CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SYSTEM’S 2003-2004 BUDGET REQUEST

FY2003-2004
INTRODUCTION

This document represents City College of San Francisco’s initial budgetary proposals for development into the System’s 2003-2004 Budget Request. This initial proposal forms the cornerstone of the grassroots efforts to build the budget for all the California community colleges. The final budget will be presented to the Governor’s Office in September of 2002 after approval by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

The format follows that of the Board of Governor’s Community Colleges’ Budget Requests, but it also includes specific projections and impact analysis as it applies to City College. The information regarding the budget requests reflects our operational requirements and priorities. The Capital Outlay Budget requests for City College of San Francisco are also included.

Because there has been no resolution as yet of the 2002-2003 budget, our initial approach will be to continue our advocacy of the 2002-2003 proposals that are supported by the entire system rather than advocating for an entirely new set of initiatives. Therefore, the issues that are included are those that have been identified-to-date by City College and will be expanded and/or modified as they move through the budget and legislative cycle.

It will be our practice throughout the legislative session to keep the entire Board and college community appraised of information regarding City College of San Francisco and the Board of Governor’s legislative priorities, as they develop and evolve. The Chancellor, his Governmental Relations Liaison, Dr. Dale Shimasaki, CEO of Strategic Education Services, and Leslie P. Smith, Dean of Governmental Relations, will communicate these priority proposals to the San Francisco legislative delegations, as well as, advise on other issues pertinent to community colleges and post-secondary education.

For further information contact:

Dr. Philip R. Day, Jr.    Dr. Dale Shimasaki
Chancellor    CEO
City College of San Francisco  Strategic Education Services
50 Phelan Avenue, E-200    1130 K Street, Suite 250
San Francisco, CA  94112    Sacramento, CA  95814
415-239-3303    916-441-3909
Fax 415-239-3918    Fax 916-441-4577

Leslie P. Smith
Dean, Governmental Relations
City College of San Francisco
50 Phelan Avenue, E-208
San Francisco, CA 94112
415-452-5132
Fax 415-239-3918
CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO  
INITIAL BUDGETARY PROPOSALS  
FY 2003-2004

The overall budget strategy contained in this document is to  
♦ restore funding cuts made to programs in FY2002-2003;  
♦ fund COLA and growth allocations to cover the costs of maintaining our effort and access to our students;  
♦ advocate for system initiatives developed for FY2002-2003.

Since the system spent a tremendous amount of time developing a comprehensive budget package, that truly reflects the systems priorities and needs, it is of fundamental importance that the system not go off in a completely new direction. In order to convince policymakers that the System’s BCP’s are serious proposals, we are going to have to stay the course and advocate fiercely for what we need.

BASE FUNDING RESTORATION

Matriculation $26.8 Million

The Matriculation budget took a 35% hit to an already underfunded program. These dollars have been used to fund assessment, placement, research, evaluation, and counseling activities in both credit and noncredit

Serving more students with fewer dollars can only have a negative effect on the integrity of the classroom. For example, since all students will no longer be able to be assessed and appropriately placed, students will self-select the courses in which they enroll. Prerequisites will not be enforced, increasing a student’s risk of failure; course repetitions will increase while retention will decrease. The quality of student support services will be negatively impacted even further because we will continue to keep the door open to students who need an education. The problem is that these students also need access to student support services in order for their educational experience to be a success.

CalWORKS/TANF $58 Million

CalWORKS and TANF have taken the biggest hit. All $8 million of the TANF dollars and $50 million of the CalWORKS dollars have been taken out of the community colleges’ budget. This leaves only the $15 million for childcare in the system budget. In the past, these funds have been used for work-study, job placement and program administration and coordination activities. In particular, the $18 million for student work-study will be abolished, leaving only $22 million statewide for all work-study for all students.

Furthermore, qualifying to receive childcare will be more difficult. For example, those transitioning off CalWORKS will no longer be automatically eligible to continue to receive childcare benefits and beneficiaries will be expected to pay a larger share of the costs.
Additionally, President Bush is proposing changes to the Federal TANF program that 1) increases the work requirement, 2) decreases the flexibility to use education to fulfill the participation requirements, and 3) substantially increases the cost to the State. We will have to carefully monitor the TANF reauthorization process in order to continue to provide access to an education to our CalWORKs students. It is the only route to true, long-term financial stability and self-sufficiency for our most vulnerable population.

**Economic Development**

$8.85 Million

The Governor has proposed significant cuts to the current Economic Development Program, focusing on the regional centers, the backbone of the community colleges regional approach to education. If there is to be any type of regional coordination of our economic development programs, the centers must be funded.

In order to continue the Economic Development mission of the community colleges, it is necessary to pass legislation to reauthorize the Community Colleges Economic Development program. Currently this program sunsets in January 2003.

**Faculty and Staff Development**

$5.2 Million

For years, the community colleges have been attempting to increase the allocations for staff development activities, but have been unsuccessful. This may be a case where our reputation for high quality instruction has hurt our advocacy for adequate funding in this area. With the large number of retirements expected in the next 10 years and the number of new hires needed to replace these retirements, address expansion issues, upgrade part-time faculty and offer new programs, there is no expectation that the training needs of our faculty and staff will diminish in the near future. Only funding development activities from each district’s general fund budget is insufficient.

Pursuit of a tax credit for faculty, paralleling what was previously granted to K-12 teachers, is one other alternative.

**Telecommunications and Technology**

$19.8 Million

Not only is there a need for faculty and staff development in the areas of telecommunications and technology, there is a need for infrastructure and backbone development.

**Other Cuts**

$16 Million

Funds for Student Success has funded many innovation programs that have increased the success of our students. Partnership for Excellence dollars cannot be used to backfill every activity of the community colleges. Additionally, $5 million needs to be restored to the recently initiated--Teacher and Reading Development program, as does $1 million to Nursing Program Expansion.
COMPENSATION, GOODS AND SERVICES

4% COLA $166 Million

The statutory COLA is minimum amount needed to keep our programs operating. However, this amount does not adequately cover the costs of step increases or the anticipated explosion in health care costs. Funding a realistic level of COLA is fundamental to maintaining our current level and quality of educational services.

4% COLA ON CATEGORIALS, PART-TIME EQUITY AND PFE $25.4 Million

A COLA must be provided for all programs. No COLA has had the greatest impact in recent years on the three part-time equity funds and Partnership for Excellence. Because these programs focus on personnel, they incur annual increases just to maintain their current level of effort.

STUDENT OUTREACH, ACCESS & SUCCESS

Growth (4%) $166 Million

The system needs at least a growth rate of 4% to accommodate the overwhelming demand experienced by all segments of post-secondary education systems during an economic downturn and the real increase in the college-age population due to expected demographic trends. While the recent 3% growth rates allow us to keep the doors to a college education open, this level of funding actually translates to a loss in per Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) funding. Because districts have refused to turn away students in need, many districts are producing unfunded overcap growth.

The community colleges are already drastically underfunded. Our mission is to serve all adults who can benefit. We need sufficient resources to keep the doors to a post-secondary education open. However, a defacto lowering of the per FTES funding is not an acceptable solution. The only way to correct this inequity is to increase the amount of growth funded.

Student Health Services $9 Million

Currently the districts with a high percentage of lower income students are unable to offer the same level of health services to students as districts with an affluent population. This occurs because students who are eligible for a Board of Governors (BOG) fee waiver do not have to pay a health fee. However, unlike for the BOG Waiver, the districts are not reimbursed for the loss of revenue from the health fee. Thus, the poorest and neediest students receive the lowest level and quality of health services. This is unjust.

Extended Opportunity Programs & Services $4.8 Million

This request fully funds EOPS services for a total of 83,019 students. Educational access for disadvantaged students is most likely to be supported via EOPS supplemental services. These services include counseling, basic skills instruction, peer counseling and mentoring, books and grants. The door to education must be kept open to the most disadvantaged.
**Disabled Students Program & Services**  
$1.5 Million

This request is for sign language interpreting and on-site classroom real-time captioning, some of the most expensive services colleges can provide to the disabled population. Although several augmentations have been made to this program in recent years, they have been targeted for other disabled student populations and other types of services. In order for colleges to be in compliance with federal and state law, these funds are needed to adequately reimburse colleges for the costs incurred when serving the hearing impaired.

**Ensuring Student Success Statewide**  
$25 Million

Historically, there has been inequity in many aspects of the community college funding formula. This specific proposal begins to address the differences in base credit funding.

**Cal Grant Administration**  
$11 Million

Recently the Cal Grant program has been expanded to offer much needed financial assistance to our students. Thus colleges have incurred increased costs in outreach, counseling and administrative services associated with the Cal Grant program. This augmentation would help defray the administrative costs associated with the new program.

### ACADEMIC QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT

**Workforce Development Initiative**  
$73 Million

Recognizing the importance of educating California’s workforce, both the Governor and the Community College system proposed changes to the way those workers are educated, emphasizing lifelong learning opportunities, a seamless structure, and clear ladders to career opportunities. Fundamental to both proposals was the integration of basic or academic skills into both vocational education and skills training offerings.

There is clearly a state interest in developing a workforce development/workforce preparation initiative and thus increasing the ability of colleges to respond to workforce needs, especially in the areas of workforce preparation, such as English language acquisition, Citizenship training, and basic skills development.

To offer the comprehensive range of services on the scale required to significantly impact California’s economic future and the economic future of Californians, the State must rely on an educational institution that is decentralized, responsive to local business and community concerns and already successfully engaged in worker training. California’s community colleges offer a unique set of assets: their location, relationship with the communities they serve, and expertise in providing remedial education, skills training and life-long. The community colleges are ready and able to do the job.

A cornerstone of the system’s workforce preparation proposal is to begin to move noncredit towards funding equity with credit. Currently, noncredit instruction is funded at roughly half the rate of dollars/FTES of credit instruction. This level of funding does not cover the true costs associated with delivering the quality of education required to ensure that the most economically,
educationally and socially disadvantaged students in our society succeed. It is estimated that $24 million would move targeted noncredit students one-quarter of the way towards equity with their credit counterparts.

**Partnership for Excellence** $100 Million

The Partnership for Excellence program is a mutual commitment between the State and the California community colleges to significantly improve the colleges contribution to the economic and social welfare and success of the state. This program begins to move the colleges towards the national average in terms of funding and at the same time holds the system accountable for improvement in goal attainment. This program has enabled colleges to make fundamental improvements to their programs and the students’ success. It needs to continue and be funded regularly in $100 million augmentations.

**Part-Time Compensation** $57 Million

The Governor has made the first year allotment of $57 million for Part-Time Equity and the $7 million for Part-Time Office Hours ongoing. While this does not increase the amount of the allocation, it indicates the Governor’s commitment to continue to fund these programs. The State has had long term policies supporting the concept of “Equal Pay for Equal Work”. The initial $57 million was just for the first of three years of augmentations needed to close the gap between part and full time faculty. There needs to be continued attention given to this matter.

**Technology II** $48 Million

Technology is expensive. The cost is not only the initial investment in hard and soft ware, but in the staffing, maintenance, and updating. This is called the Total Cost of Ownership (TCOP). If our colleges, and ultimately our students are ever going to be technologically fluent, there is going to have to be a substantial commitment of funds to this area.

**Faculty Internship and Recruitment** $10 Million

A diverse faculty is an essential component of a quality education. In order to meet the needs of our ever increasing student body we are going to have to be able to recruit the best and the brightest. The best way to do this is to grow our own from both our part time faculty and from our students. Providing internships is an excellent method of providing new and continuing faculty with the latest developments in their discipline.

**Teacher and Reading Partnerships** $5 Million

In order for our public schools to be the best learning institutions in the nation, we are going to have to have a cadre of the best educated teachers. Our California community colleges have a tremendous pool of students of whom many would make excellent teachers. However, the normal pattern of teacher training is to begin in the upper division or post-secondary level. This program would provide the recruitment and training of potential teachers in the community colleges.
ONE-TIME LOCAL ASSISTANCE

Workforce Development Initiative $11.8 Million

To add an accountability component to the noncredit programs, the community colleges need $11.8 million on a one-time basis for the following purposes:

1) $5,350,000 or approximately $50,000 per college to add 10 new data elements that would identify noncredit sequenced courses, and provide for validity and accountability, and tracking the impact of increased instructional and student support services.

2) $6,450,000 or approximately $75,000 per college for the 86 colleges that currently offer noncredit education to their community. This base funding would ensure that colleges with lower noncredit FTES receive sufficient funding to make programmatic, instructional and student support services improvement regardless of the number of FTES generated.