

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** May 31, 2001  
**TO:** Board of Trustees  
**FROM:** Dr. Philip R. Day, Jr.  
Chancellor

**SUBJECT: Chancellor's Monthly Report – May, 2001**

---

I am providing you with my Monthly Report for May and given developments at the federal, state, and local level, it has (indeed) been a very busy month. I'd like to review a few significant developments that directly impact on CCSF.

First, I'd like to talk about the state budget in terms of both our operational budget and capital. I am attaching a spreadsheet of the current status of the budget in terms of a comparison between the Governor's Proposed Budget in January; the Governor's May Revised; the outcomes of Senate Sub-Committee 1; and finally, the Assembly Sub-Committee 2. Overall, the good news is that community colleges were treated much better than most departments. In large measure, the Governor maintained his basic approach with the January spending plan for community colleges. Other areas of the state budget were hit very hard. You can see that both the Senate and Assembly notched us up a bit but each had a bit of a different approach. Of the two, and with the exception of the revised methodology suggested by the Senate for distributing the **One-Time Energy Costs and Conservation** funds, I prefer the Senate. Primarily because they specifically addressed the issue of providing a COLA adjustment (\$11M) for the Partnership for Excellence Program. I don't believe the Assembly's priorities for allocating \$2M for "low-transfer" colleges and \$10 M for High Cost Nursing Programs will survive the Conference Committee or the Governor's Veto. If we get something between the Governor's May Revised and the Senate's version of the budget (with the required change in distributing the energy funds), we will be in fairly good shape.

On the Capital Outlay side of the budget, things are a bit more complex. For review, the request that was approved and included within the Board of Governor's Budget Request included the following:

- \$ 200,000 Additional Planning Funds for Mission
- 1,334,000 Preliminary Planning for Chinatown/NorthBeach

Additionally, Senator Speier has introduced a Bill/Member's Request for \$450K for Preliminary Planning Funds for the Joint-Use Facility with SFSU. These funds, if approved, go directly to the CSU System, then to SFSU, and then to our project. At this point, we have a 50/50 chance of getting support this year and it will depend totally on the issue of available state funds to support any or some Member's Request.

As you know, the Governor's January Budget eliminated both of the above-referenced projects and we have been working hard to get them included in the final budget. The issue of the \$200K for Mission is different than the issue for Chinatown/NB. First, the Department of Finance has taken the position that they cannot release the \$900K that was approved by the Governor and Legislature **last year** until after our November Local Ballot is approved. Evidently, existing state law prohibits such action. Given the fact that the \$200K was intended to be an augmentation to the \$900K (we were shortchanged last year in the "wee hours" of the Conference Committee on Budget), it is clear that nothing can happen on this issue until after the November election. The fact of the matter is that the whole question of the Mission Campus (go or no go) hinges on the outcome of the local ballot election. Given the fact that we are in a "stop out" year from the flow of funds from the State, our planning timetable will need to be revised somewhat and we will lose about 6 months, during which time we will be "on hold" until the outcome of the November election is over. The "stop out" year was due to the fact that the Mission Campus Project was never on the Higher Ed 98-02 Capital Outlay Bond Project List, and there were no funds available to support a project of this scope. The intent was to have this portion of the project funded out of the March Statewide Higher Ed Bond for 2002-06.

For the Chinatown/NB Project, it is important to note that 32 new start projects of other districts were also cut from the Governor's Budget, in addition to ours. The rationale provided by the Governor and the Department of Finance was that they did not feel they could commit to any new start projects (with the UC Merced being a notable exception) until they got a sense of how the next statewide Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond was going to play out (when – March?; how much -- Bond rating? Interest rates?, etc.). We, in turn have been arguing that a) the money is there now, let's use it; 2) we can lose a whole year of relevant facilities planning time; and 3) the enrollment growth projected for Tidal Wave II requires us to move forward and invest or there will never be enough space and access will be denied to those most in need.

This argument has resonated extremely well, particularly within the public higher education community (UC, CSU, and CC system) who are noted for not being on the same page. This strong consensus has resulted in a major concession being made, which provides that the UC/CSU combine will reallocate some of their resources to "payback" the community colleges the \$26 M needed to fund the 32 projects. In return, we would agree to not support any legislative initiative which attempts to split the Higher Education Capital Outlay dollars on the basis of FTE's...but rather, a 1/3, 13, and 1/3 split would be followed (please note: we've never gotten a 1/3 split because the UC system has always gotten more at our expense). Also, we would help get the legislative support required for UC/CSU to "backfill" the loss of the \$26 M, i.e., they want to issue

revenue bonds, which requires legislative approval.

Having worked hard to help broker this deal, if we can get it through and receive the support of the legislature, we can get the funding for the CH/NB campus this year. If not, the Preliminary Plans will have to come out of the next statewide Higher Ed Capital Outlay Bonds. The good news in all of this is that the funding and commitment from the state is there. The real question revolves around the issue of when we receive it. It appears as though the Working Drawing funds for the Mission will not be available/released until after the November election; and, for Chinatown/NorthBeach project, it could happen as early as July 1, 2001, but no later than July 2002.

Getting back to the operational budget, I am attaching a copy of my memo to the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) dated May 3, 2001, which reflects the culmination of our efforts, working through all the Major Cost Center managers, and the shared governance committee responsible for overseeing and coordinating same. This memo and the recommendations included regarding the FY2001-2002 budget were unanimously approved by the PBC. It now serves as the primary basis for us to develop our budget recommendations to the Board. Our schedule for Board review of the budget is as follows:

- 1) Budget Workshop/Review Session hosted by Board Finance Committee – Lawrence Wong, Chairperson – May.**
- 2) Board Review and Approval of Recommended Preliminary Budget for FY 2001-2002 – June**
- 3) Board approval of Final Recommended Budget for FY 2001-2002 – September.**

The attached provides you with an early review of our budget deliberations and Peter and I will be reviewing our current status and plans in considerably more detail at our May Budget Planning Workshop.

May is always an extremely busy month as we work to “wrap-up” our semester; honor the graduates of our various programs; recognize our returning faculty and staff; and thank those of us remaining for a “job well done.” This month, there has been much of that and I’ve tried to do my best to get as many of these events as I can. In addition and as several Board members know, we hosted a very successful community meeting with the neighborhood groups surrounding the Ocean Avenue/Phelan campus. We will continue to move throughout the district and do all we can to expand our communications to our “neighbors.” It should be noted that the “centerpiece” of our Fall Schedule was a spreadsheet reflecting an overview of the projected plans of the bond initiative (see attached). This document is currently being reformatted to reflect a stand-alone publication that we can distribute selectively to our neighbors in the form of a report by the college.

Shifting back to the state level again, I have been reappointed to the Statewide Board of Governor’s Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Task Force. This group has the overall responsibility of developing the “preliminary” statewide budget for community colleges,

which then gets reviewed and finally, approved by all of the various constituent groups and the state board. This puts us in a great position to argue not only on behalf of the priorities of City College but other urban-based, high-cost districts who serve a diverse constituency through their credit and non-credit program structure.

Additionally, we have nearly completed the search process for the replacement of Jennifer Biehn's position. You may recall that we worked hard to get students involved with the hiring committee (which was finally approved by the Academic Senate) and they fully participated in the review, screening, and recommendation process. Three candidates were presented to me. I opened the process up even further and had key individuals within our shared governance constituencies and Deans, who would be working on the same Team, interview each of the three candidates. Additionally, I asked a group of student who represented the "old guard" of AS and the new team of AS to meet with all of the candidates and report back to me on their assessment of each individual's strengths and weaknesses. Don Griffin and I met with each candidate and I'll be prepared to make my recommendation shortly as soon as we do some additional background checks on the individual I regard as the top candidate. Hopefully, this process will be completed over the course of the next few days and we can bring this to a close this month.

On the other fronts, the following represents my activities for the rest of the month:

- 1) Met with SFSU President Corrigan and Superintended Ackerman regarding our joint use facilities project and other areas of potential cooperation.
- 2) Attended the reception for the annual scholarship dinner of the Council on Black American Affairs.
- 3) Met with the Enhanced Self Study Ad Hoc Coordinating Council to discuss the status of the ESS and specific recommendations.
- 4) Met with members of the Planning and Budgeting Council to review and approve FY 2001-2002 Recommended Budget.
- 5) Chaired the meeting of the College Advisory Council to discuss CCSF issues and plans.
- 6) Met with Francine Podenski and John O'Dell regarding Broadcast Media Services.
- 7) Met with Elizabeth Goldstein, General Manager of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, and Larry Klein, Acting Manager of the Department of Public Works to discuss the development and potential use of the Phelan Reservoir and ways our respective departments could collaborate on "open space" issues.

- 8) Attended receptions hosted by Dean Sandra Handler for SCANS participants, Department Chairs, and Asian Infusion faculty.
- 9) Met with Alma Soto and other AS officers regarding the AS election and Prop S.
- 10) Met with the College Curriculum Committee regarding DACUM.
- 11) Attended reception honoring our faculty retirees at Pierre Coste Restaurant.
- 12) Together with Trustees Natalie Berg and Rodel Rodis, met with Supervisor Sophie Maxwell regarding our Bond Issues.
- 13) Attended the reception and graduation/awards for International Students at Educated Palate.
- 14) Chaired the meeting of the College Diversity Committee and discussed current plans and projects.
- 15) Hosted the Chancellor's Scholarship Awards at Diego Rivera Theater.
- 16) Met with the Executive Committee of the Administrators' Council to discuss upcoming issues and plans.
- 17) Hosted a community meeting at Pierre Coste Restaurant for various community groups and organizations in the outer Mission, OMI, Ocean View neighborhoods to discuss plans for the redevelopment of the Geneva/Ocean Avenue corridor, the Geneva BART station, and the Ocean/Phelan Avenue campus.
- 18) Met with members of the Women's Coalition to discuss future projects and plans.
- 19) Attended a meeting of the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Task Force in Sacramento.
- 20) Met with leadership of Local 790 to discuss campus issues and plans.
- 21) Met with Tim Killikelly, faculty, regarding special Voter Registration Project for City College.
- 22) Met with Frances Lee, Judy Teng, and Joanne Low for a debriefing on the Osaka and Japan trip.
- 23) Interviewed finalists for the position of Associate Dean of Student Activities.
- 24) Met with the new Executive Director of the Department of Human Services, Trent Rhorer.

- 25) Met with Linda Squires-Grohe, Vicki and Jose Ramon Pena regarding CCSF's Welcome Back Grant and potential "spin-off" opportunities.
- 26) Met with leadership of AFT 2121 to discuss labor/management issues.
- 27) Attended the meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Council to update members on the status of our Bond Measure.
- 28) Met with Bill Liskamm, CCSF consulting architect, to discuss follow-up plans for the Balboa, Ingleside, and Ocean Avenue projects.
- 29) Met with project architects and Building Committee of New Mission Campus to review current plans and preservation options.

If you have any questions on any of the above, please don't hesitate to contact me directly.

Attachments

PRDJ:jcd