

# VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

## District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS)

## November 21, 2019 – 9:00 a.m. District Administrative Center, Thomas Lakin Board Room

# AGENDA

- Approval of Meeting Notes October 17, 2019
- Police Services Budget Update (Joel Justice)
- Accreditation/ACCJC Reports (returned from October DCAS meeting)
- FY20 Budget Augmentation Related to FY19 P2 SCFF
- Philosophy Statement
  - o Samples from other districts
  - o VCCCD Guiding Principles (from Budget Assumptions)
- Allocation Model
- Other Business
- Future Agenda Items

Next Meeting: December 19, 2019, 9:00 a.m.

### VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

### **District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS)**

District Administrative Center, Thomas Lakin Boardroom Thursday, September 19, 2019 NOTES

DCAS Attendees:

Silvia Barajas, Vice President, Business Services, Moorpark College Cathy Bojorquez, Vice President, Business Services, Ventura College (via Skype) Nenagh Brown, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College Jennifer Clark, Budget Director Oscar Cobian, Vice President, Student Development, Oxnard College 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 (via Skype) Amparo Medina, Classified Senate Representative, Oxnard College Lydia Morales, Academic Senate President, Ventura College (via Skype) Chris Renbarger, Interim Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College Maria Urenda, SEIU Representative

Absent:

Jenine Daly, Human Resources Representative

Recorder: Laura Galvan

Meeting called to order 9:07 a.m.

#### APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES - SEPTEMBER 19, 2019

The meeting notes from September 17, 2019, were approved by consensus with one small change regarding FON.

#### ACCREDITATION

Dr. Eberhardy explained that this item was added to the agenda based on another VCCCD participatory governance meeting as it relates to the mid-year report for ACCJC. The Annual Fiscal Report from ACCJC will be included in the Annual Report. Ms. Barajas read a few of the ACCJC's requirements. This item will be brought back to the November DCAS meeting. Ms. Brown explained that District Council on Accreditation and Planning (DCAP) will meet on November 1<sup>st</sup> after Consultation Council [this meeting did not occur]. Also, December 13, is the target date for the gap analysis to be completed. The mid-term reports will be presented to the Board at the June 16 meeting for a first reading and then presented for approval at the Board's June 23 Strategic Planning meeting.

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

Dr. Clark explained that the FON Report is due to the State Chancellor's Office by mid-November. For FY20 the District's obligation is 404; the obligation for FY19 was 417. This year the District is 26 over the obligation, last year the District was 17 over. Dr. Clark stated that the data is extracted close to

September 1. She further explained how late notices of retirement/resignations are counted in the obligation number. A chart illustrating historical FON numbers by college was distributed and discussed.

#### UNBUDGETED 2019 P2 ALLOCATION (aka \$5.7 million)

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that the unbudgeted 2019 P2 Allocation of \$5.7 million is a mid-year estimate based on April 2019 enrollment figures and should be solidified in February, based on final enrollment figures sent to the CCCCO in October 2019. He indicated that he believes the District may not receive the full amount. He further stated that half of the anticipated allocation will be distributed through the District's Budget Allocation Model to be presented to the Board at the November or December meeting. The remaining funds will be held until the numbers are confirmed and then will be distributed in the same manner.

#### ALLOCATION MODEL

Vice Chancellor El Fattal provided a guideline for developing/revising the Budget Allocation Model. Dr. Clark provided a brief overview about the mechanics of the current model. There was a discussion about the model's handling of noncredit FTES as they are compensated at a different rate. There was also a discussion about faculty release time and how it relates to the allocation by college.

There was a brief discussion about the DAC's allocation increase from 6.98% to 7.1% due to a shift in IT personnel (database administrator).

Ms. Brown stated that she understood and anticipated that DCAS would see a mock-up allocation model based on the State's Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) calculator. Ms. Day explained that the changes to the SCFF have not been modeled by the State; some of the data is still missing and rates will be recalculated. For the Student Success portion, a three-year average will be used beginning with FY2019-2020. In FY19 the three-year average was used for credit FTES. Ms. Day also reminded the group that the highest of student awards, not all student awards, will now be used and that the definition of a transfer student was amended.

Ms. Brown suggested using the data provided last April and then ensuring an internal hold harmless. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated the District doesn't have the luxury of waiting until data is firm. A Model should be developed and then adjusted, as needed, based on changes.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained there is a state-level Oversight Committee for the Student Centered Funding Formula. The Committee's first report is due February 2020.

#### DCAS participated in Great California Shakeout Earthquake Drill Break – 10:17 a.m. to 10:32 am.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained the State's Budget update regarding the SCFF. He also stated that the campus researchers are working on the SCFF data elements. There was a discussion about the possibility of having joint meetings (at least annually) with IRAC and DCAS. It is important for all involved parties to stay informed.

The State's hold harmless was extended to FY21-22.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained some of the factors that Riverside Community College District is measuring in terms of implementation of a new allocation model.

There was a discussion about the interest for establishing a philosophy statement related to the committee's process of revising the allocation model related to SCFF. Vice Chancellor El Fattal read two statements from Chabot Las Positas. Dr. Eberhardy stated that a philosophy statement might be beneficial for accreditation processes. Copies will be distributed at the next meeting.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal reminded the group that when Ms. Day modeled the SCFF (albeit with missing data elements) against our current model, there was a 1% swing in funding between Moorpark and Ventura colleges. Oxnard College's funding remained approximately the same.

DCAS members discussed various elements for consideration. They are listed below:

#### <u>Revenue</u>

What should be included in the Revenue portion of the model?

General Fund (Fund 111) apportionment; not Fund 114 as those are generated by the colleges and not provided from the State.

Ms. Barajas would like to address Bookstore revenue in a way similar to Vending revenues. The auditors will be consulted regarding this potential suggested change.

Ms. (Emily) Day provided a historical approach on the funds from an enterprise fund to Fund 114. All the indirect funds/cost recovery is accounted for on the page Ms. Day distributed. All the indirect cost revenues are kept at the colleges as well as the Economic and Workforce Development Division. There was a question about the DAC's Fund 114 indirect cost. Ms. Day explained that the Mandated Cost Block grant is accounted for in this org.

There was a general agreement that Fund 114 would stay at the colleges. There was also a discussion about nonresident tuition rates. These fees currently stay with the college that generates the international students.

Total Computational Revenue (TCR) comes from State apportionment, student fees, and property taxes. Ms. Day explained that in FY19, those revenues flowed through the Budget Allocation Model. The revenues that currently flow into the Infrastructure Funding Model (IFM) were discussed.

Ms. Barajas explained that she was asked by accreditors how the District accounts for Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). She indicated she was able to show evidence through the IFM.

Interest income fluctuates from year to year as rates and funds held in account increase and decrease.

There was a brief discussion about the DAC's rental income and how it is being accounted for. It is being held in Fund 114, org 72067. It may be considered as Total Cost of Ownership for the DAC. Those funds go towards DAC building maintenance, etc.

There was a discussion about how Growth is handled. Growth related to increased FTES is budgeted in the year after it is earned. The Model is silent on what happens if FTES decline in a subsequent year.

Ms. Bojorquez indicated the State had previously funded Districts on the higher of prior year revenue or current year revenue.

Ms. Brown explained that Moorpark is preparing for the FY21 budget as if there is a \$1 million deficit due to declining FTES. Dr. Clark stated that the hold harmless is protecting the District right now as well.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal suggested a more in depth conversation about this issue.

There was a discussion about how fund balances/carryover should be handled in the future. It was suggested that any unbudgeted revenue be allocated through the Model. This will be a possible recommendation for future meetings.

There was a discussion about Innovation funding. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated there are ways of dealing with that in the current model: Fund 113 *Other* category, major initiatives *off the top* for which colleges would have to apply, as well as general fund 111. Ms. Barajas explained that the colleges are doing innovative things on the campus that are currently being funded through the campus's general funds (PACE, dual enrollment, etc.)

A sample model will be brought to the November meeting using the updated FCMAT calculator. A sample philosophy statement will also be brought.

Other issues for consideration:

- How closely do we want to model the state's model?
- How do we handle duplicates in SCFF measures?
- How can/should we account for Bookstore revenue?

Ms. Barajas questioned how the District will proceed in the absence of updated calculator, etc. Vice Chancellor explained that he feels running concurrent models is prudent. There needs to be a comparison. There was a brief discussion surrounding the reasons for considering/evaluating a new model.

Meeting adjourned 12:59 p.m.

| VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT | 2019-2020 REVISED BUDGET SCENARIO (AII POSITIONS BUDGEED 100%) | PARKING SERVICES FUND | FUND 124 |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------|
|---|--|-----------------------|----------|

|   | CAMPUS F<br>Actual | POLICE<br>Buiddet | PARKING LOTS<br>Actual Bu | LOTS<br>Buddet | TOTAL<br>Actual | .L<br>Budget |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
|   | 2018-19            | 2019-20           | 2018-19                   | 2019-20        | 2018-19         | 2019-20      |
| BEGINNING BALANCE                       | 121,823            | 18,885            | 149,988                   | 119,678        | 271,811         | 138,563      |
| REVENUES                                |                    |                   |                           |                |                 |              |
| Parking Fees - Permits                  | 585,318            | 580,000           | 193,826                   | 207,000        | 779,144         | 787,000      |
| Parking Fees - Permits CCPG             | 395,865            | 400,000           |                           |                | 395,865         | 400,000      |
| Parking Fees - Daily/Coin               | 672,959            | 672,000           |                           |                | 672,959         | 672,000      |
| Parking and Traffic Fines               | 215,671            | 355,000           |                           |                | 215,671         | 355,000      |
| Other Local Revenues/Fees               | 3,911              | 2,500             |                           |                | 3,911           | 2,500        |
| Interfund Transfer In from General Fund | 734,768            | 1,164,768         | ·                         |                | 734,768         | 1,164,768    |
| TOTAL REVENUES                          | 2,608,492          | 3,174,268         | 193,826                   | 207,000        | 2,802,317       | 3,381,268    |
| TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE                   | 2,730,315          | 3,193,153         | 343,814                   | 326,678        | 3,074,129       | 3,519,831    |
| EXPENDITURES                            |                    |                   |                           |                |                 |              |
| Classified Salaries                     | 1,715,228          | 1,932,144         |                           | •              | 1,715,228       | 1,932,144    |
| Employee Benefits                       | 884,233            | 1,242,039         |                           |                | 884,233         | 1,242,039    |
| Supplies and Materials                  | 35,138             | 45,191            |                           | •              | 35,138          | 45,191       |
| Operating Expenditures                  | 300,967            | 351,040           |                           |                | 300,967         | 351,040      |
| Capital Outlay                          |                    |                   |                           |                |                 |              |
| Intrafund Transfer Out                  | (224,136)          |                   | 224,136                   | ı              | ı               | ı            |
|   |                    |                   |                           |                |                 |              |
| FOTAL EXPENDITURES                      | 2,711,430          | 3,570,414         | 224,136                   | 0              | 2,935,566       | 3,570,414    |
| be PROJECTED ENDING BALANCE             | 18,885             | (377,261)         | 119,678                   | 326,678        | 138,563         | (50,583)     |

| 173,334,369           | (7,865,456)        | (4,090,500)    | (12,306,740)  | 149,071,673                |  |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|--|
| FY20 Adoption Revenue | Less:District-wide | Less:Utilities | Less: District Office (7.1% revenue) <sup>[a]</sup> | Available for Distribution |  |

|                   | I   | Moo   | Moorpark  | Oxr  | Oxnard  | Ventura                                  | tura                                |                  | Total                       |                |
|-------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 3) <del>3</del> ) | Class Schedule Delivery Allocation<br>Unadjusted FTES (FY19 actual, includes NonResident)<br>WSCH<br>Productivity Factor  |   | 11,395<br>170,926<br>525  |  | 4,728<br>70,916<br>525                                  |  | 9,452<br>141,786<br>525             |                  | 25,575                      |                |
| (5)<br>(6)<br>(6) | FTEF<br>FTEF adjustment<br>less: Full Time positions (FTEF)<br>=Hourly FTEF @ <sup>[b]</sup> \$ 53.523  | 325.6<br>12.0<br>(124.2)<br>213                     | 22,193,576<br>11.422.466  | 135.1<br>7.6<br>(65.8)<br>77                     | 12,150,802<br>4.117.921                                 | 270.1<br>10.5<br>(113.4)<br>167          | 18,801,634<br>8.947.529             | \$<br>53,<br>24. | 53,146,012<br>24.487.915    | 35.7%<br>16.4% |
| . (8              | ale Delivery Allocation   | \$  | 33,616,041  | ÷  | 16,268,722  | ÷  | 27,749,164                          |                  | 77,633,927                  | 52.1%          |
| 6)                | Base Allocation   | \$  | 7,453,584   | \$   | 7,453,584   | \$                                       | 7,453,584                           | \$ 22,           | 22,360,751                  | 15.0%          |
| 10)<br>11)        | 10) Adjusted FTES ( FY19 actual)<br>11) FTES Allocation   | ↔   | 11,382<br>44.6%<br><b>21,881,388</b>  | \$   | 4,728<br>18.5%<br><b>9,088,975</b>                      | \$                                       | 9,418<br>36.9%<br><b>18,106,633</b> | \$<br>49,        | 25,528<br><b>49,076,995</b> | 32.9%          |
| 12) .             | 12) Total Allocation FY20   | ÷   | 62,951,012  | ÷  | 32,811,281  | φ  | 53,309,380                          | \$ 149,          | 149,071,673                 | 100.0%         |
| 15a)              | 15a) <b>Campus FY19 Carryover</b> [c]   | \$  | 1,175,042   | \$   | 625,049   | \$                                       | 301,942                             | \$               | 2,102,033                   |                |
| 15b)              | 15b) Campus Carryover SCFF FY19 Add'tl Rev  | \$  | 1,248,453   | ÷  | 575,930   | \$                                       | 684,096                             | \$               | 2,508,479                   |                |
| 16)               | 16) FY20 Adoption Allocation  | \$  | 65,374,508  | \$   | 34,012,259  | \$                                       | 54,295,418                          | \$ 153,          | 153,682,185                 |                |
|                   | Assumptions   Assumptions   [a] In FY20, salary & benefits for WCU068, Database Admin, shifted from DWS to DAC; thus, DAC percentage increased to 7.1%   [b] FY20 average replacement cost.   [c] Similar to the colleges, the District Office (DAC) is allowed up to a 2% carryover. The DAC carryover from FY19 is \$229,074.   [d] Due to the implementation of the SCFF, the first apportionment from the State was greater than the advance apportionment for FY19. This carryover addresses the timing of the allocation of additional one-time revenue. The amount for the DAC is \$199,266. | min, shifted fro<br>wed up to a 2<br>rtionment from | ifted from DWS to DAC;<br>p to a 2% carryover. The<br>ent from the State was gr<br>for the DAC is \$199,266 | thus, DAC per<br>DAC carryover<br>eater than the | centage increase<br>from FY19 is \$2<br>advance apporti | ed to 7.1%<br>229,074.<br>onment for FY1 | 9. This carryovei                   | addresses        | the timing                  |                |

53,309,380 52,346,689 962,691

32,811,281 32,262,109 549,172

62,951,012 61,815,224 1,135,788

Revised Line 12 Adoption Line 12 Increase Line 12



# Funding Formula Committee Philosophy Statement

The Funding Formula Committee (FFC) strives to educate the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District about the State funding formula metrics, accurate data sources on the metrics, and best practices and efficient processes to fully benefit from the metrics. We aim to capitalize on the metrics while maintaining a central focus on student success and equity.

The FFC aims to recommend high-impact initiatives and processes that are fiscally responsible and lead to increased funding based on any of the State's three funding formula components:

- *Base Allocation*: Credit FTES, Non-credit FTES, CDCP FTES, Special Admit FTES, and Inmate Education FTES
- *Supplemental Allocation:* California Promise Grant, AB 540 students, and Pell Grant recipients
- Student Success Allocation: degrees, degrees for transfer, credit certificates, completion of 9 or more CTE units, transfers to four-year university, completion of transfer level math and English, attainment of a regional living wage and equity "bumps" for California Promise Fee Waiver and Pell Grant recipients;

The FFC aims to do all the above, while also taking into consideration the initiatives' impacts on students meeting their educational goals, student equity, the College's strategic plans and educational missions, cost-benefit analyses, scalability and alignment of the initiatives across both Colleges.

The FFC strives for our committee processes to be respectful, transparent, equitable, collaborative, and grounded in data-driven analyses and evidence-based practices. We will aim to value and respect the time it takes for faculty members, Classified Professionals, Administrators, and student employees to accomplish new initiatives. We believe that all CLPCCD community members have valuable ideas and we will be most successful collectively strategizing to maximize our funding.

Approved by the Funding Formula Committee February 1, 2019

## VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

## **BUDGET CRITERIA (GUIDING PRINCIPLES) AND ASSUMPTIONS**

## FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 (FY20)

The District will develop a budget that allocates resources to achieve districtwide strategic goals and objectives. The Budget Criteria and Assumptions serve as a guide in developing the annual budget by setting forth the guiding principles by which the budget will be built and by providing assumptions which are the basis for the financial projections of revenue and expenditures. The budget is developed through a collaborative district-wide process that involves the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and his Cabinet, the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS), and the Chancellor's Consultation Council. The budget is further developed locally through collaboration at each college.

### **Guiding Principles**

To help ensure that limited available resources are optimized, a budget will be developed that:

- Allocates resources to support goals and objectives established by the Board
- Provide resources to retain and attract highly qualified and effective employees
- Provides resources for continued improvement of student success and learning outcomes
- Provides resources and support for high quality, innovative instructional programs and services to students
- Balances enrollment goals and student access
- Increases and/or maintains sufficient levels of institutional effectiveness while becoming more efficient and cost effective
- Works to maintain technological currency and efficiency by updating and replacing equipment
- Provides resources to address the total cost of ownership and to maintain building and grounds
- Manages reserves and liabilities prudently and responsibly

### **Assumptions**

Budget Assumptions are the basis for the financial projections of revenue and expenditures contained within the budget allocation process. While these Assumptions are based on the most current information available, it is recognized that ever-changing circumstances can alter the economic foundation upon which the Assumptions have been built.

The initial Budget Assumptions presented at this time are preliminary in nature and will be revised whenever significant and reliable information becomes available during the State budget development process. Events such as the "May Revise" of the Governor's

### SCFF Adoption Budget Allocation Model

| FY20 Adoption Revenue      | \$<br>173,334,369  |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Less: DWS                  | \$<br>(7,865,456)  |
| Less: Utilities            | \$<br>(4,090,500)  |
| Less: DAC                  | \$<br>(12,306,740) |
| Available for distribution | \$<br>149,071,673  |

|                               | Percent | Amount            |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1. Base allocation            | 70%     | \$<br>104,350,171 |
| 2. Supplemental allocation    | 20%     | \$<br>29,814,335  |
| 3. Student success allocation | 10%     | \$<br>14,907,167  |
|                               |         | \$<br>149,071,673 |

| 1. Base allocation                       | <br>MC           | <br>OC           | VC               | Total             |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Basic allocation                         | \$<br>4,570,724  | \$<br>3,917,761  | \$<br>4,570,724  | \$<br>13,059,208  |
| Remaining base allocation                |                  |                  |                  | \$<br>91,290,963  |
| FY19 Annual 320 Credit FTES (Resident)   | 11,160.78        | 4,706.47         | 9,257.02         | 25,124.27         |
| Percent of total                         | <br>44%          | 19%              | 37%              | 100%              |
| Campus remaining base allocation         | \$<br>40,553,550 | \$<br>17,101,320 | \$<br>33,636,092 | \$<br>91,290,963  |
| Sub-total Base allocation                | \$<br>45,124,274 | \$<br>21,019,081 | \$<br>38,206,816 | \$<br>104,350,171 |
| 2. Supplemental allocation               | МС               | ос               | VC               | Total             |
| Pell Grant recipients                    | <br>3,113        | 3,027            | 3,665            | 9,805             |
| State Non-resident fee waiver            | 387              | 357              | 435              | 1,179             |
| CA Promise Grant recipients              | <br>7,968        | 7,573            | 10,935           | 26,476            |
|  | 11,468           | 10,957           | 15,035           | 37,460            |
| Percent of total                         | 31%              | 29%              | 40%              | 100%              |
| Sub-total Campus supplemental allocation | \$<br>9,127,357  | \$<br>8,720,653  | \$<br>11,966,325 | \$<br>29,814,335  |
| 3. Student success allocation            | МС               | ос               | VC               | Total             |
| Associate degrees                        | <br>1,903        | 678              | 1,525            | 4,106             |
| Associate degrees for transfer           | 1,191            | 314              | 656              | 2,161             |
| Credit certificates                      | <br>1,492        | 677              | 1,555            | 3,724             |
| Total student awards                     | <br>4,586        | 1,669            | 3,736            | 9,991             |
| Percent of total                         | 46%              | 17%              | 37%              | 100%              |
| Sub-total Student success allocation     | \$<br>6,842,585  | \$<br>2,490,247  | \$<br>5,574,335  | \$<br>14,907,167  |
| TOTAL SCFF Allocation                    | \$<br>61,094,216 | \$<br>32,229,982 | \$<br>55,747,475 | \$<br>149,071,673 |
| Proportionate share by college           |                  |                  |                  |                   |
| Model shown above                        | 41%              | 22%              | 37%              |                   |
| Current model                            | 42%              | 22%              | 36%              |                   |
| Spring 2019 model                        | 41%              | 22%              | 37%              |                   |
|  |                  |                  |                  |                   |