

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

**Thursday, February 17, 2022 – 9:00 a.m.**

MEETING 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  
David El Fattal, Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services  
Linda Fa’asua, Classified Senate Representative, Oxnard College  
Mark Frohnauer, AFT Representative  
Erik Reese, Academic Senate President, Moorpark College  
Chris Renbarger, Vice President, Business Services, Oxnard College  
Linda Resendiz, Classified Senate Representative, Moorpark College  
Miguel Rodriguez Lupercio, Classified Senate Representative, DAC  
Maria Urenda, SEIU Representative  
James Zavas, District Budget Director

Absent:

Amy Edwards, Academic Senate President, Oxnard College  
Nubia Lopez-Villegas, Human Resources Representative  
David Munoz, Ventura College Associated Student Government  
Sebastian Szczebiot, Classified Senate Representative, Ventura College

*Recorder: Laura Galvan*

**1.01 COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR WILL CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER.**

Dr. (Dan) Clark called the meeting to order 9:02 a.m.

**1.02 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE JANUARY 20, 2022, DCAS MEETING.**

Meeting notes of January 20, 2022 were approved by consensus with a few minor corrections.

**2.01 OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

### **3.01 DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER (DAC) STAFFING PLAN (UPDATE)**

Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that the DAC staffing plan presentation included with the agenda is the same information that was presented to the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, February 15. Mr. Zavas explained the draft cost analysis of proposed DAC allocation change. The analysis provides salary information for new identified positions. If all positions are created and filled, the DAC allocation would need to be increased to 8.15%; up from 7.1%. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that an analysis of an increase of 8% for DAC positions is also provided for comparison. Salary projections, including those in both scenarios, are always based on step 4 of the salary schedule along with the family plan for health and welfare benefits, the most costly plan. Mr. Zavas explained the new allocation methodology in budgeted revenue (Total Computational Revenue (TCR) stability funding minus 1%). Mr. Zavas stated that new revenue allocation will provide an additional \$2.7 million available revenue to be distributed through the Model, with \$940,209 flowing to the colleges under the 8% scenario, as illustrated in the table below.

Total Revenue for Allocation Model	193,853,001.00	
DAC @ 7.1%	13,763,563.00	
Additional Funding for New Positions	2,222,894.00	
Less: DAC % from Change in Budgeting Methodology	(190,627.00)	
Updated DAC Funding	15,795,830.00	15,508,240.00
New DAC %	8.15%	8%
Additional Funding from Change in Methodology	2,684,886.00	2,684,886.00
Less: Increase in DAC Funding %	2,032,267.00	1,744,677.00
Additional Funding Available for Allocation to Colleges	652,619.00	940,209.00

There was a discussion about the legislature approving the “floor” in fiscal year 2024/25. This may necessitate budgeting the hold-harmless number again. Should this occur, the total amount to be allocated is larger which would mean the DAC would still receive 8% but the dollar amount shown above would be greater than the figure listed. Ms. Bojorquez cautioned the group about any deficit factor the State can impose. There was a discussion about a potential multi-year phase-in increase for ongoing funds needed. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained if the full percentage of said funds are allocated to the DAC in Year 1 for positions and some funds are unspent, he intends to reallocate the unspent funds to the colleges. Mr. Frohnauer stated the graph assumes a 2% increase in FTES. He questioned what the graph would illustrate if FTES declined by 2%. Mr. Zavas explained that the numbers would closely resemble what is currently shown.

There was clarification of the green line in the chart. It is TCR, stability, plus additional revenues.

Ms. Bojorquez questioned whether the DAC increase to 8% would be sustainable into the 2023-24 fiscal year. In other words, is that amount the entire request or will another request come in future years? Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that an 8% DAC allocation request is not enough to fund all identified positions, but he felt a discussion about 8% seemed more reasonable than 8.15%.

Dr. (Dan) Clark inquired about the 50% law and how the proposed DAC allocation change may impact that number. Ms. Bojorquez indicated she felt it could prohibit hiring non-classroom staff. This, added to the need for classroom supplies due to remote learning, may contribute to the possibility of not meeting the 50% law number. Mr. Zavas explained a contributing factor to the decrease in the 50% number is due to reduced class sections and reduced faculty total compensation. Many districts

throughout the State are experiencing the same issue. Ms. Day explained that many of the class sections added due to social distancing, etc., have been expenses using HEERF funds. Those are not counted in the percentage, as the 50% law is related to general fund expenditures.

It was stated there is a one-year waiver on the Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON) obligation. Further, a waiver can be granted for the 50% law requirement if requested. There is not a general hiatus on the requirement.

There was clarification on the timing of a DCAS recommendation for an increase in DAC funding. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained the need to adopt a Tentative Budget in June and the Adoption Budget in September. In alignment with the Budget Development Calendar, the Budget Assumptions and Allocation Model will be presented to the Board in March. Because of timing, these items will include the current 7.1% allocation; however, this item will return for a final discussion and recommendation at the March DCAS meeting(s) so that any change can be implemented as part of the Tentative Budget. He further stated this discussion is about the DAC percentage and not the positions. The colleges and DAC develop their respective budgets using available resources and cross-consultation is not required. This discussion is occurring at DCAS because of the potential percentage change to the allocation model.

### **3.02 MAJOR INITIATIVES FUNDING IN ALLOCATION MODEL**

Mr. Zavas stated that the DCAS Workgroup recently met again. Dr. (Jennifer) Clark provided a brief overview of recent discussions such as frequency of requests for funding, reporting of data driven outcomes of previous requests, and suggested enhancements to the scoring rubric. The Workgroup is also working towards identifying how major initiatives should be defined.

### **3.03 DISTRICT BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL REVIEW**

The changes to the Allocation Model previously discussed were reviewed once again and verbiage was approved by consensus.

A conversation regarding the proposed DAC allocation increase ensued. Vice Chancellor El Fattal explained that DCAS's charge is to identify or propose a DAC percentage; not necessarily identify or justify positions. Position classifications will be created by the Personnel Commission and the Board will be presented with positions for consideration. He stated that he understands the concern about some of the positions being proposed. Vice Chancellor El Fattal expressed some comments related to timing and suggestions that any increase should occur after a new Chancellor is hired. He expressed his perspective that it is best to have it in place prior to a new Chancellor's arrival.

Dr. (Dan) Clark explained that adding management positions at the DAC is less palatable for faculty.

Dr. Reese stated that Moorpark College's Academic Senate recommendation is for the DAC percentage to remain at 7.1%. Dr. Edwards conveyed that Oxnard College's Academic Senate's position is a possible .25% increase, but they prefer for the percentage to remain at 7.1%. Ms. Resendiz stated that Moorpark College's Classified Senate recommends a phase-in process for the positions that directly support the colleges. Specifically, MCCS supported the IT positions, payroll technician, and the administrative assistant for fiscal and general services. She also stated it would be unfair to not support any of the positions as many directly support the colleges.

Ms. Urenda indicated that any added positions will support the colleges.

Mr. Frohnauer explained that AFT's position is to not increase the percentage; each entity should live within their existing budgets.

Dr. Reese explained that Moorpark College Academic Senate explained it is difficult to separate the proposed percentage increase from the proposed positions. He also commented on the respective duties for the Accessibility Specialist. He stated ADA compliance is a huge task, and the larger duties are not addressed; merely, website compliance. Dr. Reese explained the campus needs in this area are great, specifically for online classes.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated the DAC Classified Senate supports a phased-in approach. DAC staff have expressed the need for more positions; they have an internal knowledge of necessity.

In reference to the proposed DAC allocation percentage, Dr. Clark explained that Moorpark College evaluated each position and determined how they would serve the college. Using that methodology, they calculated an estimated proposal of 7.8%. Mr. Renbarger explained that the needs assessment has not been adequately explained although he could conceive a half-percent increase to 7.6%. Others mentioned percentages of 7.35% and 7.5%.

Ms. Resendiz confirmed what Vice Chancellor El Fattal mentioned about the colleges not losing resources. Vice Chancellor El Fattal stated that the total amount being allocated is larger so there is not an actual reduction to the colleges. For example, of the additional \$2.7 million available for distribution, using the 8% methodology for DAC funding would provide \$940,209 to the colleges instead of a larger amount should the DAC percentage remain at 7.1%. Thus, the colleges would still receive additional funds and their existing allocations would not be reduced. The delta would be provided to the DAC.

Dr. (Jennifer) Clark explained that Moorpark College will receive a reduction due to the last year's changes to the allocation model. This is an effect of last year's decision and not the current proposal. It was suggested that a phase-in funding approach be modeled so DCAS can evaluate what it might look like. Also, it was suggested that more details on the level of value for each position to the campuses be provided.

Ms. Bojorquez supports this item returning to the March DCAS meeting with information how these positions will support colleges and District. It will help determine a value-added approach. She also supports a phased-in approach; having a set amount pre-determined for year 1 and year 2.

There was a question on timing for a decision related to the DAC allocation percentage. Mr. Zavas explained that an Allocation Model should be presented to the Board in March. A revision would need to be presented to the Board, if changes are recommended. It was suggested the rate remain the same between Tentative and Adoption budgets. It would be advised that an amount be held-back for Tentative and what amount that could be. A final discussion will be held at the next DCAS meeting, with the outcome being presented to the Board in April. For operational reasons, other changes not related to the DAC percentage need to be recommended to the Board in March, in alignment with the Budget Calendar.

### **3.04 INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING MODEL REVIEW/PROPOSED CHANGES**

The FY23 Infrastructure Funding Model was reviewed and approved by consensus.

### **3.05 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS**

Mr. Zavas presented an overview of the changes to the FY23 Budget Assumptions. The Fund 693 Retiree Health Liabilities fund was discussed. Mr. Zavas explained the implementation of the new funding mechanism for retiree health benefits.

A section of the narrative regarding Police Services was added to the Assumptions this year. Revenues are not expected to return to a level of even pre-pandemic.

The Budget Assumptions were approved by consensus.

### **3.06 OTHER BUSINESS**

There was a brief discussion regarding the Compressed Calendar implementation funding, etc. For example, it was suggested that more college funding be used and less of reserves.

**4.01 THIS ITEM PRESENTS ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED AT A FUTURE DCAS MEETING**

None.

**5.01 FUTURE DCAS MEETINGS**

- March 3, 2022, DCAS Workgroup meeting
- March 17, 2022 DCAS Meeting

**6.01 COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR WILL ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.