

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Wednesday, June 17, 2009  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, D. Nevins, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: P. English, L. Griffin, K. O'Connor, A. Scharper, C. Smith, M. Spaventa, L. Starke, M. Linn, J. Walker

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Dr. Serban called the meeting to order. She welcomed Dean Nevins, Ph.D., the new faculty member from Academic Senate,

1. Approval of the minutes of the May 19, 2009.

**M/S/C [Guillen/Molloy] to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2009 CPC Meeting.  
Everyone in favor.**

**Information Items**

2. Brief overview of Superintendent/President Serban's visit to Sacramento June 15-16.
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban went to Sacramento with a group of 21 people, from the Tri-County Education Coalition (TCEC), a non-profit group that represents K-12 and community colleges from Ventura to San Luis Obispo, as well as others from the Central and South Coast education community. The group developed talking points that they presented to everyone they met which included: legislators, staff of legislators, and representatives from ten different organizations including a CSEA representative. They also met with Senator Gloria Romero, Chair of the Education Committee and Glen Thomas, the Secretary of Education who both spent a lot of time with the group discussing the dire and critical State Budget situation ending up stating that 2010-11 is going to be worse than 2009-2010.
  - b. Superintendent/President Serban summarized what happened in the budget conference committee from the June 16<sup>th</sup> proposal that was included in the email from Erik Skinner, CCCCO Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Policy. The information that was not mentioned in Skinner's email is that the budget attached to his email is based on a significant amount of money that Democrats are proposing in new tax revenues.

These new taxes span from taxing the oil operations, reverting tax breaks that businesses received in February 2009, to taxing capital gains for business. There is a great chance these new taxes may not be enacted because there is a strong contingent who are vehemently against raising any taxes, thus if not passed would change the budget. However, everyone recognizes that this time around the legislators need to reach a compromise by June 30<sup>th</sup> because the state will be out of cash by July 1.

- c. Superintendent/President Serban spoke to several legislators about the information on the proposal of a five year suspension of the Full Time Faculty Obligation (FTFO) and the fact that the proposal had been voted down in the budget committee because of strong lobbying from faculty unions. Dr. Serban said that it would have been helpful for budgeting purposes if the college knew for a fact that for 5 years there would be a moratorium on the Full Time Faculty Obligation. It would have made budget planning very different. In a meeting with Dr. Serban, Lance Izumi, the CCC Board of Governor's President stated that the BOG can only waive the FTFO one year at a time.

## **Discussion Items**

3. Status of SoMA – reduction in state funding – continued discussion from May 19 CPC – Andreea Serban, Barbara Ben-Horin
  - a. This was postponed until there is further information on the situation with matching funds for SoMA.
4. Revised budget assumptions for 2009-10 per May 14 Governor's Budget Presentation – highlight of some revisions since the May 19 CPC (attachment)
  - a. Controller Leslie Griffin reported on the following:
    - i. Conference Committee's June 16 budget changes and the new schedule for the categorical cuts. The categorical 54% cuts were changed to 16% or 32% cuts, which is good news. She reported that for those programs with the 16% cut there will be no backfill from the general fund. Those areas with 32% cuts may need backfill from the unrestricted general fund. Superintendent/President Serban reported that in the meetings with categorical groups they spoke of the need to create a budget scenario with the cuts included and what does that really mean for this coming year and 10-11. Dr. Serban stated that the college cannot continue on an ongoing basis to fully back-fill the categorical program cuts from the general fund.
  - b. Leslie Griffin pointed out the ending fund balance and the fact that the college needs to have enough cash to cover the following requirements: The 5% contingency fund and the banked TLUs.

- c. The need to reduce \$1.5 million from the hourly expenses, leaving the need to cut \$4 million from somewhere else.
  - d. Dr. Serban spoke of the idea that the college may not be required to maintain the current base, which means that FTES can be reduced. The next step is to figure out what the budget implications are and how that will affect our students, faculty and staff along with the increase per unit coming up. What FTES will be targeted for reduction and how it can be implemented by the Fall given that students have started registering will be part of a discussion. How much FTES that will be targeted needs to be balanced with the impact that the \$26 per unit may have on enrollment.
5. Revised tentative budget for 2009-10 highlight of some revisions since the May 19 CPC (attachment) – Joe Sullivan
6. Implementing expenditure reductions and revenue generation for 2009-10 and beyond (attachment) - All
- a. Recommendations from the Academic Senate. Academic President, Ignacio Alarcon reported that the Academic Senate discussed several things at their last meeting, like taking more students, supplementing tutorial, and the instruction in some of the labs. The Senate will meet July 15<sup>th</sup> and will have more to report, depending on what happens June 30<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. Change in hourly pay schedule (attachments).
    - i. VP Sue Ehrlich reported from the updated hourly pay schedule sheet. Sue Ehrlich said that this schedule is the result of a range of discussions and exchanges relative to how the college wants to approach dealing with the budget reductions. The different levels of savings are simplified by using color codes: the red rates as the higher rate per hour and the rates indicated by the blue indicate less dollars per hour. The greater amount of savings would be achieved if the blue rates are implemented. The goal is to recognize that this college, compared to other community colleges, and compared to what our work load should look like if one reads the CA Education Code, is very heavy with hourly employees and we need to make a significant reduction. Ehrlich stated that the difference in this attachment from the first is that there are more exceptions listed which had been modified based on feedback. These are positions that carry a licensing or a certification in order to do that work, for example a registered nurse to do that work or an EMT license or an athletic training certification.

Dr. Serban noted that the targeted reduction in hourly expenditures for 2009-10 is \$1.5 million. With the blue rate, there are more hours of service for the college and the option for more people to make money versus paying the red

rate which gives the worker and the college fewer hours. The cut that is needed from the hourly budget is not across the board. The Departments' needs have to be analyzed. The cleanest way to implement a change like this is to do it all at once and all at the same time, effective July 1. Hourly pay rates are not subject to shared governance; however, because the college is in such a challenging fiscal situation, Dr. Serban wants everyone to understand where the college is and she asked for CPC's support.

There was further discussion about the concerns of not being able to hire capable people at the lower rate. The CPC members spontaneously spoke for their preference, the red rates or the blue rates, on behalf of their Departments. Many were in favor of the blue because there would be more coverage for the students. At the same time, some were concerned about the possibility of losing the current qualified responsible hourlies to the less qualified at the lower rates.

This was acknowledged as potentially being an issue and at the same time there is only so much money available. Student Senator Mike Linn stated the student's perspective that the blue rate is better because the students gain experience that they would not otherwise gain plus the international students are legally allowed to only work on campus.

Director of Human Resources Pat English informed the CPC members that currently the labor market is quite different than in the past. For example, twenty people used to apply for classified jobs whereas now 100 people are applying for those same jobs. There is currently an abundance of people to choose from and those eager to do the work that needs to be done will be getting the jobs. CSEA President Auchincloss, Director Jason Walker and Dean Marilyn Spaventa brought up pros and cons of using hourlies.

Superintendent/President Serban asked for an advisory vote because she will continue discussions with management on Friday.

**M/S/C [Sullivan/Auchincloss] that we adopt the blue model on the hourly pay schedule. Those in favor: 8; those opposed: 4; Abstained: 2.**

**M/S/C [Sullivan/Auchincloss] to move the adoption to action.**

- c. Additional international students (included in the attachment to #5) - handout Planning for Expenditure Reductions and Unrestricted General Fund Revenue Enhancement in 09-10.

Superintendent/President Serban spoke about the recent discussion with the Board at the Fiscal Committee and at the Study Session about allowing SBCC to temporarily increase the number of International Students per semester from Board approved limit of 6% to a higher percentage, per semester, and what it means in terms of

revenues and impact.

VP Sullivan reported from: International Students contribution Margin Analysis. The analysis does not include additional cost of instruction or additional cost of administration, it is looking at the additional revenue and taking out any additional direct cost that is specifically attributable to international students, not students in general. Sullivan said that there was considerable discussion about the benefit of adding international students and concluded that the benefit is significant, in terms of revenue for the college. It is one of the few ways for the college to create significant additional unrestricted general fund revenue.

Senior Director of the International Program, Carola Smith gave some quick statistics on the diverse student population in the program and reported that there is a cap on students coming from some countries because of the need to keep the student population from growing disproportionately. The number one major is Liberal Studies because students who are undecided about their majors or who might be here for a semester or two prefer the general studies; one-third of the International Students are business students which is where they have the biggest impact. Film Production and all the media programs are very popular. International Students are high achievers with an average of a 3.25 GPA and 25% are in Phi Theta Kappa. She reported further on the positive impact the International Students have on other students in the college in the various classes. Academic Senate President Alarcon stressed that we owe it to the International Students to have the extra sections in place and make sure they get into the classes that they need. Sullivan noted that the cost of instruction is the cost of doing business and if we add a section for international students or in-state students, the cost is the same overall on the average. Smith said the availability of the English and Math classes is crucial and we must assure availability to them. Academic Senator Garey asked if in adding classes, are we still netting enough to make this worth it. VP Sullivan said there is net revenue for the college.

Student Senator Linn asked about the influence on competition with local students over classes. Dr. Serban stated that the international students are the ones who in attending classes that would have been cancelled help make the minimum 20 students, therefore salvage the classes that local students would not have been able to attend. Further discussion took place clarifying the positives of adding a higher cap to the number of International Students attending the college. Dr. Serban stated that since the Board is willing to consider a potential moratorium on the 6% cap for awhile, she asked if there is a sense that the CPC members are in approval of this. She wants to be able to take this to the June Board Meeting. The increase in the cap would materialize in the Spring.

Academic Senate Member Garey reported that a question had come up in the Academic Senate and that was if the budget is going to include a workload reduction in FTES for CA students, then is the college creating a PR issue of cutting out resident students and adding international students and is there any issue in terms of

addressing that? Superintendent/President Serban stated that the State of California is not funding the community colleges to serve more than x number of California students, whereas the International students bear a different financial burden. Dr. Serban said that the main issue is that the college needs to cut millions of dollars because of the California State Budget Crisis and if the college wants to minimize layoffs and reduction in services to students, there needs to be more revenue in order to have fewer cuts. Increasing the cap on International Students is one of the few ways we have to do this. If the community has a problem with this, the college is open to problem solving ideas rather than unconstructive criticism.

VP Friedlander reiterated what Dr. Serban said. By having additional international students, the revenue they bring will help us mitigate some of the cuts that we have to make that would directly impact students. Therefore our resident students will actually be advantaged by having the extra international students because it mitigates cuts and also it will create some additional opportunities for them to take classes in sections that would they may not otherwise have access to. There was further discussion to clarify issues.

**M/S/C [Molloy/Alarcon] to approve raising the cap on International Students from 6% per semester to allow up to 8% for up to 5 years and make a commitment to ensure classes are available for those international students. Everyone in favor.**

**M/S/C [Molloy/Alarcon] to approve to move to Action Items. Everyone in favor.**

d. Other actions – Andreea Serban

e. Timeline for implementation of expenditure reductions for 2009-10

7. Server and computer refresh options for 2009-10 (handout)

Paul Bishop reported: The Technology Refresh Draft Schedule for the Next Two Years that will be paid for from the \$820,000 that have been in that capital line for equipment, since we do know that we will not have additional dollars coming in. He went through all that needs to be refreshed and in what order. Machines need to be replaced specifically in the two labs, CAD and CNEE, critical because the lack of new machines has a dramatic impact on instruction, since they are currently using older versions of the software. After much discussion, Superintendent/President Serban said that we need to spend the extra money because we have a responsibility to offer instruction that puts the students' knowledge on the cutting edge in order for them to get jobs. These are certification programs. Superintendent/President Serban asked if CPC thinks we can proceed with spending the extra \$253,000 to refresh and update computers.

**M/S/C [Alarcon/Nevins] to move to Action Item. Everyone in favor.**

**M/S/C [Molloy/Friedlander] to approve the spending of \$253,000 for refresh and replacing computers. Everyone in favor.**

8. Moodle implementation – support – Superintendent/President Serban spoke on the timely issue with the need for support for the Moodle implementation. Given that online education is so critical for the college and is 10% of our FTES, we need to continue the work on Moodle. This is time sensitive in that the Remote Learner contract comes to an end on June 30<sup>th</sup>. They were paid from Lottery Funds that are for Instructional Support and we still have Lottery Funds for Instructional Support. Superintendent/President Serban asked for a vote from CPC regarding the need to continue with Remote Learner for 09-10 and pay from the same source, Lottery Instructional Support. The cost is \$90,000 this coming year, up from \$75,000 in 08 – 09. VP Friedlander stated that this is a lot less than we were paying in the past because we have discontinued our contract with WEB/CT, and we have a savings from Banner. Superintendent/President Serban said that The Lottery Instructional Fund has restrictions and can be used only for instructional support.

**M/S/C [Garey/Nevins] to approve of giving a new contract to Remote Learner for the coming year. Everyone in favor.**

**M/S/C[Guillen/Ehrlich] to move this to an action item.**

**Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting. Depending on what happens with the budget, CPC may need to meet earlier than July 27.**

**Next meeting: Monday, July 27, 2009 3:00-4:30pm A218C**

OVERVIEW OF SBCC CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS RECEIVING STATE FUNDING 1996  
TO PRESENT

PREPARED BY WALT RENO, FACILITY SPECIALIST, STATE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

AUGUST 6, 2009

LEGEND:

A=Acquisition  
P=Preliminary Plans  
W=Working Drawings  
C=Construction  
E=Equipment

COMPLETED AND CLOSED PROJECTS

**Santa Barbara City College  
Life Science Geology Code Corrections  
CFIS 40.53.118**

State Funds – PW 1996 \$208,000, C 2000 \$7,314,000 C augmentation \$1,034,000

District had to expand the scope of work and seek an augmentation to remove asbestos not discovered until construction (demolition) was underway. Sometime during construction, after the working drawings were approved by the state and while the project was under construction, I toured the facility and discovered that the District architect had redesigned a portion of the third floor without clearance from state review agencies so that faculty offices could be on the outside edge of the building and better overlook the harbor. We discussed the situation within the Facility Unit but decided that the changes while more costly than the approved design did not impact the program space and purpose and accordingly we elected not to alert DOF to the unauthorized change in design.

Status: project completed  
Occupancy Notice Received  
Fiscal Account Closeout Notice Received and all available state funds have been claimed  
Project Considered Closed  
Unknown if district has performed project closeout with DSA

**Santa Barbara City College  
Gym Remodel  
CFIS 40.53.120**

State Funds – P 2001 \$163,000, W 2002 \$164,000, C 2003 \$3,645,000, E 2003 \$56,000  
District Funds - \$0 when proposed, District funds committed due to a redesign \$780,000



District successfully sought approval of redesign as part of approval of preliminary plans 6/25/2004. The location of the exercise area switched floors with the lecture rooms and the showers and the rest room access in the lower level of the Gym was modified. The district also discovered during the development of the plans that the structural design of the bridge between the two campuses prevented the district from incorporating the bridge deck into the planned elevator tower that would connect the gym with the main campus level. As a result the district had to design a set of ramps to provide limited mobility access to the facility. This additional effort took time and required the district to commit funds to the project. The district committed C \$682,000 and E \$98,000 to finance the additional cost of the redesign.

Status: project completed  
Occupancy Notice Received  
Fiscal Account Closeout Notice Received and all available state funds have been claimed  
Project Considered Closed  
Unknown if district has performed project closeout with DSA

**Santa Barbara City College  
Physical Science Renovation  
CFIS 40.53.121**

State Funds – P 2003 \$84,000, W 2003 \$75,000, 1st C 2004 \$1,721,000, 2<sup>nd</sup> C 2005 (Replacement) \$3,398,000.

W was Reappropriated in 2004 & 2005, 1<sup>st</sup> C Reverted in 2005.

District Funds - C \$0 when proposed, District funds committed to award lowest bid \$540,000.

District had to advocate for a redesign due to DSA comments. Division of the State Architect (DSA) added the requirement of an additional elevator and enhancement of structural strength during the development of the preliminary drawings. Both changes were not anticipated by district. State agreed to increase the C budget to finance the modifications due to their identification before the C appropriation was authorized and because a state review agency identified the issues. Award of Bid in July 2007 required district to add \$540,000 to project funding to finance lowest bid.

Status: project completed  
Occupancy Notice Received  
Fiscal Account Closeout Notice Received and all available state funds have been claimed  
Project Considered Closed  
Unknown if district has performed project closeout with DSA

## ACTIVE PROJECTS

### **Santa Barbara City College High Technology Center (SOMA Building) CFIS 40.53.122**

State Funds – P 2004 \$707,000, W 2004 \$693,000, 1<sup>st</sup> C 2007 \$28,468,000 2<sup>nd</sup> C 2009 (Replacement) \$20,518,000, 1<sup>st</sup> E 2007 \$2,204,000, 2<sup>nd</sup> E (Replacement) 2009 \$2,004,000. W was reappropriated in 2005 and 2006, W claim period was extended in 2009, 1<sup>st</sup> C was reappropriated in 2008, 1<sup>st</sup> C was reverted in 2009, 1<sup>st</sup> E was reappropriated in 2008, 1<sup>st</sup> E was reverted in 2009,

District Fund – original proposal contained no local funds-the total project budget was estimated at \$20,693,000. Preliminary plans submittal in April 2007 estimated total project costs of \$60,141,000 and the district committed to financing the \$28,069,000 difference between state financing and estimated project costs. Estimated cost of project in the revised preliminary plans submitted in December 2008 \$52,020,000 of which the district unsuccessfully asked to reduce their local commitment by the entire amount of the cost reduction.

#### District requested a redesign to lower project costs

EIR approval by the Coastal Commission delayed which delayed approval of preliminary plans by more than 2 years. Accordingly state financing of the CE phases was delayed. Cost of project when CE submitted to DOF in April 2006 to request funding in 2004 (PW); \$20,518,000 in 2007 (CE); \$29,589,000. In September 2006 amount for CE adjusted pursuant to BL 06-23 that required indexing of C phase costs to the mid-point month of construction- total cost of project and sum of state financing rose to \$32,072,000 based on published and projected CCI index levels - No local funds committed with either the 2004 PW request or the 2007 CE request. Preliminary plans submitted in February 2007, estimated cost of project in February 2007 had risen from \$32,072,000 estimated to \$60,141,000 calculated. District agreed to provide \$28,069,000 in support of the project so that project would not cease to be developed due to excessive unanticipated costs. As a result of the district commitment of funds, PWB approved preliminary plans in April 2007 and directed the district to commence to develop working drawing consistent with the approved preliminary plans.

In June 2007 district requested to redesign project to lower costs, State authorized the district to pursue redesign efforts but mandated that no change in scope be implemented and that the district submit revised preliminary plans for state Public Works Board (PWB) review. The release of State W funds was placed on hold until resolution of the redesign effort and the review of the revised preliminary plans. In December 2007, the district submitted revised preliminary plans-Department of Finance (DOF) concluded revised plans changed scope – changes included additional portable buildings to be demolished, revisions to the building footprint, modification of the program capability within all instructional lab areas (added CAD capability), and enlarged program lab space and other spaces to accommodate staff areas affected by the additional demolition. All changes were not discussed with state staff prior to incorporation into the drawings. Cost savings of more than \$8 million were realized. Staff to the PWB proposed approval of revised scope and proportional alignment of cost savings between state and local

bodies consistent with prior practice, however the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) objected to that recommendation and recommended discontinuance of project and reversion of all state funds due to changes made to drawings prior to obtaining clearance from PWB staff. Negotiated position reached in which state would realize the total cost savings. This was accomplished by reversion of the C and E appropriations and authorization of new C and E appropriations at lower amounts. The JLBC also recommended approval of the revised preliminary plans and that the district be directed to proceed to develop working drawings consistent with revised preliminary plans.

Finally, below are the building cost allowance calculations for the design of the SOMA building at various building construction cost index (CCI) levels. Estimated maximum Building cost Allowance at CCI 5065 June 2008, June 2009 and June 2010 price levels based on CCC building cost guidelines:

**JCAF 31- High Technology Center (Santa Barbara City College/Santa Barbara CCD)**

Rm. Type	Description	TOP No.	Department	ASF	Cost Per ASF CCI 5065	Max Bldg Allowance
110	Classroom	0099	General Assignment	7,393	\$419.00	\$3,097,667
115	Classroom Service	0099	General Assignment	208	\$419.00	\$87,152
210	Class Lab	0602	Journalism	2,038	\$431.00	\$878,378
210	Class Lab	1011	Photography	3,656	\$431.00	\$1,575,736
210	Class Lab	1030	Graphic Arts and Design	4,396	\$431.00	\$1,894,676
230	Individual Study Lab	0600	Media and Communications	1,445	\$431.00	\$622,795
235	Individual Lab Service	0600	Media and Communications	306	\$431.00	\$131,886
310	Office	0099	General Assignment	964	\$442.00	\$426,088
310	Office	0099	General Assignment	3,141	\$442.00	\$1,388,322
315	Office Service	0099	General Assignment	436	\$442.00	\$192,712
350	Conference Room	0099	General Assignment	623	\$417.00	\$259,791
410	Read/Study Room	4900	Interdisciplinary Studies	3,848	\$573.00	\$2,204,904
530	Audio/Visual, Radio, TV	0600	Media and Communications	6,764	\$675.00	\$4,565,700
535	AV, Radio, TV Service	0600	Media and Communications	4,187	\$675.00	\$2,826,225
610	Assembly	0600	Media and Communications	2,884	\$502.00	\$1,447,768
615	Assembly Service	0600	Media and Communications	522	\$502.00	\$262,044
620	Exhibition	0600	Media and Communications	1,601	\$465.00	\$744,465
<b>Totals:</b>				<b>44,412</b>	<b>\$509.01</b>	<b>\$22,606,309</b>

Maximum Building allowance at June 2008 prices (published CCI level is CCI 5065) = \$22,606,000

Estimated Max Allowance at June 2009 prices (published CCI level is CCI 5276) = \$23,548,000

Estimated Maximum allowance at June 2010 price levels (presume 5% annual inflation rate.) = \$24,476,000.

All amounts are building allowance only, additional funding provided to finance site work.

Status: In Final Design

District consultant is developing project working drawings consistent with revised preliminary plans. These drawings should be ready to submit to DSA if not already there.

**Santa Barbara City College  
Drama Music Building Modernization  
CFIS 540.53.123**

State Funds – P 2005 \$324,000, W 2005 \$462,000, C 2006 \$11,828,000, E 2006 \$80,000. W was reappropriated in 2006, C was reappropriated in 2007, 2008 and 2009, E was reappropriated in 2007 and 2009. The C amount was reduced to \$10,022,000 as a result of the bid award being less than the identified financing.

District Funds – none committed in the initial proposal. District committed with the request to go to bid to finance the \$7,865,000 difference between the pre-bid estimate and the available state financing in order for the development of the project could continue. The Bid award came in less than the pre-bid estimate and consistent with state operational practice, bid savings were distributed between state and local bodies in amount consistent with their proportional share of the financing. District commitment reduced to \$6,657,000 for C and \$90,000 for E. State commitment for C reduced to \$10,022,000.

**District sought permission to modify project design prior to going out to bid.**

The district cost engineered preliminary plans prior to submission for state approval in order to stay within the available state budget. Designed elements to be modified or eliminated with the redesign were reviewed with state personnel prior to incorporation into the drawings-a very beneficial step that was not performed in the SOMA Cost engineering effort. Clearances were given by DOF staff to make such changes as they did not appear to modify scope or program capability within the project. These remove items were identified as phase 2 in the working drawings later. The phase 1 only preliminary plans were prepared as anticipated based on the earlier briefing and approved as presented. Later, once the district realized that they had available financing, the district in the request to go to bid package, asked to reincorporate back into the phase 1 only design the phase 2 elements removed when creating preliminary plans. After the district provided documentation that showed the phase 2 elements were the items removed during the earlier cost engineering effort, the State agree that reincorporation of previously removed design element did not affect scope and allowed the bid effort to include both phase 1 and 2 design elements in a single bid effort.

Status: Project under construction

The State's expectation with authorization to award the construction contract is that the

district will construct the facility and submit claims for reimbursement in a timely fashion in order that the district takes beneficial occupancy, completes the reimbursement claim effort and perform final project closeout prior to the expiration of the C appropriation on June 30, 2014. The District is expected to reach 50% completion of the construction effort prior to June 30, 2012. Once construction reaches 50% complete the district is expected to request release of state equipment funds and purchase and install all equipment and seek reimbursement for the cost of the Equipment prior to June 30, 2014.

**Santa Barbara City College  
Administration Building Modernization  
CFIS 40.53.126**

State Funds Requested – P 2010 \$781,000, W 2010 \$1,248,000

State Funds needed in future years – C 2012 \$22,324,000, E 2012 \$89,000

District Funds – None in original proposal

District submitted a Final Project Proposal that competed for state funds unsuccessfully in 2009. That proposal showed a project costing 18,482,000. That proposal competed for state funding with other 2010 proposals after costs and calendar were reviewed by district consultant and updated from prior year information as needed. The project's construction contract cost detail shown in the district's submission was presented at June 2008 prices (index level CCI 5065) consistent with instructions we provide in our FPP call letter.

In August 2008, DOF issued a budget letter that directed state agencies to present their budget requests for 2010 at costs levels estimated to equal the mid-point month of construction based on published index levels and DOF identified projected inflation rate. We modified the district's estimate for the construction contract amount based on these instructions and recalculated the allowance formulas based on the higher values. This effort resulted in the budget requested amounts shown above. We expect to revisit the C and E phase amount again before they are put forth for state funding and adjust them again consistent with the published Index levels and DOF projected future inflation rates. As it stands now the project is estimated to cost a total of \$24,442,000 and have a construction contract value of \$19,771,000.

Status: Proposal under review by Department of Finance

The department will be reviewing the 2010-11 Budget requests until approximately the second week of November at which time they will make their conclusions whether they support advocating the proposal to the Legislature. Part of their conclusion will be based on whether the administration supports advocating another state bond as this project is dependent on such a bond for state funding. During this review effort no news (questions or comments) is considered good news.

**Schott Center**  
**Schott Center Modernization**  
**CFIS 40.53.201**

State Funds Requested – P 2010 \$514,000, W 2010 \$524,000  
State Funds needed in future years – C 2012 \$11,143,000

District Funds – P 2010 \$41,000, W 2010 \$47,000 and C 2012 \$1,006,000

No local funds were advocated in the initial proposal but the estimated cost to modernize the building exceeded the maximum building cost allowance for buildings with the space configuration of the Schott Center by \$721,000 at CCI 5065. This is likely due to excessive cost to modernize the older building. Indexing this cost to the mid-point month of construction and calculating the design and building allowances that are based on the higher contract value results in a non-supportable project cost of \$1,094,000. The district had to commit to provide this amount in order for the proposal to be submitted for state funding.

District submitted a Final Project Proposal that competed for state funds successfully in 2008. That proposal was not funded when the legislature decided against advocating for a 2008 state general obligation bond. That proposal showed a project costing \$9,343,000 in total. That proposal competed for state funding with other 2010 proposals after costs and calendar were reviewed by district consultant and updated from prior year information as needed. The project's construction contract cost detail shown in the district's submission was presented at June 2008 prices (index level CCI 5065) consistent with instructions we provide in our FPP call letter. Like the administration building modernization project, the June 2008 costs have been indexed to the estimated mid-point month of construction based on the project's calendar and the published and DOF projected inflation rates. This project now is estimated to cost a total of \$13,275,000 and have a construction contract value of \$10,686,000.

## Overview of 2008-09 Ending of Year Fiscal Status and Steps Taken to Achieve a Balanced 2009-10 Adopted Budget CPC, August 25, 2009

The information included in these materials reflects the changes in our revenue based on the budget for 2009-10 adopted by the California Legislature on July 28, 2009 and the work done by the College to identify additional expenditure reductions and new unrestricted general fund revenues to achieve a tentative adopted budget for 2009-10.

As reflected in the attached, in response to the severe deterioration in the State budget, we took deliberate and timely budget actions in 2008-09. The reductions in revenues from the State were also somewhat less severe than communicated to us at various points throughout the year. We were also able to generate additional revenue by capturing all allowable growth funding for 2008-09. As a result, we are concluding 2008-09 with an ending fund balance of \$15,097,377 higher than the ending balance in 2007-08. However, the actions that we took, which will continue in 2009-10, along with other additional steps to reduce expenditures and generate new revenue, are NOT sustainable in the long run. Some of them cannot continue even in 2010-11 due to the negative impact on the overall viability of the College.

Below is a chart with the budget reductions put in place in the 2008-09 fiscal year. The adjustment in the academic salaries category was due to reductions in overload, certificated hourly counseling, stipends and Continuing Education adjuncts. The reductions in classified salaries and hourly pay were due to fewer hourly staff and student workers in Spring 2009. There were also savings because of classified staff and classified management vacancies kept unfilled for many months or not filled at all. As a result, there were savings in employee benefits. Employee benefits are the retirement contributions and mandated payroll deductions (not the health insurance) applied to the reductions for academic and classified salaries. Supplies and materials were both instructional and non-instructional expenses. Other operating expense and services expenses were reduced by cutting expenditures for consultants, travel and conferences, repairs and maintenance. Capital outlay was for purchase of equipment that was not covered in fund 43. The transfer out for equipment was for the replacement of technology under the refresh program and new equipment from various departments.

### Budget Reductions in 2008-09

	Sep-08	Feb-09	Total budget reductions in 2008- 09
<b>Major Object 10 -- Academic Salaries</b>	490,752	315,123	805,875
<b>Major Object 20 -- Classified Salaries and Hourly Pay</b>	233,805	707,358	941,163
<b>Major Object 30 -- Employee Benefits</b>	92,546	119,544	212,089
<b>Major Object 40 -- Supplies And Materials</b>	163,591	101,499	265,090
<b>Major Object 50 -- Other Op Exp &amp; Services</b>	190,438	396,355	586,793
<b>Major Object 60 -- Capital Outlay</b>	49,949		49,949
<b>Transfer Out - Equipment</b>		1,300,000	1,300,000
	<u>1,221,080</u>	<u>2,939,878</u>	<u>4,160,958</u>

Overall, the \$4,160,958 reduction represented a 4.8% reduction of our unrestricted general fund budget. The reductions impacted the ability to provide the same level of support in all areas, including direct service to students, but with no reduction in regular employees. The goal was to retain regular employees and avoid layoffs while limiting the impact on instruction and services to students. This goal was accomplished in 2008-09.

### **2009-10 Budget Enacted by the Legislature on July 28, 2009 and Impact on SBCC Revenues**

1. Statewide categorical funding has been reduced by approximately 50%. The original assumption of a level of federal backfill of \$1.2 million for SBCC is no longer realistic although it was included in the July 28 budget. The federal backfill is allocated based on a formula statewide across all public education segments. Because the other public education segments were reduced more proportionally than the Community College System, the portion that now appears to be available to us is only half of the amount assumed on July 28. Attachment 7 contains selected categorical programs and two scenarios: the original amount in federal back fill and the adjusted to half amount, which is the more realistic one. At this time, we estimate that we will backfill \$900,000 for categorical programs from the ending fund balance. The estimate includes funding to cover all permanent staff included in the categorical programs.
2. Part-time faculty compensation has been reduced by \$385,693.
3. Apportionment for 2009-10 was reduced by \$1.6 million: \$550,000 general apportionment shortfall, \$283,000 student revenue fee shortfall and \$710,000 estimated property tax shortfall. This is \$557,000 less than the reductions included in the tentative budget.
4. The enrollment fee rate increase is included for 2009-10. The increase is from \$20 to \$26 per unit fee. The increase is estimated at \$930,000.
5. The 2008-09 retroactive adjustment of \$1,118,000 consists of \$550,000 in general apportionment shortfall and \$568,000 of property tax shortfall.
6. There is no funded growth in 2009-10. Due to higher FTES reported in annual apportionment report July 15, 2009, we received additional growth money for 2008-09 in an amount of \$478,399 which increased the revenues in 2008-09 and base for the adopted budget.
7. The projections for State revenues for 2009-10 are not expected to hold resulting in a mid-year deficit factor being applied. We estimated a \$1 million deficit.
8. There is no COLA for State apportionment in 2009-10.
9. Nonresident student fees from international and out-of-state students will increase by \$539,000 and \$161,600 respectively due to increases in per unit rates. An additional increase of 50 international students for fall 2009 and 100 students for spring 2010 is estimated to increase revenues by 349,500 after subtracting the additional costs.
10. An orientation fee for international students is estimated to increase revenues by \$40,000 (already included in the calculation above).
11. Interest revenue is conservatively estimated based on declining interest rates and earning cash balances.
12. Lottery revenue is assumed to decline by 5%.



## Steps Taken to Achieve A Balanced Adopted Budget for 2009-10

One of the attachments shows two slightly different versions – one realistic, one optimistic – regarding the additional expenditure reductions and additional revenues for 2009-10. The reductions put in place in 2008-09 also continue. There are only two key differences between the two versions:

- 1) We estimate that the realistic backfill needed in 2009-10 to keep all permanent employees in categorical programs employed and allow a reasonable level of operations for these programs is \$900,000. In the optimistic version, the backfill would be the difference due to the reduction in federal backfill of \$554,000. In either case, the reductions experienced in categorical programs in 2009-10 is much less than in the May 14 revise, as such there is a significant positive impact on the expenditure side of the budget compared to the tentative budget for 2009-10 where we had a backfill of \$1,912,877. However, we communicated with the categorical programs that the general fund backfill would no longer be applied in 2010-11 and beyond. The College will provide the general fund match that is required for some of the categorical programs.
- 2) As noted above, we do not expect that the projections for State revenues for 2009-10 will hold resulting in a mid-year deficit factor being applied. The realistic version includes the estimated \$1 million deficit which will be applied during the year. The optimistic version assumes no deficit factor.

We have or are taking the following measures in 2009-10 to achieve a balanced tentative budget:

- For a second year in a row, we are not transferring money to the equipment and construction funds. In addition, we are not transferring money to replace copiers and to the energy construction project. This totals \$467,909.
- Generate new revenue by enrolling an additional 50 international students in fall 2009 and 100 students in spring 2010. The estimated net increase in revenues is \$349,500 after subtracting the additional costs.
- Six permanent positions are not filled during the entire fiscal year. This results in \$516,321 reduction in salaries and benefits expense.
- Reduction in hourly expense of \$612,000 for credit and \$200,000 for non-credit.
- Workload reduction credit of 300 California resident FTES (200 sections) in credit for \$616,000 and 300 FTES in non-credit for \$345,000. The workload reduction was approved and included in the July 28 budget.
- The allowance for cell phones was reduced \$14,145.
- The allowance for mileage reimbursement was reduced \$21,542.
- Travel was reduced \$60,000.
- Institutional memberships in organizations were reduced \$16,274.

Accounting for all these measures and the additional revenues, the realistic version indicates that we still have a shortfall of \$709,616 whereas the optimistic version shows a surplus of \$842,384. Additional analysis is being conducted for categorical programs to better understand the level of backfill that would be needed from our ending balances. Also more analysis needs to be done to better estimate the savings in hourly costs in continuing education as a result of reducing sections.

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
SELECTED CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS  
BUDGETS  
10-Aug-09**

SBCCD Funds	Manager	Item	Feb 2009		Per CC League estimate of cuts			July 2009		2010-11 PROJECTED BUDGET	
			2008-09 REVISED ENACTED BUDGET	2009-10 ENACTED BUDGET	Program Reduction On-going	Anticipated Federal backfill (one-time)	Net Reduction	2009-10 REVISED BUDGET	Permanent Employees (Salary + Benefits)		
<b>Categorical Programs</b>											
12010	Scharper/Arellano	Basic Skills	419,786	419,786	(161,094)	80,547	(80,547)	-19%	339,239	107,663	258,692
12064	Shapiro	DSPS	1,150,637	1,195,453	(362,761)	181,381	(181,380)	-15%	1,014,073	750,684	832,692
12078	Wright	EOPS	1,287,960	1,326,604	(414,572)	207,286	(207,286)	-16%	1,119,318	488,630	912,032
12046	Wright	CARE	117,126	120,639	(41,053)	20,526	(20,527)	-17%	100,112	54,733	79,586
12172	McLellan	Matriculation (Credit)	895,527	922,392	(560,239)	270,054	(290,185)	-31%	632,207	446,113	362,153
12185	Arellano	Matriculation (NonCredit)	391,668	800,000	(552,397)	266,273	(286,124)	-36%	513,876	544,050	247,603
<b>Total Categorical Funds</b>			<b>4,272,704</b>	<b>4,784,873</b>	<b>(2,092,116)</b>	<b>1,026,067</b>	<b>(1,066,049)</b>	<b>-22%</b>	<b>3,718,824</b>	<b>2,391,873</b>	<b>2,692,757</b>

Systemwide Backfill may be reduced from \$130M to \$60M to \$90M

60/130 = 46%

Estimate of backfill at \$60M systemwide

SBCCD Funds	Manager	Item	Feb 2009		Per CC League estimate of cuts			July 2009		2010-11 PROJECTED BUDGET	
			2008-09 REVISED ENACTED BUDGET	2009-10 ENACTED BUDGET	Program Reduction On-going	Anticipated Federal backfill (one-time)	Net Reduction	2009-10 REVISED BUDGET	Permanent Employees (Salary + Benefits)		
<b>Categorical Programs</b>											
12010	Scharper/Arellano	Basic Skills	419,786	419,786	(161,094)	37,052	(124,042)	-30%	295,744	107,663	258,692
12064	Shapiro	DSPS	1,195,453	1,195,453	(362,761)	83,435	(279,326)	-23%	916,127	750,684	832,692
12078	Wright	EOPS	1,326,604	1,326,604	(414,572)	95,352	(319,220)	-24%	1,007,383	488,630	912,032
12046	Wright	CARE	120,639	120,639	(41,053)	9,442	(31,611)	-26%	89,028	54,733	79,586
12172	McLellan	Matriculation (Credit)	922,392	922,392	(560,239)	124,225	(436,014)	-47%	486,378	446,113	362,153
12185	Arellano	Matriculation (NonCredit)	800,000	800,000	(552,397)	122,486	(429,911)	-54%	370,089	544,050	247,603
<b>Total Categorical Funds</b>			<b>4,784,873</b>	<b>4,784,873</b>	<b>(2,092,116)</b>	<b>477,991</b>	<b>(1,620,126)</b>	<b>-34%</b>	<b>3,164,748</b>	<b>2,391,873</b>	<b>2,692,757</b>

SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
UNRESTRICTED GENERAL FUND  
TENTATIVE BUDGET TO ADOPTED BUDGET  
2009-10

WORK IN PROGRESS Aug. 10, 2009

### ***Steps Taken to Achieve a Balanced Adopted Budget***

		<u>Realistic</u>	<u>Optimistic</u>
<b>Tentative Budget - Deficit Revenues under Expenditures/Transfers</b>		<b>\$ (4,419,583)</b>	<b>\$ (4,419,583)</b>
Cancel Transfers Out Equipment	100,000		
Equip - copiers	117,909		
Constr - Energy Project	250,000	\$ 467,909	\$ 467,909
International Student Additional revenue	470,500		
Additional expense	(121,000)	\$ 349,500	\$ 349,500
Budget Reduction - Credit - Target \$1,100,000		\$ 612,000	\$ 612,000
Budget Reduction - NonCredit - Target \$400,000		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
Workload reduction-Credit			
Fall 2009 cancel 100 sections		\$ 308,000	\$ 411,000
Spring 2010 cancel 100 sections		\$ 308,000	\$ 411,000
TLUs 274 x \$1,500 =	\$ 411,000		
75% of canceled courses were offered Fall 2008, potential savings can range from 75% to 100% of cost of instructors			
Workload reduction-NonCredit		\$ 345,000	\$ 345,000
Reduce 300 FTES 300 x 525 = 157,500			
Reduce 157,500 positive attendance hours			
Hours 6,300 x \$54.88 =	\$ 345,000		
Allowance for cell phone reduced		\$ 14,145	\$ 14,145
Allowance for mileage reduced		\$ 21,542	\$ 21,542
Travel reduced		\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000
Memberships reduced		\$ 16,274	\$ 16,274
Reduce Categorical Backfill			
Cancel backfill as budgeted in Tentative Budget \$1,912,877		\$ 1,912,877	\$ 1,912,877
Estimate of backfill need		\$ (900,000)	\$ (554,000)
Vacant Positions - selected positions are not filled		\$ 516,321	\$ 516,321
Revised 2009-10 State Budget - General Apportionment			
2009-10 base adjusted for 08-09 shortfall net of growth		\$ 478,399	\$ 478,399
Deficit Factor - 2009-10 revenue estimates will not hold		\$ (1,000,000)	
<b>Reduction and additional revenue identified to date</b>		<b>\$ 3,709,967</b>	<b>\$ 5,261,967</b>
<b>Remaining Shortfall</b>		<b>\$ (709,616)</b>	<b>\$ 842,384</b>

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**General Fund - Unrestricted**

**WORK IN PROGRESS August 10, 2009**

**WORK IN PROGRESS**

	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Designated Actual	2008-10 Tentative Budget	Changes Std	2008-09 Approved Budget	2009-10 Projection	Comments
<b>REVENUES</b>							
Federal	1,807	1,695	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	
State General Revenue		0			0	0	
General Apportionment	73,136,408	73,650,760	71,787,589	(152,601)	71,634,988	71,634,988	
Other State Revenue		0		0	0	0	
Part-time Faculty compensation	624,286	680,488	291,400	0	291,400	291,400	
Lottery	2,038,971	1,977,517	1,847,800	0	1,847,800	1,847,800	
Other	221,043	1,053,231	104,393	0	104,393	104,393	
Local		0		0	0	0	
Interest	725,722	479,945	300,000	0	300,000	300,000	
International Student Fees	4,442,615	5,948,178	6,498,800	430,500	6,929,300	6,929,300	
Non Resident Fees	2,916,150	3,236,684	3,411,600	0	3,411,600	3,411,600	
Other	989,477	1,704,393	1,821,340	40,000	1,861,340	1,861,340	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>85,096,479</b>	<b>88,732,891</b>	<b>86,064,622</b>	<b>317,899</b>	<b>86,382,521</b>	<b>86,382,521</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>							
Academic Salaries	39,650,106	41,466,789	41,544,128	(1,010,719)	40,533,409	40,533,409	FT Faculty Obligation ?
Classified Salaries/Hourly Pay	19,605,622	19,982,402	20,707,117	(1,125,978)	19,581,139	19,581,139	
Employee Benefits	12,774,374	13,376,646	14,326,731	(138,311)	14,188,420	15,269,420	STRS & PERS rate increase 2%
Supplies & Materials	1,988,679	1,881,995	2,569,393	2,000	2,571,393	2,571,393	
Other Operating Expenses	6,751,049	6,428,887	7,835,151	(7,274)	7,827,877	7,827,877	
Capital Outlay	241,244	120,782	272,933	0	272,933	272,933	
Other Outgo	35,047	55,774	49,585	0	49,585	49,585	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>81,046,121</b>	<b>83,313,255</b>	<b>87,305,036</b>	<b>(2,280,282)</b>	<b>85,024,756</b>	<b>86,105,756</b>	
<b>Net Revenues &amp; Operating Exp</b>	<b>4,050,358</b>	<b>5,419,636</b>	<b>(1,240,416)</b>	<b>2,598,181</b>	<b>1,357,765</b>	<b>276,765</b>	
<b>Other Financing Sources (Uses) - TRANSFERS</b>							
Intrafund In	84,993						
Intrafund Out - Catagorical Backfill		0	(1,912,877)	1,012,877	(900,000)	(900,000)	
Interfund In	119,919	186,530	305,000	0	305,000	305,000	
Interfund Out - Equipment Fund	(1,800,000)	(500,000)	(100,000)	100,000	0	(1,800,000)	Restore Transfer
Interfund Out - Equip copiers	(233,909)	(117,909)	(117,909)	117,909	0	(117,909)	Restore Transfer
Interfund Out - Equip Banner & Moodle	(161,120)				0	0	
Interfund Out - Construction Fund	(1,200,000)	(600,000)	(640,000)	0	(640,000)	(1,200,000)	Restore Transfer
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Energy Proj	(204,786)	(250,000)	(250,000)	250,000	0	(250,000)	Restore Transfer
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Loan Pymt		0	(191,846)	0	(191,846)	(191,846)	
Interfund Out - Children's Center	(163,300)	(250,000)	(271,535)	0	(271,535)	(271,535)	
	<b>(3,558,203)</b>	<b>(1,531,379)</b>	<b>(3,179,167)</b>	<b>1,480,786</b>	<b>(1,698,381)</b>	<b>(4,426,290)</b>	
<b>Excess of Revenues &amp; Other Sources over (under) Expenditures &amp; Other Uses</b>	<b>492,155</b>	<b>3,888,257</b>	<b>(4,419,583)</b>	<b>4,078,967</b>	<b>(340,616)</b>	<b>(4,149,525)</b>	
Beginning Fund Balance	10,716,965	11,209,120	15,097,377	0	15,097,377	14,756,761	
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>11,209,120</b>	<b>15,097,377</b>	<b>10,677,794</b>	<b>4,078,967</b>	<b>14,756,761</b>	<b>10,607,236</b>	
<b>Memo:</b>							
Undesignated Fund Balance		1,757,200	(2,854,583)	1,982,891	(871,692)		
Mandated Contingency (5%)		4,251,600	4,443,800	(137,400)	4,306,400		
Designation for Banked TLUs		1,120,253	1,120,253	0	1,120,253		
Deferred Payments		7,968,324	7,968,324	2,233,476	10,201,800		Deferred Pymts increase System-wide \$540M to \$703M
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>		<b>15,097,377</b>	<b>10,677,794</b>	<b>4,078,967</b>	<b>14,756,761</b>		
Ending Fund Balance - Accrual Basis		15,097,377	10,677,794		14,756,761		
State revenue deferral		(7,968,323)	(7,968,324)		(10,201,800)		
Ending Fund Balance - Cash Basis		<u>7,129,054</u>	<u>2,709,470</u>		<u>4,554,961</u>		

GENERAL FUND CASHFLOW 2008-09

Fiscal Year	2008 ACTUALS						2009 ACTUALS						TOTAL
	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	
<b>BEGINNING CASH BALANCE</b>	10,386,141	8,241,661	4,332,149	-2,325,771	17,770,244	15,953,716	23,357,801	16,483,825	18,384,378	13,614,435	18,502,185	15,512,592	10,386,141
General Apportionment				19,448,017	4,636,805	2,576,003	3,531,894	4,249,322	3,796,426	3,058,580	3,645,063	4,226,273	49,068,382
Genl Apportionmt-deferral	2,967,850						-681,495	-2,850,386	-439,508	-268,892	-211,981	-3,384,141	2,967,850
Genl Apportionmt-deferral													(7,836,402)
Sub-total	2,967,850	0	0	19,448,017	4,636,805	2,576,003	2,850,399	1,398,936	3,356,918	2,789,688	3,333,082	842,132	44,199,830
<b>Other Apportionment</b>				3,535,996	642,389	356,881	571,015	951,925	582,900	626,194	626,114	1,228,731	9,122,145
Other State Revenue			131,050						300,105			143,219	574,374
Property Tax	37,664		46,612	1,819,253	1,619,999	8,271,854	142,405	6,006	28,785	8,467,016	115,980	831,845	21,387,419
Interest	450,499			218,704			256,255			195,190		1,120,647	1,120,647
Lottery	584,830			496,086			592,279			522,197			2,195,402
Other Income	3,186,099	2,166,271	4,059,604	827,428	1,503,008	5,145,532	2,253,360	3,252,798	1,008,844	1,807,711	3,262,873	4,169,664	32,643,193
Fin Aid Reimbursement	195,130			7,092,916	562,235	335,641		6,725,923	430,396	2,240,533	516,092	398,094	18,496,961
Other	64,452	34,446	81,362	94,278	87,540	82,368	77,718	79,917	89,751	85,457	82,238	83,253	947,779
<b>Total In-Flow</b>	<b>7,486,524</b>	<b>2,200,717</b>	<b>4,318,629</b>	<b>33,632,689</b>	<b>9,051,976</b>	<b>16,768,279</b>	<b>6,743,430</b>	<b>12,415,505</b>	<b>5,797,700</b>	<b>16,733,986</b>	<b>7,941,378</b>	<b>7,696,937</b>	<b>130,687,750</b>
<b>OUT-FLOW</b>													
Monthly Payroll	-5,279,416	-3,057,187	-7,598,373	-8,644,876	-8,081,541	-7,665,910	-6,766,691	-7,679,369	-8,274,010	-7,932,169	-8,067,360	-7,765,917	(68,812,616)
Disbursements	-4,244,243	-740,832	-1,277,524	-2,642,829	-2,286,735	-1,368,191	-1,735,392	-1,587,139	178,997	-3,482,274	-2,617,405	-1,239,566	(22,943,153)
Fin Aid Disbursement	-107,344	-2,312,211	-2,100,651	-2,248,969	-500,230	-330,082	-5,115,324	-1,248,443	-2,472,630	-431,793	-246,206	-378,033	(17,491,926)
<b>Total</b>	<b>-9,631,003</b>	<b>-6,110,230</b>	<b>-10,976,548</b>	<b>-13,436,673</b>	<b>-10,868,505</b>	<b>-9,364,193</b>	<b>-13,617,407</b>	<b>-10,514,951</b>	<b>-10,567,643</b>	<b>-11,846,236</b>	<b>-10,930,971</b>	<b>-9,383,636</b>	<b>(127,247,997)</b>
<b>ENDING CASH BALANCE</b>	<b>8,241,661</b>	<b>4,332,149</b>	<b>-2,325,771</b>	<b>17,770,244</b>	<b>15,953,715</b>	<b>23,357,801</b>	<b>16,483,825</b>	<b>18,384,378</b>	<b>13,614,435</b>	<b>18,502,185</b>	<b>15,512,592</b>	<b>13,825,994</b>	<b>13,825,994</b>

Ending Balance 06-30-09	8,801,666	Unrestricted	8,801,666
Genl-Unrestricted	8,801,666	Unrestricted	8,801,666
Genl-Restricted	5,024,328	Restricted	5,024,328
	13,825,994		13,825,994

Cash-basis		
Cash	8,801,666	Unrestricted
Other Assets	2,136,477	Restricted
	10,938,143	
Total Assets	10,938,143	

Liabilities		
Fund Balance	1,064,141	Unrestricted
Total Liab & Fund Balance	9,874,002	Restricted
	10,938,143	
	10,938,143	

5% Reserve for Contingency	4,419,100
TLU Liability	1,096,590
Undesignated Fund Balance	4,358,312
Fund Balance	9,874,002
	0

GENERAL FUND CASHFLOW 2009-10

Fiscal Year	2009 PROJECTION						2010 PROJECTION						TOTAL
	July Actual	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	
<b>2009-2010</b>													
<b>BEGINNING CASH BALANCE</b>	13,825,995	17,580,898	17,838,102	17,168,489	21,442,914	19,047,969	26,114,255	18,541,884	18,366,006	12,732,012	17,008,954	12,809,290	13,825,995
<b>IN-FLOW</b>													
General Apportionment	3,781,402	3,781,402	5,762,707	4,802,206	4,322,105	2,401,103	3,292,094	3,960,822	3,538,726	2,850,980	3,304,363	3,939,373	45,737,283
2008-09 Deferral	7,836,402												7,836,402
2009-10 Deferral	-2,967,850			2,967,850									0
2009-10 Deferral													0
<b>Sub-total</b>	8,649,954	3,781,402	5,762,707	7,770,056	4,322,105	2,401,103	2,404,894	250,022	2,966,526	2,500,880	3,028,363	-466,161	43,371,851
<b>Other Apportionment</b>	399,649	421,102	428,080	537,169	483,450	268,582	429,735	716,401	438,680	471,262	437,573	894,112	5,925,795
<b>Property Tax</b>	37,700	0	46,600	1,819,300	1,620,000	8,271,900	142,400	6,000	28,800	8,467,000	116,000	831,800	21,387,500
<b>Interest</b>	450,500		218,700				256,300			195,200			1,120,700
<b>Lottery</b>	555,600		471,300				562,700			496,100			2,085,700
<b>Other Income</b>	3,186,100	2,166,300	4,059,600	827,400	1,503,000	5,145,500	2,253,400	2,842,200	1,008,800	1,807,700	2,660,900	4,169,700	31,430,600
<b>Fin Aid Reimbursement</b>	195,100	0	0	6,087,900	562,200	335,600	0	6,725,900	430,400	2,240,500	516,100	398,100	17,491,800
<b>Other</b>	64,500	34,400	81,400	94,300	87,500	82,400	77,700	79,900	89,800	85,500	87,200	83,300	947,900
<b>Total In-Flow</b>	13,539,103	6,403,204	10,378,387	17,826,125	8,578,255	16,505,085	6,127,129	10,420,423	4,963,006	16,264,142	6,846,136	5,910,851	123,761,846
<b>OUT-FLOW</b>													
Monthly Payroll	-5,301,700	-3,070,100	-7,630,400	-8,681,400	-8,115,700	-7,698,300	-6,795,300	-7,711,800	-8,308,900	-7,965,700	-8,101,400	-7,798,700	(87,179,400)
Disbursements	-4,375,200	-763,700	-1,316,900	-2,621,300	-2,357,300	-1,410,400	-1,788,900	-1,636,100	184,500	-3,588,700	-2,698,200	-1,277,800	(23,651,000)
Fin Aid Disbursement	-107,300	-2,312,200	-2,100,700	-2,249,000	-500,200	-330,100	-5,115,300	-1,248,400	-2,472,600	-431,800	-246,200	-378,000	(17,491,800)
<b>Total</b>	-9,784,200	-6,146,000	-11,048,000	-13,551,700	-10,973,200	-9,438,800	-13,699,500	-10,596,300	-10,597,000	-11,987,200	-11,045,800	-9,454,500	(128,322,200)
<b>ENDING CASH BALANCE</b>	17,580,898	17,838,102	17,168,489	21,442,914	19,047,969	26,114,255	18,541,884	18,366,006	12,732,012	17,008,954	12,809,290	9,265,641	9,265,641

**CASHFLOW ASSUMPTIONS**

General Assumption - In general, cashflow is based on 2008-09 cashflow activity levels adjusted for expected increases & decreases based on the assumptions for the estimated 2009-10 Adopted Budget

**IN-FLOW**

General Apportionment - General apportionment revenue is reduced for expected State reduction, deficit factor and deferrals  
 Other Apportionment - Categorical programs and part-time faculty funding are reduced by expected State reductions  
 Lottery - Lottery revenue is expected to decline 5% compared to 2008-09  
 Other Income - Other income is reduced for grants that have ended.

**OUT-FLOW**

Payroll - Payroll out-flow will increase slightly in keeping with the estimated 2009-10 Adopted Budget.  
 Disbursements - Disbursement out-flow will increase in keeping with the estimated 2009-10 Adopted Budget.

Ending Balance 06-30-10	
Genl-Unrestricted	4,241,313
Genl-Restricted	5,024,328
Total Cash	9,265,641
Cash-basis Fund Balance	
Cash	4,241,313
Other Assets	2,136,477
Total Assets	6,377,790
Liabilities	
Fund Balance	1,064,141
Total Liab & Fund Balance	5,313,649
5% Reserve for Contingency	4,443,800
TLU Liability	1,096,590
Undesignated Fund Balance	-226,741
Total Fund Balance	5,313,649

# **College-wide Priorities for 2009-10**

## **Draft for Discussion**

**August 25, 2009**

- a. Accreditation visit
- b. Internal and external communication regarding impact of budget reductions and other pertinent information
- c. Budget
  - i. Resolving structural imbalance
  - ii. Planning categorical programs staffing and operations beyond 2009-10
  - iii. Assessing the sustainability of reductions implemented, their impacts and how we will operate in 2010-11 and beyond
- d. Emergency preparedness
  - i. Training
  - ii. Processes
- e. Planning agendas identified in the self study
- f. Selected objectives from College Plan 2008-11; District Technology Plan 2008-11; Enrollment Management Plan 2009-11 and related implementation strategies/actions
- g. Banner 8 upgrade
- h. Preparation and application for a Title V grant

**Planning Agendas Identified in the Institutional Self Study  
for Reaffirmation of Accreditation  
August 13, 2009**

**College-wide**

1. By June 2010, evaluate the College's revised planning and resource allocation process and identify modifications needed for its improvement.
2. The Superintendent/President will bring BPAP's recommendations for policy revisions or new policies to the Board for review and approval on a regular basis. By Spring 2012, through BPAP, the College will complete the process of 1) reviewing all existing policies and procedures; 2) separating policies from procedures, as appropriate; 3) revoking obsolete policies and procedures; and 4) formatting and re-numbering, as appropriate, all existing policies and procedures using the CCLC format and numbering system. Proposed new Board policies and administrative procedures will follow the CCLC format and numbering system, as much as possible. Post all current policies and procedures to one location on the College Web site. All electronic access to College policies will be derived from a common source and multiple versions will be eliminated.
3. In 2009-10, develop a framework for regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes and conduct the evaluation.
4. In 2010-11, develop and implement a plan that responds to the evaluation of each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process.

**Information Technology/Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning**

5. Starting in 2009-10, the Information Technology and the Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning departments will expand options for timely and accurate data extraction and reporting tools available to credit and Continuing Education student support service departments.

**Educational Programs**

6. The draft of the Educational Master Plan will be completed by October 2009 and finalized by December 2009.
7. By April 2010, evaluate the extent to which eLumen is providing the SLO performance data reports needed to help inform discussions for improving student learning and achievement. The results of this assessment will be used by the SLO Coordination



Group, in consultation with the Academic Senate, the Committee on Teaching and Learning, and the Student Services SLO Coordination Group, to identify changes that could be made to improve the effectiveness of this software for capturing and reporting the data needed to document and improve student learning.

8. By September 2010, evaluate the effectiveness of the first full year of the SLO Implementation Cycle.
9. Faculty in individual departments will review SLO data comparing students in online sections with those in face-to-face sections when this data first becomes available in 2009-10. By September 2010, improvement plans will be developed based on the review of the data collected.
10. By the end of the fall 2009 semester, an online SLO training site for adjunct faculty will be completed.
11. In September 2009, the SLO Project Coordinator will work closely with the Student Senate to involve more students in the dialogue, the improvement planning process and the evaluation of SLO performance measures. The president of the Student Senate will be asked to appoint one or two students to serve as members of the SLO Coordinating Group and one or two students to serve on the Student Services SLO Coordinating Group.
12. The SLO Coordinating group will analyze data that include both instructional and student support SLOs and make recommendations for improvement.
13. By fall 2010, the Dean of Educational Programs, Technology and the Committee on Online Instruction (COI) will develop and administer a survey of online students to determine the support services students need to successfully complete their courses.
14. In 2009-10, the Dean of Educational Programs who oversees Student Development, Counseling and Matriculation will explore opportunities for more efficient and timely evaluation of external transcripts including the use of DARS, use of Optical Character Recognition technology to convert hardcopy transcripts to data files and participation in the development of emerging electronic transcript exchange systems.
15. Educational Programs staff will study the feasibility of expanding its existing support for students and faculty from a five-day per week 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. service, to one that includes nights and weekends in recognition of the 24 hour, seven day a week nature of contemporary higher education.

## **Human Resources**

16. Monitor on an ongoing basis the efficacy of performance review processes for all employee groups and make changes, as needed.

## **Information Technology**

17. By fall 2010, the Vice President for Information Technology will form a task force to establish and gather baseline data on the information technology training needs of the campus community, analyze this data, and develop training improvement plans.

## **Continuing Education**

18. The College will develop and administer a student questionnaire for Continuing Education to assess student satisfaction.
19. In 2009-10, the Continuing Education Division will use the Curriculum Oversight Committee to plan and implement the SLO Cycle for Continuing Education courses.
20. During fall 2009, Continuing Education directors and dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Continuing Education, will implement a consistent faculty evaluation plan.
21. Achieve Objective 2.5 in the College Plan 2008-11 which states that “the Continuing Education Division will initiate the Student Learning Outcomes cycle in all non-credit courses eligible for enhanced funding and complete the SLO cycle in 1/3 of the courses per year beginning academic year 2009-10.”

## **Business Services**

22. By December 2009, the Director, Facilities and Campus Development, working with appropriate staff, will develop the College’s design and construction standards and incorporate sustainable practices where appropriate.
23. By spring 2010, the Director, Facilities and Campus Development, in collaboration with appropriate staff, will revise the College’s standard construction specifications to incorporate sustainable practices where appropriate.
24. By spring 2011, the Director, Facilities and Campus Development, in collaboration with appropriate staff, will develop the College’s Integrated Pest Management to improve sustainable practices.
25. By spring 2010, the Director, Facilities and Campus Development, in collaboration with appropriate staff, will develop the College’s recycling plan to improve sustainable practices.