


[| Help](#) | [Logout](#)

**Annual Fiscal Report**  
 Reporting Year: 2014-2015  
**Final Submission**  
 03/29/2016

Columbia College  
 11600 Columbia College Drive  
 Sonora, CA 95370

**General Information**

2.	Confirm or enter the name of the District/System or Corporate/Parent Organization:	<b>Yosemite Community College District</b>
3.	a. a. Name of College Chief Business Officer (CBO) b. Title of College CBO c. Phone number of College CBO d. E-mail of College CBO e. Name of District/System/Parent Company CBO f. Title of District/System/Parent Company CBO g. Phone Number of District/System/Parent Company CBO h. E-mail of District/System/Parent Company CBO	<b>Brian Sanders</b> <b>Interim Vice President of College and Administrative Services</b> <b>209-588-5380</b> <b>sandersb@yosemite.edu</b> <b>Teresa Scott</b> <b>Executive Vice Chancellor</b> <b>209-575-6531</b> <b>scottt@yosemite.edu</b>

**DISTRICT/SYSTEM DATA (including single college organizations)**

**Stability of Revenue**

		FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
4.	a. Annual General Fund revenues from all sources (Operating Revenues, CCC Fund 10)	<b>\$ 90,304,436</b>	<b>\$ 88,101,131</b>	<b>\$ 83,934,149</b>
	b. Revenue from other sources (non-general fund)	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
5.	Net Beginning Balance (General Fund)	<b>\$ 19,521,191</b>	<b>\$ 19,904,786</b>	<b>\$ 18,903,409</b>

**Expenditures/Transfer**

		FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
6.	a. Total annual general fund expenditures (Operating Expenditures)	<b>\$ 90,714,865</b>	<b>\$ 87,256,284</b>	<b>\$ 82,932,778</b>
	b. Salaries and benefits (General Fund)	<b>\$ 78,907,184</b>	<b>\$ 77,640,784</b>	<b>\$ 73,773,310</b>
	c. Other expenditures/outgo	<b>\$ 11,807,681</b>	<b>\$ 9,615,500</b>	<b>\$ 9,159,468</b>

**Liabilities**

		FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
7.	Did the institution borrow funds for cash flow purposes?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
8.	Total Local Borrowing	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
	a. Short Term Borrowing (TRANS, etc)	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
	b. Long Term Borrowing (COPs, Capital Leases, otherlong term borrowing):	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>
9.	a. Did the institution issue long-term debt instruments during the fiscal year noted?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	b. What type(s)			<b>GO Refunding Bonds</b>
	c. Total amount	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 0</b>	<b>\$ 59,205,000</b>
10.				

	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
Debt Service Payments (General Fund/Operations)	\$ 3,617,430	\$ 3,246,196	\$ 3,297,976

## Other Post Employment

	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
11. a. Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB:	\$ 31,467,714	\$ 31,467,714	\$ 33,381,704
b. Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL) for OPEB:	\$ 7,489,842	\$ 7,489,842	\$ 11,728,523
c. Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of plan Assets/AAL)	76 %	76 %	65 %
d. UAAL as Percentage of Covered Payroll	14 %	14 %	22 %
e. Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	\$ 1,753,417	\$ 1,753,417	\$ 2,169,245
f. Amount of annual contribution to ARC	\$ 3,814,357	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,773,397
12. Date of most recent OPEB Actuarial Report (mm/dd/yyyy):	12/01/2013		
13. a. Has an irrevocable trust been established for OPEB liabilities? Yes			
b. Deposit into Irrevocable OPEB Reserve/Trust	\$ 3,814,357	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,773,397
c. Deposit into non-irrevocable Reserve specifically for OPEB	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

## Cash Position

	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
14. Cash Balance: General Fund	\$ 29,803,155	\$ 29,346,297	\$ 8,660,945
15. Does the institution prepare cash flow projections during the year?	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Annual Audit Information

	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
16. Date annual audit report for fiscal year was electronically submitted to accjc.org, along with the institution's response to any audit exceptions:	03/31/2016	03/31/2015	02/27/2014
17. Summarize Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies from annual audit report:	<p><b>2015-001 SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCY - INFORMATION SYSTEMS Criteria Internal Controls - Information Systems Condition</b> The District's controls over the program change process were not operating effectively. During the year ended June 30, 2015, the District formally documented change process controls in its procedures manual. However, there were instances where the documented controls were not being followed. District personnel do not document the design of the testing, testing results, or approvals over system patches or other program changes to source code. Effect A program change could be initiated, tested or not tested and placed into production by the same individual, circumventing internal controls. As a result, information produced by the District's information systems, including financial data, could be inaccurate and misstated. Cause Effective internal controls are not operating effectively. Fiscal Impact Not determinable. Recommendation The District should ensure all documented controls are being followed. The testing approach and the expected and achieved results of the change should be documented to ensure that there was a proper segregation of duties, including the individual initiating the change and placing the program back into production. Corrective Action Plan The District will continue to train IT personnel regarding procedures that must be followed in order to ensure compliance with procedures, the Applications Development team will no longer have access to add code to the production server. All code changes must be initiated, reviewed and staged by the Applications Development team and the Operations team will be responsible for placing the code into production. The code will be placed into production once all appropriate documentation has been verified.</p> <p><b>2014-001 SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCY - INFORMATION SYSTEMS Criteria Internal Controls - Information Systems Condition</b> The District does not have adequate controls over the program change process. District personnel do not document the design of the testing, testing results, or approvals over system patches or other program changes to source code. There is no report or process to ensure that the person initiating the program change is not the same person who places the changed source code back into production. In addition, the program change process was not documented in a procedures manual. The District did not remove a terminated employee from having access to the District's electronic records. Effect Because the process is not documented or formally monitored, a program change could be initiated, tested or not tested and placed into production by the same individual, circumventing internal controls. As a result, information produced by the District's information systems, including financial data, could be inaccurate and misstated.</p>		

	<p><b>Cause Effective internal controls have not been designed and implemented. Fiscal Impact Not determinable. Recommendation The District should document and implement appropriate procedures over the program change process. The updated procedures should ensure that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• changes requested are initiated and approved by the appropriate functional user,</li> <li>• testing is designed, documented and performed by the appropriate personnel,</li> <li>• the functional user has the responsibility for the final approval of the test results,</li> <li>• the programmer personnel do not have access to place source code back into production,</li> <li>• source code is placed back into production by a person separate from the above functions and</li> <li>• each program change is formally documented with the appropriate approvals.</li> </ul> <p>The District should investigate using a system generated report that tracks projects placed into production to use as a monitoring tool to ensure that only authorized changes are placed into production. The District should review and revise its procedures where appropriate for the termination of employees to include steps to ensure that the former employee's access to the information system is removed immediately. Corrective Action Plan The District is developing a policy and procedure that will ensure changes requested are initiated and approved by the appropriate functional user; testing is designed, documented and performed by the appropriate personnel; the functional user has the responsibility for the final approval of the test results; the programmer personnel do not have access to place source code back into production; source code is placed back into production by a person separate from the above functions; and each program change is formally documented with the appropriate approvals. The District is also exploring a software solution that will allow it to track code changes to the software to ensure only authorized changes are placed into service. The District is also reviewing and updating procedures to ensure there is timely removal of security access for terminated employees.</p>
	FY 12/13 <b>None Noted.</b>

## Other Information

		FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
18.	a. Budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target):	16,542	16,618	16,134
	b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES):	16,542	16,541	16,134
	c. Funded FTES:	16,542	16,541	16,134

  

19.	Report the % of total tuition/fees received from federal financial aid programs (Title IV, HEA), if applicable:	FY 14/15	FY 13/14	FY 12/13
		0 %	0 %	0 %

  

20.	a. During the reporting period, did the institution settle any contracts with employee bargaining units?	Yes
	b. Did any negotiations remain open?	Yes
	c. Did any contract settlements exceed the institutional COLA for the year?	No
	d. Describe significant fiscal impacts:	<p><b>The District, through collective bargaining, agreed to increase the medical benefits cap for each employee group: faculty, classified, and management. The fiscal impact for the 2015 fiscal year was estimated at \$265,074.</b></p>

  

21.	a. Federal Financial Aid programs in which the College participates (check all that apply):	Pell FSEOG FWS
	b. Changes in Federal Financial Aid Program Participation:	
	Programs that have been DELETED:	
	Programs that have been ADDED:	

  

22.		Cohort Year 11/12	Cohort Year 10/11	Cohort Year 09/10
	College Data: USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD) (3 year rate)	0 %	0 %	0 %

  

23.	Were there any executive or senior administration leadership changes at the institution during the fiscal year?	No
	Please describe the leadership change(s)	<p><b>Not applicable.'</b></p>

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.

[Click to Print This Page](#)