



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, January 23, 2018 1:00 – 2:20 p.m. Campus Center Conference Room

POSITION/DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND	DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND	DEPARTMENT	CHAIR/DESIGNEE	ATTEND
Chair: Academic Senate President	Nenagh Brown	X	Athletics/HED/Kin	Vance Manakas	X	English/ESL	Jeff Baker	X
Chair – Classified Senate President	Gilbert Downs	X		Remy McCarthy (Alt)		Business	Ruth Bennington	X
Chair- VP Business Services	Silvia Barajas	X	Physics/Astronomy/Eng.	Erik Reese	X	Library	Mary LaBarge	X
			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 Michelle McMurtry	X				Child Dev Center	Johanna Pimentel	X
Classified Representatives (3)	Vacant		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		Behavioral Sciences	Dani Vieira	X
Dean Appointees (3)	Karen Rothstein	X	Media Arts/Comm Studies	Neal Stewart	X	Life Sciences	Andrew Kinkella	
	Norm Marten	X	Child Development	Cindy Sheaks-McGowan	X	World Languages	Perry Bennett	
	Mary Rees	X	GUESTS					
Director, Facilities, Maint. & Ops	John Sinutko	X						
Vice Presidents (Ex-Officio)	Amanuel Gebru							
	Julius Sokenu	x						

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
○ WELCOME, COME TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS	Introductions were made and a warm welcome was extended to Dean Rothstein
○ PUBLIC COMMENTS	No Public Comments
○ APPROVAL OF MEETING NOTES	
○ November 28, 2017	Motion to Approve: Sharon Manakas Second: Erik Reese Approved with no Nays Abstentions: Michelle McMurtry, Karen Rothstein, Cindy Sheaks-McGowan, Johanna Pimental
○ REPORTS & DISCUSSIONS	
○ Campus Environment Committee – John Sinutko Facilities Update – J. Sinutko Comm. 150 and 151 Enlargement – this project will be done in-house. Renovation for FTVM is also in progress. Stadium Press Box Roof – receiving some much-needed repairs after the recent winds. EATM Tiger Habitat – this project is in its design phase. Two cub cages have already been completed, as one of the cubs has arrived on campus. Applied Arts Projects – demolition of existing damaged courtyard concrete is in process. The art gallery windows were recently tinted. Gym Renovation and Field House – both of these projects are in DSA, and thankfully no geotechnical report will be needed for the Field House. The baseball field may need to be included as an assembly area, and that would mean that a PA system and alarm would need to be installed. A civil engineer has been assigned to the outdoor kinesiology classroom. HSS 2nd Floor Deck Refinishing – completed last weekend. Snack Bar Floor Replacement – recently completed. Softball Dugout Expansion – recently completed. Prop. 39 Year 5 – lighting in both HSS and the LLR received updates during the winter break. Campus Signage and Wayfinding – a Town Hall for this project will take place on Monday, January 22nd from 1 pm to 2:30 pm in the Campus Center Conference Rooms. The Wayfinding Committee, and the architects, will welcome student input so everyone who can participate is encouraged to attend. Old Business – Payton Robinson shared the campus-wide survey results in regard to what may be done with the existing fountain at Fountain Hall. Over half of the respondents agreed that the fountain should remain on campus as a water feature, but it should receive modifications so that less water is used. The second most popular idea was a request to see the area turned into a botanical garden. It	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>may be possible to create a design that combines the two ideas and remains relatively low maintenance. Further discussion is needed.</p> <p>The committee will recommend modification of the Fountain if the area receives approval for architectural funding.</p> <p>New Business – Steve Timmons introduced the idea of replacing existing junipers near the Campus Center with something tidier and more drought-friendly. Payton Robinson inquired about the possibility of requesting hot food service on campus, but the Gym Renovation will need a final bid cost before any other future projects are discussed.</p> <p>The committee approved replacing the Campus Center junipers with drought-resistant and more colorful plants. The Grounds Department will develop a planting plan.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-Curricular Committee – Silvia Barajas <p>All faculty and staff email was sent on January 16, 2018.</p> <p>Deadline to apply for CoCurricular Funds are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Spring semester due dates</i> ○ First Award <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Applications are due by the last Friday in January (January 26, 2018) <input type="checkbox"/> Funds awarded the first Friday in February (February 2, 2018) ○ Second Award <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Applications are due by the second Friday in March (March 9, 2018) <input type="checkbox"/> Funds are awarded the third Friday in March (March 16, 2018) <p>A second all faculty and staff email will be sent out for the second award period.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State and College Budget Report – Silvia Barajas <p>Silvia provided a handout on Governor’s January budget. A correction on the Base allocation needed to be made to the handout as the interpretation had changed as new information was provided at the CC statewide budget meeting. Thus the base allocation increase of \$175,000,000 should be disregarded as it will be use to transition the colleges to the new funding formula. The 175 million will be used to hold districts/college’s harmless during the transition. There is limited information on the new funding formula as it is currently being developed. Here is what is known:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 50% of the funding will be allocated using the current model. 2. The remaining 50% will be distributed base on student demographics (pell eligible), and colleges’ progress on increasing the number of certificate and degrees awarded. <p>Dr. Ballesterro asked if the COLA funding is awarded to MC directly and must it be used for COLA only. Silvia replied that the COLA funding (along with all other funding) is allocated to the district then distributed in accordance with the budget allocation model. Silvia also clarified that there is no restrictions that COLA be applied for that purpose.</p>	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>No estimate for the California College Promise funds could be made as there are eligibility requirements to receive the funds including participating in Guided Pathways and issuing Federal Student Loans. Colleges are given full flexibility on how these funds are used as long as they are in support of student completion.</p> <p>COLA for Apprenticeship, EOP, DSPS, CalWORKs, Child Care Tax Bailout Programs was provided. However no COLA for 3SP, Equity, and Strong Workforce.</p> <p>The most significant item from the Governor's budget for MC is the Physical Plant and Instructional Equipment Program. Using historical funding allocation MC is in line for \$2,779,366. This is a sizeable increase. As a point of reference this year, 2017/18 MC share was \$674,887. There were several questions regarding what would qualify as instructional equipment. Silvia will provide the committee with the guidelines. Subsequent to the meeting Silvia will email the guidelines to the committee.</p> <p>On-Line CC Initiative - \$100 million in One-time Cost and \$20 million on going to serve 4000 FTES. The Legislative Analyst Office reported that there are 2.5 million individuals that seek on-line instruction that are currently not being served by the CCs and the On-line college is a priority of the governor and the Chancellor.</p> <p>Chancellor Oakley addressed the CC Budget Workshop attendees and stated that the top priorities are Guided Pathways, the new funding formula, and the on-line college.</p> <p>Silvia presented the Multi-year budget projects for the college as was recommended by our accreditation visit. It is important to include the multi-year budget projection along with any budget projections. The Multi-year budget projections show increased cost as follows: 2018/19- \$1,887,968 2019/20 - \$2,000,473 2020/21 - \$1,947,001 2021/22 - \$1,561,005 2022/23 - \$1,557,827 The Multi-year Projection was produced using the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classified Salary increase is based on the conclusion of this year's negotiations. No predictions are made for future years. 2. Step increases for Faculty and Staff are based on the historical 1.98% increase to the budget for this item. 3. PERS and STRS rates are based on the rate increases reported by the two entities (PERS and STRS). STRS has not released their projected increases for 2021/22 and 2022/23. 	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Classified Health Care Cost increases are based on the 5% increase in health care cost. 5. OPEB: no increase in cost is estimated since we are recommending using the retiree health care trust for future increase. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FTES Report Silvia presented the FTES report which shows MC doing very well on enrollment. Discussion and comments were made regarding if we had peaked on enrollments, in particular in relation to Fall/Spring retention. Silvia advised that traditionally the college has a reduction of 200-250 FTES from Fall to Spring so we prudently set our target lower for the Spring Semester. Dr. Sokenu reminded the group that while we have this decline in enrollment from Fall to Spring it is an area that we are working on to improve our persistence rates. Dr. Abramoff asked if perhaps we have reached our saturation point and we are not able to grow anymore and perhaps we just can't chase FTES anymore. Silvia advised that MC DCAS representatives made that exact statement to DCAS that Moorpark may not be able to grow anymore. The VPs and Deans are exploring other markets (adult learners and dual enrollment in particular). Frustration was expressed with the current model not rewarding colleges who achieve or exceed FTES targets and to having any consequences for not meeting FTES targets. The effect on faculty and students is becoming untenable. Class sizes are larger at MC and services in support of instruction are few due to fewer resources at MC. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DCAS – Nenagh Brown and Silvia Barajas 	
<p>Budget Allocation Model Updates Ms. Brown and Ms. Barajas presented an updated report on MC Budget Allocation Model Proposal as follows:</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 <p><u>Status: No support from DCAS to move this recommendation forward.</u></p> 2. Fund 693 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No additional transfers are made from Fund 693 to the Irrevocable Trust. b. Ending Fund Balance at 6/30 should not exceed \$750,000. <p><u>Status: Approved Unanimously. Recommendation to be made to the Chancellor.</u></p> 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. 	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>b. The plan should have a long-term component addressing the actuarial study.</p> <p><u>Status: Support from DCAS. A subcommittee will be form to develop a recommended plan for the irrevocable trust. It was agreed that the plan would include using the irrevocable trust to cover any shortage in the actual health care retiree benefit cost. Subcommittee will consist of the three college vice presidents of business services, one academic senate president, one classified senate representative (Chris Renbarger). Steve Hall and Maria Urenda will be invited to join the subcommittee as well.</u></p> <p>4. FTES Recognition – Colleges that exceed budgeted FTES should receive additional allocation to cover the cost of the additional students. The DAC should receive a percentage in consideration of the additional cost. Colleges that do not make budgeted FTES should have their allocation reduced for that year.</p> <p><u>Status: Partially Approved. Colleges that exceed budgeted FTES should receive additional allocation to cover the cost of the additional students. Recommendation to be made to the Chancellor.</u></p> <p><u>Here is the final text of the proposal as passed:</u></p> <p><u>Colleges that exceed budgeted FTES should receive additional allocation to cover the cost of the additional students in the year achieved.</u></p> <p><u>The growth would be limited to the State growth cap for the District.</u></p> <p><u>A college will be funded for its growth up to the cap regardless of the District's overall FTES.</u></p> <p><u>Any college's growth unfunded by the state, up to the cap, would be funded by Reserves.</u></p> <p><u>If the growth exceeds the district's cap, any growth realized by more than one college would be split proportionally based on the increase.</u></p> <p><u>There will be a reconciliation of growth funds advanced to actual growth earned</u></p> <p><u>No support from DCAS for the rest of the recommendation.</u></p> <p>5. Non-Resident FTES (Intl and Domestic) – Non-Resident FTES should not be removed from Line 10. The budget allocation model already adjusts 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.</p> <p><u>Status: Approved. Recommendation to be made to the Chancellor.</u></p>	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<p>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 now rather than accumulate funds for future students. The question we should ask the DAC is at the time of worse fiscal crisis how much of the reserve was used? That is our benchmark of what we need to have in reserve above the 3% state mandated amount.</p> <p><u>Status: To be discussed at next DCAS. VC El-Fattal will bring an analysis on the historical use of reserves.</u></p> <p>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)</p> <p><u>Status: No support from DCAS.</u></p> <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><u>Status: To be discussed at next DCAS Meeting</u></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> <p><u>Status: To be discussed at next DCAS Meeting</u></p> <p>Dr. Abramoff asked what the impact would be on VC if they drop to a medium size college. Ms. Barajas said the overall reduction to the district would be about 600K however the actual effect on VC would be much less as it would run through the allocation model. Ms. Barajas said she would run it through the model and provide the committee with the information. Subsequent to the meeting Ms. Barajas provided the following to the committee: The overall effect to the District would be around \$600,000 and it would be spread among the four entities, MC, OC, VC and the DAC. VC moving to a small size college would have the following effect using the current allocation model:</p> <p>MC – Budget reduction of \$232,527 OC – Budget reduction of \$120,691 VC – Budget reduction of \$205,101 DAC – Budget reduction of \$41,895</p>	

AGENDA TOPIC	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classified General Fund Prioritization Discussion <p>Classified General Fund Prioritization will be held next Tuesday January 30, 2018 beginning at 12:00pm. Lunch will be served. It was agreed that members will be allowed to come late and still be able to vote. Absentee Ballots will also be accepted. A calendar outlook will be sent out. Since this is our first time using this process, we will evaluate the process to see where we can improve.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OTHER 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADJOURNMENT 	

HANDOUTS	FPC 2017/18 MEETING CALENDAR, 4 th Tuesday at 1:15 p.m., CCCR
FPC Agenda 1/23/2018	2017 - 08/29 ; 09/26 ; 10/24 ; 11/28
FPC Meeting Minutes 11/28/2018 (Draft)	2018 - 01/23 ; 01/30; 02/27 ; 03/27 ; 04/24
FTES Updated Report	
General Fund Classified Positions – List and Ballot	
Multi-Year Budget Projections	
Governor's Proposed Budget	

FISCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE	CHARGE AND SOURCE OF AUTHORITY	MEMBERSHIP

<p>Fiscal Planning</p> <p><u>Reports:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Campus Environment 2. Co-Curricular 	<p>Plans, monitors, and evaluates college-wide fiscal operations</p> <p><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></p> <p>The specific tasks of this committee are:</p> <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. 	<p>Co-Chairs:</p> <p>Academic Senate President Classified Senate President Vice President, Business Services</p> <p>Members:</p> <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)
---	---	---

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.	09/26/2017; 10/24/2017; 11/28/2017
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.	09/26/2017, 10/24/2017; 11/28/2017
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	1/23/2018
7. Review Infrastructure Model	
8. Participate in the PRT Process and Consider the Recommendations for Fiscal	11/9/2017