





Yosemite Community College District

District Fiscal Advisory Council (DFAC)

Thursday, December 5, 2019

11:30 a.m.

District Office Building, Conference Room A & Manzanita Building, President's Conference Room

Agenda

11:30 p.m. to 11:40 a.m.

Roll call

Approval of the minutes from the November 21, 2019 meeting

11:40 a.m. to 11:55 p.m.

Review Values for a Resource Allocation Model sheet

11:55 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Fund Balance

12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Resource Allocation Model (RAM)

Next Meeting:

December 19, 2019

UNAPPROVED MINUTES Yosemite Community College District District Fiscal Advisory Council (DFAC) November 21, 2019

Present: Kevin Alavezos, Flerida Arias, Kathy Blackwood, Doralyn Foletti, Pam Guerra-Schmidt, Jackie Hernandez (Recorder), Cecilia Hudelson, Judy Lanchester, Amy Lovett, Laura Maki, Joey Partridge, Melissa Raby, Jeremy Salazar, Brian Sanders, Sarah Schrader, Trevor Stewart, Susan Yeager, Jennifer Zellet, ASCC Student Designee

Council Members Absent: Jenni Abbott, Coni Chavez, Josh Hash, Crista Noakes, Kathren Pritchard, Henry Yong, ASMJC Student Designee

1. Roll Call

2. Acceptance of the Minutes of the November 7, 2019, District Fiscal Advisory Council

Consensus was met to approve the minutes. The minutes are approved.

3. 19-20 Institutional Expenditures

Dr. Susan Yeager, Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services, provided a handout and reviewed the Institutional Expenditures with the DFAC. The expenditures reflect district-wide costs. The discussion included types of district-wide costs and what percentages and divisors might look like to assist with future allocations. The institutional costs will be taken from the top of the annual budget. Kathy Blackwood, RAM Consultant, suggested the DFAC discuss institutional expenditures annually in the event changes are needed.

Action Items:

- A. Request for Josh Hash: What does the Computer Land contract consist of?
- B. Request for Josh Hash: Please provide a status on a potential district-wide contract for copiers.

4. Ending Balances

The Ending Balances discussion was slated for a future meeting.

5. Resource Allocation Model (RAM)

Kathy Blackwood provided a narrative and spreadsheet printout and discussed the handouts with the DFAC.

Ms. Blackwood explained, the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) will be used for the budget process. She also explained to the DFAC, the timelines and information reported in the first, second and annual Period Reports to the State. Ms. Blackwood suggested using prior year growth for

Page 1 of 2

this year's allocation. Dr. Yeager explained, percentages will be trued up annually based on a three-year rolling average. She expressed concern for the expectation of rural Columbia College to provide the same student services as Modesto Junior College and suggested adding an allocation to Columbia's base budget to assist with the responsibility.

Fund Balance will be discussed at the next DFAC meeting.

January 2, 2020 DFAC Meeting Consensus was met to cancel the January 2, 2020 DFAC meeting.

7. Close/Next Meeting

The next District Fiscal Advisory Council meeting will be held on **Thursday, December 5, 2019, at 11:30 a.m.** in the YCCD District Office, Meeting Room A, located at 2201 Blue Gum Avenue, Modesto, CA and Columbia College Manzanita Building, President's Conference Room located at 11600 Columbia College Drive, Sonora, CA.

Page 2 of 2

Information for October DFAC Meeting

Values for a Resource Allocation Model (many borrowed from the development of SB361)

Additions in red are from the 10/17 DFAC meeting

Characteristics:

- a. Promotes a "students first" culture
- b. The model must be widely perceived to be fair
- c. Simple to the extent possible
- d. Predictable -
- e. Stable 🚤
- f. Have a multi-year application not change formula each year
- g. Accommodate good and bad years
- h. Protects the integrity of base funding no sudden or major changes
- i. In synch with our mission and goals
- j. Transparent
- k. Long term sustainability
- I. Promotes access and completion

Behavioral:

- a. Promote a sensible use of public funding no "spend it or you lose it"
- b. Minimize internal conflict between colleges & with district office
- c. Timely in order for development of plans at colleges 🖊
- d. Rewards efficient use of funds
- e. Includes effects of Starfish and Guided Pathways

Data driven:

- a. Uses quantitative, verifiable factors need for good data —
- b. Metrics should be specific to the desired behaviors or outcomes

Suggestions:

- a. Tie the RAM to the SCFF, but using prior year revenues. This will assist predictability.
- b. Use only some of the SCFF data points that can be tied to a specific college.
- c. Define "off the top" or agreed upon line items that must be funded, such as retiree benefits, utilities, insurance, district-wide shared software like Colleague, etc.
- d. Create a metric for how much Central Services should cost, tied to square footage, # of employees, percentage of college dollars or the like.
- e. Don't do any simulations until the basics have been established.
- f. Once the RAM has been agreed upon, develop a transition plan.

California Community Colleges 2018-19 Second Principal Apportionment Yosemite CCD Exhibit C - Page 1

avillate o - Lage T			
Total Computational Revenue and Reve	nue Source		
Total Computational Revenue (TCR)		For Informational Purp	poses Only
Base Allocation (FTES + Basic Allocation)	69,722,502		a
l. Supplemental Allocation	25,789,897		b
II. Student Success Allocation	10,226,308		c
Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) Calculated Revenue	105,738,707		d = a+b+c
2017-18 TCR + 2.71%	98,219,989		e
2018-19 TCR	105,738,707	The greater of SCFF or 2017-18 TCR + 2.71%.	f = Max(d,e)
Constrained 2018-19 TCR**	103,403,051	The greater of the 2017-18 TCR + 2.71% or 2017-18 TCR + (3*2.71%).	В
Difference between Constrained 2018-19 TCR and 2017-18 TCR + 2.71%	5,183,062		h = g - e
Funding above the 2017-18 TCR + 2.71%	4,543,193	Proportional share of "h" to fund above the 2017-18 TCR + 2.71%.	= h * (Statewide + Statewide h)
Adjusted 2018-19 TCR Reflecting Available Revenues \$	102,763,182		1 = e + i
levenue Sources			
roperty Tax ş	45,956,494	Reported by counties for P2.	k
ess Property Tax Excess	±20		1
tudent Enrollment Fees	5,096,000	Reported by districts for P2.	m
tate General Apportionment			
General Apportionment \$ 35,344,782		Only for non basic aid districts.	n
Full-Time Faculty Hiring (FTFH) Apportionment (2015-16 Funds Only) 993,130		All districts eligible for FTFH funds.	0
otal State General Apportionment	36,337,912	Also displayed on Exhibit A.	p = n + o
		All districts eligible for EPA, paid	
ducation Protection Account (EPA)	15,372,776	quarterly.	q
Total Available Revenue \$	102,763,182		r = k+1+m+p+c

**For all districts2018-19 TCR, but no higher than 8.13% increase or	er 2017-18 TCR.
--	-----------------

				Suppor	ting Sections				
Section la: FTES Allocation	on								
	Credit Used for 3	Year Average			tions of the 2018-19 / 3-19 FTES before Grow			Credit Used for 3 Year Average	
	2016-17	2017-18	2017-18 Funded	Stability*	Restoration	Stability Adjustment	Adjustment	2018-19 Applied #1	Credit 3 Year Average
Credit	14,796.59	15,745.62	16,104.27			(925.26)	(66.02)	15,112.99	15,218.4
Special Admit Credit	209,80	282.12		•	3.45	313.32	0.000	313.32	
Incarcerated Credit	32.37	76.53	*	*		89.13	3	89.13	
CDCP	186.56	233.61	233.61			-	22.53	256.14	
Noncredit	203.33	238.45	238.45				36.78	275.23	
Totals	15,428.65	16,576.33	16,576.33	*	190	(522.81)	(6.71)	16,046.81	15,218.4
	2018-19				2018-19		Revenue	2018-19	2018-19
	Applied #2		Growth	Stability Paid*	Paid	Rate \$	\$	FTES Reported	FTES Unapplied
Credit	15,218.40	_	•		15,218.40	3,727.00 S	56,718,977	15,112.99	
Special Admit Credit	313.32		30		313.32	5,456.67	1,709,685	313.32	
Incarcerated Credit	89.13		*1	1.00	89.13	5,456.67	486,353	89.13	-
CDCP	256.14		•5	(*)	256.14	5,456.67	1,397,672	256.14	1.6
Noncredit _	275.23	576	IN	76.	275.23	3,347.49	921,330	275.23	
Totals	16,152.22	_		•	16,152.22	Ś	61,234,017	16,046.81	

*Only CDCP and Noncredit FTES workload eligible for stability.

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Tot	al Target \$
Credit		-	1.	\$	==7
Special Admit Credit	8		3.		1
ncarcerated Credit		•	23.00		5.90
CDCP	`≆	46	(0.40)		5.00
Noncredit					
Total			-	\$,

Section Ic: FTES Allocation - (Growth Target		
		201	1.60% 8-19 Growth
	FTES	201	FTES
Credit	15,218.40		243.65
Special Admit Credit			4.52
Incarcerated Credit	121		1.23
CDCP	233.61		3.74
Noncredit	238.45		3.82
Total	15,690.46		256.95
	Total \$ Equivalent	s	972,593

Report produced on 6/26/2019 6:21 PM

California Community Colleges 2018-19 Second Principal Apportionment Yosemite CCD Exhibit C - Page 2

Section 1d: Basic Alloca	101	1						
District Type/FTES		Funding Rate	Number of Colleges		Basic Allocation	Funding Number of Centers		Basic
ingle College Districts		1.076	Coneges		Attocation	Rate		Allocation
≥ 20,000	5	6,529,504.71		s	100	State Approved Centers		
≥ 10,000 & < 20,000		5,223,683.55	300	ð		≥ 1,000 \$ 1,305,921.16	\$	*
< 10,000		3,917,761.32	9.00 SES			Grandparented Centers		
Aulti-College Districts		3,317,761.32			•	≥ 1,000 \$ 1,305,921.16		
≥ 20,000		F 222				≥ 750 & < 1,000 979,440.06 -		*
		5,223,683.55	3.5			≥ 500 & < 750 652,960.04		
≥ 10,000 & < 20,000		4,570,723.51	1		4,570,724	≥ 250 & < 500 326,480.02		2
< 10,000		3,917,761.32	1		3,917,761	≥ 100 & < 250 163,241.08		
						subtotal	s	
dditional Rural \$	\$	1,246,089.31	(*):	\$	*	Total Basic Allocation	4	8,488,485
				_		Total FTES Allocation		61,234,017
			subtotal	\$	8,488,485	Total Base Allocation	\$	69,722,502

Section II: Supplemental Allocation					
Pell Grant Barri Anna	2017-18 Headcount		018-19 Rate		Revenue
Pell Grant Recipients AB540 Students California Promise Grant Recipients	8,958 1,000 18,105	S	919 919 919	s	8,232,402 919,000 16,638,495
		Т	otal Supplemental Allocation	\$	25,789,897

Section III: Student Success Allocation				****		
All management		2017-18		2018-19		
All Students		Headcount		Rate		Revenue
Associate Degrees for Transfer		610	\$	1,760.00	s	1,073,600
Associate Degrees		1,476		1,320.00		1,948,32
Baccalaureate Degrees				1,320.00		1,340,32
Credit Certificates		703		880.00		618,64
ransfer Level Math and English		77		880.00		67,76
ransfer		1,499		660.00		989,340
line or More CTE Units		2,865		440.00		1,260,600
Regional Living Wage		3,126		440.00		1,375,440
	All Students subtotal	10,356			S	
Pell Grant Recipients		,				7,333,700
Associate Degrees for Transfer		367	\$	666.00	\$	244,422
Associate Degrees		888	,	499.50	7	443,556
laccalaureate Degrees		-		499.50		443,330
Credit Certificates		416		333.00		138,528
ransfer Level Math and English		35		333.00		
ransfer		744		249.75		11,655
line or More CTE Units		1,560		166.50		185,743
Regional Living Wage		•				259,740
	Pell Grant Recipients subtotal	1,261		166.50	-	209,957
California Promise Grant Recipients	ren diant nachients sontotal	5,271			\$	1,493,601
Associate Degrees for Transfer						
Sociate Degrees		493	\$	444.00	\$	218,892
accalaureate Degrees		1,186		333.00		394,938
redit Certificates		(%)		333.00		-
		563		222.00		124,986
ransfer Level Math and English ransfer		49		222.00		10,878
		1,092		166.50		181,892
line or More CTE Units		2,150		111.00		238,650
egional Living Wage	25	2,061		111.00		228,771
	California Promise Grant Recipients subtotal	7,594			S	1,399,007
				Total Student Success A	llocation 6	10.226.308

Report produced on 6/26/2019 6:21 PM

SSC Community College Financial Projection Dartboard 2019-20 Adopted State Budget

This version of School Services of California, Inc., (SSC) Financial Projection Dartboard is based on the 2019-20 adopted State Budget. We have updated the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), consumer price index (CPI), and ten-year T-bill planning factors to reflect the latest economic forecasts. We rely on various state agencies and outside sources in developing these factors, but we assume responsibility for them with the understanding that they are, at best, general guidelines.

	Factor	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Statutory CC Apportionme		2.71%	3.26%	3.00%	2.80%	3.16%
Growth Funding		1% (\$60 million)	0.55% (\$24.7 million)	TBD	TBD	TBD
	COLA	2.71% ¹	3.26%1	3.00%1	2.80%1	3.16%1
State Categorical Programs	Funding	\$361.6 million	\$98.4 million ²	Ongoing unless otherwise stated	Ongoing unless otherwise stated	Ongoing unless otherwise stated
California Cl	PI	3.62% 3.33% 3.14%		3.14%	3.02%	3.13%
Interest: Ten	-Year Treasuries	2.58%	2.35%	2.58%	2.60%	2.70%
California	Unrestricted per FTES	\$164	\$153	\$153	\$153	\$153
Lottery ³	Restricted per FTES	\$66	\$54	\$54	\$54	\$54
Mandate Block Grant (per FTES)		\$29.21	\$30.16	\$31.07	\$31.94	\$32.95
CalPERS En	nployer Rate ⁴	18.062%	19.721%	22.70%	24.60%	25.40%
CalSTRS En	nployer Rate ⁵	16.28%	17.10%	18.40%	18.10%	18.10%

⁵ California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) rates for 2019-20 and beyond are subsidized based on the adopted State Budget.



© 2019 by School Services of California, Inc.

¹ COLA for Adult Education Block Grant, Disabled Student Programs and Services, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Fund for Student Services Programs, special services for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids, Child Care Tax Bailout programs, and the Mandate Block Grant.

² The 2019-20 adopted State Budget includes additional programmatic funding sources, the most significant of which are:

^{• \$42.6} million for the California Promise Grant Program (elimination of enrollment fees for the second year for students meeting certain criteria)

^{• \$13.5} million (one-time) for deferred maintenance, instructional equipment, and specified water conservation projects

³ Lottery funding is initially based on prior-year actual annual FTES, and is ultimately based on current-year annual FTES.

⁴ California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) rate in 2019-20 is final; that rate as well as the rates in the following years are subsidized based on the adopted State Budget.

By Shayne C. Kavanagh, Senior Manager of Research, GFOA

Reviewers: Marc D. Joffe, Principal Consultant, Public Sector Credit Solutions, and Bill Statler, Consultant and Trainer; retired Director of Finance & Information Technology, City of San Luis Obispo, California.

The GFOA would like to thank the City of Colorado Springs for allowing us to share this information, and *Public Sector Digest* for their assistance.

The Research and Consulting Center is the management analysis and consulting arm of the Government Finance Officers Association and is nationally recognized for its comprehensive analytical and advisory services, and specialized research on state and local government finance. Since beginning operations in 1977, the GFOA Research and Consulting Center has provided advisory services to hundreds of local, county, and state governments; public utilities; elementary and secondary education systems; and transit authorities.

The GFOA's Research and Consulting Center encourages enquires about this study or about repeating the analysis for other governments — please contact Shayne Kavanagh at 312-972-9700 or skavanagh@gfoa.org.

Copyright 2013 by the Government Finance Officers Association 203 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2700 Chicago, Illinois 60601 www.gfoa.org



3	

I)	Institut	ional	Costs



Resource Allocation Model for 20/21

10/00		Columbia		MJC		Central Serv		Institutional		Total	
19/20	\$	14,610,717	\$	61,673,474	١			8,605,823			Nets to the grown
Less 1X		(230,666	_	(742,922)	(222,463		0,000,020	, ,	(1,196,049)	Note: in the future, just start with the ongoing allocation
20/21 Base	\$	14,380,051	\$	60,930,552	\$		_	8,605,823	_	108,251,008	
Percentage of total		13.39	6	56.3%	6	22.59	-	7.9%		100,251,008	*
Percentage without Institutional Cost	t:	14.49	6	61.1%	6	24.49		7.57	U		
Columbia/MJC split	-	19.1%	ó	80.9%	6	,	•				
2. Add adjustments for SCFF split. No	o colle	ege loses mon	ev.	hut an additio	200	ا مالمحدد					w.
CFF split using 3 yr average		14.4%	~,,	85.6%	الر د	allocation m	ay b	e made.			
ollars split according to SCFF	\$	10,880,083		64,430,520							
djustment	\$		Ś	3,499,968							
	\$	14,380,051	\$	64,430,520	\$	24,334,582	۲	8,605,823	\$	3,499,968 111,750,976	Note: this adjustment may need to be made over several ye
. Add changes to institutional costs.										,	
							\$	179 163	¢	170 162	
	\$	14,380,051	\$	64,430,520	\$	24,334,582	\$		\$	179,163 111,930,139	
. Add prior year growth using the 3-				2.0		24,334,582	_				
9/20 Growth				2.0		24,334,582	_		\$:	111,930,139	
9/20 Growth				Basic Allocatio			_			20,000	
9/20 Growth		average exlud	ing	Basic Allocation	on	24%	_		\$:	111,930,139 20,000 N	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average
. Add prior year growth using the 3- 9/20 Growth 9/20 3 year average	year :	average exlud 11.7%	ing	88.3% 13,353	on	24% 4,884	\$	8,784,986	\$:	20,000 20,000 N 20,000	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average
9/20 Growth 9/20 3 year average	\$ \$	11.7% 1,763 14,381,814	ing \$	Basic Allocation	on	24%	\$	8,784,986	\$:	111,930,139 20,000 N	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average
9/20 Growth 9/20 3 year average Add allocations based on budgeted	\$ \$	11.7% 1,763 14,381,814	ing \$	88.3% 13,353	on	24% 4,884	\$	8,784,986	\$:	20,000 20,000 N 20,000	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average
9/20 Growth 9/20 3 year average Add allocations based on budgeted ternational Student Tuition	\$ \$	11.7% 1,763 14,381,814	ing \$	88.3% 13,353	on	24% 4,884	\$	8,784,986 8,784,986	\$: \$ \$ 1	20,000 20,000 20,000 11,950,139	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average
9/20 Growth 9/20 3 year average	\$ \$ reve	11.7% 1,763 14,381,814 enues:	ing \$	88.3% 13,353 64,443,873	on	24% 4,884	\$	8,784,986 8,784,986	\$:	20,000 20,000 N 20,000	lote: needs to be linked to new 3 year average

TS4'849'TTT \$	986'†8 <i>L</i> '8	\$ 681'080'77	\$ \(\L9'\nu\nu'\)	b 9 \$	74,338,599	\$	20/21 Ongoing & One time budget
134 O42 111 4							eaneled brut of enoifetremguA
							Operational costs
							Negotiations meet & confer
							Ending balance carryforwards
							Encumbrance carryforwards
							9. Add any one-time allocations
(c. o(TTT Ć	986'†8८'8	\$ 681'080'₺ፘ	\$\$	·' † 9 \$	5 66 5 '888'71	\$	19gbu8 gniognO 12\02
(889't90't) \$	380 VOL 0	(772,622)	\$ (961'679)) !	\$ (512'851)	\$	Allocate the difference
(002 723					(1,061,688)	¢	Remaining (Over)
					112,710,139)	\$) \$	Less Allocations
					111,648,451		Total Revenue
					120 803 111	ب	8. Balance the budget
6E1,017,S11	986'78८'8	8 \$ 997'688'7	Z \$ EL8'E6	0'\$9	\$ \$18'16\$'\$1	\$	=
							Strategic initiatives
	\$ \$ \$						Professional development
	\$						Vgolonfoet ichnology
OPC	\$						7. Add new agreed upon items:
		4 40	- 4 5/0/5/	co'co	\$ \$18'16\$'\$1		\$
112,710,139	\$ 986'1784	'8 \$ 99†'6EE't	77 \$ 878,56	כב טט	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		Compensation settlement
	\$						Fringe Benefit Increase
=	\$						PERS/STRS Rate Increase
*	\$ \$ \$ \$					15	Long/Step/Column
*	\$						Classification review
-	\$						Meet and confer
	Ś						6. Add compensation costs: