

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

Thursday, November 21, 2013

NOTES

Attendees:

Mike Bush, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College  
Dan Casey (via Lync), Classified representative, Ventura College  
Brian Fahnestock, Interim Vice Chancellor Business Services  
Alan Hayashi, AFT Representative  
Iris Ingram, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College  
Linda Kamaila, Academic Senate President, Oxnard College  
Dave Keebler (via Lync), Vice President, Business Services, Ventura College  
Deborah La Teer, District Budget Officer  
Lucia Marquez (ASVC student representative)  
Mary Anne McNeil, Director, Fiscal Services  
Darlene Melby, College Business Manager, Moorpark College  
Mary Rees, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College  
Art Sandford, Academic Senate President, Ventura College  
Daniel Seymour, Interim Executive Vice President, Ventura College

Absent:

Dominga Chavez, Classified representative, Moorpark College

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. in the Thomas G. Lakin Board Room at VCCCD, with a few members utilizing the district's Lync phone conferencing capability.

**APPROVAL OF NOTES**

The notes from the October 17, 2013 meeting were approved by consensus.

**ALLOCATION MODEL REVIEW**

Ms. La Teer provided an overview of the allocation model. She explained that although it was reviewed thoroughly in September, it is being reviewed again because we have several new DCAS members. The District receives General Fund State apportionment money in one lump sum. The Allocation Model is a method to distribute general fund dollars to each college. Ms. La Teer reminded the group what comes "off the top" (utilities, districtwide services, and DAC).

The model has three pieces. First, is class delivery allocation. This represents half of the general fund revenue. This portion provides a college with the same amount of money needed to teach the same amount of students as the prior year. The second section is the base allocation. This section recognizes the fixed expenses/core services associated with the operations of a college, regardless of the size of its enrollment. Each college is allocated an equal amount: 15%, which mirrors how we get paid from the state. The third portion is FTES – funded FTES. The bottom section allocates resources based on the amount of funded FTES per college.

There was a brief discussion about adjustments made to the model (FTES, FT faculty release time, etc.)

There was a discussion about Basic Skills classes going to non-credit and how that would affect revenue. This has been discussed at the state level, but could be a few years out. Scenarios could be developed and shared at a future DOC meeting. Those are operational issues. It was the consensus of DCAS that we will wait until more definite word is given.

Student Success money is categorical funding and not part of the general fund allocation model.

On a side note, Ms. La Teer stressed the importance of accurate student success information into MIS. Information must be coordinated and shared. There was a discussion about the need for an Executive Vice President to participate on the MIS/Student Success Task Force.

### **ALLOCATION MODEL PROPOSED CHANGES**

There were a few proposed changes to the allocation model discussed.

#### International Student Program

Mr. Keebler explained that if the District is going to have a more vibrant program, we need to address it in the revenue stream/model. More research should be done in tandem with International Students Task Force. There will be parallel efforts. DOC will look at operational decision. If moved forward, the international student change would be in effect for fiscal year 2016. This item will be studied more in DOC.

#### Increase in Percentage for DAC

An increase in percentage to the DAC allocation was also discussed. The current percentage for DAC is 8.1%. There was a discussion regarding COLA and whether or not that increase would be sufficient for the DAC's needs.

Dr. Bush expressed uncertainty as to whether the campuses could sustain an increase in DAC percentage while also absorbing the recent AFT salary increase and health and welfare increases. Mr. Fahnestock explained that an increase in percentage to the DAC could be used to fund positions such as a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and an Internal Auditor. There was a discussion as to whether these positions would alleviate some workload at the colleges.

Allocation simulations would be completed and shared at DOC and brought back to a future DCAS meeting.

### Infrastructure Funding Model

There was a discussion about the funding mechanism for the IFM. Specifically, because the District received Growth dollars, will the implementation be sped up with more Lottery revenue being moved to IFM? This will come back to a future DCAS meeting with scenario numbers for moving more Lottery revenue.

### **FULL-TIME OBLIGATION NUMBER (FON)**

Mr. Fahnestock explained that FON has been discussed in Cabinet for the last several months, but stressed the importance of recruiting. Seems we're a little behind. Recruitments should be started before the holidays. It is estimated that we hire back faculty we lose; not necessarily in the same discipline.

Ms. La Teer distributed and reviewed the FON schedule (dated October 25, 2013). She explained that next year's obligation is 369. Currently, we are over by 9. Without any hiring, we'll be short 11 – that's an approximate \$600,000 penalty. It was stressed that hiring should begin in order to avoid the penalty.

September 30, 2014 is the "magic date" to meet the FON obligation.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:35 a.m.

Next meeting – Thursday, December 19, 2013 - 9:00 a.m.