VENTURA COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS)

February 20, 2020 – 9:00 a.m.
District Administrative Center, Thomas Lakin Board Room

AGENDA

- Approval of Meeting Notes – January 16, 2020
- FY2020-21 Budget Assumptions
- FY2020-21 Allocation Model (narrative)
- FY2020-21 Infrastructure Funding Model (narrative)
- Allocation Model / SCFF Allocation Model scenarios
- Other Business
- Future Agenda Items

Next Meeting: March 19, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS)

District Administrative Center, Thomas Lakin Boardroom
Thursday, January 16, 2020
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
Dan Clark, Academic Senate President, Ventura 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
Amy Edwards, 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
Chris Renbarger, Interim Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College
Maria Urenda, SEIU Representative

Guest:
Joel Justice, Chief of Police

Absent:
Jenine Daly, Human Resources Representative

Recorder: Laura Galvan

Meeting called to order 9:03 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – DECEMBER 18, 2019
The meeting notes from December 18, 2019, were approved by consensus.

FACULTY CO-CHAIR ELECTION
Mr. Dan Clark, Ventura College Academic Senate President, was elected as the DCAS faculty co-chair.

POLICE SERVICES BUDGET REVIEW
Dr. (Jennifer) Clark presented the current Police Services budget and projected and year-to-date expenditures. Dr. Clark explained that the parking permit revenues include spring permit sales. The three, new vacant officer positons are accounted for in account 2999. She indicated the savings from vacancies is not adequate to cover a full year's salary for each position; there is a shortfall.

Chief Justice stated that as it currently stands, there is one officer vacancy, one officer on long-term leave (military), and he is anticipating one additional vacancy in March/April; an officer in Background with another agency).

Dr. Clark stated that revenue/daily coin collection will, most likely, fall short of projection. There may be a timing issue with the permit Board of Governor's (BOG) Waiver due to a lag with internal transfers. Ms. (Emily) Day explained the process for reimbursement/payment from Credentials (the third-party permit service company). The permit/BOGW numbers could be skewed based on timing issues. Dr. Clark also mentioned the student hourly (cadets) budget is below budget, not too many cadets have been hired. Chief Justice indicated that paperwork for two new cadets has been submitted and there are additional hires in the works.

Ms. Barajas summarized the Budget by stating it is short approximately $300,000 if all vacancies and on-hold positions are filled. She inquired how hiring additional officers will impact the overtime budget. For example, will it go down if the department is fully staffed? Chief Justice stated that the overtime budget would be reduced if additional officers are hired. He stated that the recent increased presence at the Board meetings has also increased the overtime budget. The request for additional officers came from Chair Kennedy (at the time) through Chancellor Luskin. Ms. Brown recalled the conversation being more recent. There was a discussion about the recurring need for additional officers now that the meetings are livestreamed. Dr. Clark and Chief Justice will ascertain the amount of funds paid for overtime at Board meetings. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained he will discuss the police presence at Board meetings with Chancellor Gillespie. Ms. Barajas explained that filling the two vacant positions immediately will also help mitigate overtime.

Chief Justice will move forward with the hiring of the vacant positon and hire a provisional for the military leave.

Mr. Renbarger suggested moving police services to the DAC budget.

GOVERNOR'S INITIAL FY21 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that he and the fiscal team attended the State Budget Workshop in Sacramento on January 15. He stated that, basically, the budget is status quo with the addition of COLA. The Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) is unchanged from the previous year related to the allocation metrics (70/20/10). He indicated the proposed budget includes some program consolidation. Vice Chancellor El Fattal said that COLA really may not be a true COLA as each District might not receive it. The budget proposal includes $15 million in faculty diversity and part-time compensation/office hours. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained there are state level discussions about paying down existing obligations such as STRS/PERS, instead of starting new initiatives with one-time funds.

MOBILE PAYMENT OPTIONS

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that mobile payment options were discussed at Districtwide Operations Committee (DOC). He stated that each campus has some form of mobile payments and that further discussions on this topic will take place at DOC. He stated that the vice presidents are having difficulty determining the scope of the request. Ms. Brown indicated the request was specifically related to PayPal and ApplePay. The issue isn't with using credit cards; it's electronic payments (digital wallet). Vice Chancellor El Fattal indicated that the discussion should start on the campus and the appropriate venue for further discussion is DOC.

FUND 693 REVIEW

Dr. Clark reviewed the budget and year-to-date expenditures for Fund 693 Retiree Health Benefits. The activity is through December 2019. She explained each category and the variances in each number. Current projections indicate that the fund will be over by $945,148; however, that is not a true representation. Dr. Clark indicated that number will change based on vacancies. She stated that any excess amount is carried over into the subsequent fiscal year as a starting balance. Ms. Barajas stated there have been years where there was a shortfall and the colleges had to come up with the balance, so her preference is to have an overage.

ACCREDITATION

Ms. Brown indicated that the Moorpark College requested data has been received. This item has been resolved.

ALLOCATION MODEL/SCFF MODEL SCENARIOS

Ms. (Emily) Day reminded the group that the differences between each scenario can be found in the meeting notes of December 2019. Ms. Barajas stated she is not in favor of changing the model and provided rationale for not supporting a change to the Model. Mr. Renbarger respectfully disagreed with Ms. Barajas and referenced scenarios 9 and 10, which he favors. There was a discussion about the State's allocation splits of 70/20/10 vs. 60/20/20. [Editor's note: 70/20/10 refers to the State's percentage distribution of 70% Base, 20% Supplemental, 10% Student Success.] Ms. Bojorquez stated there is no real movement at the State level towards the 60/20/20 split. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that this discussion seems halted, but he will strive to confirm the status with state-level colleagues. Ms. Day explained that for the FY19-20 Budget, the SCFF funds would be allocated with 70% for the base allocation, 20% for the supplemental allocation, and 10% for the student success allocation. Beginning in 2020-21, those funding rates would be adjusted by COLA. Ms. Bojorquez stated that she feels DCAS began discussing potential changes to the Model last year. She does feel that the data behind the numbers is stale because it is FY17-18; however, it still provides a guide on how the allocation will look. She would like to continue the discussion with the progress that has been made. It is unlikely all the details will be worked out in time for the FY21 Budget. Ms. Bojorquez suggested an agreement on the concept on scenarios 9 and 10. She explained those scenarios protect the Class Delivery Allocation method and stated that DCAS should select the option that works best for the District. She stated that she likes the idea of blending the two and acknowledged the challenges with the data (using outdated data, counting students that attend more than one campus, etc.). She encouraged DCAS to make a commitment to move forward with one of the scenarios. She is concerned that the Committee will run out of time again next year and by narrowing the options, the colleges can plan any impacts. Ms. Brown restated, for understanding, Ms. Bojorquez's statements: Keep the model as it is for FY21 and commit to a philosophical concept for FY22. Ms. Bojorquez said that she is proposing using scenario 10 with small modifications; keeping the Class Delivery Allocation as is and distributing the remaining, based on college size (small/medium/large) for FY22. Ms. Bojorquez stated that should the State change the allocation dramatically (for example, 60/20/20), the proposal would be reevaluated by DCAS. Mr. Renbarger supports Ms. Bojorquez's proposal. Ms. Bojorquez explained it is her desire to narrow the scope of options. Ms. Brown expressed her desire for stability.

There was a discussion about Scenario 10 as well as the base allocation numbers, which are aligned to the small/medium/large sized college. The majority of DCAS members agreed to use the current model for FY21. For FY22, the focus will be on scenarios 9 or 10 (with slight modifications). All members agreed to work with this in good faith.

Ms. Brown stated she would like to protect funds that arrive to the colleges late by allowing carryover to the colleges for at least one year. It was proposed that any amount above the 2% carryover limit be allowed. It was further proposed that it be for more than one year. There was a discussion about allowing the carryover amounts into Fund 113.

Mr. Frohnauer explained that AFT may be opposed. He read a statement on behalf of AFT:

> *"It is the AFT's position that Reserves should remain at current levels, and any unbudgeted revenues, carryovers and similar items be held in Unrestricted and Unallocated Reserves until the District and AFT agree to and sign a labor contract.*
>
> *The logic for the AFT's position is that Faculty Salaries are the largest expense item of VCCCD, and the failure to reach an agreement on Faculty Salaries prior to expiration of the CBA on June 30, 2019 leaves the District with the prospect of needing to spend significant and currently unbudgeted monies in order to provide appropriate pay raises to Faculty.*
>
> *The failure to provide fair pay raises to Faculty in the last three years has caused full-time Faculty pay to sink to near the bottom in the entire state of California, compared to other community colleges. Until this situation is recognized and addressed, the AFT will not support any diversion of funds away from Unrestricted and Unallocated Reserves."*

Mr. Renbarger asked for clarification on AFT's statement; any amount over the allowed up to 2% carryover should be deposited into the District's Unallocated, Unrestricted Reserves. Mr. Frohnauer responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Bojorquez proposed that any amount over 2% carryover (maximum allowed amount) can go to Fund 113 to be used at the campus for innovation, enrollment strategies, etc. Aside from Mr. Frohnauer's comment, all other members of DCAS support this recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Police Services Budget
- FY22 Allocation Model – Scenarios 9/10
- FY21 Budget Assumptions
- Unexpected revenue over the hold harmless amount and how that is handled
- Budget Allocation Model & Infrastructure Model

Meeting adjourned 11:16 a.m.

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

BUDGET CRITERIA (GUIDING PRINCIPLES) AND ASSUMPTIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 (FY21)

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

Budget, state mid- and year-end adjustments (P2 apportionment) in June, and legislative actions to approve a State budget may impact these Assumptions and the development of the Ventura County Community College District's budget. The Governor's January budget proposal continues the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF~~) and the 2018-19 percentages of 70% Base Allocation; 20% Supplemental Allocation; and 10% Student Success Allocation~~. The actual funding rates for the Base Allocation, Supplemental Allocation, and Student Success Allocation will be based on the 2019-20 rates~~, plus~~ with an applied COLA~~ would be applied~~. While no additional specific changes are proposed for 2020-21, the Administration notes that it supports the recommendations from the SCFF Oversight Committee to include a metric reflecting first-generation college students within the formula.

The budget development process, the Tentative Budget, and the Adoption Budget will be based on the assumptions described in this document as modified periodically.

Revenue

Governor Newsom cautions that opportunities for continued economic growth is expected to slow as both the nation and the state have reached full employment. The budget also notes that while the economy is not contracting, our continued growth is. Nevertheless, the State's General Fund continues to enjoy stronger than estimated revenue from personal income, corporation, and sales and use taxes. The 2020-21 revised revenue forecast is over $5 billion more than the 2019-20 State Budget Act projection.

With regard to the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee, funding for FY20 has increased by $517 million from the 2019-20 State Budget Act – raising the Proposition 98 guarantee to an estimated $81.6 billion, up from $81.1 billion. For 2020-21, the Governor's State Budget proposed a Proposition 98 guarantee of $84 billion, an increase of $3 billion year over year. The estimated statutory COLA in 2020-21 is 2.29%. Unrestricted revenues will be budgeted in accordance with BP and AP 6200.

Educational Services

The Governor's State Budget proposals for other community college programs include an ~~proposed~~ increase of $83.2 million for apprenticeship programs; $27.6 million in Proposition 51 capital outlay funds to support 24 new projects; a $125 million shift in funding from several existing categorical program set-asides and statewide programs to create a new CCC System Support Program; $17.3 million for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment; $15 million for a pilot fellowship program for improving faculty diversity; $11.4 million to establish or support food pantries; $10 million to develop and implement zero-textbook-cost degrees using open educational resources; $10 million to continue providing legal services to immigrant students, faculty, and staff; $9.2 million to fund the 2.29% COLA for certain categorical programs; $5.8 million to fund Dreamer Resource Liaisons; and $5 million to provide instructional materials for dual enrollment students.

The Governor's January proposal did not include any funding augmentations for other categorical programs not referenced above. Thus, the current categorical program budgets will be developed assuming the State's 95% funding guarantee will still be in place, consistent with prior year budget assumptions.

Enrollment Management

The Governor's January proposal gives a 0.5% growth factor to the system. The Tentative Budget will be developed with the assumption that FTES will remain flat in FY21 as compared to FY20's actual operational FTES. The 70% Base Allocation portion of the SCFF is calculated on a three-year rolling average of District FTES. Whereas, the other two revenue components of the SCFF (Supplemental and Student Success Allocations) are based on student demography and outcomes, respectively. The District does not anticipate any growth FTES.

Salary and Benefits

The cost of personnel makes up a significant portion of the District's budget and continues to increase for salary column/step movement and benefits. Care will be given to review and eliminate vacant positions and redundancies, and create consolidations where possible and necessary to reduce costs and increase efficiencies while recognizing the need for additional support of enrollment growth and student success efforts. For the Tentative Budget, salaries costs will include step and column increases, as well as increases in contributions for pension costs.

At the State level, while Governor Newsom makes reference to the $3.15 billion one-time CalSTRS and CalPERS investment that was made on behalf of employers as part of the enacted 2019-20 State Budget, he does not propose to provide any additional CalSTRS and CalPERS relief for LEAs in his 2020-21 State Budget proposal. Employer contribution rates for the State Teachers' Retirement System (STRS) will increase from 17.1% in 2019-20 to 18.4% in 2020-21. For the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) rates are expected to rise from 19.72% to 22.7%. The impact of collective bargaining agreements will be budgeted when known. Based on historical rate increases, the District is budgeting a 7.5% increase for faculty health and welfare costs. The District's share of health benefit costs is capped for all other employee groups.

Proprietary (Enterprise) and Auxiliary Funds
Food Service and Child Care Center

The enterprise/auxiliary funds account for business operations that are to be managed similar to private enterprise and will be budgeted assuming they are self-supporting.

Infrastructure Funding

The Infrastructure Funding Model represents the methodology for distribution of certain variable revenues such as interest income and miscellaneous revenue to address the infrastructure needs at the colleges. The colleges determine the budgeting of these funds within the allocation categories in accordance with their specific budget development processes and priorities.

Reserves

The District has designated its ending balance into five categories: State Required Minimum Reserve, Revenue Shortfall Contingency Reserve, Budget Carryover, Designated Reserves and Unallocated Ending Balance.

State Required Minimum Reserve
In accordance with the State Chancellor's Office Accounting Advisory FS 05-05: Monitoring and Assessment of Fiscal Condition, the State Chancellor's Office requires a minimum prudent unrestricted general fund balance of 5%. To ensure the District does not drop below this minimum requirement, the Board authorizes the segregation of this amount in a reserve designated for that purpose.

The Revenue Shortfall Contingency Reserve
This reserve is designated to cover any mid-year reductions (including, but not limited to, statewide property tax shortfall, enrollment fee shortfall, general statewide deficit, mid-year "triggers", etc.), thus mitigating the need for mid-year reduction in operating budgets. This reserve was exhausted in FY12 due to trigger cuts, enrollment fee, property tax shortfalls, etc. The District faced these same potential mid-year revenue reductions in FY13 at which time the Board authorized $6 million to be designated as a contingency for revenue shortfalls. The Tentative Budget will continue to include the Board-authorized $5 million designated Revenue Shortfall Contingency for FY21.

Budget Carryover
The Budget Allocation Model allows colleges and the District Administrative Center to carryover 2% of their prior year Unrestricted General Fund Budget.

The revenue projections for the 2019-20 Adoption Budget were based on the most up-to-date SCFF information available at the time. Due to the timing of the allocation of additional 2018-19 apportionment funds, cost centers were able to carryover funds into 2019-20 not to exceed the amount of the late allocation that is separate from the 2% maximum. For the 2020-21 Tentative Budget, cost centers will be permitted to transfer to Fund 113 any unspent one-time apportionment funds from the 2018-19 SCFF implementation separate from the 2% maximum ~~to Fund 113~~. This action will allow cost centers to phase in any new programs, enhancements, and innovations over time.

Designated Reserve
Recognizing the extensive infrastructure and one-time expenditure needs that cannot be met through existing budgets, the Board has approved designating a portion of the Unallocated Ending Balance to address these needs. For FY21, designated reserves include $1.17 million designated for State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) and Energy Efficiency.

Unallocated Ending Balance

Unallocated ending balance is the remaining balance that has not been designated for the other four reserves or uses. This balance is maintained in large part to augment cash to handle the significant cash flow requirements of the District. The Unallocated balance can be expended as approved by the Board.

Compliance

Budgeted expenditures will reflect compliance with all existing collective bargaining agreements, external requirements, laws, including the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, Full Time Faculty Obligation Numbers, FTES targets, the 50% law, and financial accounting standards (such as GASB, including post-retirement health benefit costs), etc.

Allocation

The allocation of resources will be in accordance with the Budget Allocation Model approved by the Board in May 2007 and modified on March 2009, April 2012, March 2015, March 2017, March 2018, and March 2~~2~~019. DCAS will continue its process of examining the allocation model in light of the SCFF. DCAS has established a timeline to complete its review of the allocation components effective with the FY22 budget.

Timeline

The Tentative Budget will be presented to the Board for approval in June 2020 with the Adoption Budget planned for presentation to the Board for approval in September 2020.

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL
GENERAL FUND – UNRESTRICTED BUDGET

Fiscal Year 2020-2021

I. **Introduction**

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model (Allocation Model) represents the methodology for distribution of Unrestricted General Fund revenues to the District's various operating units. The Allocation Model is complex enough to reflect the needs of a multi-college district and the unique characteristics of the colleges, yet simple enough to be readily understood, easily maintained, and transparent. The Model considers how the District is funded by the State and contains factors to help ensure accountability, predictability, and equity. Further, the elements of the Allocation Model are based on both resources and expenditures.

The Allocation Model addresses the distribution of resources, and is not prescriptive in how funds are to be spent at the various locations (colleges and district office). The District acknowledges differences between its colleges and recognizes the need to direct resources based on plans and objectives to meet the needs of each college's diverse populations and constituencies. The colleges have separate and specific budget development processes that are unique to each college and are reflective of the organizational culture and priorities. It is at this level that the budget must be tied to each college's strategic plans and address accreditation requirements.

Annually, the Allocation Model is reviewed by the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) and Cabinet. Modifications and/or revisions to the Allocation Model may be recommended for Board consideration as deemed appropriate for the maintenance of the model's equity and integrity. In light of the changes to the State's funding model with the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF), DCAS will continue to review ~~be reviewing~~ the components of the District Allocation Model extensively. Any changes to the model would be effective with the 2021-22 ~~2020-21~~ budget.

II. **Model**

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model utilizes formulas and variables that have been meaningfully studied, readily defined, easily measured, and consistently reported. The following describes the elements of the Allocation Model:

A. Revenue

The Allocation Model is designed for the distribution of all General Fund unrestricted revenue, unless identified to be distributed in a different fashion (such as to fund structural deficits). At this time, only state apportionment, unrestricted lottery, a portion of non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits are included in the Allocation Model. Restoration revenue is not included in the allocation model until the year after it is earned. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. Revenue from shifted FTES will be distributed through the Allocation Model. Restricted revenue sources of funding are allocated by the state directly to a specific college or by a district agreed-upon distribution method.

B. Districtwide Support

Resources are allocated to a set of services and expenditure elements which are recognized as best administered in a centralized fashion.

1. Districtwide Services (DWS)

The Allocation Model provides a pool of resources, referred to as Districtwide Services (DWS), to support expenditures required to meet general districtwide obligations which support the district as a whole and cannot be conveniently or economically assigned to the other operating locations through a cost center. These expenditures include property and liability insurance, legal expenses, governing board expenses, financial and compliance audits, central technology hardware, software and management services, and other activities. These common costs benefit all operating units, but are not the direct result of any individual unit. Components and specific line item budgets will be considered each year by DCAS for inclusion in DWS or movement to another budget location.

2. Utilities

The district accounts for utilities in a central location, so as to mitigate the significant differences in utilization due to building size, construction, age, and climatic conditions affected by college locations. Expenditures represent the districtwide costs for electricity, water, gas, and land line telephone. The budget for utilities is based on historical and projected rates and usage, and presented to DCAS for review and concurrence.

3. District Administrative Center (DAC)

The district recognizes that it is fiscally prudent to provide certain services centrally through the operation of a district office (District Administrative Center – DAC). These services primarily represent those functions that can be most effectively and efficiently administered in a centralized fashion. Typical of such functions are the Chancellor's office, human resources, information technology oversight, payroll, purchasing, accounts payable, and so-forth. Currently, the DAC receives 7.1~~6.98~~% of projected revenue. Each year, after review, if it is determined that specific budget items are to be reassigned between DWS and DAC or the colleges and DAC, the percentage of revenue will change accordingly, maintaining the same effective rate.

4. Major Initiatives

This element represents as “set aside” of available revenues to be solicited by the individual colleges for initiating new programs or activities that they otherwise may be unable to fund. This element has not been previously funded and is not currently funded. However, the element will be retained in the Allocation Model for future consideration of funding.

C. College Allocations

The Allocation Model is designed to provide fair and equitable allocations to the colleges by acknowledging areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities. The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities considered include, but are not limited to, areas such as classroom capacity, program mix, full time equivalent students (FTES), and ratio of full time to part time faculty. These elements are considered in one or more of the components of the Allocation Model to ensure an equitable allocation process. The three separate mechanisms below address different equity issues which have been recognized by the colleges.

1. Class Schedule Delivery Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses differences among the colleges related to instructional productivity which is dictated in part by facility limitations, program mix, student preparedness, full-time/part-time faculty ratios, internal organization, and faculty longevity. Using a productivity factor of 525 and actual FTES (resident, non-resident, credit, special admit credit, incarcerated credit, non-credit, and enhanced non-credit) produced by each college for the period of July 1 through June 30 of the prior year, a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) number for the budget year is calculated. The college receives an allocation for the actual cost (salary and benefits) for the full time classroom faculty currently employed. This allocation is adjusted to reflect non-teaching assignments, such as those on approved sabbaticals and load bank leaves, department chair, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and Academic Senate release time, and planned additional full-time faculty for the budget year. The balance of the allocation is then funded at the average hourly part-time salary and benefit rates for teaching the equivalent of a full-time load. The total of full-time faculty salary and benefit costs and the hourly FTEF is the total Class Schedule Delivery Allocation for each college.

2. Base Allocation (Fixed Allocation)

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the differences among the colleges relative to respective enrollment size. The Base Allocation recognizes that each college is required to provide core services and staff certain positions to support the operation of a comprehensive college. Thus, the Base Allocation represents an “economy of scale” factor and provides differential benefit to the college as a result of their varying sizes. The base allocation is 15% of revenue available for distribution, divided equally among the colleges. Each college receives an equal allocation that recognizes the fixed expenses and core services associated with operating a college, regardless of the size of its enrollment.

3. FTES Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the method in which the District receives the bulk of its state apportionment through FTES. The remainder of the available revenue is allocated to the colleges proportionate to the percentage of actual FTES earned at each college in the prior year. Colleges are funded proportionate to their actual FTES (including growth) up to the maximum growth percentage the District was funded. Each college may then carry unfunded FTES (as does the District as a whole), and be entitled to use that excess if and when the District does.

As of 2018-19, non-resident students are included in Line 10 of the allocation model; they had previously been excluded. Including non-resident students in the FTES count represents each college's percentage of available funds and more accurately reflects the actual number of students served.

FTES generated through enhanced noncredit will be funded at the 2017-18 credit FTES rate plus COLA. Non-enhanced noncredit FTES is adjusted by the ratio of non-enhanced noncredit state funding rate to credit state funding rate (approximately 60%). Therefore, each college's noncredit FTES will be reduced by approximately 40%. Not-for-credit classes (community education) are not included in the Allocation Model since these classes are self-supporting. A portion of the non-resident tuition that is equivalent to the FTES amount paid by the state will remain in the Allocation Model. The amount of non-resident tuition that is in excess of the reimbursed rate will remain at the college that earned it.

The FTES Allocation to each college represents each college's proportionate share of total FTES represented in this element of the Allocation Model.

D. Transition/Implementation Funding

Potential adjustments to the Allocation Model can result in a shift of resources between the colleges. The district recognizes the need to provide stability and may choose to phase-in the effects of these adjustments.

E. Carry-over

The Allocation Model recognizes the incentive in allowing budget locations to maintain their unexpended funds for future needs. In addition to the allocation derived through the mechanism of the model, the colleges and district office are allowed to carry-over any unexpended funds as of June 30 into the new budget year, up to a maximum of 2% of their respective prior year's budget allocation. Any allowable carryover is then added to each college's total allocation to produce the college's budget allocation for development of their operating budgets.

In 2018-19, the revenue projections for the FY2019-20 Adoption Budget were based on the most up-to-date SCFF information available at the time. Due to the implementation of the SCFF, the first and second apportionment estimates from the State were greater than the Adoption Budget revenue for 2018-19. ~~As the District completed its review and submission in January 2019 of the headcount and student outcomes for 2017-2018 with the CCCCO,~~ As a result, additional 2018-19 apportionment revenue was allocated in May 2019 and November 2019.~~is anticipated for 2018-2019.~~ Due to the timing of the allocation of these additional apportionment funds, cost centers were ~~will be~~ able to carryover funds into FY 2019-20 not to exceed the amount of the late allocation that is separate from the 2% maximum.

In 2019-20, a majority of DCAS membership recommended that cost centers be permitted to transfer any unspent one-time apportionment funds from 2018-19's SCFF implementation separate from the 2% maximum. This action will allow cost centers to phase in any new programs, enhancements, and innovations over time.

III. Background

Effective in fiscal year 2003-04, the District set aside the then-existing budget allocation model, which had been used to distribute district resources for the prior six years.

The model was primarily revenue-driven while providing for college base allocations and other fixed costs which did not necessarily equate directly to FTES generation. As such, the model relied both on revenue (FTES) and expenditure elements (dual characteristics) to serve as the mechanisms to produce the colleges and district level budget allocations. The model was, however, primarily FTES driven, with no cap placed on the funding of growth at the colleges, although the district as a whole had a funding cap. As the colleges evolved over time, the shift of resources favored the college(s) growing most rapidly and disadvantaged the college(s) growing more slowly, and the movement happened in an uncontrolled fashion. As a result, the model had been adjusted several times during its six-year period, and was believed to no longer meet the needs of the district and its colleges.

In 2003-04 when the model was set aside, the District distributed resources using the fiscal year 2002-03 allocation as a base, increasing or decreasing it proportionately each subsequent year based on changes in additional available resources from that point forward. That process continued over the next four years. Although this method distributed funds, there was not an agreed-upon budget allocation model. Distribution of new resources did not consider how the colleges had evolved since 2003-04. Further, the allocation of funds did not reflect how funding from the state was received, the uniqueness of the colleges, nor the priorities of the District. In addition, the lack of an agreed-upon allocation model had been cited in the accreditation reports and would have been a major issue if not resolved.

During fiscal year 2006-07 the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS) and the Cabinet worked simultaneously toward identifying the features of a model that would reflect the unique characteristics of each college, while recognizing how the District is funded by the state, and be perceived as more equitable than the then existing arrangement.

In an attempt to develop a model that would be accepted as fair and equitable, areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities, were identified. A model that considers and reflects these differences would be consistent with the objective of equitability.

The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities identified included, but were not limited to, areas such as:

- Facility constraints/classroom capacity on each campus
  How many rooms hold 25, 35, 100, etc. students?
  How will capacity change over the new few years?

- Program Mix - mix of general education and vocational programs
  Does each college have the same proportion of vocational/career tech to general education classes?
  Does the difference in program costs impact the college’s decision on what programs to maintain or develop?

- Students’ level of educational preparedness
  Does each college have the same proportion of students who are prepared to take college-level classes?
  Are needs for basic skills classes the same? (Some of the additional requirements/services of these students are to be met through special funding, such as categorical, not necessarily general fund – unrestricted dollars distributed through this model)

- Does each college have the same proportion of senior faculty (salary schedule placement)?

- How do full-time / part-time ratios of faculty compare?

- Are the contractual obligations, such as reassigned time and leaves, disproportionately distributed?

- What are the similarities/differences in core services?

- How does the size of each student body compare? (FTES)

It was imperative that each of these elements were considered in one or more of the components of the budget allocation model to ensure an equitable allocation process.

The Allocation Model was adopted for use in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

IV. **Updates**

Since the adoption of the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and in accordance with the commitment to the Board to regularly review the model components to ensure a more sustainable model, the DCAS reviews the model annually.

In 2008-2009, DCAS recommended modifications to the Class Schedule Delivery Allocation and the FTES Allocation segments of the model. The Board of Trustees approved the recommended changes at its March 2009 Meeting.

In 2010-11, DCAS developed a plan to address the district's capital structural deficits and recommended that specific revenues (lottery, interest income and administration fee revenue) be removed over time from the general budget allocation model and allocated in a different method.

Through FY12, all general fund – unrestricted revenue was distributed through the model, including, but not limited to, state apportionment for FTES, local revenues such as lottery, non-resident tuition, interest income, and miscellaneous, unless agreed to be distributed through a separate allocation method. This aspect of the allocation model was changed with the adoption of the Infrastructure Funding Model, beginning in the 2012-13 fiscal year. At the end of the full transition of revenue to the Infrastructure Funding Model, only state apportionment, non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits were to remain in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model.

In 2014-2015 DCAS recommended the excess revenue related to FTES generation from international students be taken out of the Allocation Model and be placed in Fund 114. This incentivizes each campus to develop an international student program by allowing the excess revenue to be retained by the home campus. DCAS also recommended a productivity factor of 525 be used for each campus. This change caused a significant shift of $500,000 from Ventura College to Moorpark College. To alleviate possible operational disruptions, the change in the productivity factor will be phased in over four years with all campuses being held harmless in the first year (FY 15-16). In the subsequent three years, Ventura College's allocation will be reduced by $166,666 each year. Further, DCAS recommended the carryover percentage be changed from 1% to 2%. These changes were executed in the 2015-2016 adopted budget. The final reduction was made in the 2017-18 budget year.

In 2015-16, a review of the components of the Infrastructure Funding Model resulted in a change in the treatment of unrestricted lottery revenue. Beginning with the 2016-17 fiscal year, unrestricted lottery was ~~will be~~ removed from the Infrastructure Funding Model and included in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the distribution of General Fund unrestricted revenues. The percentage of revenues the District Administrative Center will receive will be adjusted accordingly to maintain the same effective rate prior to the change.

In 2015-16, the District did not fully achieve its FTES goal. However, State regulations provide the flexibility to shift qualifying class sections between fiscal years. The District utilized this option and shifted 685 FTES from 2016-17 to 2015-16. As a result of this transfer, the 2016-17 State reported FTES was ~~is~~ 685 FTES less than the actual operational FTES. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. For the 2017-18 budget, state apportionment was ~~will be~~ calculated assuming the 2017-18 base FTES was ~~is~~ the same as the 2016-17 actual operational FTES, which excludeds~~s~~ the impact of the shift of 685 FTES.

In the 2016-17 Adoption Budget, the districtwide support in the Budget Allocation Model provided funding for the District Administrative Center (DAC) at 6.98% of available revenue. Within this allocation, $420,000 was budgeted for the annual lease payment for the Stanley Avenue office. In November 2016, the District closed escrow on a property in Camarillo at Daily Drive for the DAC relocation. With the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, members of DCAS wanted ~~would like~~ a model where the budget savings that resulted from the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would flow to the colleges and DAC over time. It was agreed that the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would bring the DAC share to 6.7%. DCAS agreed to hold the DAC harmless for FY18 and agreed, with the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, to recommend the phase-in of an adjustment over four years. Due to a lack of unanimity, DCAS continued its discussions on the topic. For the FY18 ~~through FY20~~ Budget~~s~~, the percentage allocation to the DAC ~~has and will~~ remained at 6.98%.

In 2017-18, the District once again utilized its option to shift qualifying FTES between fiscal years. 590 FTES were shifted from 2018-19 into 2017-18. As a result, State reported FTES in 2017-18 was 590 more than its operational FTES. This shift not only increased District state apportionment revenue in 2017-18, but it also increased the District's 'hold-harmless' apportionment amount within the SCFF for FY 2018-19 through FY 2021-22~~2020-21~~. The effect of the shift in 2017-18 was $3 million which fell to the ending fund balance. In 2018-19, the shift also increased the District's state apportionment revenue by $3 million and has flowed through the allocation model with the 2018-19 Adoption Budget. Regarding the DAC percentage allocation for FY19, a recommendation from DCAS was taken to Board in March 2018 to reduce its share to 6.7%. The motion was not approved and the percentage allocation to the DAC remaineded~~s~~ at 6.98%. DCAS also recommended at that time to allow amounts in excess of the 2% allowed carryover be transferred to Fund 113 to help the colleges and the DAC with anticipated future expenditure increases. These amounts are one-time budget savings from FY18 that will be available in FY19 and reflected in the Adoption Budget.

For the FY20 Budget, a position in Information Technology (IT) shifted from DWS to the DAC, thus, increasing the DAC percentage to 7.1%. Database Administrator services had been outsourced and budgeted in DWS. However, when these IT duties were insourced, the DAC percentage increased for the amount of related salary and benefits of this position. The DAC percentage for FY21 will remain at 7.1%.

Commented [A1]: Should this be a separate paragraph for the update beginning with the FY 2019-20 Budget? We should discuss that database administrator services used to be outsourced and budgeted in DWS but when these IT duties were in-sourced, the DAC percentage increased for the amount of related salary and benefits of this position.

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING MODEL

Fiscal Year 2020-21

I. **Introduction**

The Infrastructure Funding Model (Infrastructure Model) represents the methodology for distribution of certain variable revenues such as interest income and miscellaneous revenue to address the infrastructure needs at the colleges. These needs include scheduled maintenance, furniture and equipment, library materials and databases, technology refresh, as well as other identifiable infrastructure needs. Although the Infrastructure Model may not fully address all identified funding needs, its intent is to provide each college a dedicated, ongoing (although variable) source of funds to mitigate operating concerns and maintain quality facilities and equipment in order to provide excellent instructional programs.

The funds allocated to the Infrastructure Model are budgeted and accounted for in a separate Infrastructure Fund (113) from the Unrestricted General Fund (111). The colleges determine the budgeting of these funds within the allocation categories in accordance with their specific budget development processes and priorities. These budgets are presented to the Board for approval as part of the overall budget development process.

Annually, the Infrastructure Model is reviewed by the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) and Cabinet. Modifications and/or revisions to the Infrastructure Model may be recommended for Board consideration as deemed appropriate for the maintenance of the model's equity and integrity.

II. **Model**

The following describes the elements of the Infrastructure Model:

A. Revenue Categories

These revenue categories are included as a result of their relative instability to other funding sources and in recognition that a number of districts across the state do not include these resources as a part of their Unrestricted General Fund budget allocation model, but instead allocate them for specific purposes. These revenues will be recorded in the Unrestricted General Fund (Fund 111) with the equivalent amount being transferred out at year end. The Infrastructure Model includes the following specific revenue categories:

- Enrollment fee local revenue
- Interest income

- Any unbudgeted Unrestricted General Fund revenue other than apportionment
- Any net savings between budget and actual expenses from the District Wide Services and Utilities allocations

B. Expenditure Categories

The Infrastructure Model includes specific expenditure categories that are necessary and fundamental to the maintenance of a quality educational institution. The expenditure categories are:

- Scheduled Maintenance and Capital Furniture (including classroom, faculty and administration)
- Library Materials and Databases
- Instructional and Non-instructional Equipment
- Technology Refresh and Replacement (hardware and software)
- Other - to be restricted to one-time and not on-going expenditures, such as new program/process start-up costs, staff innovation, and program specific accreditation (e.g., nursing, dental hygiene, child development)

Funds carried forward from all expenditure categories remain in those categories to be expended in future years.

C. Allocation Basis and Rates

Basis for Allocation of Resources to Identified Categories

Category	Allocation Basis
Scheduled Maintenance and Capital Furniture	Assignable Square Footage
Library Materials and Databases	FTES
Instructional and Non-instructional Equipment	FTES
Technology Refresh and Replacement	Number of Computers
Other	Equal shares (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)

Funding Rate for Each Category

Category	Funding Rate
Scheduled Maintenance and Capital Furniture	\$1.60/square foot
Library Materials and Databases	\$10.00/FTES
Instructional and Non-instructional Equipment	\$30.00/FTES
Technology Refresh and Replacement	\$150.00/computer
Other	\$150,000/college

During years when the total dollar allocation to the Infrastructure Fund is insufficient to fully fund the Infrastructure Model, based on the then approved funding rates, the funding rates for all categories will be adjusted downward by a coefficient equal to the total of the funds available divided by the calculated full funding amount. For example, if the calculated full funding amount, based upon funding rates and allocation bases is $4 million and the available funds based upon the allocation parameter is only $3 million, then the funding rate for all categories will be computed at 75% (3 million/4 million) of their then approved rate.

The funding rates are determined based on recent experience/estimate of need, previous funding levels used by state, etc**.** As part of DCAS's annual review of the Infrastructure Model, the allocation bases and funding rates are assessed for appropriateness.

D. Carry-over

The Infrastructure Model recognizes that while infrastructure needs are ongoing, the frequency and amount of expenditures fluctuates. Therefore, colleges are allowed to carry over all unspent balances in these accounts from year to year in order to meet the fluctuating needs.

III. <u>Background</u>

The Infrastructure Model became effective with the adoption of the 2012-2013 fiscal year budget. Prior to that time, the District distributed nearly all its unrestricted general fund resources through a single funding allocation model. Those resources included state apportionment (enrollment fees, property taxes and state appropriation), non-resident tuition and fees, lottery revenue, interest income, and miscellaneous other fees and revenues. Noticeably, neither the State allocation model nor the then current district budget allocation model considered funding based on, or for, college infrastructure (e.g. size of the campus (number of buildings), age of the buildings, number and age of equipment, etc.).

For several years prior to the implementation of the Infrastructure Model, the State had reduced or eliminated funding for Instructional Equipment/Library Materials (IELM), Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP), and scheduled maintenance. Faced with its own funding constraints, the District had eliminated the majority of Unrestricted General Fund (Fund 111) support for library books and materials, instructional materials and equipment (IELM), scheduled maintenance, and technology equipment refresh and replacement and relied primarily on restricted (categorical) funding provided by the State for those purposes as well as college carryover of general funds unspent from the prior year. The District's past practice of including variable, and sometimes volatile, funds in its Unrestricted General Fund Budget Allocation Model had further destabilized funding. Additionally, in 2010, the colleges received Accreditation Recommendations from the ACCJC for giving insufficient attention to the "total cost of ownership" in their operating budgets as it related to their facilities and infrastructure.

Over approximately a two-year period, the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) diligently studied and discussed the matter extensively. The Infrastructure Model was developed in an effort to provide ongoing funding for each college's infrastructure needs, take direct corrective action to remedy the Accreditation Recommendations from the ACCJC on "total cost of ownership", and further stabilize the District's Unrestricted General Fund Budget Allocation Model, used primarily for instruction, some student services, and general operations. Great care was exercised in developing the Infrastructure Model to ensure the colleges' General Fund operating budgets would be buffered from any long-term impact and that the instructional and student service needs of the District would be preserved and adequately funded to meet the needs of the students.

To minimize the impact of reallocating resources from the Unrestricted General Fund Budget Allocation Model on the colleges' budgets, the implementation of the Infrastructure Model was phased in over several years. The transition process reallocated the funding as follows:

- Year 1 (FY2012-13)
  - Any net increase in General Fund Unrestricted lottery, interest, or enrollment fee local share revenue above budgeted for FY12
  - Any unbudgeted Unrestricted General Fund revenue (with the exception of growth and COLA) received in FY12, such as mandated cost reimbursement for collective bargaining
  - Any net savings between budget and actual expenses from District Wide Services and Utilities for FY12

- Year 2 (FY2013-14)
  - Those items included in Year 1 (2012-13) reallocation, and
  - Enrollment fee local revenue
  - Interest income over two years (50%)

- Year 3 (FY2014-15)
  - Those items included in Year 2 (2013-14) reallocation, and
  - Reallocate remaining 50% of interest income
  - Lottery income over five years (20%)
  - If growth funding is received, reallocate an additional 25% of lottery income balance

- Years 4-and beyond
  - Those items included in the prior year, and
  - Reallocate an additional 20% of lottery income each year until fully allocated
  - If growth funding is received, reallocate an additional 25% of lottery income balance

Additionally, only in the first two years of implementation, the colleges were not required to spend their allocation in accordance with the specific categories which generated the allocations, but were restricted to use these funds for only expenses associated with allocation categories in total. For example, in only the first two years, a college may have elected to fully expend its entire annual allocation for scheduled maintenance even though the allocation was derived from all infrastructure funding categories.

IV. Updates

In 2015-16, a review of the components of the Infrastructure Funding Model resulted in a change in the treatment of unrestricted lottery revenue. Beginning with the 2016-17 fiscal year, unrestricted lottery was removed from the Infrastructure Funding Model and included in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the distribution of General Fund unrestricted revenues.

In 2016-17, DCAS discussed how to incorporate the DAC within the Infrastructure Model now that the district had closed escrow on a property in Camarillo at Daily Drive for the DAC relocation. When these discussions occurred, it was too early to have accurate figures for the District expenses that would occur as a result of the DAC relocation alongside the extra revenue that would be produced from existing tenant leases. For FY 2017-18 the committee agreed to continue with past practice. DCAS will continue discussions toward a recommendation for the FY 2018-19 budget. No changes were recommended to the Model for either FY 2019-20 or FY 2020-21.

Scenario 9: Simplified Student Success Counts after Class Schedule Delivery

FY20 Adoption Revenue	$	170,484,369
Less: DWS	$	(7,865,456)
Less: Utilities	$	(4,090,500)
Less: DAC	$	(12,104,390)
Available for distribution	$	146,424,023

	MC	OC	VC	Total
Class Schedule Delivery Allocation	$ 33,616,041	$ 16,268,722	$ 27,749,164	$ 77,633,927
Base Allocation				$ -
Remaining to be Allocated				$ 68,790,096

	Percent	Amount
1. Base allocation	70%	$ 48,153,067
2. Supplemental allocation	20%	$ 13,758,019
3. Student success allocation	10%	$ 6,879,010
		$ 68,790,096

1. Base allocation	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Basic allocation	$ 4,570,724	$ 3,917,761	$ 4,570,724	$ 13,059,208
Remaining base allocation				$ 35,093,859
FY19 Annual 320 Credit FTES (Resident)	11,160.78	4,706.47	9,257.02	25,124.27
Percent of total	44%	19%	37%	100%
Campus remaining base allocation	$ 15,589,501	$ 6,574,049	$ 12,930,308	$ 35,093,859
Sub-total Base allocation	$ 20,160,225	$ 10,491,811	$ 17,501,032	$ 48,153,067
2. Supplemental allocation (FY17-18)	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Pell Grant recipients	3,113	3,027	3,665	9,805
State Non-resident fee waiver	387	357	435	1,179
CA Promise Grant recipients	7,934	7,526	10,883	26,343
	11,434	10,910	14,983	37,327
Percent of total	31%	29%	40%	100%
Sub-total Campus supplemental allocation	$ 4,214,354	$ 4,021,218	$ 5,522,448	$ 13,758,019
3. Student success allocation (FY17-18)	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Associate degrees for transfer	1,191	314	656	2,161
Associate degrees	1,903	678	1,525	4,106
Credit certificates	1,492	677	1,555	3,724
Total student awards	4,586	1,669	3,736	9,991
Percent of total	46%	17%	37%	100%
Sub-total Student success allocation	$ 3,157,556	$ 1,149,141	$ 2,572,313	$ 6,879,010
Total College Allocation	**$ 61,148,175**	**$ 31,930,891**	**$ 53,344,956**	**$ 146,424,023**

Proportionate share by college			
Scenario above	41.76%	21.81%	36.43%
2019 Adoption Budget, $	$ 61,815,224	$ 32,262,109	$ 52,346,689
2019 Adoption Budget, %	42.22%	22.03%	35.75%
$ difference	$ (667,049)	$ (331,218)	$ 998,267
% difference	-0.46%	-0.23%	0.68%

Scenario 10: All Student Success Counts after Class Schedule Delivery

FY20 Adoption Revenue	$	170,484,369
Less: DWS	$	(7,865,456)
Less: Utilities	$	(4,090,500)
Less: DAC	$	(12,104,390)
Available for distribution	$	146,424,023

	MC	OC	VC	Total
Class Schedule Delivery Allocation	$ 33,616,041	$ 16,268,722	$ 27,749,164	$ 77,633,927
Base Allocation				$ -
Remaining to be Allocated				$ 68,790,096

	Percent	Amount
1. Base allocation	70%	$ 48,153,067
2. Supplemental allocation	20%	$ 13,758,019
3. Student success allocation	10%	$ 6,879,010
		$ 68,790,096

	Weight	MC	OC	VC	Total
1. Base allocation		**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Basic allocation		$ 4,570,724	$ 3,917,761	$ 4,570,724	$ 13,059,208
Remaining base allocation					$ 35,093,859
FY19 Annual 320 Credit FTES (Resident)		11,160.78	4,706.47	9,257.02	25,124.27
Percent of total		44%	19%	37%	100%
Campus remaining base allocation		$ 15,589,501	$ 6,574,049	$ 12,930,308	$ 35,093,859
Sub-total Base allocation		$ 20,160,225	$ 10,491,811	$ 17,501,032	$ 48,153,067
2. Supplemental allocation (FY17-18)		**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Pell Grant recipients		3,113	3,027	3,665	9,805
State Non-resident fee waiver		387	357	435	1,179
CA Promise Grant recipients		7,934	7,526	10,883	26,343
		11,434	10,910	14,983	37,327
Percent of total		31%	29%	40%	100%
Sub-total Campus supplemental allocation		$ 4,214,354	$ 4,021,218	$ 5,522,448	$ 13,758,019
3. Student success allocation (FY17-18)					
All Students		$ 5,143,902			
	Weight	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Associate degrees for transfer	4	1,191	314	656	2,161
Associate degrees	3	1903	678	1525	4,106
Credit Certificates	2	1492	677	1555	3,724
Transfer Level Math & English	2	611	146	416	1,173
Transfer	1.5	2,533	589	1,606	4,728
Nine or More CTE Units	1	1610	964	1416	3,990
Regional Living Wage	1	987	568	1,128	2,683
Total student awards		10,327	3,936	8,302	22,565
Percent of total		47%	17%	36%	100%
Sub-total Student success allocation, All Students		$ 2,435,038	$ 849,383	$ 1,859,481	$ 5,143,902
Pell Grant Recipients		$ 878,833			
	Weight	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Associate degrees for transfer	6	408	235	368	1,011
Associate degrees	4.5	704	506	878	2,088
Credit Certificates	3	515	477	840	1,832
Transfer Level Math & English	3	150	97	160	407
Transfer	2.25	662	359	654	1,675
Nine or More CTE Units	1.5	530	560	707	1,797
Regional Living Wage	1.5	211	240	335	786
Total student awards		3,180	2,474	3,942	9,596
Percent of total		34%	25%	41%	100%
Sub-total Student success allocation, Pell		$ 300,938	$ 218,564	$ 359,331	$ 878,833
California Promise Grant Recipients		$ 856,275			
	Weight	**MC**	**OC**	**VC**	**Total**
Associate degrees for transfer	4	630	294	527	1,451
Associate degrees	3	1079	614	1222	2,915
Credit Certificates	2	793	599	1195	2,587
Transfer Level Math & English	2	226	126	251	603
Transfer	1.5	1,173	491	1,046	2,710
Nine or More CTE Units	1	862	761	1078	2,701
Regional Living Wage	1	445	410	629	1,484
Total student awards		5,208	3,295	5,948	14,451
Percent of total		37%	22%	41%	100%
Sub-total Student success allocation, College Promise		$ 318,737	$ 187,093	$ 350,445	$ 856,275
Total Student Success Allocation		$ 3,054,712	$ 1,255,041	$ 2,569,257	$ 6,879,010
Total College Allocation		**$ 61,045,332**	**$ 32,036,791**	**$ 53,341,900**	**$ 146,424,023**

Proportionate share by college			
Scenario above	41.69%	21.88%	36.43%
2019 Adoption Budget, $	$ 61,815,224	$ 32,262,109	$ 52,346,689
2019 Adoption Budget, %	42.22%	22.03%	35.75%
$ difference	$ (769,892)	$ (225,318)	$ 995,211
% difference	-0.53%	-0.15%	0.68%