introduced as the incoming Academic Senate President at Ventura College.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the April 11, 2013 meeting were approved by consensus.

FY14 BUDGET

May Revise

Vice Chancellor Johnson explained that the May Revise was released on May 14 and there are not significant differences from the Governor's Initial Proposal. She said that Growth and COLA are down slightly from original projections by staff. Pursuant to VCCCD Board Policy, Growth is budgeted in the year following the year it is actually earned (FY15 in this case).

The Legislature's deadline to adopt the state budget is June 15. The Governor's deadline is June 30. Vice Chancellor Johnson fully expects a budget to be approved within this timeline.

Revenue/Cost Schedule

The preliminary Revenue/Cost schedule dated May 15, 2013 was distributed. Vice Chancellor Johnson explained that the health and welfare numbers are now confirmed. The District is still waiting to hear final rates from PERS and worker's compensation. Another estimated expense is a pending classification study for classified staff as well as the restoration of approximately 11 classified positions to full-time status. With the most current numbers, there is a projection for total increased costs (over 2012-13) of approximately \$2.8 million, excluding the classification study and the worker's compensation rates, which are still unknown.

FY14 Allocation

The FY14 Tentative Budget Allocation dated 5/16/13 was distributed and discussed. Vice Chancellor Johnson again explained each line of the Model. She then pointed out the increase to the DAC percentage which is a result of the **agreed-upon cost shifting** from the colleges to DAC for the balance of the Information Technology personnel which were centralized in June of 2009. At the time of the restructure we agreed to delay the cost shifting until the restructure was operational for a

couple of years. For the FY14 Budget, and in accordance with the approval Budget Allocation Model, the costs will be shifted from the respective colleges to the DAC along with the associated funding, which will produce no net budgetary impact to any site.

Vice Chancellor Johnson cautioned the group not to compare line 14 of the Model as they cannot be compared without looking at expenses and IT shifts, which equates to approximately \$1.8 million in expenses. Additionally, the carryover amounts on Line 13 are only projected at this time.

DCAS SURVEY RESULTS

The results from the DCAS Self-appraisal were distributed. Although the survey is conducted for evidence for Accreditation purposes it is also used to measure the effectiveness of communication and whether or not the committee can identify areas for improvement. Each survey question and corresponding responses were discussed in detail.

Prompted by a comment on the survey, there was general discussion regarding how at the districtwide level planning is tied to budget. The MC Vice President stated that management has significant discussions regarding enrollment management (FTES) and the subsequent flow of resources. She further explained that the planning of revenue based on FTES happens at the district level and the execution is happening at the site level. The VC Academic Senate President made reference to a Districtwide Institutional Effective Matrix for Business Services, including areas of fiscal stability, etc. The committee also discussed our role in the development of the Infrastructure Funding Model which will help address our requirement for total cost of ownership (TCO), the review and development of Districtwide Services budget which has many elements tied to planning such a New Technology Systems funding, etc.

There was a discussion about the original assumption for the percentage for Line 8 of the Allocation Model: Total Class Schedule Delivery Allocation. When the current Allocation Model was developed, there was an original goal of 50-53% of resources to be allocated Class Schedule Delivery. The current percentage is 55.1%. The higher number is a result of budget decline and the protection of the class schedule. It was noted that one of the Board's goals is to protect the classroom.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:40 a.m.

Next meeting – Tuesday, June 4, 2013 – 8:30 a.m. – *please block your calendar until noon*

Agenda Topics include:

FY14 Tentative Budget

Progress Toward 2012-13 Board of Trustees' Goals and Objectives