PRESENT:
Gabi Agraz (Student Representative), Rosalinda Buchwald, Roseann Manfre-Campillo, Carol Cone, Marilyn Eng, Carol Horton – chair, Ruben Hoyos (Student Representative) Dennis Korn, Patricia Lawrence, Rocky Reynolds, Judy Rojas (recording secretary), Tasha Van Horn. Absent: Thom Armstrong, Mike Fehrs, Betty Gilham, Jeanne Hamilton, William McCusker and Dr. Michael Viera.

OLD BUSINESS:

2.1 Approval of minutes of September 29, 2003 and November 17, 2003 – Minutes were approved as presented.

NEW BUSINESS:

2.2 State Budget Update – Carol Horton presented an editorial document from School Services of California dated January 16, 2004 regarding the State Budget and how it affects the community colleges. This document was reviewed at the January 20, 2004 Board of Trustees Meeting and Carol would like this committee to read it and ask any questions. Carol Horton reviewed the highlights of the document.

Last year at this time we were looking at severe cuts to community colleges. This year we are actually expecting an increase in funding based on the governor’s proposed budget. The community college system requested approximately $500 million in increase funding for 2004-05 school year and the governor proposed approximately $211 million increase. On the statewide ballot on March 2, propositions 55, 57 and 58 are essential to the community colleges. If they do not pass the state will look at 25% cuts across the board, including education and suspension of proposition 98 funding.

A 1.84% COLA will be provided this year adding $74 million of additional funds.

The increase in funding proposed $211 million or 4.4% is broken down by category on the document. The 4.4% increase is not only to the general fund but also to restricted funds.

Equalization aid is funded at $80 million. This is the first time in several years that the Governor has proposed equalization funding for community colleges. The legislature and the community college system have proposed it in the past, but the Governor has vetoed it the last three years. Our share of equalization is anywhere between $600,000
or $790,000 depending on whether we use Governor’s scenario or community college league scenario and how the legislature approves it.

The Governor has proposed that current categorical programs be consolidated into the district’s base apportionment. Those programs include Partnership for Excellence, Matriculation, a portion of Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure, and Part-Time Faculty Compensation, Office Hours, and Health Benefits. Other programs such as EOPS, Fund for Student Success, Scheduled Maintenance/Special Repairs, Instructional Equipment and Library Materials Replacement, Hazardous Substances, and the balance of Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure, and California Virtual University are combined to reduce the overall number of programs.

The PERS rate for non-instructional staff will rise from 10.4% to 12.2%.

The Capital Outlay Program will help fund the Voch Tech Building if Prop 55 passes at the March 2 election.

The Administration’s Transfer Plan proposed by the Governor would require the UC and CSU systems reduce their freshman enrollment by 10% and direct those students to community colleges. These amounts will not impact us greatly.

The Governor’s $15 Billion bond is trailing in the polls. Bond measures 57 and 58 must pass together for them to become effective.

2.3 Bond Update – Carol Horton reported that the $121 million dollar amount for Measure G was determined by the architect to fulfill the facilities master plan. We cannot issue $121 million dollars in bonds in one year because of the effect to the tax base. The law states that taxpayers cannot pay more than $25.00 per $100,000 of assessed value per year for a community college bond. It will take five issuances over a ten-year period to issue the debt. As you issue new debt you are paying off old debt. Since we are only one campus we can only construct so much per year without disrupting campus so the ten year time frame is good for us.

Carol reported that we still need volunteers for the last month of campaign calling. Our campaign consultant’s entire campaign strategy is based on telephone calling to prospective voters. There are no yard signs. Initially we are calling to get the yes vote and keeping track of that and then in the last two weeks of the campaign we insure that they vote either in person or by absentee ballot. Carol expressed her appreciation for all who have volunteered to call. We are getting positive responses from people on the phone and now we need to turn those into “yes” votes.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50am