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SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION

DATE: May 4, 1999  
TO: Peter R. MacDougall, Superintendent/President  
FROM: Charles L. Hanson, Vice President, Business Services  
SUBJECT: PROJECTED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE / COSTS (BOND MEASURE FACILITIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Construction Period</th>
<th>Additional Gross Sq Ft</th>
<th>Est. Cost (ENR 5850)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life Science/Geology (seismic, HVAC)</td>
<td>January 2000 - August 2001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classrooms/Accessibility (P.E.)</td>
<td>June 2000 - August 2001</td>
<td>11,623</td>
<td>2,846,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wake Center (Phase I)</td>
<td>September 2000 - December 2001</td>
<td>27,560</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Center (Phase II/III)</td>
<td>September 2003 - December 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High Technology/Classrooms/Offices - East Campus</td>
<td>January 2001 - December 2002</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>11,572,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Schott Center</td>
<td>January 2002 - July 2003</td>
<td>17,080</td>
<td>7,573,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Multidisciplinary Classrooms - West Campus</td>
<td>July 2003 - December 2005</td>
<td>24,812</td>
<td>7,286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parking Structure</td>
<td>When needed (Sept. 2001 - Dec. 2002?)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Classrooms / Offices - East Campus</td>
<td>January 2006 - August 2007</td>
<td>15,000±</td>
<td>($7,030,000 unfunded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**                                      |                                 |                        | $45,927,000           |
System Advocacy Nets Big Gains in Budget Subcommittees

Responding to a disappointing May Revise budget package, advocates at both the system and college level moved quickly and diligently this week to ensure community college priorities were included in the subcommittee actions. By the end of the week, the subcommittee budgets included many of the system priorities, and substantial progress was made in the overall funding of community colleges.

The Assembly subcommittee augmented the Governor’s May Revise proposal by over $40 million, primarily by augmenting the Partnership for Excellence (Partnership) program, full-time faculty, and outreach programs. By augmenting the Governor’s proposal with additional funds for Partnership, full-time faculty, outreach programs and member's projects, the Senate subcommittee increased the Governor's May Revise total by over $73 million.

Although the Governor’s May Revise would have only provided the community colleges around 10.23% of Proposition 98 funds, the actions of the subcommittees escalated the proportion to 10.34% (Assembly) and 10.43% (Senate). While it is disappointing that community colleges declined on the Assembly side from the 10.4% level funded in the Governor’s January budget proposal (also the split level agreed to by K-12 and community college organizations), the additional appropriations on the Senate side leave room for the system to receive at least 10.4% in the budget produced by Conference Committee. The Conference Committee will convene in upcoming weeks to resolve the differences between the Assembly and Senate versions of the budget, producing a final budget to send to the Governor.

A chart listing the actions of each subcommittee, along with the Governor’s proposal, is attached to this update or is available at http://www.ccleague.org/leginfo/budget under "Budget Charts."

Consultation Council Responds to May Revise

Meeting on Thursday, May 20, the Consultation reviewed the Governor’s May Revise and the budget subcommittees actions through this week and provided guidance for system and district advocacy. The Council approved the following items, with an overarching position of ensuring community colleges receive as much funding as possible to overcome the insufficient funding provided to the system:

- Support the Senate version of the budget, with the addition of $45,200 for the statewide Academic Senate.
- Any additional funds from redirection of current items or addition of new Proposition 98 funds should be used to augment the Partnership for Excellence program toward the system’s $100 million augmentation goal.
- The community college system should receive the same cost-of-living (or similar) adjustment as the K-12 system. The cost-of-living adjustment should be applied to all appropriate programs that are negatively impacted by inflationary pressure.
- Any augmentation made that increases the apportionment rate for K-12 adult education should be similarly provided for community college noncredit instruction to enhance program quality.
- Consultation Council members expressed concern about the four community college district projects appropriated in subcommittee without being reviewed through the Consultation process and requested those districts support deletion of those projects from budget consideration so funds may be redirected to system priorities that benefit all districts.

Districts are requested to contact their legislators to urge them to support the system priorities as identified above. The Conference Committee soon will be accepting input from individual legislators about their budget priorities.

Language to Restrict Partnership Funds Rejected

Also this week, the Assembly Budget Subcommittee #2 on Education Finance rejected a proposal to establish that full-time faculty hires would be the first priority for expenditures within the Partnership for Excellence funds. This move, supported by the Faculty Association of the CCC, Calif. Teachers Assoc and the Calif. Federation of Teachers, was vigorously opposed by the Chancellor’s Office and the League, as the language had not been discussed in Consultation and it would have fundamentally changed the premise of the Partnership for Excellence program.

The original language reviewed by subcommittee members, but never formally discussed in the hearings, would have earmarked a specific portion of new Partnership funds for full-time faculty hires, without consideration of the number of faculty hired by a district with the first $100 million distributed in the 1998-99 fiscal year.
# 1999-2000 Proposed Budget

(All figures represent increases over 1998-99 funding levels.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item (all figures are increases in ongoing funds except as noted)</th>
<th>Community College System Budget Priorities</th>
<th>Governor’s May Revise</th>
<th>Senate Sub 1 Actions</th>
<th>Assembly Sub 2 Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>116,685,885 (3.5%)</td>
<td>116,683,000 (3.5%)</td>
<td>116,683,885 (3.5%)</td>
<td>116,685,885 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-of-Living Adjustment</td>
<td>62,547,000 (1.83%)</td>
<td>48,117,000 (1.41%)</td>
<td>48,174,000 (1.41%)</td>
<td>50,174,000 (1.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>9,192,000</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>9,192,798</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Excellence</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>40,800,000</td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Rate Augmentation</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Needs</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Transfer Effectiveness</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Students Programs and Services</td>
<td>4,863,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puente Program</td>
<td>3,666,250</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,366,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESA Program Expansion</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Report Cards</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Teacher Development Partnerships</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Colleges</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Governor’s Budget Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPS Program Expansion</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>1,860,000</td>
<td>1,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE Program Expansion</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Program</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton College Stadium</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Sequoias - Hanford Joint Use</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced College - Video Conferencing Tech.</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Programs Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>199,707,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>273,580,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>240,191,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>240,191,335</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Funding (non-program) Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Proposed</th>
<th>12,900,000</th>
<th>12,900,000</th>
<th>12,900,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fee Reduction Backfill (accompanied by reduction in fee revenue) (Prop. 98)</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>20,500,000 (automatic)</td>
<td>20,500,000 (automatic)</td>
<td>20,500,000 (automatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease-Payment Costs (Prop. 98)</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Support Language</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>Approved: Language Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Maintenance-2:1 Match Language</td>
<td>Not Proposed</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Both the Growth and COLA allocations include base appropriations and categorical programs.

2 The Governor's May Revise growth proposal would restrict 1% of the system’s growth to core transfer and pre-collegiate courses.

3 The Assembly version of the COLA would provide an inflationary adjustment to additional programs including Academic Senate, Faculty and Staff Diversity, Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure, Instructional Equipment and Library Materials, Foster Care Education Program and BFAP Administration.
COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE POLICIES:
A JOINT STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND
TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS (CCCT)

DRAFT
(March 4, 1999)

1. Given the broad and comprehensive mission of the California Community Colleges, the people of the State and their local communities are best served by a bilaterally-governed system of community colleges with locally-elected boards of trustees and a gubernatorially-appointed board for the system.

2. The broad responsibilities of each of the governing components within the bilaterally-governed system should be established by the Legislature.
   - The respective responsibilities should be clear, consistent with the mission, and support a unified system meeting distinct local and state needs.
   - The current delineation of responsibilities set forth in Sections 70901 and 70902 of the Education Code largely achieves these objectives, although minor modifications and clarifications are being discussed and agreed upon as part of the system’s effort to revise the Education Code.

3. The Board of Governors should exercise general supervision over the system of community colleges and provide leadership and direction through planning and policymaking, technical assistance, positive incentives, enforcement of laws and regulations, and accountability in support of student success. The work of the system board should be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local authority and control in the administration of the community colleges.

Board of Governors responsibilities should include:
- Employing a chief executive officer who shall be responsible for the development and implementation of system board policy and who shall act as the primary spokesperson for the system.
- Establishing, consistent with the mission of the system, minimum standards for the operation of each local district and minimum conditions entitling districts to receive state aid and conducting periodic reviews of each district related to the minimum standards and conditions.
- Reviewing and approving academic and facilities plans for each district.
- Conducting necessary system-wide research, evaluating and issuing annual reports on the educational and fiscal effectiveness of the districts based on indicators of performance.
- Providing technical assistance and support when districts encounter severe management or fiscal difficulties; and, in cases where fiscal difficulties worsen despite assistance and support, appointing a fiscal monitor.
• Providing representation and accountability for the system before state and national legislative and executive agencies.

• Overseeing the administration of state and federal support programs, including: preparing and adopting the proposed system budget; determining the formulas for computing and allocating the state general apportionment; establishing a uniform budgeting and accounting structure and procedures; and establishing space and utilization standards for facilities planning and funding allocations.

• Coordinating and encouraging interdistrict, regional, and statewide development of programs, facilities, and services; and coordinating interdistrict attendance of students.

• Facilitating articulation with other segments of education

• Exercising general supervision over the formation of new districts and the reorganization of existing districts.

• Establishing and implementing a consultation process to ensure that local governing boards, their representatives, and community college organizations have an opportunity to participate effectively in the review and development of system policy.

4. Each locally elected governing board should exercise general supervision over its local district and provide leadership through planning and policymaking to assure local education programs and services meet the education needs of the communities the district serves, as well as regional and state needs. The work of the local boards should be consistent with the policies of the Board of Governors.

Local board responsibilities should include:

• Employing a district chief executive officer who is responsible for the development and implementation of local board policy and who acts as agent of the board.

• Establishing the educational priorities of the district, consistent with the legislatively-established mission of the California Community Colleges; and, in so doing, local boards shall also respond to regional and statewide needs within the mission in conjunction with the Board of Governors.

• Establishing policies for current and long-range academic and facilities plans and programs; for the approval of courses of instruction and educational programs; and for determining the academic calendar.

• Establishing academic standards, as well as probation, dismissal and readmission policies; graduation requirements; and policies for governing student conduct.

• Assuring the employment and assignment of all personnel and establishing employment practices, salaries, and benefits for all employees.

• Determining the district’s operational and capital outlay budgets; determining the need for elections for tax levies and bond measures; establishing policies for student fees where permitted by law; and establishing policies for the receipt and administration of gifts, grants, and scholarships.

• Assuring the management and control of district property.
- Monitoring effectiveness and efficiency in the use of public resources and in meeting student needs.
- Participating in the review and development of system policy through the system’s consultation process.

5. In furtherance of the mission of the community colleges within the bilateral governance functions specified in statute, it is appropriate for the local board and Board of Governors to establish understandings and protocols for the exercise of governance functions. These understandings and protocols, which may be established, reviewed, and revised over time, set forth expected behaviors and rules of conduct. The initial understandings and protocols are the following:

a. **Mission:** In fulfilling the mission of the California Community Colleges, local boards recognize their responsibility not only to serve the needs of their respective communities, but also to respond to regional and statewide needs. And, the Board of Governors, recognizes in this regard, the local boards and the Board of Governors work in partnership to assure that community, regional and statewide needs are addressed.
   - Primary authority to address community needs resides with local boards.
   - Primary authority to coordinate and assure that regional and statewide needs are addressed resides with the Board of Governors.

b. **Accountability:** With the legislatively-established bilateral structure of governance, the authority and responsibility of local boards and the Board of Governors flow from statute, and each local board and the Board of Governors therefore remain accountable to the State (Legislature and Governor) for the performance of their respective functions. However, except as provided by law, the Board of Governors is not legally responsible for the actions of local boards, and local boards are not legally responsible for the actions of the Board of Governors.

   When conflicts arise about the appropriate exercise of legal or governance responsibilities, both the Board of Governors and local boards have an interest in resolving these conflicts without having to resort to legislative review or adjudication.
   - The Board of Governors embraces accountability, not only to the State and the general public, but also to local governing boards.
   - Local boards embrace accountability, not only to the state and their local publics, but also to the Board of Governors.

c. **System Assistance:** In fulfilling its role of leadership and assistance the Board of Governors and Chancellor should be prepared to support local districts as requested.
   - As concerns arise that may require assistance, the Chancellor first should seek the advice and counsel of the state association of community colleges trustees and chief executive officers, the accrediting commission and other relevant parties; and the Chancellor should work with these parties in
shaping the assistance to be provided. When this need for informal assistance is identified, local boards and their chief executive officers should be responsive to inquiries and offers of technical assistance from the Chancellor and should recognize that all districts within the system are prepared to help fellow districts.

- If formal intervention into fiscal or management matters is necessary, and given the responsibility of the Board of Governors to maintain, to the maximum degree permissible, local authority and control in the administration of the community colleges, the Board of Governors should proceed deliberately and cautiously. Formal intervention should be predicated on the basis of established criteria and standards.

d. Legislative Representation: Local boards recognize that the Board of Governors has a responsibility to represent the collective interests of the system before state and national legislative and executive agencies. At the same time, the Board of Governors recognizes that local boards will remain respectful of the Board of Governors' role only if it provides for full involvement of the local boards in the formulation of system priorities which are articulated before state and national legislative and executive agencies.

- Local boards retain legal authority to represent their local communities' particular interests in these arenas
- Local Boards will remain respectful of the Board of Governor's role to represent the best interests of all districts, the students, and the State.

Prior to advancing a local interest before state and national legislative and executive agencies, the local boards recognize the value of following these protocols:

- If the interest advances a new system policy or has an effect on other districts generally, the local board should first seek to have the matter addressed through the system's established consultation process. If the local board's interest is not incorporated or accommodated by a system position, the local board should strongly consider refraining from advancing the interest. If the local board determines it necessary to proceed, it should inform the Board of Governors or its Chancellor before proceeding.
- If the interest only affects the local district and does not establish any system policy or put system policy in detriment, the local board should inform the Board of Governors, or its Chancellor, before proceeding.

e. Resolution of Conflicts Between Districts or Colleges: In a system as large and diverse as the California Community Colleges it is inevitable that there occasionally will be conflicts among or between districts, whether it be the duplication of programs, the location of facilities, or the primary right to serve students in certain areas. In addition, it is inevitable, in multi-college districts, that there occasionally will be disputes among colleges. In either instance, the practice of the Board of Governors should be to allow and enable a full opportunity for resolution of these disputes at the local level. At the early stages,
the system should refrain from intervention unless a law has been broken or unless all parties to the dispute ask the Chancellor to assist. If, after reasonable opportunities for local resolution, the conflict persists, local boards should be responsive to offers of the Chancellor to provide assistance or otherwise mediate the conflict.

6. In order for a unified and bilaterally governed system to be fully effective, the Board of Governors must be enabled to fulfill its functions.

In order to fulfill its delineated leadership responsibilities, the Board of Governors should be granted authority to:

- Select the Chancellor and senior management, to determine the compensation levels for these employees.
- Determine the appropriate organizational structure for the agency.
- Determine the level of funding necessary for system-wide operations.

7. The Legislature and Governor should allow the Board of Governors and local boards an opportunity to perform their respective governance roles before intervening into the governance and management of the colleges.

- The Legislature and Governor should give due weight to the recommendations of the system, recommendations which attempt to balance the interests of all districts and further the best interests of students, the system, and the State.
- The Legislature and Governor should refrain from approving legislation that advances narrow or district-specific issues to the detriment of the system.

8. While the system should be entrusted, enabled, and provided the opportunity to perform its delegated governance functions, the Board of Governors and local boards recognize that they exercise these responsibilities in response to the overall direction and oversight of the Legislature and the Governor. The Board of Governors and local boards thus recognize that there are a number of policy determinations and functions appropriate for the Legislature and Governor.

- Establishing the broad mission of the colleges.
- Establishing who is entitled to access to the colleges.
- Establishing the major functions of the Board of Governors and its membership.
- Establishing the major functions of the local boards, and provisions for election.
- Determining the amount of funding for the system, determined each year through the budget process.
- Establishing the general parameters for determining the apportionment formulas.
- Approving state-funded capital outlay projects.
- Determining mandatory student fees.
- Determining necessary categorical programs.
- Establishing broad policies for the employment of college staff.
- Establishing intersegmental education systems relationships.
• Determining broad policies for the sale, lease, and use of real and personal property.
• Establishing provisions to assure nondiscrimination and affirmative action.
• Establishing provisions for uniform residency determination.
• Determining mandatory holidays for colleges.
• Determining general policies regarding territory of districts, and district reorganization (of territory).
• Determining broad policies on student rights and responsibilities.

Within this broad framework, the Education Code, as it pertains to community colleges, should be rewritten. The system is developing a legislative proposal to accomplish this objective, and the measure will be introduced in 2000.

As local and state leaders of a system whose mission is student centered, success is essential. Thoughtful study of history, traditions and alternatives brings us to understand the locally-elected governing boards and Board of Governors are committed to working within this governance framework and to implementing the improvements outlined.