

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

**January 21, 2021 – 9:00 a.m.**  
**ZOOM ONLY**

NOTES

DCAS Attendees:

Cathy Bojorquez, Vice President, Business Services, Ventura College  
Dan Clark, Academic Senate President, Ventura College  
Jennifer Clark, Vice President, Business Services, Moorpark College  
Oscar Cobian, Vice President, Student Development, Oxnard College  
Emily Day, Director, Fiscal Services  
Jeanine Day, Classified Senate Representative, Ventura 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  
Amparo Medina, Classified Senate Representative, Oxnard College  
Erik Reese, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College  
Chris Renbarger, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College  
Linda Resendiz, Classified Senate Representative, Moorpark College  
Maria Urenda, SEIU Representative  
James Zavas, District Budget Director

Absent:

*Recorder: Laura Galvan*

Vice Chancellor El Fattal called the meeting to order 9:02 a.m.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES – DECEMBER 17, 2020**

The meeting notes from December 17, 2020, were approved by consensus.

**GOVERNOR'S INITIAL FY22 BUDGET PROPOSAL UPDATE**

Mr. Zavas introduced the Governor's Initial FY22 Budget Proposal. He explained that the Governor's budget is a good budget, overall. There is a slight increase to revenue, which includes a \$15.5 billion windfall in one-time resources. This is due, in part, to stock market sales, which has generated tax revenue. Mr. Zavas explained operating deficit projections for future years. The 2020-21 deferrals will be paid down in FY22, using some of the one-time revenue windfall. There will be a small amount of deferrals, \$326 million, into FY22. By November of 2021, the deferral will have been paid back from FY21. Mr. Zavas explained that the FY22 budget has a 1.5% COLA for the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF); however, the K-12 system will receive 3.84%. The difference is due to the K-12's local control funding formula and its provision for funding a foregone COLA from a previous year. The FY22 Budget proposal includes an additional 0.5% enrollment growth. Also included in the proposed budget is a Call to Action Fund of \$600,000 to

coordinate statewide antiracism efforts. There are also additional resources for Workforce Development. Mr. Zavas also stated that the Budget proposal includes a mandate to increase online learning courses by 10% (compared to the amount offered in 2018-19). There are no additional buy downs for pension costs. For the FY22 year, the STRS rate is fairly flat, but the PERS employer rate increases significantly.

### **CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE AND RELIEF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (CRRSAA)**

Ms. (Emily) Day explained the Higher Education Emergency Relief Funding (HEERF) allocations. This is the second funding relief, which equals approximately \$28 million for the District. Ms. Day explained the amounts for each college, including institutional and student aid portions. She explained how the amounts were formulated and distributed to districts. Ms. Day also explained the restrictions related to each portion of funding. The institutional portion allows the defraying of expenses related to COVID-19, including lost revenue, reimbursement for expenses already incurred. She further explained that one thing omitted from this is round of stimulus funding is the immigration status restriction for student-aid portion. Additionally, a portion for the institutional portion can be used for student-aid, if necessary. The \$28 million has been allocated to the District. The student aid portion will be presented the Board in February. To date, no dollars have been spent.

### **MIDDLE SIZED COLLEGE UPDATE – VENTURA COLLEGE**

Ms. (Emily) Day provided an update on middle-sized college state thresholds and explained that credit, CDCP, and non-credit FTES are included in the threshold count. A historical 10-year trend of FTES for Ventura College was distributed and discussed. Ms. Day also explained how the previous FTES shift affected the state threshold as well as reported FTES for Ventura College. The operational FTES (i.e., reported number without the shift) was below the state's threshold. For the FY20 fiscal year, Ventura College's reported FTES was 9,401, which is below the state's threshold. There is language in statute that prescribes any reduction will occur three years after the initial reduction (2018-19). Thus, any reduction for Ventura College will occur in FY22. Ventura College has not operationally generated over 10,000 FTES since the 2011-12 year. Ms. Day explained that the state's middle-sized college threshold was lowered subsequent to fiscal year 2011-12. Dr. (Dan) Clark asked what factors contribute to the lowered threshold. The primary factor is the workload reduction identified by the state and the reduced budget. The monetary difference is approximately \$670,000 for middle sized vs. small sized college. There was a discussion about Ventura College's efforts and strategic approach to increasing enrollment.

## **FY22 District Budget Allocation Model**

Ms. (Emily) Day reviewed Allocation Model Scenarios 9, 9A, 10, and 10A.

There was a discussion about implementation timelines. Mr. Renbarger explained that he prefers Scenario 10. Specifically, the students who are identified as more disadvantaged. A concern is that Scenario 10 has metrics that cannot be calculated or defined by the District: living wage and transfers, which the District is reliant on information from the State. Ms. Bojorquez suggested removing the living wage metric in Scenario 10. Dr. (Jennifer) Clark would like to see a more simplified model so that there is a greater ease of understanding; therefore, she prefers 10A. Dr. (Dan) Clark also prefers 10A for its simplicity. Ms. (Emily) Day shared her screen and removed Regional Living Wage from Scenario 10A (thus creating Scenario 10B). There was discussion on the importance of whether to include the Regional Living Wage metric.

Regional Living Wage is not calculated by the District. It is provided by the state, using information from the Employment Development Department. A number is provided to the District and John Cooney identifies which student attends what campus. The data is in arrears.

There was a suggestion to use Scenario 10 and collapse individual student success calculations and provide subtotal numbers for each metrics, strictly for presentation purposes.

There was a brief discussion on the workload/implementation of a more difficult scenario using many metrics as opposed a simplified scenario. Mr. Zavas explained that the numbers are confirmed and provided once a year, normally around February, and will not change between Tentative and Adoption.

Dr. (Jennifer) Clark expressed hesitation and concern about aligning the District's allocation model so close to the State's model as there are many changes on the horizon expected. She questioned whether the District will change the model each time the State changes the SCFF.

Dr. El Fattal stated that the new model to be implemented will be based on what is best for the District, regardless of staff workload. It has to be decided based on what is best for the District. He also expressed caution about the aspect of one college putting more emphasis on the weighted metrics of the model. In essence, will the colleges begin focusing on the metrics to yield a better allocation for each respective college?

Ms. (Emily) Day explained the issue of simplicity is not based on workload. It is based on explanation and ease of understanding by all constituent groups, trustees, and community members.

Dr. Reese reiterated that there is no data that shows that performance based funding increases success. For a more practical aspect, a question may be whether one scenario prevents less swings than another.

Ms. Bojorquez explained that Section 3 (Student success allocation) of the proposed model only accounts for \$6.5 million, 10% of the available resources. She reiterated the reason behind revising the model: to better serve students.

Vice Chancellor El Fattal that he will introduce Scenario 10 to Cabinet. He also explained he believes the Presidents will want Section 3 to remain in the Model.

Dr. Reese expressed concern about shifting funds from Moorpark College to Ventura College. The majority of the funding is based on FTES and the largest generating college is being penalized in reduced funding. There was also a comment about the types of students at different colleges.

Vote for using Scenario 10:

Cathy Bojorquez – Yes  
Dan Clark – Yes  
Jennifer Clark – No  
Oscar Cobian – Yes  
Jeanine Day – Yes  
Amy Edwards – Yes  
Mark Frohnauer - Yes  
Amparo Medina – Absent for vote  
Linda Resendiz - Yes  
Erik Reese – No  
Chris Renbarger – Yes  
Maria Urenda – Yes  
Emily Day – N/A  
David El Fattal – N/A  
Nubia Lopez Villegas – N/A  
James Zavas – N/A

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT TRANSITION/PHASE-IN – DISCUSSION**

Ms. (Emily) Day introduced the historical phase-in, specifically in the 2014-15 year. The impact was approximately \$500,000 and the phase-in implementation was over four years (hold-harmless, 1/3, 2/3, full amount of impact).

Using scenario 10, the impact is between Moorpark and Oxnard colleges. Mr. Renbarger suggested a five-year transition plan (year 1 hold harmless, and 25% each subsequent year). Ms. Bojorquez suggested evaluating the difference amounts each year and the percentages would be already identified and determined.

Ms. Bojorquez explained her campus may be more in favor of a four-year transition plan (hold-harmless, 1/3, 2/3, full implementation).

The consensus is that the first year of the transition will be hold-harmless.

This item will return to the February DCAS meetings: workgroup and regular.

## **POLICE SERVICES – DISTRICT ALLOCATION MODEL**

There was a discussion about the police services budget, in general, and whether budget overruns are specific to VCCCD or all community college departments.

Ms. Bojorquez explained that the department's budget was not increased when raises were negotiated, thus contributing to the overrun. Additionally, permit sales fluctuated and came in under what was projected.

Mr. Renbarger also introduced the idea of budgeted overtime. In other departments, workload can be redistributed, but police services does not have that flexibility. They must work when issues arise.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### Workgroup Meetings

Vice Chancellor El Fattal expressed pleasure at the Workgroup Meeting. Ms. Medina stated that she felt the workgroup meeting was extremely helpful understanding how numbers are derived, etc. The meetings will continue.

Meeting adjourned 11:18 a.m.

Next Meeting(s):

February 4, 2021 – DCAS Workgroup Meeting

February 18, 2021 – DCAS Meeting