

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

Thursday, October 18, 2012

NOTES

Attendees: Blanca Barrios, Dana Boynton, Dominga Chavez, Riley Dwyer, Erika Endrijonas, Steve Hall, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Linda Kamaila, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Darlene Melby, Mary Anne McNeil, Peter Sezzi

Absent: Mike Bush

The meeting was called to order by Co-chair Sezzi at 8:35 a.m. in the Thomas G. Lakin Board Room at VCCCD.

Ms. Johnson introduced and welcomed Dana Boynton as the new classified representative from Ventura College.

APPROVAL OF NOTES

Steve Hall requested a few minor changes to the notes regarding his statements. With suggested changes, the notes from the September 20, 2012 meeting were approved by consensus.

Review of (continued from 9/20/12):

Sue re-iterated that although each item of the review process may take considerable time, it is important to review thoroughly and ensure everyone's understanding and concurrence. Items not discussed or completed will be carried forward to next meeting until the process is complete.

Timeline and Process for Budget Development:

The Timeline and Process for Budget Development chart was distributed. Sue mentioned that this page is included in the FY13 Adoption Budget book but should also be a part of DCAS's review process and we be included in the planning manual. A suggestion was made to clarify the "Vice Chancellor" by adding Business and Administrative Services. This change will be made throughout the document. There was a discussion on how/who recommends to the Board (i.e., DCAS?, Consultation Council?, Chancellor?) The document will be changed to read, "DCAS recommends to the Board through Consultation Council". Other than those changes, the committee felt it was effective to keep the timeline/process on a single sheet and only include those key items now presented.

Infrastructure Funding Model:

The Infrastructure Funding Model was distributed and discussed. After some discussion of the possible anomalies as this first year, it was agreed that the model should stand as initially approved for a couple of years before considering changes.

CLASS SCHEDULE DELIVERY ALLOCATION (Impact of Full-time faculty RIF on college budgets):

Ms. Johnson noted that Steve Hall asked that this item be put on the agenda. He asked for clarification on the budgetary impact to a college of reductions in force (RIF). Sue used the white board to outline several hypothetical scenarios of program eliminations regarding full-time faculty. She illustrated several scenarios: 1.) where faculty who meet MQs who have an FSA who would make load at the same college; 2.) where faculty would transfer from one college to another; 3.) where full-time vs. part-time backfill is needed to maintain FTES. Sue then explained the expenditure

side and allocation side of these scenarios. Basically, the money follows full-time faculty, which is different than with classified staff. The Model allocates resources but it does not require the allocation to be spent in a particular way. Although spendable dollars do not shift in some of the above scenarios, there may be greater or less flexibility in offering classes. Once again, Sue offered to attend, if invited, any meeting to further explain the workings of the Model.

FY14 BUDGET – SUGGESTIONS FOR REDUCTIONS:

Although not directly related to the charge of DCAS, Sue asked whether members had any recommendation regarding possible district-wide saving strategies. No substantive proposals were offered.

District Administrative Center (DAC) ALLOCATION:

The discussion from the September 20, 2012 meeting regarding consideration of an increase to the DAC allocation percentage was continued. Sue reminded the committee that the philosophy articulated in the Model was to fund services that could be delivered more efficiently from a central office or which had to be completed for the district in aggregate. She explained that without a DAC, the functions would still be required, would need to be performed by the colleges, and would be more costly.

Dave Keebler distributed two charts on VCCCD Proportional Expenses. The charts illustrated a proportionality of functions and a conceptual map. Dave further explained that the definitions provided for each major function are national definitions taken from the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). He provided examples of roles contained in each function.

Iris Ingram presented a diagram entitled “What the DAC Does for Us (colleges)”. The chart illustrated various functions of the DAC as well as potential replacement costs if the colleges were to absorb those functions.

Sue distributed a Comparison of FY13 District office/District Wide Services schedule (dated 10/18/12). The schedule compared other multi-college districts’ allocations for District Office and DWS as a percent of General Fund Unrestricted Budget. The data is still draft form and is being analyzed but a rough comparison indicates that the VCCCD District office/DWS schedule as a percentage of General Fund Unrestricted funds is well below the percentages of the same for many other multi-college districts. Staff will continue to attempt to refine the data.

Sue distributed organizational charts for DAC departments. She further stated that the DAC currently has 62 staff. If Proposition 30 fails, in order for the DAC to balance the budget under the current percent, 8 FTE staff would need to be eliminated – an absolute number disproportionately higher than any other budget site.

A potential increase to the DAC allocation of .5% (6.64% to 7.3%) would be approximately \$600,000. Sue explained that a .5% increase would be a short term resolution to the problem as opposed to a long-term fix. The .5% does not include funds for a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs or any other needed positions such as Facilities, Risk Manager, Institutional Researcher, etc. She suggested the discussion should continue regardless of the results of Prop 30.

Sue stated that she had heard there may be members of the committee who did not believe that the discussion of the percentage of the DAC allocation belonged at DCAS. With the exception of the AFT rep, the members stated that it belonged there as it was a discussion of possible change to the allocation model. The discussion will continue in November.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:02 a.m.

Next meeting topics:

- 2012-13 Board of Trustees Goals and Objectives – Action Steps
- DAC Allocation
- FON