

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

Thursday, April 7, 2011

NOTES

Attendees: John al-Amin, Robert Cabral, Dominga Chavez, Riley Dwyer, Alan Hayashi, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Darlene Melby, Mary Anne McNeil, Karen Osher, Trevor Zierhut, Peter Sezzi

Absent: Blanca Barrios

The meeting began at approximately 8:32 a.m. in the Board Room at VCCCD.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the March 10, 2011 meeting were approved by consensus.

BP/AP 5030 – STUDENT FEES

Previously Peter Sezzi asked that this item be added to the DCAS agenda, indicating that although it may not be the appropriate forum, there appears to be no other place to discuss the matter. The issue is surrounding inconsistency in the message(s) being delivered to students and the impending change in practice for non-payment of fees. When students register they receive a message indicating that payment is due immediately. There is a conflict between the screens at time of registration and the class schedule, which states that there are consequences for not paying timely. More importantly, neither the BP nor AP that address fees, addresses this issue. Peter asked for clarification and specific, uniform language to be included in what the students are told at the point of registration, in a revised BP/AP 5030, and in practice.

Ms. Johnson explained that the district is changing practice for non-payment of fees to be consistent with what students are being told when registering. With sections being cut due to budget constraints, it is more important than ever to make seats available for students who are truly planning on attending. The district is moving toward the required “immediate payment” for fall 2011. Banner Financial Aid will also be implemented for fall 2011 and will make the student’s process not only easier, but more transparent. In addition, we currently have payments plans available during on-line registration for students who may not have yet arranged for payment or Financial Aid, and these options will be expanded for students for the upcoming semester through our approved contract with Higher One.

A revised policy and procedure will be brought to the Board policy committee that reflect the Fall practice.

For the record, Peter stated he opposes the immediate payment policy, but understands the reasons behind the implementation, but a delay in the process would be appreciated.

COMPONENTS OF ALLOCATION MODEL

Ms Johnson distributed a copy of the Allocation Model narrative that was approved by DCAS and the Board. She reminded DCAS members, that this document is reviewed annually by the group, and is regularly being refined. That was the intention of the model when it was developed in 2003-04. In addition, a part of the initial budget development process, which begins as early as late fall, is to walk through the allocation model (line-by-line) and if anyone has questions or comments or wishes to recommend additional modifications, they should understand that that is appropriate any time during any review. Sue also reiterated that during the refinement process if DCAS realizes the current model no longer meets the needs and objectives as defined, it can be scrapped and re-designed.

Sue explained that it has recently come to light that some people may perceive the current model as being inequitable, specifically at Oxnard College, and stated that she had not heard that prior to a week or so ago. During a recent review of the accreditation findings, the college made statements that the model is inequitable. That is the reason for bringing the topic/discussion to DCAS at this time even at this late date.

Sue solicited DCAS member's understanding about the evaluation of the model and whether or not they felt it was their responsibility to review the model. There was general consensus that it is the responsibility of the committee to review the elements of the model and they believe that is done routinely.

Robert Cabral (OC Academic Senate President) indicated surprise at the stated sentiments of the Oxnard campus. He stated that, to his knowledge, there has never been official communications at OC indicating the inequity of the model. Robert further explained that the Senate regularly discusses the allocation process, but has not taken such a position. He questioned whether the statement had been taken out of context.

Sue explained that if the colleges felt there was inequity in the model, it would need to be reevaluated through DCAS. If only a few feel there is inequity, perhaps the issue might be resolved through education about the components of the model and the process. Robert concurred that more education on the elements may be helpful. Sue offered her support and attendance at Academic Senate meetings for such purposes if Robert felt that appropriate. He stated, as far as he is aware, there is not a general consensus of inequity of the model at OC, but would consider her offer.

Sue asked Dr. al-Amin (VP, Business Services, OC) his understanding. He also indicated that the comments may have been taken out of context and were probably made at the campus's Open Forum meeting in regard to the accreditation findings. He felt the comment may have been in relation to the finding on the total cost of ownership because the model does not address new classrooms coming online, new buildings, etc. There are fiscal needs that are not being met through the model. Sue clarified the model's allocation mechanism is aligned with the State's funding mechanism, differences in colleges' program mix, student populations, etc, and is based on primarily on FTES, not square footage or buildings; however, that our current discussion around structural deficit funding (such as for equipment and scheduled maintenance) may very well add an element of total cost of ownership "equity".

Dominga Chavez commented that she was on the committee back when the current model was developed. She stated that there was a lot of discussion surrounding equity in the model and DCAS members (at that time) seriously took into consideration the differences of each college to sure equity in allocation of funds.

Robert also commented that the model does not define how individual campuses budget funds. After the funds are allocated, the colleges' own processes for priorities kick-in. Faculty may see that they do not have the funding they desire and therefore blame the model.

Sue also reminded DCAS members that the model does not generate revenue (and in these financially-challenged times that is even more apparent). It merely distributes the resources. Sue said the model is complex and through its complexity, it is designed to address the differences between the colleges.

It was the consensus of DCAS to move forward with the budget process with the current model as presented.

LOCAL STRUCTURAL DEFICITS

Sue briefly recapped the District's continued need to address local structural deficits and the elements that have already been agreed to:

Structural Deficit (Revenue) Resources:

- Lottery Proceeds
- Interest Income
- Enrollment Fees (Waivers & Local Share)

Structural Deficit Resource Allocation:

- Scheduled Maintenance & Capital Furniture (including admin, faculty & classroom)
 - o Assignable Square Footage
- Library Materials & Databases (previously IELM/TTIP)
 - o FTES
- Instructional and Non-Instructional Equipment
 - o FTES
- Tech Refresh (hardware & software)
 - o Number of Computers
- Other
(such as R&D, staff innovation, lab software, program transition costs, program accreditation, staff development (classified and faculty))
 - o 1/3, 1/3, 1/3

Sue distributed a draft of possible funding levels for the Structural Deficit Model. This initial funding level was developed to stimulate discussion and be a starting point only. The committee indicated a recognition that the need may be significantly great than we can fund initially, but by developing a model and triggers for funding we will gradually move toward that funding goal. Sue pointed out that the DAC was not included in the draft model as the capital needs are very different at that site and discussed a possible way to address the impact to DAC.

Dave Keebler briefly explained each component of the structural deficit model and stated that the “drivers” are key to the integrity of that model.

Dominga expressed concern about the reductions already going to the Board and how each campus may incur additional cuts by removing revenue from the general allocation model to fund the structural deficits.

Alan suggested that staff create hypothetical structural deficit funding scenarios to be evaluated at the next meeting. He said it would paint a clearer picture of what kind of numbers we’re looking at. Sue said that we will get scenarios out to DCAS in advance of the next meeting.

A list of possible triggers (draft) along with a possible timeline was also distributed. Sue asked that DCAS members thoroughly review the handouts, including possible triggers, for a meaningful discussion in May or June.

John al-Amin raised the issue of the ultimate timeline for full funding. He suggested that the model and simulations be more aggressive in order to achieve the ultimate goal sooner and in a meaningful fashion.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, May 19, 2011 – 8:30 a.m. – Review of the Tentative Budget for Recommendation to Board.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:44 a.m.