

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

Thursday, September 20, 2012

NOTES

Attendees: Mike Bush, Riley Dwyer, Erika Endrijonas, Steve Hall, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Linda Kamaila, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Darlene Melby, Mary Anne McNeil, Peter Sezzi

Absent: Blanca Barrios, Dominga Chavez

The meeting began at approximately 8:35 a.m. in the Thomas G. Lakin Board Room at VCCCD.

Erika Endrijonas was introduced to the group as the Chancellor's delegate for Instructional and Student Services. Erika does not represent any specific college but rather represents all three colleges.

Sue expressed a concern that no classified representatives were in attendance at the meeting. She further explained that although the agenda is lengthy, it is more important to review each item thoroughly as opposed to getting through every item. Items not discussed will be carried forward to October's meeting.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

The notes from the August 23, 2012 meeting were approved by consensus.

BOARD POLICIES/ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

BP/AP6200 and 6250 were once again distributed. These board policies and administrative procedures were discussed and edited at previous meetings. There was discussion related to BP and AP6200 - specifically the language regarding reserves - whether or not to include the level of targeted reserves. Steve Hall asked that the record state that AFT cannot support a specified level of reserves. All others believed the inclusion would help with full disclosure and were in favor of keeping the 7 – 15% in the AP.

The four documents will move forward to the Policy Committee for recommendation to the Board for approval. Sue suggested that as part of DCAS's annual review of the Model, committee charge, etc. the committee also review BP and AP6200 annually. The group concurred.

AP6330-Purchasing was again distributed. There was a brief discussion about the conflict of interest language included and it was suggested that language be added regarding trustees disclosing potential conflicts "in public session" prior to the vote. With this addition, the AP was approved by consensus and will move forward to the Policy Committee for recommendation for approval by the Board.

Review of:

DCAS Committee's Charge:

DCAS's charge (excerpt from Participatory Governance Manual, rev. 5/22/12) was distributed and again discussed. There were no proposed changes to the group's charge.

Election of Co-Chair:

Sue briefly described the role of the DCAS Faculty Co-Chair. Sue explained the role is fairly light and helps balance faculty and administration input into the development of the DCAS meeting agendas. The term is for one year and elections will typically take place at DCAS's first meeting each fall.

Peter Sezzi was nominated by Riley Dwyer and seconded by Linda Kamaila. All members were in favor and Peter was elected Co-Chair.

Budget Allocation Basic Principles:

The Budget Allocation Basic Principles were distributed and discussed. Sue explained that these were adopted/approved in November 2005 and while some may no longer be relevant to the current model they should be kept as guiding principles for future models. Riley further commented that they inform the model and the process. The Principles were reviewed and re-affirmed.

Budget Allocation Model (narrative and calculations)

The FY12-13 Budget Allocation Model narrative was distributed. This is the same narrative that is found in the FY13 Adoption Budget book. There was a suggestion to clearly identify the Infrastructure Funding Model (IFM) as the "separate allocation method" under the Revenue section of the narrative. Additional language on the IFM will also be added.

The Allocation Model Events and Elements document dated 2012-13 was distributed. Again, it was suggested that language addressing the IFM be added to the document. Sue also reminded the group that as we look at the Model, we are looking ahead to FY14 as FY13 budget is completed.

The FY13 Adoption Budget Allocation (page 56 of the Budget Book) was distributed. Each line on the Allocation was thoroughly discussed.

Districtwide Services (DWS), Utilities, District Administrative Center (DAC).

There was a lengthy discussion of districtwide support. Sue explained that an analysis of the DAC costs over the last 3 or 5 years has been done. She explained that the allocation percentage for the DAC has changed only when elements of the model have shifted (i.e., expenses moved from college or DWS to DAC or vice versa). When the Model was implemented in 2007-08, the percentage allocated to the DAC was based on historical percentages and didn't take into consideration whether it would work or not. Sue explained that, in her opinion, the DAC is experiencing disproportionate cuts in recent years and that the current percentage needs to be evaluated. She explained that in recent years, the reduction in state revenue has been accompanied with a reduction in funded FTES, and, as a result, when the college budgets are reduced, the reductions are typically split proportionally between instruction and non-instruction (primarily administrative staffing and operating expense). There is no instructional component at the DAC; therefore, all the reductions are from administrative staff and operating expenses.

Sue further explained that when the model was built, this was the most difficult piece of comparative data to obtain. The Districtwide Services and District Administrative Center combined allocation is less than 14%. Riley stated that Riverside Community College District has approximately 24 or 27%

of revenue for those cost centers. Peter stated that there is no plausible way to broach the possibility of increasing the DAC allocation without knowing the complete functions of the DAC; district level functions must be delineated. Iris stated she is an advocate for more DAC support, however she agreed that there is a need to evaluate what the DAC does, what should continue being done and what shouldn't be done. Sue added that we also need to consider where there is a significant void in positions, such as a potential Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and the risk/cost to the District of not having those positions. Sue added that whether or not state funding is increased or reduced (Proposition 30) these gaps/issues need to be addressed.

The discussion ensued and led to the realization that the strength in our current model is that it does not specify how the DAC, nor colleges, spend their allocation so we need to exercise caution in getting into a great deal of detail. This item will be continued over the next couple of meetings.

Transitional Funding

Transitional funding is no longer applicable on this model, but should remain in the Narrative/Elements to include historical aspect of the transitional funding of this model. That language will be slightly revised.

College Initiatives

This portion of the model was never implemented. It was the consensus of the group that it should be removed from the Elements as it is now included in the Infrastructure Funding Model.

Class Delivery Schedule

Sue explained that credit and non-credit FTES are funded differently by the State. The District receives only \$2,745/non-credit FTES; whereas credit FTES are funded at \$4,565/FTES. There was a proposal to adjust the allocation to recognize the funding differential of credit and non-credit FTES and that the calculation will be handled off-schedule, similar to Productivity Factors. The result will be that the number of non-credit FTES will be factored at 60% for a college. The discussion ensued as to where the factoring would occur; on line one of the Class Delivery section or later in the model as part of the FTES distribution. It was decided that it would be placed at the bottom of the allocation model and renamed Adjusted FTES. The FTES number at the top of the Model includes every FTES regardless of type (funded, unfunded, non-resident, non-credit, etc.). This category will be renamed to Unadjusted FTES.

The productivity number is a combination of goal and actual. This element represents differences in program mix, etc. between the colleges.

Base Allocation

There was a discussion regarding the base allocation number and how that figure came about. Sue explained that the number was arbitrary and can be changed at any time, but was initially the most difficult number to agree upon in the entire model. There consensus to leave the percentage at 15%.

Carryover

There was a discussion regarding carryover funds. The Allocation Model guidelines state that sites can carry up to 1% of unexpended funds over to the next fiscal year. For the last several years, on a year-by-year basis, there has been an exception through the Budget Assumptions allowing sites to carryover up to 2%. Sue explained that this carryover amount has been used as a contingency at all four sites. Overall the number is relatively small compared to the entire budget number.

Sue suggested that whichever number the committee supports, the Model and Assumptions should be in consistent.

There was a general consensus to recommend the Board change the model to reflect an “up to 2% carryover”. Steve Hall, on behalf of AFT, opposed the change.

Other

There was a discussion about the delivery/dissemination of political information in light of the need to support Proposition 30. Sue explained that it is a fine line. Information must be solicited and provided as information without any intent to persuade voters, including students.

Sue distributed part of a recent communication from Scott Lay (dated 9/17/12) regarding polling trends for Proposition 30.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Next meeting topics:

- FY14 Budget – Suggestions for Reductions
- Review of:
 - Timeline and Process for Budget Development
 - Infrastructure Funding Model
- 2012-13 Board of Trustees Goals and Objectives – Action Steps
- DAC functions/support