I. Review and Approval of CCSF Budget 2006/7

Present: John Bilmont, Denton Crews, Adam D’Aquisto, Philip R. Day, Jr., Carlota del Portillo, Bob Gabriner, Peter Goldstein, Don Griffin, Stephen Herman, Marc Kitchel, Donald Lind, Susan Lopez, Madeline Mueller, Dennis Piontkowski, James Rogers, David Yee.

Vice Chancellor Goldstein gave the Council a presentation on the current budget, which is being presented in its final form to the Board of Trustees on Sept. 28. It is a balanced budget for the amount of $178,896,763. There is no ending balance rolling forward from 2005-2006 in the operating budget.

The vice chancellor reported that this is the best state budget in over a decade, representing an opportunity for the College to make some headway in replacing funds in the reserve as well as funding on-going expenses and salary increases for employees. The state is funding 2% systemwide in enrollment growth and is making available a 5.92% COLA, plus increased block grant funding of $194 mil. The COLA translates into ~$8.18 mil. in new funds for CCSF. We could get at least $1.4 mil. in growth funding, depending on growth. Unfortunately, it is no longer considered likely that CCSF will qualify for any credit equalization funding, as it is more advisable to shift some summer FTES to next year to protect our base funding. Last year, $2 million was taken from the reserve; additionally, $256,000 needs to be transferred retroactively. The fund balance will recover slightly.

The CCSF 2006/7 budget funds continuation of summer school at last year’s level. It is anticipated that the shift of summer FTES will be “used up” in two years.

Vice Chancellor Goldstein discussed some of the revenue assumptions. Total estimated revenues are about $179 mil., much better than last year. The budget assumes we will get restoration money and will get ~$4 mil. of the $30 mil. statewide in new noncredit funding, although the governor had not signed SB361 at the time of the meeting. Unless the governor were to veto it, which is certainly not expected, it will become law.

The lottery money is up 2%, but may come in lower. However, sales tax revenues are up 4%, which is higher than was expected and that will help us. Matriculation funding at the College will increase by $900,000. CCSF is getting a lot more basic skills money than in 2005-06, but this time it comes with many strings attached. We will be devoting more money to basic skills because it was earmarked more specifically than usual in the trailer bill. The assumption is that the state will impose no deficit coefficient, although that is always a possibility.

There is an increase in one-time monies of various kinds, and discussion of how to spend those should take place at a future Council meeting.

Our expenditures for last year were over budget. We are still spending well over 90% on personnel. It will be possible to fill some classified positions as soon as SB361 is signed. This
year, our budget is funding 30 new tenure-track faculty positions, including some replacement positions. The Institutional Advancement Office is being expanded, and the College hopes to hire a permanent Vice Chancellor of Student Development.

The Council unanimously approved the CCSF final budget in its totality, with one abstention.

II. CCSF Budget Review Process: Progress Report 2

Senior administration performed additional work over the summer on the process of reviewing programs and services to see where greater efficiencies can be achieved, and where reallocations might have to be made. In particular the administration wanted to make it clearer why particular recommendations were being made to examine certain program areas. The three areas of greatest concern that have been identified are Aircraft Maintenance Tech, Journeyman/Training, and Transitional Studies. Only these programs are subject to an accelerated timeline of review, with recommendations to be made to the council by a working group on December 7. Of these, Transitional Studies is a concern in the sense that more needs to be accomplished in that area to meet the objectives of the College; there is no suggestion to cut the program. The members accepted the report and concurred with moving ahead with review according to the proposed timeline.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Lopez