

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

Thursday, March 10, 2011

NOTES

Attendees: John al-Amin, Blanca Barrios, Robert Cabral, Dominga Chavez, Alan Hayashi, Iris Ingram, Sue Johnson, Dave Keebler, Deborah LaTeer, Darlene Melby, Mary Anne McNeil, Lisa Putnam (for Riley Dwyer) Peter Sezzi

Absent: Riley Dwyer, Karen Osher, Trevor Zierhut

Utilities

Utilities are being projected as flat for Tentative Budget. (The chart shows the amount in error and will be corrected and redistributed.) The Adoption Budget will reflect actual utility expenses.

There was a discussion regarding the variance between utility budget and actual expenses. Sue explained that if the actual expenses come in under the budget amount, the surplus amount (currently) is put into Unallocated Reserves. This could be something to keep in mind when discussing structural deficit triggers.

Allocation

The FY12 Budget Allocation schedule (dated 3/10/11) was distributed. Ms. Johnson pointed out that the revenue ties to that from the Preliminary Revenue Schedule previously distributed

Ms. Johnson then walked through each element of the Model, explaining in detail how the amounts are calculated and how many are used to support the agreed-upon principles of the Allocation Model. She also reminded the group that the Allocation Model is used only for allocation purposes, not to control expenditures. (If the Districtwide budget is modified as discussed, the model will include the revised amount)

The Class Schedule Delivery Allocation has been updated to include the agreed-upon goals (between the Presidents and Chancellor) for productivity for the upcoming year. The productivity factor used in the Model is a blending of the most recent year's (FY11) actual and next year's goal.

A schedule showing historical productivity rates was distributed as supporting information for the Budget Allocation.

Budget Assumptions

A draft of the FY12 Budget Assumptions and Guidelines was distributed. DCAS thoroughly reviewed the document and offered several suggestions for clarity.

There were questions regarding language in the Budget Assumptions referencing personnel actions that will be presented to the Board in April. Sue explained that vacant positions are being considered first, but incumbents may be affected. Sue also cautioned the group about a possible second round of position reductions if the tax extension ballot fails to become a ballot measure or fails.

There was a suggestion that the assumptions should state that the elements of enrollment management (especially reductions in the class schedule) were determined at each college. There was a discussion regarding FTES at Ventura College and how dropping below the 10,000 FTES threshold may affect district funding. Peter Sezzi explained that should Ventura College drop below the 10,000 FTES, the affect would be felt at all three colleges, not only Ventura. The added revenue for small vs. medium college flows through the model. Sue clarified that the sites alone determine the specific reductions in the class schedule, not the district.

The Tentative Budget assumes a “best case” scenario. The Adoption Budget might be worse depending on the passage/failure of the ballot measure.

There was a brief discussion about the process for earning/budgeting growth. Sue reminded DCAS that if enrollment growth is earned, it is not budgeted until the subsequent year. Growth reven

