

COLLEGE PLAN

Vision: Provide Open access to curriculum, instruction and support services for students in the pursuit of their educational goals.

Community
ResponsivenessLearning and
Instruction

Leadership

Institutional
Support

College Policy: CPC
Tech. Advisory:
Prjt. Champion: SBCC President
Prjt. Manager:
Implementation: Cabinet
On-Going Ops.:

PROJECT REDESIGN

Vision: Apply reengineering principles to enhance the viability of the college.

TransformationsDistributed
LearningAnytime/
Anywhere
AccessStudent/
Client
CenteredFocus on
Process vs.
Organizational**Supporting
Processes**Ongoing
Change
ManagementRedirection of
ResourcesStaff
Development
and Training**Planning Documents**

College Plan

Technology
Vision and
Directions

Self Study

Resource Plan

Project
Implementation
PlansOrganizational
(Human
Resources) Plan

College Policy: CPC
Tech. Advisory: Tech Team
Prjt. Champion: SBCC President
Prjt. Manager:
Implementation:
On-Going Ops.:

BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING METHODOLOGIES

Vision: Provide the framework to implement new functional processes as a result of reengineering.

Team
ReportsConversion
Project
ImplementationDepartmental
Plans

Grants

Donations

College Policy: CMC
Tech. Advisory: Tech Team
Prjt. Champion: SBCC President
Prjt. Manager: VP IRD
Implementation:
On-Going Ops.:

IMPLEMENT**INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT,
DELIVERY**

Vision: Produce a framework for developing technology-mediated courses in an effective, efficient and flexible manner.

Technology
EnhancedHybrid
CoursesOnline/
Distance

College Policy: Academic Senate
Tech. Advisory:
Prjt. Champion: VP Academic Affairs
Prjt. Manager: Dir. Instrl. Technolgy
Implementation: LRC
On-Going Ops.: LRC

**CONVERSION PROJECT
(ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM)**

Vision: Provide a new comprehensive applications system that will be a college model for the 21st Century.

Student Information
SystemHuman
Resources

Finance

College Policy: CPC
Tech. Advisory: Tech Team
Prjt. Champion: VP IRD
Prjt. Manager: VP IRD
Implementation: SPM Team
On-Going Ops.: IRD

WEB BASED DELIVERY

Vision: Deliver the best college services to students by developing the capacity to conduct all external and internal processes using the Web.

Internet

Information

Enhanced

Interactive

Intranet

Groupware

Forms

Documents

Universal Internet AccessStudent
E-mailInternet
Access

College Policy: Web Committee
Tech. Advisory:
Prjt. Champion: Dean ?
Prjt. Manager: Webmaster
Implementation:
On-Going Ops.: IRD

COLLEGE-WIDE TECHNICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Vision: Provide a Technical infrastructure to support the current technology projects and provide a framework for effective modifications to encompass future technology trends.

Backbone
WiringSwitching
& Routing


Servers

Desktops

Support
Staff

College Policy:
Tech. Advisory:
Prjt. Champion: VP IRD
Prjt. Manager: Dir. Tech Services
Implementation: IRD
On-Going Ops.: IRD

Santa Barbara City College Funding Resources For College Infrastructure Needs



College Planning Council
Planning and Resource Allocation Issues
Discussion With Dr. MacDougall
May 26, 1998

1. Overview of Contextual Framework For SBCC Change Initiative: Project Redesign (Attachment 1)
 - a. College Plan
 - b. Vision And Direction
 - c. Business Process Reengineering Methodologies
 - d. Alternative Learning: Instructional Design, Development, and Delivery
 - e. Conversion Project (Administrative Systems)
 - f. Web Based Delivery of Programs and Services
 - g. College-wide Technical Infrastructure
2. Funding For College Infrastructure Needs
 - a. Principles
 - There is a need for the College to plan and budget for the timely renewal and maintenance of the institution's physical facilities and equipment inventory.
 - There is a need for a regular, predictable, and equitable distribution of available resources to meet identified needs.
 - There is a need for a structured process for development and review of annual allocations by Cabinet, College Planning Council, and Board of Trustees.
 - A variety of revenue sources are used to meet identified needs.
 - b. Annual Target Revenues
 - Regular Equipment Replacement (\$ 800,000 Reduced to \$ 730,000 For Telecommunications Transfer)
 - \$11+ Million Inventory, 15 Year Average Replacement Cycle
 - Review of Allocation Mechanisms in 1998-99
 - Business Services (Purchasing) Maintain Current Inventory
 - Define College-wide Replacement Categories and Amounts
 - Delegate to VPs Control and Administration of Area Funds
 - Identify Any Exceptions to Replacement (MDT, Others)
 - Technology Equipment Replacement (\$ 600,000 Increased to \$ 670,000)
 - Telecommunications Equipment (Switches, Routers, Hubs) \$ 70,000
 - College-wide (Servers, Printers, ADA, Emergencies) \$120,000
 - VP Areas (Instructional Labs, Faculty, Staff) \$480,000
 - 240 Machines @ \$2,000 Average
 - 1,200 Machines @ 5 Year Replacement Cycle

- New Computer Initiatives (\$ 250,000)
 - 5 Years, 1996-2001, To “Build Out” Campus
 - Conversion to Replacement \$ in 2001-2002
 - Total Equipment Replacement Reserve (\$ 1.4 to 2.8 Million)
 - (One to two years of funding needs minus ongoing Instructional Equipment Replacement)
 - Construction, Rehabilitation/Deferred Maintenance (\$ 690,000)
 - Classroom Improvements, Deferred Maintenance
 - Capital Outlay Project Shortfalls For Specific Projects
 - Capital Outlay Reserve (\$ 1 Million to \$ 1.5 Million)
- c. Present Revenue Sources (Attachment 2)
- Ongoing Sources
 - Instructional Equipment Replacement (Ongoing \$ 560,000)
 - Required 3:1 District Match (\$ 186,667)
 - Lottery (\$ 200,000 to \$ 700,000) *Reflects* \$ 600,000 for 2% Salary
 - One-Time Revenues
 - Block Grant (\$ 0 to \$ 995,000)
 - One-time Funds / End-of-Year Balances (\$200,000 to \$2,000,000)
 - General Fund Budget (Reallocation of Existing Resources)
 - Deferred Maintenance (Project Specific Application and Funding)
- d. Issues
- Board Commitment of One-Time Funds to Meet Annual Needs of \$1,780,000 (\$2,340,000 - \$560,000)
 - Allocation of Specific Revenue Sources to Target Areas
 - “Buy-Out” of Salary Two Percent (or Annual Increases) From Lottery
 - Process For Planning and Review
 - Budget Development (August)
 - Mid Year Adjustments (March)
 - End-of-Year (June)

3. Planning and Resource Strategies For Technology Initiatives

- a. College-wide Infrastructure
- Conversion Project - Fully Funded
 - Campus ATM Backbone - \$ 750,000
 - Campus Firewall and Security - \$ 50,000

b. Institutional Directions

- Internet / Intranet Development - Phase II & III
- Universal Internet Access (\$ 400,000)
- Instructional Design, Development, and Delivery
- Web-Based Development and Delivery
- Departmental Training and Support
- Decision Support, Research, Planning

c. Major Departmental / Area Initiatives

- Multimedia, High Tech Center (Admin, LSG Remodel Projects)
- Process For Evaluation of New Initiatives - Particularly Direct and Indirect Cost Implications
- Process For Identifying Long-Range (3 Year) Plans By VP Area

d. Grants, Donations, Categorical, Capital Outlay, and Departmental Resources

- Process For Identifying One-Time and Ongoing Costs Before Approval
- Process For Funding Ongoing Replacement Costs
- Assessment of Support Requirements and Sustainability

e. Potential Sources of Revenue

- One-Time Revenues
 - Use of Equipment Replacement Reserve / Block Grant
 - One-time Funds / End-of-Year Balances
 - Bonds (2/3 Vote, Requires Ballot Initiative)
 - Certificates of Participation (Must Have Cash Flow For Payback)
- Ongoing Revenue Sources
 - General Fund Budget (Reallocation of Existing Resources)
 - Growth Funding

4. Project Redesign 1998-99

- Operating Budget (Attachment 3)
- Role of Governet (George Tamas, George Beahan)

5. Tentative Plans For College Plan Assessment

- D R A F T -

May 26, 1998

Mr. Tom Nussbaum, Chancellor
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Santa Barbara Community College District's Recommendations for the State Budget

Dear Tom:

Your request for college feedback regarding the State Budget was received with enthusiasm at Santa Barbara City College. The College community appreciates the invitation to provide our thoughts regarding system budget planning.

SBCC's Academic Senate took this charge seriously and devoted segments of their meetings to the development of recommendations. Their recommendations and those of others were submitted to SBCC's College Planning Council. The College Planning Council consists of leadership for all College groups: classified, Academic Senate, students, and administration. A consensus emerged regarding the following primary recommendations. They are forwarded for your consideration.

1. Development of the Technological Capability

For the California Community Colleges to be competitive in the 21st century, individual colleges need to leverage the power of technology to respond to issues of enhancing access to higher education, increasing our effectiveness in learning outcomes for all programs, and seeking greater efficiencies. Technological tools are seen as fundamental enablers in the creativity of faculty and staff being applied to meet those ends. It is toward that end the following budget items are viewed as critical:

- a. Financial support for colleges to develop and sustain a technological infrastructure that will enable universal Internet access by staff and students, support the delivery of educational programs over the World Wide Web, and be applied on campus to enhance learning and support greater operational efficiency.
- b. Financial support to obtain staff to develop technology-based initiatives and sustain the College's technology infrastructure.

2. Recognition of the Serious Underfunding of Community Colleges by Any Objective Standard

Provide "catch up" funding that will enable general support (supplies, equipment and maintenance) to be updated to a level of adequacy.

Our college governance groups recognize the serious underfunding of the California Community Colleges vis-à-vis community colleges nationally. The gap (California is almost fifty percent below the national average) is shameful. It places the California Community Colleges at a serious disadvantage in developing and maintaining excellence. In addition, the four-year period in which no cost-of-living adjustment (C.O.L.A.) was provided has resulted in a serious underfunding in the basic supply and support categories of colleges. Efforts to place the California Community Colleges full-time equivalent funding at a level equal to the national average and much more competitive with K-12, CSU and UC in California are essential. If it is not addressed, it will be very difficult for the colleges to maintain quality and meet the access needs of the State.

- a. Increase base FTEs funding to at least 80 percent of the national average in three years (by 2001-2002).

3. Adjustment in the Structural Support Base for the California Community Colleges

- a. A more equitable split of Proposition 98 funds.
- b. Provide special funds to enable the 75/25 category to be reached. Growth funds should not be used for that purpose (as is presently required). Growth funds are not received at the full funding rate and need to be applied to meet fundamental deficiencies in our budgets and costs associated with growth.
- c. Fund the noncredit, full-time equivalent students at a level at least equivalent to K-12 funding.

4. Decrease Grant Funding from General Fund (Proposition 98) Dollars

There is concern about the increase in grant-based funding. The allocation of state dollars to achieve statewide initiatives based on FTEs, rather than an increase in grant-based programs, is desired. Grant programs take a considerable amount of staff time to apply, monitor and implement. Though the grants are more desirable than not receiving money, this form of funding for the core funding for system-wide issues is not appropriate. Such initiatives can best be addressed through appropriation based on per FTEs.

These suggestions are intended to assist you as you develop the State budget for the California Community Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback.

Sincerely yours,

Peter R. MacDougall
President

PRM:sjc

Santa Barbara City College
Academic Senate

**Recommendations to College Planning Council Regarding
Chancellor's Office Request for Input on Budget Process**

Faculty members on the Planning & Resources Committee discussed the Chancellor's Office request for input on budget development for the 1999-2000 fiscal year and submitted its recommendations to the Academic Senate on 4/28/98. The recommendations of the P&R Committee were reviewed, amended and endorsed by the Academic Senate on May 13, 1998. Asterisks are used to identify priorities of the Academic Senate. The following ideas and suggestions are forwarded to CPC for inclusion in the development of the district's response to the Chancellor's request.

- * o Develop a budget line for ongoing maintenance of the technology infrastructure for all community colleges. +
- * o Provide funding for staffing to support technology and the technology infrastructure. +
- * o Recognize the increased costs of supplies and equipment in all areas, but particularly in equipment/supply-intensive programs (e.g. Sciences, some technology areas, etc.) and fund accordingly. +
 - o Augment supplies budgets across the board.
 - o Concern was voiced about the significant amount of resources currently disbursed via grant projects and the amount of time expended in order to obtain those resources.
 - o Increase base funding and decrease the numbers of grants. Questioned whether grant funds are subject to the Prop 98 split and, if not, that may be a reason for the increased number of grants. (This needs to be clarified.)
 - o Maintain some categorical funding. (e.g. EOPS, DSPS, CARE, Matriculation)
 - o Augment budgets for categorically funded programs to make up for years of no COLAs.
- * o Seek a more equitable split of Prop 98 funds for community colleges.
 - o Recommend that the FTES funding structure for community colleges be brought back into line with other institutions of higher learning.
 - o Recommend increasing the non-credit funding ratio to a level that is at least equivalent to K-12 funding or 80% of credit funding.
- * o Re-emphasize the 75/25 full time/part-time faculty split and provide budget support to achieve it.
 - o Recommend separation of library funding and technology funding into two separate categories.
 - o Questioned why the item for California Virtual University Centers is included as a line item in the community college budget.
 - o Re-examine program-based funding (or full needs funding) as recommended by AB 1725 instead of Performance-Based Funding.

- * SBCC Priority
- + endorsed by State Academic Senate 4/98