General Background

When the citizens of the district approved the acquisition, by bond issue, of the thirty-acre East Campus, the Board of Trustees set in motion the development of a Master Plan for construction for the entire campus. This plan was adopted by the Board in 1974. Development proceeded pretty much according to this plan until 1978, when the Jarvis-Gann initiative and the state economy brought community college capital construction to a near standstill.

As the funding picture appears to have eased somewhat, it is appropriate to reconsider the original plan in light of changed conditions ten years later. Enrollments appear to have levelled off and current projections indicate slight decreases in the future. More demand is occurring in occupational and developmental education. Numerous temporary structures still are located on the campus and need to be removed. The land once reserved for a community Performing Arts Center has been determined by the Board to be available for other uses, with primary emphasis at this time to be given to an Educational Conference Center.

A Learning Resource Center was identified as a critical need in the original Master Plan, and the need has been exacerbated by subsequent increases in enrollment and a trend to increasing use of technology in educational delivery. The Educational Conference Center continues the concept of public access that was embodied in the original Performing Arts Center, but is more consistent with on-going educational program needs. The proposed plan described herein retains the Interdisciplinary Center to house English, Math, and Social Sciences, and the Fine Arts Building in the original Master Plan has been retained with ultimate classroom use to be determined later based on needs at that time.
A. Learning Resource Center

1. Functions
   a. Library
   b. Learning Assistance Center
   c. Tutorial Center
   d. Reading/Study Skills Center
   e. Computer Assisted Instruction Laboratory
   f. English Composition/Writing Laboratory

2. Size of Project
   a.Assignable Square Feet (ASF) - 41,000
   b. Outside Gross Square Feet (OGSF) - 49,200

3. Secondary Effects (see also attached diagram)
   a. Space vacated in Library will be occupied by Admissions, Counseling, College Nurse, Student Activities, Security, Career Center, Financial Aids, Placement, EOPS, and Dean of Student Services.
   
   b. Space vacated in Humanities will be occupied by Instructional Media expansion and Computer Science expansion.
   
   c. Student Services consolidation in Library makes available space in the Administration Building which will be occupied by Accounting, Personnel or Payroll, Duplicating, and Planning/Research.
   
   d. Student Services consolidation also makes available space in the Campus Center which will be used for HRM and Food Service expansion.
   
   e. Student Services consolidation also makes available all of the SC relocatable building which will be moved and converted to Facilities and Operations.
   
   f. The above changes permit the retirement of four temporary buildings (T2, T4, T6, and say T7) and the two trailers (Tr1 and Tr2).
4. Costs of project and financing.
   a. LRC Project.
      1) Total Cost at $100/OGSF - $5,000,000
      2) District share at 40% - $2,000,000 (Assume sale of 814 Santa Barbara Street applied to this)
      3) State share at 60% - $3,000,000
   b. Cost of Secondary Effects
      | Total     | District Share (40%) |
      |-----------|----------------------|
      | 1) Remodel Library | $375,000*          | $150,000     |
      | 2) Remodel Administration | 100,000*  | 40,000       |
      | 3) Remodel Campus Center   | 50,000*          | 20,000       |
      | 4) Move/remodel SC Bldg.   | 75,000*          | 30,000       |
      | 5) Remodel Humanities      | 125,000*         | 50,000       |
      | 6) Retire T-Bldgs/Trailers | 50,000**         | 20,000       |
      | Totals                    | 775,000          | 310,000      |

* Based on $25/ASF
** Does not take into account possible resale value of these buildings.
A. Learning Resource Center (continued)

5. Steps/Timeline

a. Learning Resource Center

1) Hire EIR consultant (est. cost - $7500) 8/23/84
2) Submit PPP to Chanc. Off. 9/15/84
3) Complete EIR 11/1/84
4) EIR Hearing 1/10/85
5) Coastal Act review complete 1/1/85
6) Chanc.Off. approval of PPP 1/15/85
7) Dept. of Finance approval of PPP 5/1/85
8) City of SB ABR preliminary review 6/1/85
9) Legislative approval of budget 6/15/85
10) Governor final approval of budget 7/1/85
11) Start working drawings 8/1/85
12) Complete working drawings 4/1/86
13) Final ABR approval 6/1/86
14) Go to bid 7/1/86
15) Begin construction 9/1/86
16) Complete construction 3/1/88

b. Secondary Effects

1) Submit PPG 2/1/86
2) Environmental review (Categ. Exemption) 6/1/86
3) Submit PPP 9/15/86
4) Chanc.Off. approval of PPP 1/15/87
5) Dept. of Finance approval of PPP 5/1/87
6) Coastal Act review of project 6/1/87
7) Legislative approval of budget 6/15/87
8) Governor final approval of budget 7/1/87
9) Start working drawings 8/1/87
10) Complete minor remodel - Humanities 11/1/87
11) Complete working drawings - Library 1/1/88
12) Receive bids for Library remodel 3/1/88
13) Start construction - Library 3/15/88
14) Complete working drawings - Admin. Bldg. 7/1/88
15) Receive bids Admin. Bldg. remodel 9/1/88
16) Complete construction - Library 10/1/88
17) Start construction - Admin. Bldg. 11/15/88
18) Move and remodel SC Bldg 12/1/88
19) Retire Trailer #1 1/1/89
20) Complete construction - Admin. Bldg. 3/1/89
21) Complete minor remodel - Campus Center 3/1/89
22) Retire T2,T4,T6,T7,Trailer #2 4/1/89
A. Learning Resource Center (continued)

6. Board Decision Points
   a. Learning Resource Center

1) Approve hiring EIR consultant        8/23/84
2) Approve PPP submittal               9/13/84
3) Set EIR hearing                     12/13/84
4) Conduct EIR hearing                 1/10/85
5) Certify EIR                         1/10/85
6) Determine initial fiscal feasibility 6/30/85
7) Approve architectural contract      7/15/85
8) Approve drawings                    5/ 1/86
9) Re-examine fiscal feasibility       6/30/86
10) Authorize bids                     5/15/86
11) Enter construction contract        8/15/86
12) Accept building                    3/ 1/87

b. Secondary effects
   1) Approve PPG submittal              2/ 1/86
   2) Approve environmental review       6/ 1/86
   3) Approve PPP submittal              9/ 1/86
   4) Approve architect(s)               8/ 1/87
   5) Approve drawings and authorize bids -
       Library Bldg.                      1/15/88
   6) Enter contract to remodel Library   3/ 1/88
   7) Approve drawings and authorize bids -
       Admin. Bldg.                      7/15/88
   8) Enter construction contract - Adm. Bldg.10/ 1/88
   9) Accept building - Library          10/ 1/88
  10) Approve retirement of T-Bldgs & Trailers 1/ 1/89
  11) Accept building - Admin. Bldg.     3/ 1/89
B. Educational Conference Center

1. Functions
   a. Pre-function foyer
   b. Auditorium
   c. Banquet room
   d. Banquet kitchen
   e. Contract food service
   f. Support facilities for banquet/contract
   g. Lecture/demo rooms
   h. HRM Library
   i. Porte Cochere
   j. Staff offices
   k. Lobby/front desk
   l. Baggage room
   m. Computer room
   n. Educational display area
   o. Recreational areas
   p. Staff conference room
   q. Guest rooms
   r. Coffee shop
   s. Gourmet dining room
   t. Laundry/linen storage
   u. Locker rooms

2. Size of Project
   a. Assignable Square Feet (ASF) -
      94,249 square feet plus circulation space
   b. Outside Gross Square Feet (OGSF) -
      Approximately 108,000 gross square feet

3. Secondary Effects - None

4. Costs of project and financing
   a. Educational Conference Center
      1) Total cost at $100/OGSF - $10,800,000
         plus $2M for parking $ 2,000,000
         $12,800,000
      2) District share at 100% - $12,800,000
         Funds to be raised through contributions and/or revenue bonds.
   b. Cost of secondary effects - None
B. Educational Conference Center (continued)

5. Steps/Timeline

a. Educational Conference Center

1) Concept approval by Bd. of Trustees 10/1/84
2) Evaluate funding options & feasibility 10/1/84
3) Contract with architect for prel. plans 10/15/84
4) Define scope of EIR 10/15/84
5) Concept approval by ABR 12/1/84
6) Geologic study 1/1/85
7) Complete preliminary plans 2/1/85
8) Start fund raising efforts 2/1/85
9) Contract for EIR (est. $20,000-30,000) 2/15/85
10) Complete EIR 4/15/85
11) Environmental hearing 5/1/85
12) Coastal Act review 6/1/85
13) Planning Commission development review 6/1/85
14) City ABR preliminary review 7/15/85
15) Submit to Chanc. Off. for review 3/1/85
16) Contract with architect for work'g dwgs 7/1/85
17) Start working drawings 8/1/85
18) Complete working drawings 5/1/86
19) City ABR final review 6/1/86
20) Complete fund-raising incl. bond issue 7/1/86
21) Go to bid 7/1/86
22) Receive bids and award contract 9/1/86
23) Complete construction 2/1/88

b. Secondary effects - None

6. Board Decision Points

a. Educational Conference Center

1) Concept approval 10/1/84
2) Approve contract w/architect (prel.plan) 10/15/84
3) Approve contract for geologic study 12/1/84
4) Approve fund-raising plan 2/1/85
5) Approve preliminary plans 2/15/85
6) Approve contract for EIR 2/15/85
7) Conduct environmental hearing 6/1/85
8) Approve working drawings 6/1/86
9) Approval to bid 6/1/86
10) Approve contract w/architect (wrkg dwg) 7/1/85
11) Approve contractor 9/1/86
12) Accept building 2/1/88

b. Secondary effects - None
C. Interdisciplinary Center

1. Functions
   a. Classrooms and offices for - 
      1) English
      2) Social Science
      3) Mathematics

2. Size of project
   a. Assignable square feet (ASF) - 14,800
   b. Outside gross square feet (OGSF) - 17,750

3. Secondary effects
   a. Retire T8, T9, T10, T11, T12
   b. Retire Social Science Center
   c. Retire R-Building

4. Costs of project and financing
   a. Interdisciplinary Center
      1) Total cost at $100/OGSF - $1,775,000
      2) District share at 40% - $710,000
      3) State share at 60% - $1,065,000
   b. Cost of secondary effects
      1) Retire T8 through T12 - $50,000  $20,000
      2) Retire Social Science Ctr  10,000  4,000
      3) Retire R-Building  10,000  4,000
      70,000  28,000
D. Additional West Campus Building

1. Functions - Undefined at this time but possibly Computer Science, Computer Maintenance, Electronics, or other High Technology

2. Size of project
   a. Assignable square feet (ASF) - 8,700
   b. Outside gross square feet (OGSF) - 10,500

3. Secondary effects
   a. Dependent upon definition of functions. Could use vacated space to meet remaining unmet needs as listed under E. below

4. Costs of project and financing
   a. Fourth building
      1) Total at $100/OGSF - $1,050,000
      2) District share at 40% - $420,000
      3) State share at 60% - $630,000
   b. Secondary effects - Depends upon definition of functions.
E. Remaining unmet facility needs

1. Warehouse  
   Approx. 4,000-6,000 ASF

2. Bookstore  
   Approx. 5,200 ASF

3. Handicapped Student Services  
   Approx. 2,000 ASF

4. Basic Skills Center  
   Approx. 1,000 ASF

Total ASF  
12,200-14,200
S.B.C.C. HOTEL & RESTAURANT DEPT.  

ESTIMATED INCOME & EXPENSE  

100 GUEST ROOMS AT E.C.C.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Rooms @ $80./day</td>
<td>$7200.</td>
<td>$6800.</td>
<td>$6400.</td>
<td>$6000.</td>
<td>$5600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor 15%</td>
<td>1080.</td>
<td>1020.</td>
<td>960.</td>
<td>900.</td>
<td>840.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen 5%</td>
<td>360.</td>
<td>340.</td>
<td>320.</td>
<td>300.</td>
<td>260.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance 3%</td>
<td>216.</td>
<td>204.</td>
<td>192.</td>
<td>180.</td>
<td>168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities 4%</td>
<td>268.</td>
<td>272.</td>
<td>256.</td>
<td>240.</td>
<td>224.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone 2%</td>
<td>144.</td>
<td>136.</td>
<td>128.</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 1%</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>68.</td>
<td>64.</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Promotion 3%</td>
<td>216.</td>
<td>204.</td>
<td>192.</td>
<td>180.</td>
<td>168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maint, 5%</td>
<td>360.</td>
<td>340.</td>
<td>320.</td>
<td>300.</td>
<td>280.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. 10%</td>
<td>720.</td>
<td>680.</td>
<td>640.</td>
<td>600.</td>
<td>560.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Supp. 2%</td>
<td>144.</td>
<td>136.</td>
<td>128.</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES 50%</td>
<td>$3600.</td>
<td>$3400.</td>
<td>$3200.</td>
<td>$3000.</td>
<td>$2800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFIT BEFORE TAXES, DEPRECIATION, MORTGAGE</td>
<td>$3600.</td>
<td>$3400.</td>
<td>$3200.</td>
<td>$3000.</td>
<td>$2800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFIT 365 DAYS/YEAR</td>
<td>$1,314,000.</td>
<td>$1,241,000.</td>
<td>$1,168,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,022,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFIT 300 DAYS/YEAR</td>
<td>1,080,000.</td>
<td>1,020,000.</td>
<td>960,000.</td>
<td>900,000.</td>
<td>840,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment b.  
8/9/84
### S.B.C.C. HOTEL & RESTAURANT DEPT.

#### ESTIMATED INCOME & EXPENSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Desk</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>120.</td>
<td>120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellhops</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td>80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head housekeeper (1)</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>70.</td>
<td>70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1080.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1020.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$960.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$900.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$840.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Labor will not be this high as H.R.M. students are learning and not being paid.*

*When no educational seminars, room rates will be $100. per night and up.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Guests</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast $3.</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch $5.</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner $8.</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee break .50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$14.50 TOTAL DAILY SALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER DAYS/YEAR</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALES 100%</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>$206,250</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$74,250</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD 35%</td>
<td>173,250</td>
<td>72,187.5</td>
<td>46,200</td>
<td>25,987.5</td>
<td>11,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS PROFIT 65%</td>
<td>$321,750</td>
<td>$134,062.5</td>
<td>$85,800</td>
<td>$48,262.5</td>
<td>$21,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor 35%</th>
<th>173,250</th>
<th>72,187.5</th>
<th>46,200</th>
<th>25,987.5</th>
<th>11,550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities 5%</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>10,312.5</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,712.5</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance 3%</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td>6,187.5</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>2,227.5</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen 1%</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>2,062.5</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>742.5</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning 1%</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>2,062.5</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>742.5</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement 1%</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>2,062.5</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>742.5</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Maint. 1%</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>2,062.5</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>742.5</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. 8%</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>10,560</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 55%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>$272,250</th>
<th>$113,437.5</th>
<th>$72,600</th>
<th>$40,837.5</th>
<th>$18,150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET 10% PROFIT</td>
<td>$49,500</td>
<td>$20,625</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$7,425</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NET PROFIT $94,050.00

Other income to be derived from events other than conferences, such as dinner shows, Continuing Education dinner speakers, etc.
Burton Miller  
Administrative Assistant  
to the Superintendent  
Santa Barbara Community  
College District  
721 Cliff Drive  
Santa Barbara, CA 93109-9990

Dear Burt:

You have asked whether the Community College District must obtain a Coastal Development permit from the City of Santa Barbara in connection with the development on the City College Campus.

In response to your request, I am enclosing a copy of an opinion of the Attorney General (65 Ops.Cal. Atty.Gen.88) wherein it is concluded that generally public agencies are required to obtain Coastal Development permits from a City in order to develop public property located within that portion of the coastal zone under the City's jurisdiction, where the City's local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the Coastal Act. Although the opinion dealt specifically with counties and the state, the conclusion expressed in the opinion would apply equally to a community college district.

You will note that at page 93 of the opinion, there is reference to an alternative whereby a plan for public works may be submitted to the Coastal Commission for approval. If this process is followed, a case by case review by the City would not be necessary (see Section 30605, Public Resources Code, copy enclosed). You may wish to inquire of the Coastal Commission concerning this alternative.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH L. NELSON, COUNTY COUNSEL

By DON H. VICKERS
DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL

DHV:mjv
Enclosures (2)
According to local ordinances, a city council or county board of supervisors may review decisions of a city or county building department in interpreting and enforcing the provisions of sections 19935-19959. Where an appeals board has been created, the decision would take the place of the building department's decision and be reviewable as such to the city council or board of supervisors if local law so provides.

We have found no expression of legislative intent in the statutory scheme as a whole to support a contrary conclusion. While the Legislature has directed local building departments to administer the access provisions, we do not believe it has addressed the issue of whether a local building department's decision may be reviewed by a city council, board of supervisors, or another body. The designation of the building department as the enforcement agency (§ 19958) merely reflects the fact that the access requirements would normally be within its area of expertise rather than within the province of some other department such as police, fire, or sanitation. Also, the specification of certain qualifications for members of an appeals board (§ 19957, subd. (b)) cannot be said to preclude review outside the building department appeals board process.

Although the issue is a close one, we believe that in order for the Legislature to deny review of city and county building department decisions by locally elected representatives, more expressive language is required than is now contained in sections 19935-19959. This is especially true in this field of the law where the "home rule" constitutional grant of authority to charter cities and counties and counties to affect such a legislative decision (See Cal. Const., art. XI, §§ 3-5; San Mateo County Organization of Public Eutlities v. Gemein (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 296, 315-316; Rivera v. City of Fresno (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 132, 135; Soto, supra, at pp. 1077-1081.)

In answer to the third question, we conclude that a city council or a county board of supervisors may render the same decisions for the same matters as could be rendered by an appeals board appointed pursuant to section 19957.5 if local law so provides.

Opinion No. 81-1114—January 28, 1982

SUBJECT: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT. With certain specified exceptions, counties and the states are required to obtain a coastal development permit from a city in order to develop public property located within that portion of the coastal zone under the city's jurisdiction, where the city's local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976.

REQUESTED BY: CHIEF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA, CIVIL DIVISION

OPINION BY: GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General

Roxinoy O. Lijjagh, Deputy

The Honorable William A. Shank, Chief Assistant Attorney General of California, Civil Division, has requested an opinion on the following question:

Are counties and the state required to obtain a coastal development permit from a city in order to develop public property located within that portion of the coastal zone under the city's jurisdiction, where the city's local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976?

CONCLUSION

With certain specified exceptions, counties and the state are required to obtain a coastal development permit from a city in order to develop public property located within that portion of the coastal zone under the city's jurisdiction, where the city's local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act 1976.

ANALYSIS

The Legislature has enacted a comprehensive statutory scheme (Pub. Res. Code, §§ 30000-30900) recently amended (Stats. 1981, ch. 1173) and known as the California Coastal Act of 1976 (§ 30000; hereafter "Act") to accomplish the following basic purposes:

(a) Protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and man-made resources.

(b) Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state.

(c) Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.

(d) Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast.

(e) Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation in preparing procedures to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses, including educational uses, in the coastal zone." (§ 30001.5)

The Legislature has made this abundantly clear by defining "building department" for purposes of the statute where as "the department, bureau, or office charged with the enforcement of laws or ordinances regulating the erection or construction, or both the erection and construction, of buildings." (§ 19938.1)
city regulation, and in this case has done so in the provisions of the Act.

"The state's immunity from local regulations is merely an extension of the concept of sovereign immunity. (Board of Trustees v. City of Los Angeles (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 45, 49.) When the state engages in sovereign activities, "it is not subject to local regulations unless the Constitution says it is or the Legislature has consented to such regulation." (Hall v. City of Taft, supra, 47 Cal. 2d 177, 183, italics added; see Board of Trustees v. City of Los Angeles, supra, 49 Cal. App. 3d 45, 50; City of Orange v. Valenti (1974) 37 Cal. App. 2d 240, 241.)"
ment proposed within the area to which such certified local coastal program, or any portion thereof, applies and shall at that time be delegated to the local government that is implementing such local coastal program or any portion there-

"(b) Subdivision (a) shall not apply to any development proposed or undertaken on any tidelands, submerged lands, or on public trust lands, whether filled or unfilled, lying within the coastal zone, nor shall it apply to any development proposed or undertaken within ports covered by Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 30700) or within any state university or college within the coastal zone, however, this section shall apply to any development proposed or undertaken by a port or harbor district or authority on lands or waters granted by the Legislature to a local government whose certified local coastal program includes the specific development plans for such district authority."  

(Indels added.)

Subdivision (a) of section 30519 transfers development review authority to the local government after certification of the local coastal program. Subdivision (b) of the statute provides certain limited exceptions to this transfer of control.

Significantly, the Legislature would not have excluded development located, for example, within a state university or college under subdivision (b), if public property in general was not to be subject to the issuance of permits by the local government under subdivision (a) of the statute. We must construe section 30519 in a manner that avoids surplusage and renders every word and phrase meaningful. (See Wells v. Marina Cities Properties, Inc. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 781, 788; Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 114.)

Moreover, as was stated in Wildlife Alive v. Chickering (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 190, 195, "Under the familiar rule of construction, expressio unius est exclusio alterius, where exceptions to a general rule are specified by statute, other exceptions are not to be implied or presumed. [Citations.]" Since certain public property is excluded from the transfer of the authority to the local government, other public property is presumed to be covered by subdivision (a) of section 30519.

Having cities issue permits to counties and the state under section 30519 is also consistent with other statutory directives contained in the Act. A statute is to be construed in context and harmonized with the other provisions of the statutory scheme as a whole. (California Mfrs. Assn. v. Public Utilities Comm. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 816, 844; Meyer v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 222, 230.)

In section 30003, the Legislature mandates that "[t]he public agencies . . . shall comply with the provisions of this division." In section 30009, the Legislature directs, "This division shall be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes and objectives."

1Although the rule of construction "is inapplicable where its operation would contravene a discernible and contrary legislative intent" (Wildlife Alive v. Chickering, supra, 18 Cal. 3d 190, 195), in application it contains here with the general legislative purposes of the Act. The local goals of the Act enunciated in section 30001.5 are in applicable to state-owned and county-owned property as to private property.

In section 30005.5, the Legislature recognizes that it has given authority to local governments in section 30519 that would not otherwise be within the scope of the powers of local governments. The statute provides:

"Nothing in this division shall be construed to authorize any local government, or to authorize the commission to require any local government, to exercise any power it does not already have under the Constitution and laws of this state or that is not specifically delegated pursuant to section 30519."  

(Emphasis added.)

If section 30519 had not been mentioned in section 30005.5, an entirely different analysis and conclusion may well have been necessary. As it is, the various provisions of the Act are consistent with each other.

It is important to note that we do not have here the usual case of a city "regulating" the sovereign activities of the state. A coastal development permit must be given where the proposed development is in conformity with the certified local coastal program. (§ 30604, subd. (b).) It is the California Coastal Commission, a state body, (§ 30000), that certifies local coastal programs (§§ 30512-30513) and may at times actually prepare them (see §§ 30560, 30517.5), while all amendments of local coastal programs must be certified by the commission (§§ 30514). Not only must local coastal programs meet the requirements of state law (see §§ 30512-30513), but the commission has the duty to see that the programs are being implemented in accordance with the provisions of the Act (§ 30519.5). The state's involvement in the creation and implementation of local coastal programs is pervasive. (See §§ 30000, subd. (b), 30510.5.)

Finally, it must be observed that the Legislature has provided an alternative to the provisions of section 30519 with regard to "public works." Under section 30605, after certification of a local coastal program, a plan for public works may be submitted to the California Coastal Commission for approval. Approval under the statutes is required, however, only after the commission "shall, after full consultation with the affected local governments, that the proposed plan for public works is in conformity with certified local coastal programs in jurisdictions affected by the proposed public works." If the plan is approved, section 30605 states that "any subsequent review by the commission of a specific project contained in such certified coastal program shall be limited to improving conditions consistent with Sections 30607 and 30607.1." Hence, under the alternative provisions of section 30605, a local coastal program would still control the proposed public works development, but the California Coastal Commission rather than the local government would actually grant the permit.

In answer to the question presented, therefore, we conclude that with certain limited exceptions specified in subdivision (b) of section 30519 and in section 30605, com-
ties and the state are required to obtain a coastal development permit from a city in order to develop public property located within that portion of the coastal zone under the city's jurisdiction, where the city's local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

FEBRUARY 1982

Opinion No. 81-301—January 29, 1982

SUBJECT: DISQUALIFICATION OF PERSON WITH FELONY CONVICTION FROM HOLDING JOB INVOLVING CUSTODY OF WARDS—The 1980 amendment to Penal Code § 830.5 disqualified a person with a felony conviction from holding a job that requires having custody of wards in an institution operated by the probation department in a general law county. Such disqualification applies to employees working in such positions before the effective date of the amendment. Relief granted under Penal Code § 1203.4 would not remove such disqualification.

Requested by: COUNTY COUNSEL, ORANGE COUNTY

Opinion by: GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General

Randy S. Sawada, Deputy

The Honorable Adrian Kuyper, County Counsel for the County of Orange, has requested opinions on three questions we have rephrased as follows:

1. Does the 1980 amendment to Penal Code section 830.5 disqualify a person with a felony conviction from holding a job that requires having custody of wards in an institution operated by the probation department in a general law county?

2. Would such disqualification apply to employees working in such positions before the effective date of the amendment?

3. Would relief granted under Penal Code section 1203.4 remove such disqualification?

CONCLUSIONS

1. The 1980 amendment to Penal Code section 830.5 disqualifies a person with a felony conviction from holding a job that requires having custody of wards in an institution operated by the probation department in a general law county.

2. Such disqualification applies to employees working in such positions before the effective date of the amendment.

3. Relief granted under Penal Code section 1203.4 would not remove such disqualification.

ANALYSIS

Penal Code section 830.5, as amended in 1980 (Stats. 1980, ch. 1340, eff. 9/10/80), states in relevant part:

"The following persons are peace officers .... [A]ny .... employee having custody of wards in any institution operated by a probation depart-
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property is to be acquired by a public agency when the application for such a 
resubmitted.
(Amended by Stats.1978, c. 1075, p. 3304, § 14, urgency, eff. Sept. 26, 1978; Stats.1978, 
§ 7.)
1978 Amendment. Added the last sentence to subd. (a) and rewrote subd. (d).
1979 Amendment. Inserted in subd. (d) "within the 
coastal zone" following "proposed development" and 
added subd. (e).
Administrative Code References
Coastal development permits issued by local govern-
ments, see 14 Cal.Admin. Code 13300 et seq.

Notes of Decisions
1. In general
With certain specified exceptions, counties and the 
state are required to obtain a coastal development permit 
from a city in order to develop public property located 
within that portion of the coastal zone under the city's 
jurisdiction, where the city's coastal program has been 
certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 

§ 30605. Public works or state university or college or private university long-
development plans

To promote greater efficiency for the planning of any public works or state unive-
private university development projects and as an alternative to project-by-project 
public works or state university or college or private university long-range land use 
can be submitted to the * * * commission for review in the same manner prescribed 
local coastal programs as set forth in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 30600), 
for public works or state university or college development project is submitted pri-
the local coastal programs for the jurisdictions affected by the proposed * * * 
commission shall certify whether the proposed plan is consistent with * * * Chap-
with Section 30200). The commission shall, by regulation, provide for the submission 
the public, prior to public hearings on the plan, detailed environmental informa-
the consistency of the plans with the policies of such plans. Any such plan for public 
works is submitted after the certification of local coastal plan shall be approved by the commission only if it finds, after full consultation with 
governments, that the proposed plan for public works is in conformity with certain 
programs in jurisdictions affected by the proposed public works. Each state unive-
private university shall coordinate and consult with local government in the prepara-
development plans so as to be consistent, to the fullest extent feasible, with the 
coastal program. Where a plan for a public works or state university or college or 
development project has been certified by the commission, any subsequent review of 
of a specific project contained in the certified plan shall be limited to imposing out 
with Sections 30607 and 30607.1. A certified long-range development plan may be 
state university or college or private university; but no * * * amendment shall be 
taken certified by the commission. Any proposed amendment shall be submitted to, 
the * * * commission in the same manner as prescribed for amendment of a local 
(Amended by Stats.1983, c. 600, p. ——, § 1.)

Administrative Code References
Colleges and universities, long range development plans, see 14 Cal.Admin. Code 13500 et seq.

Notes of Decision
1. In general
With certain specified exception state are required to obtain a coastal from a city in order to develop pu
§ 30605

Note 1

within that portion of the coastal zone under the city’s jurisdiction, where the city’s local coastal program has been certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976 (§ 30000 et seq.), 65 Ops.Am.Gen. 88, 1-28-82.

§ 30606. Public works or state university or college or private university long range land use development; notice of impending development

Prior to the commencement of any development pursuant to Section 30605, the public agency proposing the public works project, or state university or college or private university, shall notify the commission and other interested persons, organizations, and governmental agencies of the impending development and provide data to show that it is consistent with the certified public works plan or long-range development plan. No development shall take place within 30 working days after the notice.

(Amended by Stats. 1983, c. 600, p. —, § 2)

Administrative Code References

Colleges and universities, long range development plans, see 14 Cal.Admin. Code 13000 et seq.

§ 30607. Permit; terms and conditions

Administrative Code References

Revocation of permits, see 14 Cal.Admin. Code 13104 et seq.

Notes of Decisions

Terms and conditions 2.5

2.5. Terms and conditions

Imposition of parking regulations as a condition to granting application by petitioner to construct restaurant in order to provide adequate parking for customers using restaurant was within power of the coastal commission and, given need for more parking in area in fact that other restaurants had not satisfied need for parking with amount of parking area required of them, was neither unreasonable nor arbitrary and did not contravene principles of due process or equal protection. Liberty v. California Coastal Commission (1989) 170 Cal.Rptr. 247, 111 C.A.3d 491.

3. Review

Where owner of beachfront lot sought permit to build residence on beachfront, where regional commission voted to grant permit with certain conditions included and owner filed appeal to coastal zone conservation commission, which determined that appeal raised substantial issue, but where, before de novo public hearing could be held, owner arranged to sell property to individual who had no objection to condition, and where commission determined that it would no longer proceed on the matter, homeowner’s association, which had noticed all administrative proceedings but did not appear, failed to exhaust available administrative remedies and was precluded from seeking judicial review. La Costa Beach Homeowners Assn v. Wayne (1979) 152 Cal.Rptr. 359, 59 C.A.3d 327.

§ 30607.1. Wetlands site and fill development; mitigation measures

§ 30607.2. Low or moderate income housing; incorporation of conditions into coastal development permits; amendment or modification

(a) Conditions requiring housing for persons and families of low or moderate income, as defined in Section 50063 of the Health and Safety Code, which were incorporated into a coastal development permit issued prior to January 1, 1982, may, at the request of the permittee, be amended or modified by the commission or by a local government having the authority to issue coastal development permits. In approving such amendments or modifications, only those conditions and requirements authorized by Section 55500 of the Government Code may be imposed on the permittee.

(b) Any person who, prior to January 1, 1982, has been issued a coastal development permit containing requirements for low and moderate-income housing but who, prior to January 1, 1982, has not performed substantial work on the development site (such as grading, installation of streets, sewers or utilities or construction of major buildings) may elect to proceed under either of the following options:

1. To proceed pursuant to all of the requirements of the coastal development permit, in which event the provisions of subdivision (a) shall apply to any subsequent request to amend or alter the coastal development permit in regard to housing requirements.

2. To proceed without complying with the housing requirements contained in the coastal development permit, in which event the housing requirements for the development shall be governed by Section 65590 of the Government Code.

Underline indicates changes or additions by amendment.
July 26, 1984

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Lana Rose, Executive Director, The Foundation for SBCC

RE: Status Report on The Foundation

History

In 1976 The Foundation for Santa Barbara City College was established as a tax exempt corporation for the purpose of receiving gifts of cash and property for the benefit of the departments and programs of the college. Mr. Sam Wake, in his retirement, agreed to direct the operations of The Foundation. He ably led The Foundation through the ensuing years, until his second retirement in 1983.

One year ago I was hired as a half-time Executive Director, and continued my duties on campus in biology for the other half-time. During this period of time, The Foundation has acquired its first real estate, another limited partnership and a generous grant for the art department, as well as doubling the number of donors.

In the last six months it has become apparent to me and to our Board of Directors that the nature of the operations of The Foundation has changed. The volume and complexity of operations has increased and, if maximum effectiveness is to be attained, the organization needs to continue to grow.

Present

The Executive Committee and the Board of The Foundation has taken a thorough and comprehensive look at the present status of our capabilities. We have benefited from professional consultation and Board discussions concerning ways of maximizing both the effectiveness of the operation and of the Board itself.

As an outcome of these meetings and discussions, three funding options were presented to the Board for review at its annual meeting July 19, 1984. While it was generally agreed that The Foundation should proceed as quickly as possible toward Option 3 (see attachment A), it was also clear that the current state of internal readiness and financial capability would not support such a move at this time. The Board unanimously recommended to proceed with Option 1, which provides for a full-time executive director, purchase of a computer, and the addition of two half-time positions for donor research and data entry.
Future

The specific objectives for 1984-85 are outlined in Attachment B-D. Broadly, the decisions of The Foundation Board involve:

a) Implementing the Option 1 budget;
b) Offering a full-time contract to the present executive director;
c) Establishing a state of internal readiness to allow for a professional fundraiser to be hired as soon as is feasible.

Specific Considerations for the Trustees

The most valued contribution to be made to The Foundation by the Board of Trustees is their continued support and recognition of the efforts of The Foundation itself. The dedicated community volunteers who serve on behalf of the college are an invaluable resource to SBCC. The Foundation's Board of Directors continue to give of their time, expertise and money to augment and enhance the quality of education at our institution. The Trustees' support of these efforts is most desirable.

One specific need of The Foundation which deserves scrutiny is the need for additional space. The Foundation offices currently occupy one room at the Schott Center approximately 200 square feet in size. On the short term, it is imperative that there be more space available to us. In considering the long term space needs of the college, The Foundation should be carefully considered for on-campus facilities which would accommodate the staff of Option 3.

The Trustees may also want to consider, as recommended by the Board of The Foundation, assumption of some financial responsibility for the operations of The Foundation. Portions of staff salaries could be contributed by the college general budget, for example. In addition, purchase of the computer and accessories by the college would greatly relieve The Foundation budget. Since there is real dollar-and-cents benefit to the college, this financial support would certainly be justifiable.

Summary

The Foundation is moving out of its childhood into an energetic adolescence. If full maturity is to be achieved, the trend toward professionalism must continue to be pursued. While financial independence is still in the future, the commitment toward recruitment of secure funding continues to be a primary goal. We hope that we can continue to count on the encouragement you have all given us in the past, so that we can meet our new challenges with unity, pride...and success!
### 1984-85 Staffing and Resources

**OPTION #1**
Present structure augmented by full time Exec. Dir., 2 other full-time functions (data entry, research); computer; operational expenditures. Minimal use of professional consultants (phonathon only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>$29,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>45 hrs/wk</td>
<td>14,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraiser</td>
<td>20 hrs/wk</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>12 hrs/wk</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry</td>
<td>10 hrs/month</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $51,795

**OPERATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer/Printer/Software</th>
<th>5,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (IBM Selectric)</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions/Books</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance/Legal Services</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $17,650

**OPTION #2**
Present structure, with augmentation of #1 plus use of professional consultants on project basis; additional secretarial/research support for consultants; additional operational augmentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>$29,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>85 hrs/wk</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraiser</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry</td>
<td>30 hrs/wk</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>20 hrs/month</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $89,940

**OPTION #3**
Expanded structure, including that of Option #2 plus full-time fundraiser, including benefits; additional operational augmentation to support fundraiser position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>$29,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>85 hrs/wk</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraiser</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>30 hrs/month</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $126,440

**Projected Income**

- Net = $54,000, gross = $70,000
- Net = $95,000, gross = $123,000
- Net = $138,000, gross = $196,000

**NOTE:**

**Represents 130% increase over 1983-84. This is seen as a minimal budget.**
Proposed Objectives 1984-85

1. Continue soliciting funds for and building the Operational Endowment, funded with property, partnerships, stock and other income generating donations.

2. Begin planning for capital campaigns to solicit donations for the new Library and Educational Conference Center.

3. Expand the Annual Fund:
   a. Establish gift clubs and activities/benefits.
   b. Separate mailing list into target groups (e.g., parents, adult education, students).
   c. Develop solicitation appeals to different target groups.

4. Computerize operations:
   a. Purchase computer, printer and software; hire ½-time data entry person.
   b. Computerize donor files, mailing list and financial accounting.
   c. Purchase software for wordprocessing (appreciation letters, solicitation materials, correspondence, office business).
   d. Investigate purchase of software for estate analysis.

5. Reanalyze investment of accounts to maximize return on investments.


7. Establish Board committees to:
   a. Recruit and manage volunteers.
   b. Investigate and research grant proposals.
   c. Manage properties.

8. Offer estate planning seminars for donors.

9. Investigate and operationalize SBCC payroll deductions for contributions to The Foundation.

10. Operationalize the Development Council - estimate November 1984
    a. Monitor campus fundraising
    b. Advise Foundation on campus priorities for solicitation of donations.

11. Continue recruiting funds for additional scholarships.

-more-
12. Continue to streamline operations of Foundation:
   a. Bring Foundation in line with payroll, unemployment, social
      security and insurance requirements.
   b. Continue refinement and expansion of mailing list.
   c. Standardize letterhead, "reminder forms", community relations
      folders and so forth.
   d. Publish newsletter.
   e. Determine best use of advisory groups (ie: Dean Witter group).
   f. Install new telephone system - two lines, hold button.

13. Move offices to larger quarters.

14. Proceed with follow-up on projects:
   a. Tuohy grant
   b. Audit
   c. Klinger/Horticulture Dept. project
   d. Business and corporation contacts.
   e. Other follow-up as needed.
THE FOUNDATION FOR SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

JOB DESCRIPTION - Executive Director

The Executive Director shall serve as the chief executive officer of The Foundation and be responsible for administering The Foundation activities under the direction of The Foundation's Board of Directors, President, and Executive Committee.

S/he shall be responsible for:

A. Planning and Evaluation

1. Develop for review and adoption by the Board of Directors concise and operational short-term (one year) and long-term (five years) action plans.

2. Develop criteria for evaluating the achievements of The Foundation.

3. Conduct a formal review (evaluation) of Foundation activities with the Executive Committee and Board of Directors by June 30 of each year.

B. Administration and Supervision

1. Supervising office personnel and making recommendations regarding hiring, terminating, and establishment of staff salaries.

2. Preparation of agendas in consultation with the president, secretary, and/or chairperson of each committee.

3. Preparation of minutes of all meetings, to be mailed to members involved, with original to be kept in office file.

4. Maintaining accurate records of all gifts and donations of materials to the College through The Foundation, including items sold or disposed of by departments.

5. Attendance at College meetings relating to The Foundation.

6. Preparation of regular reports to the Executive Committee and Board of Directors at quarterly meetings, or as requested by the President or Executive Committee.

7. Maintenance of and addition to The Foundation's mailing list, and development of specialized mailing lists by category of donor.
The Foundation for SBCC
Job Description – Executive Director

8. Working closely with Foundation officers in all procedural matters.

9. Developing and implementing appropriate activities to publicize the work of The Foundation.

C. Fiscal Management/Development

1. Preparation of an annual budget for adoption by Board of Directors.

2. General fiscal management, including the approval of disbursements from Foundation accounts.

3. Seeing that quarterly financial reports are produced for each quarterly meeting of the Board of Directors.

4. Preparation of appropriate acknowledgement of donations.

5. Preparation of general development - fundraising plans and supervision of their implementation. Working with Board members, consultants, and volunteers for the purpose of achieving the established fundraising plans.

6. Following "Guidelines to Giving" as developed by The Foundation Board. Consulting with appropriate persons prior to accepting gifts that would expose The Foundation or College to excessive cost or liability in the use of such gifts.

7. Preparation of copy for printed materials.

8. Preparation of prospective donor profile studies for possible gift giving to The Foundation. Make such contacts as time permits.

D. General

1. Perform such other duties as the President, Executive Committee, or Board of Directors request.
June 22, 1984

TO: Presidents, Boards of Trustees  
Superintendents and Presidents

FROM: George David Kieffer, President, Board of Governors  
Carol Enos, President, California Community College Trustees

SUBJECT: Prospectus on the Governance Project

Attached for your information and review is a copy of the Prospectus developed by the Commission on Local and State Board Relationships. As you may know, this Commission, composed of Board of Governors members and local trustees, has been created to identify recommendations to improve working relationships between local boards and the Board of Governors.

The Prospectus addresses the purposes, plan of action, and timeline for the Commission's activities. We hope you'll take the time to read this important document.

GDK/CE/mh

Attachment
THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE PROJECT

Commission on Local and State Board Relationships

A PROSPECTUS ON THE GOVERNANCE PROJECT

Commission Members
George David Kieffer, Chair
Arthur H. Bronson
Mario Camara
Carol Enos
Roberta Mason
Jack Messerlian
Kathy Neal
Robert C. Smithwick
James M. Tatum
Lawrence C. Wanlass

Resource Advisors
Gerald C. Hayward
David L. Viar

Staff
Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
I. Background

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges was created by an act of the California Legislature in 1967. Prior to that time, state-level responsibility for community colleges was exercised by the Bureau of Junior Colleges within the State Department of Education. The Board of Governors was created with the active participation and support of local boards and chief executives. Legislative intent for the Board of Governors was set forth in Section 71023 of the Education Code. This Section states:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of community colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the board shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the community colleges.

In addition to this statement of intent, the Legislature prescribed that the Board of Governors succeeded to the powers and duties of the State Board of Education and charged the Board of Governors with regulatory, enforcement, and supervisory responsibilities. Thus, from the beginning, there has been inherent contradiction in the role of the Board of Governors as regulator and supervisor of community colleges on the one hand and as leader, director, and preserver of local control on the other.

In 1969, two years after the Board of Governors was created, the Legislature enacted statutes more specifically delineating the functions of the Board of Governors and local governing boards. But the language of the 1969 statutes lacked thorough conceptual analysis and description and has proven to be
unclear, has not always been honored by the Legislature itself, and has been rendered largely incomprehensible by numerous uncoordinated changes over the years.

The 16 years since establishment of the Board of Governors has seen developments of far-reaching significance for California community colleges: a severe decline in revenues in the late 60's and early 70's during which the use of part-time faculty increased enormously; the passage in 1973 of SB 6, a revenue-limit finance measure that produced unexpected growth incentives, rapid enrollment increases, and consequent state efforts to control this growth; the enactment in 1975 of SB 160, the Rodda Act for collective bargaining, which changed and sometimes destabilized local districts' internal decision-making process; and the passage in 1978 of Proposition 13 by the people of the State of California.

The direct and indirect consequences of Proposition 13 constitute, perhaps, the most rapid and powerful series of shocks and aftershocks any group of institutions could sustain in so brief a time. These dislocations, among other consequences, have induced tensions in the relationships between the local governing boards and the state Board of Governors.

The relationship between local boards and state boards will forever be imperfect. It will always be characterized by a degree of tension. There are stresses inherent in such relationship that cannot be eliminated, and it is likely that some tension can generate energy and attentiveness which are healthy for both parties, particularly in view of the incursions into community college affairs of major forces external to the community college family.
At the same time, the changes described above have served to exacerbate the tensions between the Board of Governors and local boards of trustees. Recognizing that it was in the best interest of California community colleges to mutually address this problem, the Board of Governors and the California Community College Trustees have established a Community College Governance Project. A Joint Commission consisting of five members of the Board of Governors and five members of CCCT and chaired by the President of the Board of Governors, George David Kieffer, has been appointed to conduct the project. Other members of the Joint Commission include:

Arthur H. Bronson
Mario Camara
Carol Enos
Roberta Mason
Jack Messerlian
Kathy Neal
Robert S. Smithwick
James M. Tatum
Lawrence C. Wanlass

As one of its first actions, the Joint Commission selected Richard C. Richardson, Jr., to serve as staff. Serving in a resource capacity to the Joint Commission are staff members of the Board of Governors under the direction of Gerald C. Hayward and of CCCT, under the direction of David Viar.

Meeting on April 4 in Los Angeles, the Joint Commission considered: project assumptions, a statement of purpose, a plan of action and preliminary time
lines. The following sections of this prospectus present the results of their deliberations:

II. Assumptions and Statement of Purpose

The following assumptions have governed the development of the plan of action presented in this prospectus.

A. The Joint Commission has the responsibility for identifying recommendations to improve working relationships between local boards and the Board of Governors. Such recommendations could be directed to local boards, to the Board of Governors, or to the Legislature.

B. In carrying out this responsibility, the Joint Commission recognizes the need to establish a process that is perceived to be equitable, is visible to the general public and is open to input from those who wish to provide information to assist the Joint Commission in its deliberations. At the same time, the Joint Commission believes it is important to avoid dependence in the consultative process upon any single constituency of community colleges.

C. While the Joint Commission emphasizes its desire for extensive consultation and broad participation in the information gathering process as well as in determining public reaction to draft recommendations, it is not the intent of the Joint Commission in adopting this process to discover and propose least common denominators. The Joint Commission reserves the right to report its best judgment of
how issues should be resolved but only after listening to the concerns of those whose support will be needed for implementation.

D. The Joint Commission believes that its purposes will best be served by avoiding *apriori* judgments about the effectiveness, desirability, or immutability of existing arrangements for governing the California Community Colleges. By adopting this posture, the Joint Commission indicates its intention of remaining open to the possible needs for changes in existing practices, in structural arrangements, in regulations or in legislation.

E. At the same time, the Joint Commission affirms its belief in the current excellence of California Community Colleges, as well as the belief that the governance arrangements which produced such colleges have positive characteristics. Remaining open to the need for change in all aspects of current governance arrangements should not be interpreted as any preliminary judgment by the Joint Commission that changes are needed in all of these areas.

F. Many of the tensions currently affecting working relationships between local boards and the Board of Governors can be traced to three central themes:

1) The role of the Board of Governors, including areas in which it is perceived to have been more involved than desirable, as well as areas where more involvement is perceived as desirable.
2) The role of local trustees, including areas in which they are perceived to have been more involved than desirable as well as areas where more involvement is perceived as desirable, as well as the extent to which they recognize the ways in which their relationships with the Board of Governors and the State Legislature have been altered by events of the past decade.

Based upon these assumptions, the Joint Commission has adopted the following three major purposes to guide the project:

A. To explore and recommend methods of improving mutual understanding between the Board of Governors and local boards.

B. To review and delineate the responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the local boards.

C. To address related issues of governance and to advance recommendations as appropriate.

III. Plan of Action

The project will be conducted in three phases. Each of the phases is described below:

A. Information Gathering. The Joint Commission plans to collect four types of information. Staff to the Joint Commission, with assis-
tance from Resource Advisors, will be responsible for collecting the information and for synthesizing it in a report to the Joint Commission.

1) Survey of Attitudes About Roles -

A survey will be developed identifying the functions that must be carried out either by local boards or by the Board of Governors. Each local board, in consultation with representatives from the district it serves, selected as the local board shall determine, will be asked to classify the functions according to two questions:

a) Who is currently responsible for the function?

b) Who should be responsible for the function?

For each question there will be five possible responses, including primarily or exclusively the function of either the local board or the Board of Governors, or a shared responsibility. Space will be provided on the survey for written comments. The Board of Governors will also complete the survey. The intent of this process is to identify areas of agreement and disagreement about roles and responsibilities to assist the Joint Commission in identifying those aspects of governance relationships most in need of attention.
2) Review of Governance Changes Since Proposition 13 - 

A thorough review of the current community college governance structure will be compiled, with particular emphasis on changes in statutes, regulations or other governance documents since the passage of Proposition 13. This compilation will assist the Joint Commission in relating these changes to discrepancies between what survey respondents perceive to be current practice, as contrasted with desired practice in the governance of California Community Colleges.

3) Literature Review - 

Available literature on relationships between local and statewide governing boards will be synthesized to assist the Joint Commission in assessing whether the problems of improving working arrangements between the two types of boards has been considered in other settings and, if so, whether any of the approaches tried might be relevant to California.

4) Interviews - 

Counterparts to the Chancellor of California Community Colleges and the Director of CCCT will be interviewed by telephone in those states where both local and statewide governing boards are found. A synthesis of their experiences in maintaining effective working arrangements will be provided to the Joint Commission as in (3) above.
B. Recommendations and Draft Report

Following completion of the information gathering phase and receipt by the Joint Commission of a report on the results of this phase, those issues requiring detailed study will be identified. Such a detailed study may include additional interviews and the gathering of additional information. Several criteria will be used in selecting issues for indepth consideration by the Joint Commission, including:

1) Functions where the largest discrepancies between "what is" and "what should be" are revealed by the survey.

2) Functions without largest discrepancies but where comments or other information available to Joint Commission members suggest need for consideration.

3) Other issues brought to the attention of members of the Joint Commission during the information gathering phase.

The issues identified through the process described above will form a working agenda for the Joint Commission. For each issue the Joint Commission will answer the following questions:

1) Is the degree of tension associated with the issue a normal consequence of coping with a healthy system of checks and balances, or does it give evidence of a need for change?
2) If change is required, what form of change would be recommended?

3) What specific actions, and by whom, will be required in order to implement the change?

When the Joint Commission has completed its deliberations on the issues, a draft report will be prepared by Joint Commission staff to report the issues identified, the recommendations adopted and the information used in this process. The Joint Commission will make the draft available for public inspection and will accept comments and suggestions. Following receipt of comments and suggestions, the Joint Commission will adopt its final report.

C. Dissemination

Copies of the final report will be made generally available to the public. In addition, the following specific dissemination strategies are under consideration depending upon the content of the report:

1) An "executive summary" designed for broader distribution than the total report. Copies of this summary might be used with legislators and other public officials who have an interest in community colleges but who lack the time to read a more detailed treatment.
2) At least one forum would be held in conjunction with a regularly scheduled statewide meeting of local trustees to provide an opportunity for dialogue between them and members of the Joint Commission.

3) Depending upon timing and outcomes, the Joint Commission might sponsor a forum at the April 1985 meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges to be held in San Diego. Similarly, Joint Commission members might decide to sponsor a forum at the annual meeting of the Association of Community College Trustees.

4) Dissemination activities will include a design for feedback on progress in implementing recommendations through normally scheduled meetings of the Board of Governors and CCCT.

IV. Timeline

The Joint Commission has established the following timeline for activities related to the information gathering phase of the project. Following completion of this phase and development of the Joint Commission's agenda for study, a timeline will be established for completing the second and third phases of the project.
A. Information Gathering

1) Circulation of the Draft Prospectus to Joint Commission - By April 23

2) Approval of Draft Prospectus (by phone or mail if no major changes are required, by meeting, otherwise) - By May 5

3) Circulation of the Draft Survey to Joint Commission members and Chancellor's Advisory Committee - By May 15

4) Comments on Survey to Staff - By June 25

5) Final Draft of Survey to Joint Commission for Approval - By July 16

6) Printing and mailing - By August 20

7) Returns to Staff - By September 21

8) Information Report to Joint Commission - By October 15

B. Recommendations and Draft Report

Joint Commission will convene a study session with adequate time for discussion, issue development, and establishing a timeline for completing the project. Timeline established - By November 1.
RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATIVE JOB TITLES

A review of prevailing job titles assigned to certificated administrators in the California community colleges was recently conducted. As a result of this review, the Superintendent-President recommends that the job titles assigned to certificated administrators be changed to bring them in line with job titles assigned to comparable positions in other community colleges.

The recommended changes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Dean</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no fiscal implications to the proposed changes.
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July 31, 1984

To: Members of the Board of Trustees

From: Benjamin P. J. Wells

Re: Proposed Contract Adjustment for Superintendent/President

On Tuesday, July 17, I met with Dr. MacDougall and discussed terms and conditions of his contract. Based upon that discussion, I make the following proposal for a contract change:

1. Extend the existing contract for an additional year; i.e., July 1, 1984, through June 30, 1988.

2. For the 1984-85 year, salary and personnel benefit increases will not exceed the amount agreed upon for the District certificated staff; however, the distribution between benefits and salaries may differ.

3. The District's standard doctoral bonus provision shall apply.

In addition to the above, continuing contract provisions include a salary step increment scale with 4 steps at 3% per step,* a $100,000 term life insurance policy, and a $200 per month travel allowance.

Should you have any questions or comments before the Board meeting regarding the Superintendent/President's contract, please call me at home (967-1085) or at work (967-1711).

* For 1984-85 the Superintendent/President will be on the 3rd step.
CONFIDENTIAL

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

July 25, 1984

TO: Dr. Peter MacDougall
FROM: Dan Oroz
SUBJECT: Annual Report on Staffing & Salaries 1983-84

What follows is a summary and analysis of the Chancellor's Annual Report on Staffing and Salaries for 1983-84. For ease of follow-up review, I have indicated the table and page number on which the referenced material is found.

I Full Time Faculty
Profile on Average Salary Paid (Table D p. 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975-76</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
<th>1981-82</th>
<th>1983-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>$20,076</td>
<td>26,229</td>
<td>$26,545</td>
<td>$29,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Est.</td>
<td>19,823</td>
<td>25,166</td>
<td>28,273</td>
<td>32,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC difference from statewide average</td>
<td>+253(1.3%)</td>
<td>+1,063(4.2%)</td>
<td>-1,728(6.1%)</td>
<td>-2,836(8.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Mean Salary (Table E-6 p.20)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>$29,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>32,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-3,389(10.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Distribution of Salary Change Over Prior Year (Table E-7 p.22)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2% one time only not shown

Hourly Average Compensation Rate for Contract Instructors Overload Instruction (Table E-13 p.34)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-6.79(26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II  Part Time Faculty (Hourly)

Hourly Teacher Compensation Rate (Table F-7 p.48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBCC</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>4.64(20.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III  Certificated Administratives

Annual Mean Salary (Table H-6 p.80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBCC</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43,315</td>
<td>46,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>3,229(6.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV  Classified Administrative

Annual Mean Salary (Table I-6 p.66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBCC</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,424</td>
<td>33,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>658(2.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V  Classified Employees

Annual Mean Salary (Table J-6 p.111)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBCC</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,542</td>
<td>17,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>2,766(16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS

For the fourth consecutive year SBCC has been below the statewide average for salaries paid to full-time faculty.

For 1983-84, SBCC is 8.8% below the statewide average compared to 4.2% above the average in 1979-80 which is the last year that SBCC was above the statewide average (Table D).

The median salary increase in 1983-84 was 2.9% compared to .03% for SBCC. (Table E-7)

The difference from the average for SBCC part-time hourly instructors was even greater as SBCC was 20.7% below the average ($17.77/hr vs $22.41/hr.) It should be noted that the District's "bonus hours" provided credit instructors, were not included in the SBCC figure. If bonus hours were factored in, it is estimated that SBCC would show as 16.0% below the average (Table F-7).

The classified employee group is listed at 16% below the average; the certificated and classified administrative group as 6.9% and 2.0% below the average respectively.
20 July 1984

Dr. Peter R. MacDougall
and
Members of the Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara City College

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

Before getting down to the substance of this letter, I would like to note a few things. First, in accordance with the chain of command I am sending this letter to Dr. MacDougall; since I hope and expect that he will pass it along to the Board I am addressing myself to all of you. Second, please note that this is not an official attempt at salary negotiation, nor an attempt at an "end run" around the Instructors' Association that has done such a good job of representing the faculty. It is, rather, a personal opinion, but one that I hope may be of use to you.

We have just received a 10% pay raise, and I'm sure that you will expect to hear expressions of outright joy from the faculty. Yet I foresee that the joy will not be unmixed, and that there will even be those who speak with scorn of this salary agreement; in fact, I've heard some such rumblings already. I would like to try to explain the reason behind such discontent to you, and to make some suggestions for future actions to rectify the situation. First, the rationale of the grumblers:

A 10% raise does indeed sound like a lot, and it will certainly help those of us who are teetering on the brink of insolvency. But please remember that the raise is actually 9% on the salary schedule, and that it comes after 3 years, hence it is really a 3% per year rise in salary, much below the inflation rate and hardly a cause for rejoicing. Furthermore, we hear that this agreement is for 18 months rather than 12, thus the raise is 9% over 3½ years, or less than 3%. Had we been given raises of just 3% each of the last few years we would still be ahead of this agreement, since we would have had some of the benefit years earlier. And there are those who will say that the 18-month clause is a cynical attempt to reduce this raise and to detract from our further bargaining ability. We are all happy to have a raise at last, but although a drowning man is happy to receive a life-ring it does not make him any more pleased about the shipwreck.

So, you will be asking yourselves, what does this faculty really want? Is it a specific amount of money, or is it "all they can get"? I would like to suggest to you that it is not a specific amount of money that the faculty seeks, but rather it is equity, a sense that we are being dealt with fairly. If we are, as you often tell us, one of the very best community college faculties in this state, is it equitable that
we have been paid well below the median for years? If Santa Barbara is, as stated in a recent LA Times article, one of the 5 most expensive areas in which to live in the whole nation, is it equitable that our salaries are not at all commensurate with the cost of living? We wish to feel that we are treated fairly by our employers, that we are treated with equity. If we see our treatment as unfair, then no amount of money will suffice to make us happy, the grumbling will continue, and we will be prey for the union organizers waiting in the wings. But if our salary agreement is perceived as equitable then the faculty will be content, even with salaries that are not the absolute highest in the state.

So where does equity lie, and how may we reach it? These are the questions that must be asked and answered if we are to make real progress. Personally, I think that the faculty would welcome any plan rationally based upon merit, performance, and local cost-of-living, but such a plan could be very difficult to write and to administer. There is an alternative, one that once was tried, that worked and was regarded as equitable by the majority of the faculty for a number of years: it was the "Rule of the 67th Percentile". During the early and middle 1970s the faculty was paid a salary sufficient to keep us at the 67th percentile of the pay scales of the other California community colleges; in some of those years there were even mid-year salary adjustments to maintain us at the agreed-upon percentile. This was indeed a compromise: both the Board and the faculty knew that we deserved to be in the 90-100th percentile on the basis of merit, output, and cost-of-living, but the faculty accepted the lower figure because they knew that the Board would maintain it without yearly negotiations and hostilities. It was, as I remember it, a "golden age" of Board/faculty relations, and one that was marveled at and envied by my colleagues in other community colleges. Of course, Proposition 13 ended all that and plunged us into fiscal chaos, from which we are only now starting to return. But now it is time to ask: Return to what? Shall we return to what we did not have, low pay, yearly negotiations, and constant discontent, or to what had worked so well: a Board/faculty agreement that was mutually perceived as friendly and equitable? I propose that we try the latter.

Of course, such a return to a 67th percentile agreement could not occur instantly, but only through careful long-range planning. Time, however, is running out, with talks of union elections as early as next year. If you wish, as I do, to avert such a disaster and to build toward a future of mutual cooperation and good will, the first steps will have to come soon. Here are some suggestions:

1) Ask yourselves what your long-term goal should be, as regards faculty salaries. Could you live again with a fixed-percentile agreement? Then call in the Instructors' Association, and ask them about their long-term goals, and how they would feel about the 67th, or some other, percentile.
2) Come, in person (as many Board members as possible), to the "in-service" day that precedes the academic year, and tell us your goals and your plans. If the faculty can see a clear commitment on your part to a 67th percentile agreement, plus a plan to achieve that goal and a tentative time-table, they will find the inevitable delays easier to understand and to bear.

3) The 18-month clause could become a part of that plan, rather than a detriment, in the following way: Since next Spring the faculty cannot negotiate a salary increase, but must wait until the following Fall, that extra 6 months will give the administration time to receive the figures on new state funds in final form, and to propose a salary increase to the faculty. If that administration-proposed increase shows adequate good faith in moving toward a planned attainment of a percentile agreement it would be ratified by the faculty without dissent, and our raises that year would be seen as the result of goodwill by the Board and administration, rather than as the result of extortion by the faculty practised upon an unwilling Board.

In closing, let me thank you for the raise this year; it was sorely needed, and I am quite appreciative. But I would hope that you see it as a necessary first step towards an agreement that will satisfy the faculty for years to come. Perhaps then we will again be the envy of the other California community colleges.

Sincerely yours,

Michel Masson
Department of Biological Science
SBCC
AGREEMENT
between the
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
and its
CHAPTER 289
and the
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Santa Barbara, California

July 1984

1. The District will provide health and benefit allowances for employees the sum of $2,500 per year.

2. A 9% across-the-board salary increase retroactive to July 1, 1984. After the 9% has been calculated and salaries adjusted an additional salary increase of $34 per month will be applied to the salary schedule for full-time employees. (Part-time employees will receive a pro rata amount computed on the ratio that the hours, days or months worked bear to full-time service.)

3. It is understood that the ability of the District to sustain adjustments is dependent upon maintaining the present ADA level of 8,482. (A drop in ADA results in reductions of revenue.)

4. Should the District's ADA decline in 1984-85 (unless the present funding formula has changed) there will be no upward adjustments in salaries or benefits for the 1986 calendar year.

5. If the District receives general revenues prior to July 1, 1985, in excess of those presently projected ($16,929,577 as stated in the Chancellor's Report dated June 28, 1984) and ADA is maintained, a proportion of such funds equal to the proportion of the classified salary allocations in the budget shall be granted for upward adjustment in the classified salary and benefit schedules effective July 1, 1985.

6. This agreement will be effective through December 31, 1985. Future salary adjustments will be effective with the calendar year.


THOMAS P. ANDERLE, Attorney
Chief Negotiator
Santa Barbara Community College District
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President
California School Employees
Association Chapter # 289

PETER R. MACDOUGALL
Superintendent/President
Santa Barbara Community College District

LEONARD C. BONILLA
Field Representative
California School Employees
Association Chapter # 289

President
Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara Community College District
AGREEMENT

This Agreement is made and entered into this day of _______, 1984, by and between the Santa Barbara Community College District (hereinafter referred to as "District" and California School Employees Association and its Santa Barbara Chapter #289 or its successors (hereinafter referred to as CSEA).

The District wanted to extend the present agreement which expires in July 1986 to December 1986. CSEA could not agree as it was concerned about the decertification process. Therefore, as a compromise, the parties agreed that CSEA will present their proposals for a full and complete contract (i.e. wages, salaries, terms and conditions, etc) by March 15, 1986. The District will respond through proper procedures within normal time limits.

The parties further agree that they will delay all negotiations on the new contract until October 1, 1986, because of uncertain funding. District agrees to extend the present agreement on a day-by-day basis after July 1, 1986, until a new agreement is reached which the parties hope will be on or about January 1, 1987.

__________________________________________
THOMAS P. ANDERLE, Attorney
Chief Negotiator
Santa Barbara Community College District

__________________________________________
President
California School Employees
Association Chapter # 289

__________________________________________
PETER R. MacDOUGALL
Superintendent/President
Santa Barbara Community College
District

__________________________________________
LEONARD C. BONILLA
Field Representative
California School Employees
Association Chapter # 289
MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR
FORMER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

In accordance with the provisions of Government Code 53201, any member of the Board of Trustees who has served on the Board for a period of 12 years and terminates service on the Board shall, at age 55, be eligible to receive the following medical benefits:

a. The District will contribute toward the specified premium amount for the former Board member's District group medical plan up to a maximum of $1,600 annually.

b. District contribution shall continue until the retiree reaches 65 or the date of the retiree's death, whichever is earlier.
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SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

MAJOR CAMPUS PROJECTS

1984-85

1. Capital Projects
   a. Learning Resources Center (Library)
   b. Educational Conference Center

2. Matriculation

3. Administrative Data Processing

4. Marketing
   a. Student Oriented Approach
   b. Excellence
   c. Business/Industry (Partnership)

5. Planning

6. Accreditation (Self-Study)

7. Cal SOAP / CARE

8. Transfer Program

9. Curriculum
   a. Computer Maintenance
   b. Computer Assisted Drafting
   c. 2 x 2 Technology Instruction

10. International Programs
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Materials from Administrative Planning Retreat
(July 16, 1984)
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

INSTRUCTIONAL DIVISION
TO: Dr. MacDougall  
FROM: Pat Huglin  
SUBJECT: Administrative Planning Retreat  

I. 1983-84 Accomplishments (Instruction)  
II. 1984-85 Goals (Instruction)  

I. Accomplishments 1983-84  

A. General  

1. Developed and implemented the first phase of the Program Planning and Review procedure.  
2. Initiated major improvements to the operation of the Curriculum Advisory Committee.  
3. Initiated studies on teacher aid and large class policies.  
4. Fully implemented the Santa Rosa master course file and schedule building systems.  
5. Implemented the comprehensive levying of class material fees in credit program courses and completely revamped how these fees were budgeted.  
6. Implemented the Cambridge Study Abroad Program.  
7. Developed the Centers of European Art Program with the Art department and implemented the student screening and selection procedures.  
8. Began the institutionalization of the Honors Committee.  
9. Maintained liaison with the CCA on data processing matters.  
10. Supervised Dennis Ringer in implementation of the College CAI effort.  
11. Maintained liaison with and supported all instruction related College Readiness efforts.  
12. Continued communication with high schools on coordinated courses and services.  
13. Investigated with UCSB the development of a minority transition conference and institutional study.  
14. Revamped telecourse offerings.  
15. Coordinated development of CAI Accounting and English proposals.  
16. Worked with industry and other Higher Education Institutions in developing greater cooperation.  
17. Prepared recommendations to Division Council on evaluation of certificated hourly staff.  
18. Completed reorganization of the LAC/Tutorial and Faculty Enrichment activities.  
19. Supervised the development of the afternoon English as a Second Language Program aimed at foreign students.  
20. Implemented a comprehensive analysis of the Dental Assisting Program and prepared recommendations on program status.  

B. Health Technologies/Disabled Student Services  

1. Kellogg Project. Completion of clinical evaluation tool in conjunction with hospital staff and utilization of this tool with current ADN students. (H.T.)
I. Accomplishments 1983-84

B. Health Technologies/Disabled Student Services

2. Dental Assisting. Review of feasibility of reinstituting D.A. program by Superintendent-President and Board of Trustees. Decision made regarding circumstances which would allow for its reopening. (H.T.)

3. R.T. Program. Preliminary discussion with Marion Hospital in Santa Maria regarding satellite R.T. program for limited number of students from that area. (H.T.)

4. Office. Purchase of HP-150 with the help of Burt Miller for use initially as a word processor and, in the near future, for its computer capabilities. (H.T.)

5. Initiation of cooperative effort with the Continuing Education division to include their disabled students in the count submitted to the CCC Chancellor's Office, thereby increasing funding. (D.S.S.)

6. Direct registration of disabled students with academic advisement prior to registration. (D.S.S.)

7. Remodeling of DSS facility. (D.S.S.)

8. Continuation of AWARE publications monthly through the College Memorandum. (D.S.S.)

9. Development of A.V. materials related to disabled students for the purpose of outreach and for campus-wide faculty inservice. (D.S.S.)

10. Improved articulation and collaboration with SBHS district and with UCSB. (D.S.S.)

11. Career planning class for all disabled students taught by career education specialist. (D.S.S.)

C. Occupational Education

1. CADD Program. Received $35,100 from local JTPA (8% funds) to purchase 8 CADD stations by training 10 JTPA eligibles.

2. Computer Maintenance. Scheduled for Fall 1984, use of District (Dental Asstg.) & VEA funds. May try for local JTPA funds also to subplant VEA.

3. VEDS. Still in progress. Major drawback is that our Data Processing lacks necessary sophisticated software.

4. R.O.P. Worked with the local R.O.P. director in establishing a credit/non-credit advanced automotive body and fender program at Santa Barbara High School...still in progress.

5. Assessment Center. Attempted to establish community assessment center which would serve students with occupational training needs... in limbo.


7. New application process for certificates of completion effected (with cooperation of counseling. Also, new certificate award effected.

II. Goals, 1984-85

A. General

1. Fully implement the new Instruction Office reorganization plan. This will be a major activity as we will be making a major change in how the Instruction Office relates to department and divisions.
2. Phase-in the two new assistant deans into the new structure and overall Instruction Office operation.
3. Refine the instructional program planning and review procedures. The major priorities here will be to streamline the existing procedures and to more fully integrate the 5-year plan with program review procedures.
4. Maintain the highest quality of the Study Abroad Programs and to begin to emphasize on bringing international perspectives into the curriculum on campus.
5. Continue work on developing a study abroad program in China.
6. Work in implementation of the modular schedule experiment.
7. Supervise directly the implementation of the Accounting and English CAI labs.
8. Continue to press for data processing needs in the Instruction Office.
9. Continue to expand the Instruction Offices knowledge in using the new data processing capabilities.
10. Improve and coordinate the Instruction Offices departmental data collection and analysis procedures.
11. Develop contingency plans for dealing with possible enrollment declines in the Fall 84 semester.
12. Work more closely with Lana Rose and the Foundation in identifying major resource needs on campus and potential sources of external funding.
13. Expand knowledge of and activity in seeking external funding. We will identify sources of funding and be more active in the development of proposals.
14. Coordinate with local industry and UCSB the development of a cooperative part-time B.S. degree program in electrical engineering.
15. Evaluate the effectiveness of the new telecourse format. Prepare position paper to UCSB on transferability of telecourses.
16. Obtain college approval of recommended policies and procedures for the evaluation of certificated hourly staff.
17. Implement the "Course Information" recommendations of the College Readiness Committee.
18. Prepare recommendations to revise the District's International Education policies.
19. Closely supervise the implementation of the Mass Communications and Information Studies major.
20. Evaluate the College English and Math assessment programs.
21. Initiate a study of current procedures for pay of certificated hourly instructors.
22. Expand liaison with high schools to include coordination of programs and courses in transfer and vocational areas.
23. Develop 2 engineering courses 1) Electrical Circuit and Devices and 2) Computer Operations to strengthen the engineering program.
24. Increase enrollment in engineering major through improved course offerings, better marketing and more successful transfer procedures.
I. Accomplishments 1983-84

A. General

25. Develop engineering program in conjunction with UCSB that is accessible to and intended for personnel employed in local industry.
26. Complete feasibility study for the development of a fitness testing and appraisal laboratory (Phys. Educ.)
27. Development of a Dance Majors Program. (Phys Educ.)
28. Build on findings of Dave Williams related to ADA and WSCH per department to determine more reliable way of obtaining and utilizing this data in a meaningful consistent fashion.
29. Evaluate the method presently utilized for assignment of T.L.U.s to each department and adjust as necessary.
30. Assist in the development of a program to gradually improve faculty advisement of students.
31. Evaluate resources, guidance, assistance, orientation given to hourly faculty and revise as necessary.
32. Institution of educational program for faculty to increase awareness of available grants and to stimulate desire to seek those grants that would facilitate improvement of the instructional program.
33. Continued planning for Learning Resources Center/Library facility on West Campus via the Library/LC Committee. (Library)
34. Continued cataloguing of library holdings using OCLC. (Library)
35. Evaluate computer print-outs on students to identify those who have withdrawn from classes, especially those who have dropped a significant number of classes and institute a peer counseling program for these students. (Disabled Student Service)

B. Health Technology

1. Kellogg Project. The project will be in its final semester during Fall 1984. Results of clinical evaluations will be computed. Plans will be made for dissemination of results statewide and for continued collaboration with local hospital R.N.s after the project terminates.
2. ADN Accreditation. The N.L.N. (National League for Nursing) will make a site visit in Spring 1985. The ADN faculty will complete a self-study report in Fall 1984 in preparation for this visit.
3. Dental Assisting. Resumption of the Dental Assisting Program will be decided by the Board of Trustees in December 1984. If they decide in the affirmative, a qualified coordinator will be hired for the Spring 1985 semester and preparations will be made during that semester to enroll a class beginning September 1985.
4. Radiography Program. We will explore the possibility of transferring students from Simi Valley into the second year of the RT program. Continue feasibility study related to extension of RT program to Santa Maria.
5. Office. With a new HP-150, explore more efficient means to organize office procedures and to plan for future needs, e.g., inventory equipment and supplies.
6. E.M.T. Evaluation of course and institution of revisions as necessary to meet guidelines set up by Emergency Medical Services certifying authority.
7. Advisory Committees. Set up and convene advisory committees for the LVN program.
II. Goals, 1984-85

C. Occupational Education

1. Computer Maintenance Program: Implementation of same for F'84. VEA Funds, as well as District, to be used. Some additional $56,000 of VEA Funds may be available pending outcome of #2.

2. Computerized Machining Program: Problems with Sacramento resulted in our missing out on $56,000 of State SECG 8% Funds. Negotiations underway in an attempt to fund through other state funds. However, the additional VEA Funds mentioned in #1 will be used if all else fails. Unfortunately, this would mean that the pay-off of the phototypesetting lease would not be pulled off (the lease is about approximately $26,000 yearly of VEA Funds).

3. Santa Rosa VEDS Follow-Up System: Continue implementation process with Data Processing and Burt Miller. Results so far have not been too impressive. Process involves reformatting Continuing Education information and conversion of data base containing USOE #’s to TOP #’s, etc.

4. Small Business Development Center: Assist with developing the aforementioned. Continue working with George Gregory.

5. Assessment Center: Continue assisting in establishing a community assessment center.

6. CADD: Use of VEA Funds for additional software, etc.

7. BOE Adv. Comm.: Continue assisting in having an active and up-to-date advisory committee. Also, to review and make necessary changes in curriculum in order to be current with needs of industry.

ONGOING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR 1984-85

1. Develop district plan for 1985-86 (in latter part of year).
2. Complete claims for 1983-84 VEA funding (standard/yearly).
3. Cosmetology -- develop contract (standar/yearly).
4. ROP -- serve as SBCC representative (standard/yearly).
5. Advisory Committees -- standard/yearly. Perhaps issue revised booklet this year.
6. Contracted Instruction.
7. State reports (standard/yearly) -- Chancellor's Office.
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

STUDENT SERVICES DIVISION
TO: Dr. Peter MacDougall
FROM: Lynda Fairly
DATE: July 10, 1984
RE: Goals for 1984-85 and Summaries of Accomplishments for 1983-84

Goals for 1984-85

A. Student Operations
   1. Admissions and Records
      a. Evaluate alternate methods of registration
      b. Development of a faculty attendance manual
      c. Assist in the development and implementation of the Early Warning System

   2. Bookstore
      a. Design and purchase an additional module for a holding area and a warehouse

   3. Campus Safety Office
      a. Implement a new fine collection system
      b. "Crime Prevention" program to continue with increased visits to classrooms

B. Student Services
   1. Financial Aid Office
      a. Publish a scholarship and student consumer information guide
      b. Implement the new BOGGs, Fee Waivers and Credits
      c. Develop an office manual

   2. EOPS
      a. Hire a part-time academic counselor
      b. Interface with Cal-SOAP project to increase minority recruitment and transfer rate
      c. Secure state funding for C.A.R.E. child care needs

   3. Minority Recruitment and Transition Program
      a. Secure long-term funding for the programs
      b. Implement the Cal-SOAP project

   4. Student Activities
      a. Increase funding for the Co-curricular Budget
      b. Fund an additional copier machine for the Library

C. Student Development
   1. Counseling
      a. If "Matriculation" grant is funded, there would be mandatory orientation and advisement for all new students; mandatory counseling for students on probation, those enrolled in remedial courses, and those who are undeclared majors.
b. Implementation of an "early warning system" by Spring 1985
c. Promotion of "English Language Institute" with ESL department
d. Increase transfer rate to UCSB, with a special emphasis on the minority students
e. The Career Center will make outreach efforts towards the new, undecided and undeclared major students.

2. Health Services
   a. Emphasis placed on screening for high blood pressure for students and faculty
   b. New health education days, such as hearing testing
   c. Publish a monthly newsletter for greater health awareness

D. Intercollegiate Athletics

1. The Athletic Advisory Committee will be expanded and requested to assist in evaluating long-term funding for athletics.
2. Academic standards will be evaluated and specialized counseling provided as needed.

E. Student Services in General

1. If the Student Matriculation Grant is funded, the college under the supervision of Student Services will coordinate the State mandated matriculation plan. The plan will make dramatic changes in the process by which our students participate in the college.

2. An additional emphasis will be placed on marketing and recruiting of students. A task force began the process in the Spring 1984.

3. The Exit Questionnaire will be continued and results evaluated each semester.

4. A continued effort will be made to coordinate activities, programs with UCSB. The Symposium on Minority Transition will be held during the year.
STUDENT SERVICES: YEARLY SUMMARY REPORT 1983-84

A. Student Operations

1. Admissions and Records
   a. The on-line Santa Rosa Student Records student data system was fully implemented.
   b. Drop fees were imposed upon the students and a new system was developed for collection and data gathering.
   c. High school relations were improved due to two informational meetings, and better distribution and coordination of applications and college information in general.
   d. The physical surroundings of the office were improved with the addition of carpeting, built-in cabinets, and a rearrangement of office furniture.

2. College Bookstore
   a. New equipment has modified the operation of the store. The addition of a computer terminal, cash registers, and a word processor has increased efficiency.
   b. The purchase of a new module was researched.

3. Campus Safety Office
   a. Portable radios were purchased to provide instant communication with the local police department.
   b. In-service training continued in C.P.R., first aid, mace, self-defense, and legal rights of a security officer.
   c. A parking permit program was implemented which mandated that students would pay for parking permits.

B. Student Services

1. Financial Aid Office
   a. Installed the CSFAS/SAFERS 3000 software system
   b. Two HP 150 computer terminals with printers, one HP 150 microprocessor, one letter-quality printer, and several computer tables were purchased.
   c. A coordinated Financial Aid Office, EOPS Bridge Program and County Schools' Summer Youth Employment Program was implemented to assist in providing summer jobs for SBCC students.
   d. Developed better articulation with the Financial Aid Office at UCSB for the students enrolled in the SBCC/UCSB Concurrent Enrollment Program.

2. EOPS
   a. The C.A.R.E. Special Program Advisor became a permanent position and the program has received much publicity, gained recognition and will be funded next year.
   b. The Student Intern program increased by 50%.
   c. Senator Gary Hart was honored at a special EOPS breakfast.
   d. Increased the number of students transferring to four-year institutions.
3. Minority Recruitment and Transition Program
   a. Formalized the program with funds from Chancellor's Grant, SBCC EOPS, and UCSB.
   b. Program brochure developed and sent to minority students in our area.
   c. Assigned four peer recruiters to each local high school and developed good working relations with the counseling staffs.
   d. Designed a tracking model for identifying and monitoring potential UC transfer students.

4. Student Activities Office
   a. Orientation model implemented emphasizing faculty group interaction.
   b. Increased student participation in student government.
   c. Club advisors and presidents were honored at an "End of the Year" breakfast.
   d. Student Senate purchased a new typewriter for the Library, and re-strung the Library Patio chairs.

C. Student Development

1. Counseling
   a. College Readiness efforts were assisted by the development of an audio-slide presentation for orientation and advisement sessions, specialized letters developed for students on probation, counselors participated with assessment testing, and special efforts were made to assist departmental faculty to improve advisement.
   b. Counselors coordinated the Walk-Up counseling station in the Campus Center Lobby daily.
   c. The Foreign Student program maintained the same level of participants and assisted the ESL program in developing a program for students who do not meet our foreign student eligibility standards for the 1984-85 school year.
   d. Enrollments in the Advanced Student program continued to grow.
   e. The SBCC/UCSB Transition Program continued to flourish. Enrollments of former SBCC students transferring to UCSB increased 29% above the prior year. Program activities included articulation of SBCC courses to 50 academic majors, 20 seminars by UCSB faculty, transfer brochure sent to 2500 students and joint departmental meetings between the two campuses. A study skills class was developed for the Transition students.
   f. The Career Center had a dramatic increase in student contacts. The Center had 10 career seminars, conducted 8 in-class workshops, instituted a testing package for non-students, purchased a micro-computer, and held the annual Job Faire.

2. Health Services
   a. The entire program was evaluated by the Health Services Advisory Committee due to the change in comprehensiveness of the program. A guideline of Standardized Procedures were approved and implemented.
   b. A contract with St. Francis Hospital for emergency room treatment was implemented.
c. Numerous Health education days and a Health Fair was conducted.
d. Mental health counseling was provided throughout the year and
   used extensively.

D. Intercollegiate Athletics

1. Championships were earned by Men's Basketball, Football, Women's
   Volleyball, Men's Volleyball and Women's Tennis.
2. W.S.C. selected Frank Carbajal, Pat Moorhouse and Rick Olmstead
   as Coaches of the Year.
3. Athletic participation increased by 6.1%.
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

CONTINUING EDUCATION DIVISION
CONTINUING EDUCATION DIVISION

1984-85 GOALS

1. Evaluate the use of the services provided by the Central Coast Computer Authority.

2. Implement some of the suggestions received from instructors in a recent survey on expanding enrollments in English as a Second Language, Basic Education, and Evening High School.

3. Modify the Schott Center to be more fully accommodating to the handicapped. (The Wake Center is fully accommodated.)

4. Survey students and make recommendations about the possibility of offering programs in adult education which lead to a certificate in areas of interest to students.

5. Evaluate the possibility of closing the San Marcos High School Parent-Child Workshop.

6. Investigate various means of marketing classes more effectively.

7. Investigate the possibility of increasing student enrollments in enrollment fee classes.
The Continuing Education Division continues to serve over 33,000 different individuals with over 66,000 enrollments. There were more classes and more individuals teaching during 1983-84 than in any previous year in the history of adult education. The following represent responses to some specific annual goals of the Division.


During the winter term, a survey was sent to faculty in the ESL, Basic Education and Evening High School programs requesting suggestions for expanding enrollments in those areas of instruction. The survey resulted in a number of ideas that will be evaluated and some that will be implemented during the 1984-85 school year.

2. Visit various industrial firms and businesses to identify training and/or educational needs which the District could provide. This needs to be coordinated between the Vocational Assistant Deans of the credit and non-credit programs.

This is a very critical and important divisional goal. However, it has been found that little time is available to contact industrial firms and businesses. Two contract instruction projects were conducted and others will be done in the 1984-85 school year. Contract instruction requires much additional time to negotiate. For example, one of the completed projects with Santa Barbara Research required eight off-campus meetings and numerous phone calls. This goal will be pursued during the '84-85 school year, but limited time prohibits more activity.

3. Evaluate the effectiveness of the various means of publicizing the Continuing Education Program to the public.

In the fall of 1983, a survey was conducted of how students first learned about classes in which they were enrolled. Of the five options given (Schedule of Classes; newspaper articles or ads; flyers; word-of-mouth; previous attendance in same class), the Schedule of Classes was by far the primary source of information. However, the other four options are all important in certain ways to encourage student attendance. The survey did highlight some significant facts about the means of publicizing programs.
4. Survey the Wake and Schott Centers with respect to accommodation of facilities to the handicapped and recommend needed changes.

Both the Wake and Schott Centers were surveyed using a document called Standard Specifications for Handicapped Accessibility to Buildings and Facilities. The Wake Center, after making some minor modifications, is now fully accommodating. More work needs to be done at the Schott Center to be fully accommodating. This will become a responsibility of the new assistant dean.

5. In light of the failure of the youth college and sports camps during the 1983 summer session, evaluate and recommend the type of program to offer during the 1984 summer session.

Approximately 100 classes were offered during a six-week summer session. These classes were selected from the most popular ones offered during the school year. While the cancellation rate was considerably higher for the summer session than during the regular school year (15% summer compared to 6% during the regular school year), the success rate warrants a repeat in future summers if the annual ADA generated beyond the non-credit Cap is fundable from the State.

6. Survey students and make recommendations about the possibility of offering programs in adult education which lead to a certificate in areas of interest to students.

Because one Assistant Dean and one Program Planning Assistant left during the school year, this item was not pursued.

7. Evaluate the use of the services provided by Central Coast Computer Authority to see if any changes, improvements, or additional services are necessary.

The present services provided by the CCCA are not to the level of service provided before the installation of the present Hewlett-Packard equipment. Because of its importance, this item will be repeated as one of the 1984-85 goals.

The program continues to be the most intensive, most comprehensive and most community responsive in the state and continues to be recognized as a model throughout the nation.
SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

PERSONNEL DIVISION
III. SPECIFIC PLANS

A. 1984-85

Provide a brief, but specific description of objectives, and, if applicable, describe changes in requirements for personnel, equipment, facilities, or other budgetary categories. As appropriate, include new courses, or programs, new delivery methods, new scheduling concepts, or inter-departmental activities. Be as specific as possible. This information will serve as the basis for developing the 1984-85 budget, and the College's educational master plan.

1) Negotiate annual 1984-85 CSEA Collective Bargaining Agreement re-opener. Develop contract proposal and conduct negotiations. Handle all related matters such as unfair labor practices and impasse procedures.

2) Coordinate legal actions for District (Little, Harkins, etc.)

3) Update seniority lists for classified and certificated employees.

4) Continue implementation of Personnel Data Base System. Provide in-service training to Personnel staff as needed.

5) Update and review District's affirmative action goals and timetables as required by the Chancellor's Office.

6) Coordinate all layoffs and reduction-in-force actions initiated by the District: legal counsel, procedure, preparation of documents, hearings.

7) Provide staff assistance to Superintendent-President in annual faculty and staff salary and benefit discussions.

8) Prepare for and coordinate District's Open Enrollment Personnel Benefits period. Advise on changes to Personnel Benefits Program and implement adopted changes. Provide in-service staff training as appropriate.

9) Administer Affirmative Action Recruitment and Selection program: advertising, committee procedures, EEO, etc.

10) Develop Management Training Program (Ad Hoc Committee)

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS: 1984-85
- Data Processing printer (letter quality)
- Data processing terminal (HP150)
- Management training fund $1,500
- Classified hourly funds $2,500
A. FISCAL MANAGEMENT

1. **Budget Control**

For the second time in three years, the fiscal/accounting system was changed. The District adopted the new Pertaine Software package interfacing with the new HP-3000 at the Central Coast Computer Authority. The staff freeze made routine conversion impossible. For the first six months, the system did not work well and input using part-time help was replete with inaccuracies. However, the Budget Control system "came into its own" and overexpenditures were held to a minimum. Paper flow was reduced as the on-line system became more effective. Budget controls were so current that transfer requests tripled the year previous. In spite of substantial transfers, the lateness of transactions, and last minute adjustments by Cost Centers, the year end balances were accurate. The system worked!

2. **Budget Development**

In November, 1983, nine scenarios on funding for 1984-85 were projected which were eventually condensed to three; and finally, the Tentative Budget reflected the best estimates of funding levels. The final budget will utilize computer capabilities of Visicalc and the main frame software to accurately calculate the entire budget.

3. **Funding/ADA**

As described above, we had a most difficult time estimating income levels during the year; however, the District was able to maintain enrollment and expenses for 1983-84 at the adjusted levels consistent with modified state funding.
FISCAL MANAGEMENT (cont.)

4. Activity Measures

These measures and statistics are not yet available until the books are closed and audited.

5. Fiscal Reorganization

Consistent with our goals, the fiscal department was reorganized and responsibilities rearranged to reflect new duties and additional responsibilities. The reorganization was accomplished without additional cost to the District and represents a better work distribution within fiscal services.

6. Parking Fees/Fines Collection

The responsibility for collection of parking fees and parking fines is now fully under Business Services and improvements are apparent.

B. FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT/MAINTENANCE

1. Lease - 814 Santa Barbara Street

Agreement was reached with a lessee for the 814 Santa Barbara Street property which will yield the District about $25,000 annually. The property saw significant improvement (under the lease) which has made it more attractive, functional and saleable.

2. Campus Center Renovation/Snack Bar

The construction of a Snack Bar next to the Campus Center was completed with Cafeteria funds. This enabled more efficient use of HRM staff/students and provided additional revenue for the Cafeteria fund.

The long needed renovation of the Campus Center kitchen and serving area provides a better laboratory for the students and a significant aesthetic improvement. The $204,000 renovation cost was paid entirely from the Cafeteria fund.
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT/MAINTENANCE (cont.)

3. Handicapped Access - Phase II

Phase II of the handicapped access program was completed at a cost of $85,000 (approx.) which was funded jointly by State construction funds and the College.

4. Library/LRC Design

A library consultant was engaged and an architect hired to plan and submit the PPP and PPG to the State for Library/LRC funding.

5. West Campus Site Plan

An architect was selected to provide a definitive update of the West Campus Master Plan considering functions and site locations.

6. Outdoor Art Sculpture

Efforts of College staff secured a Touhy Foundation Grant of $5,000 that was matched with $10,000 of District commitments and provides for an outdoor Art Sculpture area.

7. Educational Conference Center

Design, plans and program specifications for an Educational Conference Center on the West Campus are underway through staff and architectural assistance.

8. Front Entrance Improvements

Through private donations, District staff and resource allocations, and considerable "volunteer" efforts on the part of the community, the front entrance of the campus has experienced a dramatic face-lift. A right turn lane, stone wall work and extensive landscaping has been constructed by College staff. The new kiosk has been erected with cooperative efforts of the Board, College staff and community assistance.

9. Parking Lot Repairs

Extensive engineering and repairs of College and leased parking lots is underway and will be completed by the opening of the fall semester.
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT/MAINTENANCE (cont.)

10. Deferred Maintenance

Six major roof repair projects were completed during the year including: Library, PS-101, LSG, Campus Center, Humanities, and the Administration building. These projects totaled $250,000 (approx.) which was funded under the deferred maintenance program of the Chancellor’s Office on a 50% matching basis.

The removal of PCB and major repairs to electrical panels/vaults for about $65,000 will be completed over the next five months.

11. Energy Management

The installation of a computerized energy management/clock/fire alarm system was completed in October at a cost of $165,000 (approx.) on a 50% cost sharing basis under deferred maintenance. It is estimated the District saved $40,000 during the fiscal year just on electrical charges as a result of the new system. The District investment will be paid off in less than two years in electrical cost savings. As a bonus, Southern California Edison has awarded the District a $11,700 one-time payment for our energy conservation efforts.

12. Activity Measures

Statistics will not be complete until August.

C. OTHER BUSINESS SERVICE

1. Switchboard/Telephone

Specifications and design configuration for a new telephone system were completed and bid. Five proposals were received which are presently being analyzed to determine the best alternative for the College.

2. Duplicating/Printing

All ten satellite copiers were replaced during the year with upgraded plain-paper copiers. In addition a new offset press, replacing a ten year old machine, was purchased for $45,000 (approx.) and will be installed this summer. The charge-back system in Duplicating was evaluated and improved.
OTHER BUSINESS SERVICE (cont.)

Duplicating/Printing (cont.)

The Print Shop reported a dramatic increase in the campus photo-typesetting services and overall volume in excess of 1½ million impressions of high quality printing. Additional statistics will be available in August.

The Duplicating area will be redesigned and improved with the addition of the new offset press and additional IBM copier. Renovation will be completed by the fall semester.

3. Self Insurance/Risk Management

The District joined the Southern California Community College JPA for workers' compensation. Increased efforts to control and reduce litigated cases meant expeditious handling of claims and a very favorable loss/premium ratio.

Liability claims continued to be well below normal loss levels which again resulted in no increase in premiums. Immediate and rigorous followup procedures have been the key to our low loss levels.

4. Community Services/Transportation

Statistics and comments will be available in August.

5. Lease of La Playa/Leadbetter Parking Lots

After several years of discussion, the District and the City of Santa Barbara signed a 53 year lease of the La Playa parking lots and agreed to specific tenets of use for the Leadbetter lot. The agreement places specifics into a heretofore "informal" arrangement, allowing for College use through the year 2037.

6. Los Banos Pool Costs - Joint Use Agreement

New arrangements for the use and costs associated with Los Banos pool are now clearly enunciated in the amendment to the 1962 Joint Use Agreement with the City of Santa Barbara. The District is now able to determine accurately the cost of operating the Physical Education swimming classes at Los Banos pool and has a clear choice on utilization.

C. L. Hanson
m.r.
7/12/84
# FIVE YEAR PLAN

**Business Services Division**

**January 10, 1984**

**DEPARTMENT** Business Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Develop and expand (within the CCCA capabilities) on-line data processing capabilities in: accounting, accounts payable, accounts receivable, budget development, purchasing, encumbrances, payroll, general ledger, student loan collections, cost center department reports, and refine control mechanisms in the budget control system.</td>
<td>1) Develop and expand administrative data processing for: Student Finance, work order processing, asset controls/accountability, grants and contracts, cashiering and fee collection, CCFS 311 production, Chancellor's Office fiscal reports, budget development modifications, and implementation of forecasting model/matrix.</td>
<td>1) Modify administrative data processing applications as needed to maintain a responsive business service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Installation of Phase I energy monitoring micro-processor, clock system and fire alarm controls. More technical training for maintenance staff will be required.</td>
<td>2) Installation of Phase II energy monitoring, fire alarm, and clock system.</td>
<td>2) Installation of Phase III energy monitoring, fire alarm, and clock system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Expansion of deferred maintenance projects with local and state funding. Addition of one Maintenance Worker II rather than subcontracting and hiring hourly assistants.</td>
<td>3) Construction of deferred maintenance projects through state and local matching funds. (Ref: Five year deferred maintenance program.)</td>
<td>3) Establish computerized preventative maintenance program with automated work schedule/project generation and forecasting model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Develop West Campus into a park-like setting with additional planting of trees, shrubs, grass, and installation of an irrigation system. One additional Groundskeeper, and large tractor/mower is required.</td>
<td>4) Improve facilities for maintenance personnel and equipment and the addition of a workshop space.</td>
<td>4) Develop better efficiencies in positions to allow expanded service and/or staff reduction through attrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Custodial workloads to be restructured requiring retraining and upgrading of a Custodian to Senior Custodian.</td>
<td>5) Begin Library project, additional erosion control measures, and completion of Handicapped barriers, Phase III.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FIVE YEAR PLAN

**Business Services Division**  
January 10, 1984

**DEPARTMENT** Business Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Reduction of paper flow to screen (CRT) viewing and recall - more queries capability - less hard copy.</td>
<td>6) Continue to monitor staffing patterns to work load changes - shifting, deleting, adding as ability/needs dictate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Evaluate the charge back system of printing, duplicating, utilities, overhead, telephone, etc. to contain/control costs.</td>
<td>7) Campus painting to be expended if resources allow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Utilization of more college work study students in place of classified hourly (casual) assistants as resources and abilities allow.</td>
<td>8) Handicapped access, Phase III planning for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Install a new state of the art phone system through a lease-purchase arrangement at no additional annual cost. Savings in future years when the system is paid off.</td>
<td>9) Greater self-insurance of property/liability areas (as market dictates), and expanded risk management emphasis and training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Completion of the following construction projects during summer, 1983: Handicapped access, Phase II; construction of the Snack Bar; renovation of the Campus Center.</td>
<td>10) Possible combination of Print Shop production with Instruction. Renovation of Print Shop areas for better classroom/lab use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Analysis of instructional costs for various instructional programs.</td>
<td>11) Implementation of the new Accounting Manual and reporting forms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12) Collection of parking fees and parking fines at Cashier -- addition of one clerk position paid for with additional revenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Business Services Division

**January 10, 1984**

**DEPARTMENT** Business Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) Leasing of property at 814 Santa Barbara Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Workers compensation - self-insurance program with Southern California Community Colleges J.P.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Maintenance program on parking lots - if funds become available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Lease of city parking lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Improvement of risk management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Reorganization of some responsibility functions in the Business Services Division.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Improvement of asset inventory methodology, control, and accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Campus parking permit program expanded to include staff and faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Repair and resurface parking lots as funds become available. Improve lower level leased parking lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Modify plans/reduce costs to employees of fringe benefits programs (negotiable.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>