

VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
DISTRICTWIDE RESOURCE BUDGET ALLOCATION MODEL  
GENERAL FUND – UNRESTRICTED BUDGET

Fiscal Year 2021-2022

**I. Introduction**

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model (Allocation Model) represents the methodology for distribution of Unrestricted General Fund revenues to the District's various operating units. The Allocation Model is complex enough to reflect the needs of a multi-college district and the unique characteristics of the colleges, yet simple enough to be readily understood, easily maintained, and transparent. The Model considers how the District is funded by the State and contains factors to help ensure accountability, predictability, and equity. Further, the elements of the Allocation Model are based on both resources and expenditures.

The Allocation Model addresses the distribution of resources, and is not prescriptive in how funds are to be spent at the various locations (colleges and district office). The District acknowledges differences between its colleges and recognizes the need to direct resources based on plans and objectives to meet the needs of each college's diverse populations and constituencies. The colleges have separate and specific budget development processes that are unique to each college and are reflective of the organizational culture and priorities. It is at this level that the budget must be tied to each college's strategic plans and address accreditation requirements.

Annually, the Allocation Model is reviewed by the District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS) and Cabinet. As necessary, modifications and/or revisions to the Allocation Model, when appropriate, are recommended to the Board for consideration as deemed appropriate for the maintenance of the model's equity and integrity.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office implemented the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) beginning with the 2018-19 fiscal year. Shortly after the implementation, the District proceeded with consideration to modify the existing Budget Allocation Model to reflect the components contained in the SCFF. Over the last approximately three years, DCAS has spent substantial time discussing and studying various allocation model scenarios and the resulting impacts to the District and its colleges, while concurrently evaluating the existing model. Further, DCAS members have spent significant time discussing and advocating for equality and equity in the proposed Model. In culmination of comprehensive analysis and discussions, DCAS recommends that the model be updated for the 2021-22 budget to more closely align the District's allocation model with the SCFF. The key components of the proposed model are described below.

## II. Model

The Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model utilizes formulas and variables that have been meaningfully studied, readily defined, easily measured, and consistently reported. The following describes the elements of the Allocation Model:

### A. Revenue

The Allocation Model is designed for the distribution of all General Fund unrestricted revenue, unless identified to be distributed in a different fashion (such as to fund structural deficits). At this time, only state apportionment, unrestricted lottery, a portion of non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits are included in the Allocation Model. Restoration revenue is not included in the allocation model until the year after it is earned. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. Revenue from shifted FTES will be distributed through the Allocation Model. Restricted revenue sources of funding are allocated by the state directly to a specific college or by a district agreed-upon distribution method.

### B. Districtwide Support

Resources are allocated to a set of services and expenditure elements which are recognized as best administered in a centralized fashion.

#### 1. Districtwide Services (DWS)

The Allocation Model provides a pool of resources, referred to as Districtwide Services (DWS), to support expenditures required to meet general districtwide obligations which support the district as a whole and cannot be conveniently or economically assigned to the other operating locations through a cost center. These expenditures include property and liability insurance, legal expenses, governing board expenses, financial and compliance audits, central technology hardware, software and management services, and other activities. These common costs benefit all operating units, but are not the direct result of any individual unit. Components and specific line item budgets will be considered each year by DCAS for inclusion in DWS or movement to another budget location. *There are no proposed changes to this portion of the model.*

## 2. Utilities

The district accounts for utilities in a central location, so as to mitigate the significant differences in utilization due to building size, construction, age, and climatic conditions affected by college locations. Expenditures represent the districtwide costs for electricity, water, gas, and land line telephone. The budget for utilities is based on historical and projected rates and usage, and presented to DCAS for review and concurrence. *There are no proposed changes to this portion of the model.*

## 3. District Administrative Center (DAC)

The district recognizes that it is fiscally prudent to provide certain services centrally through the operation of a district office (District Administrative Center – DAC). These services primarily represent those functions that can be most effectively and efficiently administered in a centralized fashion. Typical of such functions are the Chancellor’s office, human resources, information technology oversight, payroll, purchasing, accounts payable, and so-forth. Currently, the DAC receives 7.1% of projected revenue. Each year, after review, if it is determined that specific budget items are to be reassigned between DWS and DAC or the colleges and DAC, the percentage of revenue will change accordingly, maintaining the same effective rate. *There are no proposed changes to this portion of the model.*

## 4. Major Initiatives

This element represents a “set aside” of available revenues to be solicited by the individual colleges for initiating new programs or activities that they otherwise may be unable to fund. This element has not been previously funded and is not currently funded. However, the element will be retained in the Allocation Model for future consideration of funding. *There are no proposed changes to this portion of the model.*

The previous four categories (Districtwide Services, Utilities, DAC, and Major Initiatives) reduce the revenue available for distribution to the colleges. The remaining revenue available for distribution is allocated in the subsequent categories.

### C. College Allocations

The Allocation Model is designed to provide fair and equitable allocations to the colleges by acknowledging areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities. The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities considered include, but are not limited to, areas such as classroom capacity, program mix, full time equivalent students (FTES), and ratio of full time to part time faculty. These elements are considered in one or more of the components of the Allocation Model to ensure an equitable allocation process. The three separate mechanisms below address different equity issues which have been recognized by the colleges.

## 1. Class Schedule Delivery Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses differences among the colleges related to instructional productivity, which is dictated in part by facility limitations, program mix, student preparedness, full-time/part-time faculty ratios, internal organization, and faculty longevity. Using a productivity factor of 525 and actual FTES (resident, non-resident, credit, special admit credit, incarcerated credit, non-credit, and enhanced non-credit) produced by each college for the period of July 1 through June 30 of the prior year, a Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) number for the budget year is calculated. The college receives an allocation for the actual cost (salary and benefits) for the full time classroom faculty currently employed. This allocation is adjusted to reflect non-teaching assignments, such as those on approved sabbaticals and load bank leaves, department chair, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and Academic Senate release time, and planned additional full-time faculty for the budget year. The balance of the allocation is then funded at the average hourly part-time salary and benefit rates for teaching the equivalent of a full-time load. The total of full-time faculty salary and benefit costs and the hourly FTEF is the total Class Schedule Delivery Allocation for each college. *There are no proposed changes to this portion of the model.*

The Class Schedule Delivery Allocation totaled approximately 55% of the revenue available for distribution in the 2020-21 Adoption Budget. The remaining revenue available for distribution is allocated in the following manner: Base Allocation 70%, Supplemental Allocation 20%, and Student Success Allocation 10%. These percentages are in alignment with the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF).

## 2. Base Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the differences among the colleges relative to their respective enrollment size. Each college will receive a Basic allocation equal to the basic allocation provided as part of the SCFF. This allocation is based on each college's size based on total resident FTES. The remainder of the 70% Base Allocation will be allocated to each college based on their share of the District's total credit FTES for the previous fiscal year. For example, the allocation for the FY 21-22 budget will be based on the Annual 320 report for FY 20-21.

## 3. Supplemental Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the Additional costs associated with serving disadvantaged students. Funding will be allocated based on each college's share of the District's total counts of Pell Grant recipients, AB540 students, and Promise Grant recipients. For allocation

purposes, counts will be based on the most recently finalized counts submitted to the Chancellor's office. For example, the allocation for the FY 21-22 budget will be based on the counts from FY 19-20.

#### 4. Student Success Allocation

This element of the Allocation Model addresses the funding provided in the SCFF related to student success. Colleges will be provided funding based on their share of counts in the success metrics used in the SCFF. These counts will be weighted using the same weighting used by the SCFF. As in the SCFF, additional funding will be provided for success outcomes by Pell Grant recipients, and California Promise Grant Recipients. For allocation purposes, counts will be based on the most recently finalized counts submitted to the Chancellor's office. For example, the allocation for the FY 21-22 budget will be based on the counts from FY 19-20

#### D. Transition/Implementation Funding

Potential adjustments to the Allocation Model can result in a shift of resources between the colleges. The district recognizes the need to provide stability and may choose to phase-in the effects of these adjustments. The changes proposed for the 2021-22 budget will be phased in over 5 years. The first year will provide each college with the same funding that would have been received under the previous model. The changes will then be transitioned over the next four years by annually calculating each college's allocation under the previous and new allocation models. In the second year, 25% of the difference will be implemented, in the third year 50% of the difference will be implemented, in the fourth year 75% of the difference will be implemented. The model will be fully implemented in the fifth year.

#### E. Carry-over

The Allocation Model recognizes the incentive in allowing budget locations to maintain their unexpended funds for future needs. In addition to the allocation derived through the mechanism of the model, the colleges and district office are allowed to carry-over any unexpended funds as of June 30 into the new budget year, up to a maximum of 2% of their respective prior year's budget allocation. Any allowable carryover is then added to each college's total allocation to produce the college's total expenditure budget.

In 2018-19, the revenue projections for the FY2019-20 Adoption Budget were based on the most up-to-date SCFF information available at the time. Due to the implementation of the SCFF, the first and second apportionment estimates from the State was greater than the Adoption Budget revenue for 2018-19. As a result, additional 2018-19 apportionment revenue was allocated in May 2019 and

November 2019. Due to the timing of the allocation of these additional apportionment funds, cost centers were able to carryover funds into FY 2020-21 not to exceed the amount of the late allocation that is separate from the 2% maximum.

In 2019-20, a majority of DCAS membership recommended that cost centers be permitted to transfer to Fund 113 any unspent one-time apportionment funds from 2018-19's SCFF implementation separate from the 2% maximum. This action will allow cost centers to phase in any new programs, enhancements, and innovations over time.

### III. **Background**

Effective in fiscal year 2003-04, the District set aside the then-existing budget allocation model, which had been used to distribute district resources for the prior six years.

The model was primarily revenue-driven while providing for college base allocations and other fixed costs which did not necessarily equate directly to FTES generation. As such, the model relied both on revenue (FTES) and expenditure elements (dual characteristics) to serve as the mechanisms to produce the colleges and district level budget allocations. The model was, however, primarily FTES driven, with no cap placed on the funding of growth at the colleges, although the district as a whole had a funding cap. As the colleges evolved over time, the shift of resources favored the college(s) growing most rapidly and disadvantaged the college(s) growing more slowly, and the movement happened in an uncontrolled fashion. As a result, the model had been adjusted several times during its six-year period, and was believed to no longer meet the needs of the district and its colleges.

In 2003-04 when the model was set aside, the District distributed resources using the fiscal year 2002-03 allocation as a base, increasing or decreasing it proportionately each subsequent year based on changes in additional available resources from that point forward. That process continued over the next four years. Although this method distributed funds, there was not an agreed-upon budget allocation model. Distribution of new resources did not consider how the colleges had evolved since 2003-04. Further, the allocation of funds did not reflect how funding from the state was received, the uniqueness of the colleges, nor the priorities of the District. In addition, the lack of an agreed-upon allocation model had been cited in the accreditation reports and would have been a major issue if not resolved.

During fiscal year 2006-07 the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS) and the Cabinet worked simultaneously toward identifying the features of a model that would reflect the unique characteristics of each college, while recognizing how the District is funded by the state, and be perceived as more equitable than the then existing arrangement.

In an attempt to develop a model that would be accepted as fair and equitable, areas of differences or unique characteristics between the colleges, as well as similarities, were identified. A model that considers and reflects these differences would be consistent with the objective of equitability.

The differences, unique characteristics, and similarities identified included, but were not limited to, areas such as:

- Facility constraints/classroom capacity on each campus  
How many rooms hold 25, 35, 100, etc. students?  
How will capacity change over the new few years?
- Program Mix - mix of general education and vocational programs  
Does each college have the same proportion of vocational/career tech to general education classes?  
Does the difference in program costs impact the college's decision on what programs to maintain or develop?
- Students' level of educational preparedness  
Does each college have the same proportion of students who are prepared to take college-level classes?  
Are needs for basic skills classes the same? (Some of the additional requirements/services of these students are to be met through special funding, such as categorical, not necessarily general fund – unrestricted dollars distributed through this model)
- Does each college have the same proportion of senior faculty (salary schedule placement)?
- How do full-time / part-time ratios of faculty compare?
- Are the contractual obligations, such as reassigned time and leaves, disproportionately distributed?
- What are the similarities/differences in core services?
- How does the size of each student body compare? (FTES)

It was imperative that each of these elements were considered in one or more of the components of the budget allocation model to ensure an equitable allocation process.

The Allocation Model was adopted for use in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

Beginning in the 2018-19 fiscal year, the State implemented a new funding formula for California Community Colleges. The new Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) sought to align funding with the Vision for Success by adding supplemental funding for

low income students, and rewarding Districts for student's success. Based on this new formula the District Council on Administrative Services (DCAS) began discussing how to align the Allocation Model with the SCFF. The issue was reviewed throughout the 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21 fiscal years. The resulting model keeps the previous allocation model's allocations for District-wide services, Utilities, the District Office, and Class Schedule Delivery untouched. The remaining funds are then allocated to each college using the metrics from the SCFF.

#### IV. Updates

Since the adoption of the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and in accordance with the commitment to the Board to regularly review the model components to ensure a more sustainable model, the DCAS reviews the model annually.

In 2008-2009, DCAS recommended modifications to the Class Schedule Delivery Allocation and the FTES Allocation segments of the model. The Board of Trustees approved the recommended changes at its March 2009 Meeting.

In 2010-11, DCAS developed a plan to address the district's capital structural deficits and recommended that specific revenues (lottery, interest income and administration fee revenue) be removed over time from the general budget allocation model and allocated in a different method.

Through FY12, all general fund – unrestricted revenue was distributed through the model, including, but not limited to, state apportionment for FTES, local revenues such as lottery, non-resident tuition, interest income, and miscellaneous, unless agreed to be distributed through a separate allocation method. This aspect of the allocation model was changed with the adoption of the Infrastructure Funding Model, beginning in the 2012-13 fiscal year. At the end of the full transition of revenue to the Infrastructure Funding Model, only state apportionment, non-resident tuition, and items related to part-time comp and benefits were to remain in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model.

In 2014-2015 DCAS recommended the excess revenue related to FTES generation from international students be taken out of the Allocation Model and be placed in Fund 114. This incentivizes each campus to develop an international student program by allowing the excess revenue to be retained by the home campus. DCAS also recommended a productivity factor of 525 be used for each campus. This change caused a significant shift of \$500,000 from Ventura College to Moorpark College. To alleviate possible operational disruptions, the change in the productivity factor will be phased in over four years with all campuses being held harmless in the first year (FY 15-16). In the subsequent three years, Ventura College's allocation will be reduced by \$166,666 each year. Further, DCAS recommended the carryover percentage be changed from 1% to 2%. These changes were executed in the 2015-2016 adopted budget. The final reduction was made in the 2017-18 budget year.



In 2015-16, a review of the components of the Infrastructure Funding Model resulted in a change in the treatment of unrestricted lottery revenue. Beginning with the 2016-17 fiscal year, unrestricted lottery was removed from the Infrastructure Funding Model and included in the Districtwide Resource Budget Allocation Model for the distribution of General Fund unrestricted revenues. The percentage of revenues the District Administrative Center will receive will be adjusted accordingly to maintain the same effective rate prior to the change.

In 2015-16, the District did not fully achieve its FTES goal. However, State regulations provide the flexibility to shift qualifying class sections between fiscal years. The District utilized this option and shifted 685 FTES from 2016-17 to 2015-16. As a result of this transfer, the 2016-17 State reported FTES was 685 FTES less than the actual operational FTES. In years affected by the shift of FTES, revenue will be projected based on operational FTES or state reported FTES subject to the maximum of state funded base. For the 2017-18 budget, state apportionment was calculated assuming the 2017-18 base FTES was the same as the 2016-17 actual operational FTES, which excluded the impact of the shift of 685 FTES.

In the 2016-17 Adoption Budget, the districtwide support in the Budget Allocation Model provided funding for the District Administrative Center (DAC) at 6.98% of available revenue. Within this allocation, \$420,000 was budgeted for the annual lease payment for the Stanley Avenue office. In November 2016, the District closed escrow on a property in Camarillo at Daily Drive for the DAC relocation. With the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, members of DCAS wanted a model where the budget savings that resulted from the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would flow to the colleges and DAC over time. It was agreed that the elimination of a lease payment for the district office would bring the DAC share to 6.7%. DCAS agreed to hold the DAC harmless for FY18 and agreed, with the exception of Vice Chancellor El Fattal, to recommend the phase-in of an adjustment over four years. Due to a lack of unanimity, DCAS continued its discussions on the topic. For the FY18 Budget, the percentage allocation to the DAC remained at 6.98%.

In 2017-18, the District once again utilized its option to shift qualifying FTES between fiscal years. 590 FTES were shifted from 2018-19 into 2017-18. As a result, State reported FTES in 2017-18 was 590 more than its operational FTES. This shift not only increased District state apportionment revenue in 2017-18, but it also increased the District's 'hold-harmless' apportionment amount within the SCFF for FY 2018-19 through FY 2021-22. The effect of the shift in 2017-18 was \$3 million which fell to the ending fund balance. In 2018-19, the shift also increased the District's state apportionment revenue by \$3 million and has flowed through the allocation model with the 2018-19 Adoption Budget. Regarding the DAC percentage allocation for FY19, a recommendation from DCAS was taken to Board in March 2018 to reduce its share to 6.7%. The motion was not approved and the percentage allocation to the DAC remained at 6.98%. DCAS also recommended at that time to allow amounts in excess of the 2% allowed carryover be transferred to Fund 113 to help the colleges and the DAC with anticipated future expenditure increases.

These amounts are one-time budget savings from FY18 that will be available in FY19 and reflected in the Adoption Budget.

Revenue projections for the FY2018-19 Adoption Budget were based on the most up-to-date SCFF information available at the time. Due to the implementation of the SCFF the first and second apportionment estimates from the State were greater than the Adoption Budget revenue for 2018-19. As a result, additional 2018-19 apportionment revenue was allocated in May 2019 and November 2019. Due to the timing of the May 2019 allocation of additional apportionment funds, cost centers were able to carryover funds into FY 2019-20, separate from the 2% maximum, an amount not to exceed the additional apportionment funds.

For the FY20 Budget, a position in Information Technology (IT) shifted from DWS to the DAC, thus, increasing the DAC percentage to 7.1%. Database Administrator services had been outsourced and budgeted in DWS. However, when these IT duties were insourced, the DAC Percentage increased for the amount of related salary and benefits of this position.

For the FY21 Budget, the Allocation Model will be updated to align the District's revenue allocations with the Student Centered Funding Formula. The new model will be phased in over 5 years, with FY21 being a hold harmless year for each college.