

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**May 27, 2003  
3:00 – 4:30 PM  
Room A218C**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** J. Friedlander, J. Romo, B. Fahnestock, B. Hamre, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, P. Haslund, G. Carroll, E. Frankel, T. Garey, L. Rose, L. Auchincloss and J. Jackson

**ABSENT:** A. Serban, E. Frankel and E. Salazar

**GUEST:** Leslie Griffin, Mark Ferrer and Laurie Vasquez

**1.0 Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jack Friedlander

**2.0 Announcements**

CPC will meet on July 29<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m.

**3.0 Information Items**

**3.1 Update on budget: actions taken by the state Assembly and Senate budget committees regarding community colleges**

Brian Fahnestock distributed to and led the Council through the spreadsheet of the 2-year comparison of the unrestricted General Fund which reflects the 2003-04 Governor's May revise released May 14<sup>th</sup>. This spreadsheet is the same as the one presented to CPC last week. Brian said the state is reducing our general apportionment and giving us growth funding. Today's presentation to CPC is a rough estimate of the undesignated ending balance for 2003-04 of \$2,062,000. However, the end-of-year undesignated balance does not include any transfer of money into the equipment or construction funds. He cautioned as we look at this spreadsheet that we are basing not only next year's proposal but also this year's proposal on our interpretation of the state's action to date as we have not yet had any confirmation on how to calculate the current budget correctly. Brian reminded that Council that these figures are assumptions. The P2 Attendance Report due in June will give us a more accurate picture of the current year.

John Romo added that in early April the state budget for 02-03 was finally signed. He said that the Chancellor's Office has not and refuses to give us at this time any information on how that is actually going to apply to us.

Brian also distributed: (1) the 2003-04 reductions for restricted and unrestricted budgets as well as equipment and construction funds based upon the May revise, (2) the budgeted certificated and classified vacancies, and (3) the 2003-04 Budget Deliberations

for California Community Colleges, distributed by the Community College League of California, upon which Brian modeled the 2-year comparison of the unrestricted general fund for 2002-03 & 2003-04. Brian said the big changes, if one takes the average of the Assembly and the Senate proposed budgets compared to what the Governor, is that the general apportionment goes up substantially as well as Partnership for Excellence. He said these both are the best kind of money for us because it comes with the least spending restrictions. Brian summarized by saying that the spreadsheets and models provided today are probably not accurate in that the Legislature is further refining the budget.

Jack Friedlander added that both the Assembly and the Senate are asking for a fee increase of \$15 to \$18 to be implemented this fall. Our challenge will be, once the budget is signed, to determine how we will collect the increase of fees from students who registered prior to the state budget being passed. The other issue is the \$25m they agreed to penalize the districts for alleged abuses in the dual enrollment program. Rather than individual district audits, they will take money away from each district next year based on FTES each district generated from special admit high school students enrolled in physical education and possibly personal development courses.

#### **4.0 Discussion Items**

##### **4.1 Review of Oracle Student Information System**

John Romo distributed an outline to provide an update on the Oracle Student System which chronicles our partnership with Oracle from May 1996 to present. He said the unanimous recommendation in a report to him was that although we do not have the full product in hand, we have enough of the product to be able to draw the conclusion that the Oracle Student System is going to deliver what we had hoped and that we should proceed with our plans for implementation. John said prior to making a recommendation to the Board, we needed to have preliminary discussions with Oracle on pricing. We felt the pricing did not reflect our role as a partner in the development of this product. John said we were finally successful in getting Oracle to come down rather significantly in their pricing both on some of the one-time costs as well as the ongoing costs. We came up with a price that we thought was fair compared to the cost for similar products and a price that reflected our participation with Oracle. Bill said we had requested over a 3-year period over a quarter-million dollar reduction in costs. Oracle exceeded this proposal in their counter of a \$265k reduction. This is a permanent ongoing reduction in the fees Oracle will charge the college for use of its products.

John said this is still pending final analysis of the contract that Oracle submits to the college in that the agreement has been verbal to date. He also said that we did have input from the Gartner Group in our negotiations. John Romo said that he will report to the Board Fiscal Committee today his recommendation to continue to proceed with the plan to implement OSS.

Bill Hamre provided the Council a spreadsheet that identifies the resource requirements for personnel and operational costs to support the implementation of OSS as well as the potential revenue sources to support this project. A source of one-time funds is the dollars that have been set-aside in the Fund 41 accounts. John Romo said, in terms of the Fund 41 being our source of revenue for equipment replacement, we have no monies going into the fund for 03-04. He indicated that we cannot go much more than a year without putting some money into that fund for needed equipment replacement. We

are fortunate that it has built up over time and we have some reserves which will help next year for equipment replacement.

**5.0 Other Items**

There were no other items.

**6.0 Adjournment**

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.