

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS)

(Combined meeting with IRAC and college Presidents and Vice Presidents)

District Administrative Center, Thomas Lakin Boardroom

Thursday, January 17, 2019

NOTES

DCAS Attendees:

Silvia Barajas, Vice President, Business Services, Moorpark College
Cathy Bojorquez, Vice President, Business Services, Ventura College
Nenagh Brown, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College
Mike Bush, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College
Jennifer Clark, Budget Director
Emily Day, Director, Fiscal Services
Jeanine Day, Classified Senate Representative, Ventura College
Gilbert Downs, Classified Senate Representative, Moorpark College
Diane Eberhardy, Academic Senate President, Oxnard College
David El Fattal, Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services
Mark Frohnauer, AFT Representative
Nubia Lopez-Villegas, Human Resources Representative
Lydia Morales, Academic Senate President, Ventura College
Chris Renbarger, Classified Senate Representative, Oxnard College
Maria Urenda, SEIU Representative

Other Attendees:

Cynthia Azari, President, Oxnard College
Oleg Besplaov
Damon Bell, President, Ventura College
Patti Blair, Administrative Officer to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor
Lisa Bratten
Phillip Briggs
Oscar Cobian
John Cooney
Nan Duangpun
Amanuel Gerbu
Michael Haberberger, SEIU Representative
Cynthia Herrera
Kimberly Hoffmans
Lisa Hopper
Mike Rose
Luis Sanchez, President, Moorpark College
Rojelio Vasquez
Dan Watkins, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology
Kim Watters
Alexandria Wright

Recorder: Laura Galvan

Vice Chancellor El Fattal called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. He explained the agenda was rearranged due to Mr. Brahmbhatt from Cambridge West Partnership being delayed due to weather related traffic issues.

Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) White Paper Discussion Meeting

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that the State Chancellor's Office is hosting regional meetings regarding the SCFF and introduction of an SCFF calculator. VCCCD hosted the Region 6 meeting on Friday, January 11, 2019. There are still elements of the SCFF calculator that are being finalized and fine-tuned.

FY20 Budget Proposal Update

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained the FY20 Governor's Budget Proposal contains a one-third cut to the Strong Workforce program; constituent groups are concerned. There was a discussion about VCCCD's reduced funding amount for this program; all expressed concerns. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that information regarding proposed cuts is still forthcoming.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal also explained that the SCFF category funding percentages will remain at 70/10/20, which is the same as year 1 (FY19). The category funding percentages do not change until the subsequent year (FY21); the phase-in period will remain at three years, not four years. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated this is one way to handle some of the unintended consequences of the changes. He stated there is an oversight committee for the SCFF implementation; participants were recently named. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that many believe there is a desire to change the formula; specifically, there are members of the Oversight Committee that are interested in changing formula. Vice Chancellor El Fattal expressed concern about major swings in funding based on any potential changes to the SCFF. Currently, there is no cap on outcomes. The Oversight Committee is charged with developing a cap on outcomes. The Governor's proposal contains a cap of 10% on outcomes. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated he believes the cap is on money, not successes.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that most of the economic forecasters suggest a recession is coming around 2020. Projections also forecast that unemployment will increase to over 8%. FCMAT (Financial Crisis and Management Assistance Team) presented information on issues related to fiscal health for more than an hour at the State Budget Workshop on Wednesday, January 16, 2019. There was caution that apportionments and projections may decrease at the May Revise.

MIS Data Submission

The District had a deadline of November 30 to submit final data corrections, stated Vice Chancellor El Fattal. There are different data submission dates for different metrics. Systemwide, there needs to be workflow changes on the campuses to have data ready and accurate for submission to for the deadlines. Vice Chancellor El Fattal said that it is his understanding that the data submitted by VCCCD is accurate; other districts' data is not. In previous submissions by VCCCD, the data had not been reviewed or signed off by a campus level administrator. Recently, IRAC has developed recommendations for a new approval process geared to ensuring the highest quality data submissions. This recommendation provides that the registrars, researchers, vice presidents and presidents will review/approve data. The recommendations will be brought to the Chancellor through Consultation Council. There was a request from the Vice Presidents of Business to be able to access the data; further to see a written procedure on the authorization process. Mr. Cooney explained that the aggregated data is available on the state's DataMart site. Disaggregated data is available to campus researchers.

Cambridge West has worked with the Chancellor's Office to create a calculator for revenues related to the SCFF. There are still algorithm issues that continue to be worked out. It is becoming more refined and closer to finalization. It is available on the FCMAT website. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that it appears, by all indications, VCCCD will receive more funding. The numbers are not final; he will share additional data with DCAS in February as the bugs with the calculator are mitigated.

Ms. Barajas explained that one-time dollars for IELM and Scheduled Maintenance have been eliminated as part of the Governor's January budget proposal.

10:00 a.m.

CM Brahmhatt, Cambridge West

Mr. Brahmhatt explained the involvement of Cambridge West in the development of the funding formula. He said that more than half of the districts in California are declining in FTES. The remaining are not growing or are moving up-and-down with FTES from year-to-year. Further, the existing funding formula has allowed resources to be used for varied blanket reasons. One of the goals of the funding formula is to move students into the workforce or transfer programs. The theory behind the SCFF is that resources should be directed to students to achieve specific purposes.

Mr. Brahmhatt provided a disclaimer on the calculator; the legislature is still finalizing things. There are many moving parts. He encouraged all constituency groups on campus to work together to serve students better.

He explained that no changes will be made to the formula during the first two years. The task force (Oversight Board) will be listening and observing.

Mr. Brahmhatt explained that Governor Newsom is pro-education. His website and proposed budget reinforce this perception. For FY19-20, the percentage will change from 70% to 65% for the base allocation of FTES.

Further, there is a three-year hold harmless period for Districts adversely affected by the SCFF.

Mr. Brahmhatt suggested a way to increase funding is to help students be successful, rather than chasing FTES. There is a funding difference of \$5,400 vs. \$8,300.

There was a discussion about the functionality of shifting FTES. Mr. Brahmhatt explained that eventually, if districts keep shifting FTES, it will catch up with them. This is why the three-year average is helpful with this formula. Mr. Brahmhatt feels that this issue will arise again in the future and it is his feeling that it will likely be eliminated.

There was a question on the Regional Living Wage. Districts have no control over the wage; further, the data is two years old.

There is transparency on where the dollars are coming from; what metrics/groups. This will provide apportionment by District. There is one calculator for all districts to utilize; this will provide empowerment to districts. Forecasting simulations are provided in the calculator.

Dr. Clark inquired if Districts are all subject to the Prop 98 guarantee; Mr. Brahmbhatt confirmed in the affirmative.

There was a question about the small/medium/large sized college threshold/funding. The threshold remains the same as in the prior formula.

Mr. Brahmbhatt said the message is clear; District stakeholders must work together.

(Non-DCAS members were excused.)

DCAS Meeting began at 11:15 a.m.

Approval of Meeting Notes – November 15, 2018

The meeting notes from November 15, 2018, were approved by consensus.

FY20 Budget Process

Calendar/Timeline

Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that the Calculator will be brought in for the February meeting. Ms. Brown suggested looking at the Allocation by college, not just by District. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained the calculator is only by District; it is not broken down by college. Ms. (Emily) Day said that headcounts are unduplicated. There are some outcomes that are hard to obtain locally: for instance, transfer data and living wage. As an example, if students attend all three campuses, they are only counted once. Dr. Bush suggested there may be some metrics that may need to be left off. For example, living wage. There is a desire to see revenue projection by college. How much is each college contributing towards the District's revenue projection and what is fair to allocate out. This data, if relevant, would be considered for FY21, as it was previously agreed that the current model would be used for FY20. Ms. Day clarified that some metrics are previous year data.

Ms. Brown stated that what colleges are earning is important to the Allocation. Last year, DCAS spent a lot of time looking at allocations, specifically Moorpark College. She reminded DCAS members that, in essence, what we agreed to last year is a shift to what is currently being proposed. Ms. Brown just wants to be clear on the reasons behind evaluating revenues by college. Dr. Bush said that DCAS may end up where we are today, but we should take a close look. Dr. Bush stated that the current model addresses equity. Transfer data is challenging to obtain on a districtwide and local basis because students take classes at each of the three colleges.

Dr. Clark reviewed the proposed timeline/calendar by month, and detailed each related process. The May Revise will affect FY20, but we will begin discussions in March/April for FY21. It was suggested that the timeline clarify budget years.

Finalize Allocation Model Review

It was agreed that the District's current allocation model will be used for the FY19-20 Budget.

Infrastructure Funding Model

After reviewing the Infrastructure Funding Model, it was suggested that language be added regarding carryover funds. Carryover Funds is addressed in two separate locations in the narrative. Ms. Barajas asked that language be added regarding funds received for any potential shift in FTES. It would be considered unbudgeted, unrestricted general fund revenue. The language should be clarified (see November notes). Dr. Bush says there needs to be a larger discussion about what is accounted for in Districtwide Services. Regarding Fund 693, Ms. Barajas clarified that \$5.3 million is projected to be collected; there is an "overage" of \$311,138. The fund balance for Fund 693 was requested by VPs. She suggested adding the fund balance to the spreadsheet on a quarterly basis.

Other Business

Dr. Bush will provide an update at the February DCAS meeting on the work being done by the Irrevocable Trust Workgroup.

Meeting adjourned 12:05 p.m.