

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL
GENERAL FUND – UNRESTRICTED BUDGET

Fiscal Year 2013-14

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 we set the model aside we 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 we had a method to distribute funds, we did not have an agreed-upon budget allocation model. Distribution of new resources did not consider how the colleges had evolved since 2003-04. That method of allocating funds did not reflect how we received our funding from the state, the uniqueness of our 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.

New Model

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 we are funded by the state, and be perceived as more equitable than the then existing arrangement.

The allocation model was adopted for use in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

Elements of the Model

The district recognized the value in developing a model with dual characteristics, i.e. one that includes elements based on both revenue (FTES), as well as expenditures. The model considers how the colleges have evolved, and is responsive to changes that will occur in the future. The model also considers how we are funded from the state. The model is objective based, formula-driven, readily understood, reasonably applied, flexible and responsive, widely communicated, adequately documented, and perceived as equitable.

The adopted budget 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 colleges' needs to direct their resources based on their own plans and objectives in meeting the needs of their diverse populations and constituencies. The colleges have separate and specific budget development processes unique to each college, reflecting their 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. DCAS will consider processes/templates to be used for this accreditation purpose.

Revenue

The budget allocation model is designed for the distribution of general fund-unrestricted revenue only. Other sources of funding are allocated either by the state directly to a specific college or the district has agreed on a separate allocation method for those funds.

All general fund – unrestricted revenue will be 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 revenue traditionally accounted for in the general fund – unrestricted, unless agreed to be distributed through the infrastructure funding model.

Districtwide Support

The district recognizes that it is fiscally prudent to provide some services centrally through the operation of a district office (District Administrative Center –

DAC). These services should primarily represent those functions that can be most effectively and efficiently administered in a centralized fashion.

In addition, the allocation model will continue to provide a pool of resources to support expenditures required to meet general districtwide obligations such as property and liability insurance, legal expenses, governing board expenses, financial and compliance audits, central technology hardware, software and management services, and other activities which support the district as a whole and cannot be conveniently or economically assigned to the other operating locations through a cost center referred to as Districtwide Services.

The district will continue to account 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.

College Allocations

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 is consistent with the objective of equitability.

The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities identified include, but are 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 fulltime / 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/calculation to ensure an equitable allocation process.

Year- end Balances

The allocation model recognizes the incentive in allowing budget locations to maintain their unexpended funds for future needs.

MECHANISM OF THE MODEL

Revenue

All projected general fund – unrestricted revenue will be included, unless identified to be distributed in a different fashion (such as to fund structural deficits). Restoration and growth revenue will not be included until the year after it is earned.

Districtwide Support

Districtwide Services (DWS)

The definition of DWS will be reviewed regularly. Components and specific line item budgets will be considered each year by DCAS for inclusion in this budget category or movement to another budget location.

Utilities

The budget for utilities will be based on historical and projected rates and usage, and presented to DCAS for review and concurrence.

District Administrative Center (DAC)

The District Administrative Center will receive a percentage (initially 5.8%) 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. (Effective with the FY12 Tentative Budget, costs had been redirected and the DAC's proportionate percentage was 6.64%.)

College Allocations

Class Schedule Delivery Allocation

Using each college's productivity factor (as defined below) and FTES from the current year, we derive a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) number for the budget year. 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 assignment for these faculty, such as those on leave or reassigned time, and planned additional full-time faculty for the budget year. The balance of the allocation is distributed based on the average cost of a non-contractual FTEF.

The productivity factor (which is the college's average weekly student contact hours (WSCH) taught by a full time faculty equivalent (FTEF)) reflects, among other things, differences in class sizes (and subsequently costs) due to facility limitations, program mix (general education vs CTE), and educational preparedness of the student population of each college. Effective FY10, the model was changed to utilize an average of a budget year productivity factor (i.e. the goal) and the prior year actual productivity factor.

The productivity goal for a budget year is independently set for each college, and is based upon historical data and takes into consideration a college's unique circumstances and the economic environment. Because a portion of funding to a college is based on that goal, it is essential that the productivity goal-setting process be thoughtful and have integrity. It is therefore recommended that each college's goal-setting team, which will be determined by each college and may include not only the college president, but also the instructional and business vice presidents as well as the academic senate president, establish a process to project a realistic and attainable goal. The college president meets with the chancellor to discuss the environment and challenges, and set the goal.

Base Allocation (Fixed Allocation)

Each college receives an equal dollar amount that recognizes the fixed expenses/core services associated with operating a college, regardless of the size of its enrollment.

This base allocation was established at 15% of revenue available for distribution, divided equally among the colleges. This recognizes economies of scale and provides a "small college" factor to the model.

FTES Allocation

The remainder of the available revenue is allocated to the colleges proportionate to their FTES (%) actually earned in the prior year, and recognizes how the District receives the bulk of its revenue through SB361.

Colleges are funded proportionate to their FTES (%) for their actual growth, up to the maximum percentage that 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. By using a blended average in the productivity factor as recommended above, colleges are not penalized for “overgrowth” if attained through efficiencies, i.e. because they experience less costs.

Transition/Implementation Funding

As implementation of the new allocation model shifted resources, the district recognized the need to provide for stability during the transition for colleges to gradually move towards full implementation of the new model.

During the implementation year, FY08, \$2 million of total revenue was allocated - 50% each to Oxnard and Ventura colleges. In FY09, \$1 million of available resources was available to be allocated - 50% each to Oxnard and Ventura colleges. Once applied, the amount of transition/implementation funding was assessed to ensure the colleges were able to transition without undue financial hardship.

Carry-over

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 1% of their respective prior year budgets. (There was no maximum for carryover from June 30, 2007 to July 1, 2007). These amounts are placed in a designated reserve as of June 30, to be distributed for expenditures as of July 1 of the budget year. (This percentage has been increased to 2% in years where fiscal difficulties were anticipated for the following year.)

Updates

Since the adoption of this new model for 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 District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) reviews the model annually. During the first part of 2009, they 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.

In Summary

The District resource budget allocation model is complex enough to reflect the unique characteristics of our colleges and the needs of a multi-college district while recognizing how the district is funded from the state, yet simple enough to be readily understood, easily maintained, and transparent. Finally, it is driven by factors which command accountability, predictability, and equity.

Overall, the model addresses the Basic Principles for a budget allocation model previously adopted by the board. It utilizes formulas and variables that have been meaningfully studied, readily defined, easily measured, and consistently reported. As with this budget, no model will ever be perfect and it is doubtful that the district will ever achieve complete consensus as to how its resources should be distributed; however the model as proposed, adopted, and modified comes as close to that consensus as we can reasonably expect. DCAS and Cabinet independently reviewed the model prior to recommendation to the Board and concurred that it meets the budget principles established by the board and is "fair and equitable" for all colleges and the district operational units. Annually, the model is reviewed by DCAS and Cabinet and revised consistent with the requirements identified and agreed upon at that time. Any proposed revisions to the model are presented to the board for approval with the budget assumptions document.