



MOORPARK COLLEGE Fiscal Planning Committee

The Fiscal Planning Committee makes recommendation on college-wide fiscal processes. Responsible to plan, monitor and evaluate the college-wide fiscal operations: Ed Code 53200(c): - processes for budget development

Minutes Tuesday, November 28, 2017 1:00 – 2:20 p.m. Campus Center Conference Room

| POSITION/DEPARTMENT | CHAIR/DESIGNEE | ATTEND | DEPARTMENT | CHAIR/DESIGNEE | ATTEND | DEPARTMENT | CHAIR/DESIGNEE | ATTEND |
|--|------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|---------------------|------------------|--------|
| Co-Chair: Vice President, | Silvia Barajas | x | Athletics/HED/Kin | Vance Manakas | x | English/ESL | Jeff Baker | x |
| Business Services | | | | Remy McCarthy (Alt) | x | Business | Ruth Bennington | x |
| Co-Chair: | Nenagh Brown | x | Physics/Astronomy/Eng. | Erik Reese | x | Library | Mary LaBarge | x |
| Academic Senate President | | | Student Health Services | Sharon Manakas | x | ACCESS | Silva Arzunyan | |
| AFT Faculty Appointee (1) | Renee Fraser | | Chemistry/Earth Sciences | Vincent Crisostomo | | Health Sciences | Christina Lee | x |
| Associated Students Representative (1) | Houston Holohan | x | Counseling | Wendy Berg | x | Mathematics | Phil Abramoff | x |
| Classified Supervisors' Representative (2) | Michele Perry Kim Korinke | x | | | | Child Dev Center | Johanna Pimentel | |
| Classified Representatives (3) | Gilbert Downs | x | Social Sciences | Lee Ballestero | x | EOP&S | Marnie Melendez | x |
| | Linda Sanders | x | | Hugo Hernandez (Alt) | | EATM | Brenda Woodhouse | |
| | Obalid Younan | x | Fine & Performing Arts | John Loprieno | x | Behavioral Sciences | Dani Vieira | x |
| Dean Appointees (3) | Helga Winkler | x | Media Arts/Comm Studies | Neal Stewart | x | Life Sciences | Andrew Kinkella | |
| | Norm Marten | x | Child Development | Cindy Sheaks-McGowan | | World Languages | Perry Bennett | |
| | Mary Rees | x | Zoo | Michlyn Hines | x | | | |
| Director, Facilities, Maint. & Ops | John Sinutko | x | | | | | | |
| Vice Presidents (Ex-Officio) | Amanuel Gebru | x | | | | | | |
| | Julius Sokenu | x | | | | | | |

| AGENDA TOPIC | ACTION |
|---|--|
| ○ WELCOME, COME TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS | |
| ○ PUBLIC COMMENTS | |
| ○ APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 24, 2017 | <p>Motion by Ruth Bennington, Second by Sharon Manakas to approve the minutes with following adjustment: 1. Add the following Members to attending the October 24 Meeting: Kim Korinke, Neal Stewart, Ruth Bennington, Mary LaBarge, and Silva Arzunan.</p> <p>Motion Carried with Michele Perry and Vance Manakas abstaining.</p> |
| | |
| ○ REPORTS & DISCUSSIONS | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Campus Environment Committee – John Sinutko The committee met on November 21, 2017 <p>Campus Center Renovation – a meeting for this project took place on Thursday, November 16, 2017. The new estimated costs for construction and design, but no FF&E, is already \$9.7 million when the initial budget maximum was \$6 million.</p> <p>EATM Security Gate – issues are being ironed out with the I.T. department for this project. A solution to programming difficulties may be a monthly subscription priced at \$2 per user so far.</p> <p>Gym Swing Space – the purchase order number for this project has been sent to the vendor. DSA has asked for a resubmission of the plans because there were several corrections, due to the fact that it's a custom building. This may put the project about three weeks behind schedule. In the meantime, John will need to find time to visit USC in the next week with Bill Amador, Greg Sayles and Eric Lopez in order to look at their new restroom sinks, which may possibly be used in the facility. The earliest start time for this project will be April or May of 2018.</p> <p>Dance Equipment – currently in storage while the Gym and associated swing space are being renovated. Its relocation should be addressed soon.</p> <p>EATM Fence – work will begin on this project soon.</p> <p>Parking Structure Fencing – price quotes are being sought for this project.</p> <p>HSS Second Floor Deck – the bid opening for this project is next Monday, November 27, 2017. Work needs to be completed between December 16, 2017 and January 8, 2018. Vending machines in the area will need to be moved. John will speak with Lynda Dobson about this.</p> <p>A survey has been released to the campus regarding possible future uses for the fountain area.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-Curricular Committee – Silvia Barajas The Co-Curricular Committee met twice on November 16 and 17, 2017. The following projects were funded: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moorpark Art Gallery - \$760 | |

| AGENDA TOPIC | ACTION |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Film, Television, and Media - \$578 3. Com Building GRMM Gallery Space - \$300 4. Performing Arts/Costume - \$750 5. Journalism – Student Travel – \$750 | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State and College Budget Report – Silvia Barajas | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FTES Report | |
| <p>Silvia provided an FTES Update. MC is currently on target to meet 11,414 FTES for the 2017/18 Academic Year. This is 166 FTES more than we are currently funded for. The dollar value of that FTES is \$833,449. In the current allocation model this amount will be added to the District reserve. This will be discussed in greater detail in the Budget Allocation Model discussion below. Phil Abramoff asked if there was a ceiling limit on number of FTES the State will fund. Silvia advised that for the district as a whole it is 26,647 (26,468 base + 180 Growth). Phil asked if there is a philosophy about whether we go over the FTES or not. Nenagh advised that there is some wisdom in going over some as other districts are not making their FTES Growth so there is a redistribution of those funds and VCCCD could pick up some additional funds.</p> <p>Silvia also provided some information on the Leg Analyst Office issued in Mid November regarding 2018/19 Prop 98 funds. The report projected a significant increase in Prop 98 funding for K-12 and Community College. Phil Abramoff asked if those funds could be used for additional hires. Silvia replied that it would be best to wait until the governor release the January budget before any decisions are made. Neal Stewart asked if the funds were categorical or general fund, Silvia replied that it was general fund. Silvia said she would provide the exact figures via email which she did on November 28 advising the committee that the figure was 3.2 billion more in Prop 98 funding for 2018/19.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DCAS – Nenagh Brown | |
| <p>Budget Allocation Model The discussions occurring at DCAS regarding the budget allocation model were discussed in great detail.</p> <p>A presentation on the use of irrevocable trust made by Steve Hall at the last DCAS meeting was shared and discussed. Ruth Bennington asked if the irrevocable trust was part of the 30 million dollar reserve, Silvia replied that it was not it was a separate trust that can only be used to pay for retiree health care benefits. Phil Abramoff asked if the state required us to fully budget these funds. Silvia replied that the requirement is for us to identify our obligation and come up with a plan to pay our obligation. Obi Younan asked if the plan as presented has sufficient funds to pay the full obligation. Silvia replied yes as the proposal is to use the fund to address increases in cost and the general fund already has about 14.1 million that is being used to pay for this obligation. Michele Perry and Mary Rees also added that the proposal if approved can also be adjusted if for some reason the increase cost rise significantly higher than anticipated. Nenagh Brown added that DCAS agreed that we should monitor this fund annual.</p> | <p>Phil Abramoff Moved, Vance Manakas Seconded (along with many others) that the nine MC recommendations be made to DCAS. Motion Carried unanimously.</p> |

| AGENDA TOPIC | ACTION |
|---|--------|
| <p>The committee reminded DCAS representatives that in an effort to help out VC FTES, MC ceded the Fillmore area to VC.</p> <p>Phil Abramoff asked if DCAS can make recommendations to spend down Reserves in particular to help infrastructure needs at the colleges. Mary Rees advised that it probably was not a good idea as it under the purview of the trustees. Silvia advised that she would look at the charge of DCAS and report back.</p> <p>The Fiscal Planning committee agreed that the following recommendations should be made to DCAS on behalf of Moorpark:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 9 Base Allocation be reduced to either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State Allocation for Medium (\$4,201,509) and Small (\$3,601,294) or b. 9% - \$3,984,970 per college 2. Fund 693 – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No additional transfers from Fund 693 to the Irrevocable Trust. b. Ending Fund Balance at 6/30 should not exceed \$750,000. 3. Irrevocable Trust – Develop a plan for using the Irrevocable Trust to alleviate the retiree health care benefits on the general fund. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The plan should include the short-term use of funds to coverage any shortage in actual Health Care Retiree Benefit Cost. b. The plan should have a long-term component addressing the actuarial study. 4. FTES Recognition – Colleges that exceed budgeted FTES should receive additional allocation to cover the cost of the additional students. Colleges that do not make budgeted FTES should have their allocation reduced for that year. 5. Non-Resident FTES (Intl and Domestic) – Non-Resident FTES should not be removed from Line 10. The budget allocation model already adjust for non-resident cost by allocating \$5006 per FTES (see Budget Book, Page 42 Line). The colleges still need to provide services to non-resident students. The remaining differential from tuition is not sufficient to cover the additional services. 6. District Reserves – No additional funds should be added to District reserve. No new funds unless in response to new circumstances. The District has more than enough reserves to ensure stability for the district and our urgent need today is to serve our current students. The question for DAC is as follows: At the time of the worse fiscal crisis how much of the reserve was used? That should be our benchmark of what we need to have in reserve above the 5% state mandated amount. 7. Small/Medium College – If a college drops below the required FTES for a medium size college the reduction of Basic Allocation shall be the responsibility of that college ($4,201,509 - 3,601,294 = 600,215$) | |

| AGENDA TOPIC | ACTION |
|---|--------|
| <p>8. Any new on-going revenue received by the District shall first be allocated to Moorpark and Ventura to bring the FTES funding closer to parity with Oxnard.</p> <p>9. District Allocation of 6.98% should be reduced to reflect the reduction in rental expenses of \$420,000. Once a year DCAS should review and approve the budget for the revenue and expenses associated with the rental and maintenance of the DAC. Fund balance in excess of \$500,000 should be distributed to the colleges as part of the infrastructure model.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Categorical Classified Positions (Information) - The approved Categorical Classified Positions were distributed. Nenagh advised that group that we were distributing these first so that the committee had complete information before the general fund classified positions were discussed in January/February. ○ Classified General Fund Prioritization Discussion – The list of General Fund Classified Positions request were distributed so committee members had time to review before the prioritization process in Jan/February. | |
| | |
| ○ OTHER | |
| ○ ADJOURNMENT | 2:25pm |

| HANDOUTS | FPC 2017/18 MEETING CALENDAR, 4 th Tuesday at 1:15 p.m., CCCR |
|---|--|
| FPC Agenda 11/28/2017 | 2017 - 08/29 ; 09/26 ; 10/24 ; 11/28 |
| FPC Meeting Minutes 10/24/2017 (Draft) | 2018 - 01/23 ; 02/27 ; 03/27 ; 04/24 |
| FTES Updated Report November 18, 2017 | |
| Categorical Classified Positions | |
| District Budget Allocation Model – Update | |

| FISCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE | | |
|--|--|--|
| COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE | CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY | MEMBERSHIP |
| Fiscal Planning <u>Reports:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Campus Environment 2. Co-Curricular | Plans, monitors, and evaluates college-wide fiscal operations <i>The Fiscal Planning Committee makes recommendations on college-wide fiscal processes. Responsible to plan, monitor and evaluate the college-wide fiscal operations: Ed Code 53200(c): - processes for budget development</i> The specific tasks of this committee are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually review the District Budget Allocation Model and make recommendations for changes as necessary • Receives reports on the development of the college General Fund budget in alignment with District processes • Review emergent budget needs and constraints, and • Implement the annual Classified Hiring Prioritization process. | Co-Chairs: Academic Senate President Classified Senate President Vice President, Business Services Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Faculty Appointed by AFT (1) › All Department Chairs and Coordinators or Designees › Associated Students Representative (1) › Classified Representative (3) › SEIU Classified Representative (1) › Classified Supervisors' Representative (2) › Dean Appointees (3) › Director of Facilities, Maintenance & Operations › Vice President, Academic Affairs (Ex-officio) › Vice President, Student Support (Ex-officio) |

| DRAFT - Goals 2017-18 | Date of Action/Completion |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. Annually review the revised District Allocation Model and supporting documentation to determine the impact on College operations and the continued efficacy of the budget allocation process. | |
| 2. Define the committee's role in strengthening the connections among planning, resource allocation, and assessment processes. | |
| 3. Through the Program Plan Review process, recommend ways the campus can better utilize the Classified Service to meet the College Mission; recommend prioritization for classified staff hiring. | |
| 4. Provide information updates on fiscal and budget components to entire campus. | |
| 5. Set IEPI goals as related to Fiscal Planning – for the next 3 years | |
| 6. Review Multi Year Budget Projection | |
| 7. Review Infrastructure Model | |
| 8. Participate in the PRT Process and Consider the Recommendations for Fiscal | |