

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**April 27, 2004
3:00 – 4:30 PM
Room A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, K. McLellan, A. Serban, T. Garey,
L. Rose, G. Carroll, P. Haslund, E. Frankel, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, R. Ladanyi

ABSENT: S. Ehrlich

GUESTS: J. Schultz, L. Griffin, S. Coffield, P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the April 6th CPC meeting.

**M/S/C [Carroll/Rose] to approve the minutes of the April 6th CPC meeting.
Tom Garey abstained.**

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Andreea Serban reported that the system-wide enrollments are down 6.7% fall 2003 compared to fall 2002. In fall 2003 the system had an unduplicated headcount of 1.6 million; in fall 2002 the system had over 1.7 million. Dr. Serban remarked that this is a tremendous decline, even worse than what was anticipated. In terms of unit load, SBCC experienced in fall 2003 more full-time students. She added that 20.7% of the students were full-time at the system level. Dr. Friedlander added that we want to determine whether this will affect our overall chance of receiving additional FTES. Dr. Serban indicated that we will probably receive more funded FTES even though there were more full-time students system-wide which may off-set much of the overall decline in headcount.

2.2 Jack Friedlander announced that Kathy Molloy was selected as the new president-elect of the Academic Senate.

2.3 Jack Friedlander reported that all faculty positions except the PE track and cross-country position have been filled. He said that we had a superb quality of finalists and are very fortunate to have the persons who accepted the positions as members of our faculty.

2.4 Dr. Friedlander related that John Romo traveled to Minneapolis to be present when SBCC student Ben Eidelson was named to the All-USA Academic Team for Community

Colleges. Ben received national recognition for his achievements at Santa Barbara City College.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on state budget deliberations

Jack Friedlander reported that the latest information from CLCC is that revenues for the state in the last month or so have come in higher than expected. It is too early to determine if the increase in state revenue will expand the amount of money available for Prop. 98. Thus, at this point in time, we shouldn't count any more dollars being available to expand the full Prop 98 dollars available for K-14. Dr. Friedlander and Tom Garey expressed a concern that dollars to fund COLA may come from equalization. The statutory COLA for next year is going to be 2.4 percent as opposed to 1.87 percent because of inflation. The unknown is where that money is going to come from to pay for the entire COLA.

3.2 Interim reorganization for Educational Programs

Dr. Friedlander discussed the interim reorganization of Educational Programs implemented as a result of the resignation of Michael Gallegos as Dean of Educational Technologies. The intent is not to fill that position for one year. The responsibilities of that position will be absorbed by other administrators in Educational Programs. There is quite a savings as a result of not filling that position. Dr. Friedlander wants to preserve that position because of the extra responsibilities the deans are taking on as a result of not filling that position. The reorganization was endorsed by the Instructional Technologies Committee and it will be on the Academic Senate agenda as an information item to discuss any concerns.

3.3 Status of remodels for Campus Center, Sports Pavilion and Physical Science Building

Campus Center

Joe Sullivan reported that the initial bids were too high and they have gone out for re-bids. Alex Pittman will act as the general contractor as a cost saving measure. It should be completed by the end of summer.

Sports Pavilion

The remodel is scheduled to start in January. The temporary buildings will go in for the Life Fitness Center which is scheduled to move on December 10th. Joe Sullivan said that although there will be a loss of 37 parking spaces in this move, there is plan being developed to add a minimum of 149 parking spaces over the next couple of years. Alex Pittman, with an outside contractor, has been putting together proposals that will provide additional spaces. The intent here is to develop enough parking spaces so that we do not have to build a parking structure in order to build the SoMA building.

P.S. Building

The remodel timeline has been extended until the completion of the construction of the Sports Pavilion in order to not lose existing classroom space. Vice President Sullivan said we are going through the planning stage and completing the working drawings and then will ask for the extension of this project so as not to lose the funding.

3.4 Faculty hiring (*addressed under 2.3*)

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Overview of college budget projections for 2004-05 *and*

4.2 Update on college's multi-year budget projections

Joe Sullivan provided and discussed the spreadsheet which incorporates the revised salary models, the expense budgets for the supplies and materials and other operating expenses. He said we now have a consolidated budget based on the input to date from the governor's January proposals. Joe Sullivan informed the Council that the recommendation to the Board would be that we operate at a deficit for this year. When we receive the May revise and have more information we can address the deficit in 2005-06 as the primary issue going forward to balance the budget. Vice President Sullivan said that we can estimate receiving \$1m in growth money which is not included in the budget but cautioned that the deficit factor is also not included in the budget. He will bring a four-year projection to the next meeting. Dr. Friedlander indicated that the budget reflects the reinstatement of sabbaticals, the \$4.8m for equipment and \$1.2m for the construction fund. The intent is to keep these items in the budget subject to the May revise in the final budget and the Board's willingness to draw down end-of-year balances for the third year to balance the budget. President Romo will recommend to the Board that we discontinue drawing down our balances beyond next year because we cannot continue to rely on deficit spending. Dr. Friedlander said that the Council will start its work on the budget on May 25th and into next year to determine how we are going to correct our structural imbalance, through additional revenue and reductions in expenses. Vice President Sullivan added that in this budget we didn't include the cost of the classification study once its completed, any estimate on the outcomes of the collective bargaining agreement that would be negotiated this year, the funding for sabbaticals leaves, and the funding of the construction and equipment funds which are in discussion with the Board.

5.0 First Hearing

5.1 Educational Programs, Continuing Education and Business Services requests for one-time funds, budget restorations and budget augmentations

Jack Friedlander discussed the total of requests for one-time funding, restoration of budget reductions and requests for budget augmentations for Educational Programs. He said given where we are with the instructional deficit, John Romo has asked each of the vice presidents to do their best to meet their most pressing needs within their own budget areas. What will be brought back on May 25th are those items that meet the two criteria established by CPC that rise to the point of urgency or a program that will not be able to operate without these dollars. Dr. Friedlander said there will be a fairly limited number of items for CPC's consideration.

5.2 Web Policies

Bill Hamre said this is the first hearing of a very distilled set of web polices that has undergone review all year. He said Keith McLellan has worked very hard on refining this policy which has been discussed in the Academic Senate. The purpose of these policies is to establish some structure and standards for navigation, accessibility, compliance and

also ensuring the accuracy and recency of content on the web page through various levels of the web pages. These policies were developed by a workgroup of faculty and administrative staff and were reviewed with the vice president of HR/LA. The Board policy statements have been reviewed and approved by the Instructional Technology Committee, the Academic Senate and District Technology Committee. Keith McLellan said this has been a 2.5- to 3-year process. The recommendation is to separate out general policy from operating procedures. This is now the policy statement. There is another group working on the procedures which are being reviewed by ITC and DTC. There is nothing in this document that differs from what was approved last year in both spirit and content by ITC and the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate will be asked to approve the abbreviated web policy. This is a policy statement that authorizes the President to develop operating procedures. The operational procedures are in the process of being developed will go back through consultation.

M/S/C [Garey/Rose] to move the item to action.

M/S/ [Rose/Garey] to approve the web policies.

Keith McLellan indicated that we had a high level of conceptual and procedural consent on this policy. Bill Hamre said that CPC will have ultimate review and approval of the procedures after they have gone through consultation. Procedures do not have to go to the Board for approval.

The motion was unanimously approved.

6.0 Action Items

- 6.1 *Smoke-Free Workplace Policy 2510.* Tobacco Prevention Settlement Program can provide \$3,400-plus for signage to support a designated smoking area policy at SBCC.

M/S [Carroll/McLellan] to approve the Smoke-Free Workplace Policy 2510 effective September 1, 2004 with the understanding that a workgroup will be formed to identify the designated smoking areas and to make specific recommendations as to the signage. Those recommendations will be brought back to CPC for ratification. The policy will be reevaluated once it has been implemented and if changes are needed.

Jack Friedlander indicated that the clarification on the obligation we have to go to a designed smoking area under the law or signage was distributed to CPC by Joe Sullivan. The next step is to form a workgroup to identify designated smoking areas. Appropriate constituent groups will be represented on the committee [CSEA, students, faculty, administration, security, facilities]. The committee will also determine the location of the signage. This will be an evolving process. Dr. Friedlander acknowledged that it would be a fair assumption that, if needed, the policy would be re-evaluated in one year. Tom Garey recommended that once the committee makes its recommendations, it be brought back to CPC for ratification. A decision was made to implement the policy for the fall semester so that this can be announced in our publications. Liz Auchincloss added that insofar as staff discipline for a violation of this policy it would be subject to negotiation.

M/S/C [Garey/Rose] for a friendly amendment to have the policy effective September 1, 2004.

The original motion was carried: Yeas: Nine; Nays: Liz Auchincloss and Jan Jackson (*representing CSEA*) and Rose Ladanyi (*representing Associated Students*); Abstention: Tom Garey

6.2 See item 5.2, Web Policies

7.0 Other Items

CPC will not meet on May 4th.

CPC will next meet on May 25th from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon. CPC will determine a date for a summer meeting at that time.

Jack Friedlander acknowledged Lana Rose for her 10 years of participation in CPC and for her exceptional and valued contributions to the Council.

8.0 Adjournment

On motion [Garey/McLellan] the meeting was adjourned by chairperson Jack Friedlander.



S TATE BUDGET UPDATE

UPDATE #7 • MAY 13, 2004

A status report on the actions, discussions, and rumors in Sacramento related to the community colleges' state budget for fiscal year 2004-05. This update is distributed to all chief executive officers for distribution to trustees, administrators, faculty, classified, public/governmental relations officers and student leaders.

Governor Releases May Revise

Today, Governor Schwarzenegger released his scheduled revision to the budget he proposed in January. The proposal would provide a larger increase of funding for community colleges from the January budget through the funding of an increased (2.41%) cost-of-living adjustment and the restoration of equalization to the \$80 million proposed in January, but which was reduced in an April letter from the Department of Finance. The Governor did not revise any other significant proposals from January relating to enrollment growth, noncredit, student fees or categorical clustering. Finally, the budget shifts a significant share of community college property taxes back to local government and backfills the funds with state General Fund money.

As it currently stands, the 2004-05 Governor's budget would provide:

- 3% enrollment growth funding for apportionments
- 2.41% cost-of living adjustment
- 1.66% enrollment growth funding for selected categoricals (Basic skills, Matriculation, DSPS, EOPS)
- \$80 million for equalization
- \$4 million for noncredit growth (earmarked for non-equalization districts)

The following program changes are proposed:

- Enrollment fee of \$26 per unit with a \$50 per unit "differential" enrollment fee for students with a BA degree.
- Fold Partnership for Excellence, Matriculation, part of Technology and Telecommunication Infrastructure and Part-time faculty programs into the general apportionment
- Create program clusters for Targeted Student Services (EOPS and Fund for Student Success) and Physical Plant and Instructional Support (Scheduled Maintenance, Instructional Equipment, and Hazardous Substances)

Table 1		Governor's Revised Budget 2004-05			
		Support by Funding Source			
	Estimated	Proposed	Proposed Change		
(Funding Numbers in 000s)	2003-04	2004-05	Actual	Percentage	
General Fund	2,444,391	3,037,921	593,350	24.3%	
Property Taxes	2,121,398	1,771,829	-349,569	-16.5%	
Student Fees	260,138	338,207	78,069	30.0%	
Lottery	140,922	140,922	0	0.0%	
TOTAL	4,966,849	5,288,879	322,030	6.5%	
State-supported FTES	1,104,943	1,137,150	32,207	3%	
Funding per FTES	\$4,495	\$4,651	\$156	3.5%	

Source: Department of Finance, League Staff Analysis
Note: The \$200 million deferrals are accounted for in their program funding year.

The Assembly and Senate budget subcommittees writing the community college budget plan to complete work on the Governor's budget by Thursday, May 20. Because neither committee has taken significant action on the community college budget, next week's hearings will feature votes on virtually all of the Governor's budget proposals.

A draft chart is attached. Please note that the official documents reflecting the Governor's May Revise have not yet been released and may result in minor changes to the chart.



**COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA**

Item	2003-04 (as enacted)	2004-05 Governor's Budget, with April Revisions	2004-05 Governor's May Revision
General Apportionment			
Apportionments: General Fund	1,589,149,000	1,463,049,000	1,973,549,000
Apportionments: Local Property Tax Revenues	2,121,398,000	2,264,429,000	1,771,829,000
Apportionments: Student Fees	260,138,000	356,107,000	338,207,000
Programs folded into the base apportionment (below)		302,819,000	302,819,000
Cost-of-living adjustment (categorical COLA incl. below)		76,405,000	100,205,000
Equalization		59,800,000	80,000,000
Total General Apportionment (incl. 59.8 for equalization)	3,970,685,000	4,522,609,000	4,566,609,000
Categorical Programs			
Academic Senate for the Community Colleges	467,000	467,000	467,000
Basic Skills and Apprenticeship	40,552,000	41,582,000	42,218,690
California Virtual University	1,347,000	Folded into T&T state.	Folded into T&T state.
Disabled Students Programs and Services	82,583,000	85,641,000	85,977,166
Economic Development	35,790,000	35,790,000	35,790,000
Extended Opportunities Programs and Services	82,671,000	Program Cluster A	Program Cluster A
CARE	12,221,000	Program Cluster A	Program Cluster A
Faculty and Staff Diversity	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000
Foster Care Education Program	1,754,000	1,754,000	1,754,000
Fund for Student Success	6,158,000	Program Cluster A	Program Cluster A
Growth for Apportionments	57,900,000	121,120,000	121,120,000
Hazardous Substances	4,404,000	Program Cluster B	Program Cluster B
Instructional Equipment and Library Materials	12,471,000	Program Cluster B	Program Cluster B
Instructional Improvement	312,000		
Matriculation	54,307,000	Folded into base.	Folded into base.
Noncredit Growth		4,012,000	4,012,000
Noncredit Rate Enhancement			
Partnership for Excellence	225,000,000	Folded into base.	Folded into base.
Part-Time Faculty Compensation	50,828,000	Folded into base.	Folded into base.
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	1,000,000	Folded into base.	Folded into base.
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	7,172,000	Folded into base.	Folded into base.
Scheduled Maintenance/Special Repairs	12,470,000	Program Cluster B	Program Cluster B
Special Services for CalWorks Recipients	34,580,000	34,580,000	34,580,000
Student Financial Aid Administration	46,447,000	47,265,000	48,993,364
Teacher and Reading Development Partnership	3,700,000		
Telecommunications and Technology Infra.	22,025,000	T&T State/Base	T&T State/Base
Transfer Education and Articulation	1,974,000	1,974,000	1,974,000
Program Cluster A (Targeted Student Services)		104,565,000	105,090,000
Program Cluster B (Physical Plant and Instructional Support)		29,345,000	29,345,000
Telecommunications & Technology State Init.		10,897,000	10,897,000
Miscellaneous (Non-program) Items			
Health Fee Mandate Reimbursement	1,000	2,000	2,000
Lease-Purchase Bond Payments	55,039,000	57,381,000	57,381,000
Lottery	140,922,000	140,922,000	140,922,000
Total State-Determined Funding	4,966,849,000	5,241,653,000	5,288,879,220
Funded FTES	1,104,943	1,137,150	1,137,150
Funding per FTES	\$ 4,495	\$ 4,368	\$ 4,368

(a) Because of the effect of the deferral, PFE is being folded into the base at \$175 million. However, because of the deferral, the effect will be a \$225 million fold-in. The Board of Governors recommends retaining Matriculation and the Part-time faculty programs as discrete categorical programs, and are therefore excluded from the apportionment.

(b) The Board of Governors reaffirmed its policy that fee increases should be gradual, moderate and predictable. Increased state general fund money would be sought to offset any reduction in fee level, or the elimination of the differential fee.



News Release

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 13, 2004

CONTACT:

Cheryl Fong (916) 323-5954

Linda Michalowski (916) 327-5361

Governor's May Revise Proposes Increased Funding for Community Colleges – Proposition 98 Share Boosted to 10.25 Percent

SACRAMENTO – Chancellor Mark Drummond announced that “the California Community Colleges received excellent news this afternoon” when Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger unveiled the May revisions to his proposed budget for fiscal year 2004-2005. Drummond expressed his appreciation for the Governor’s recognition that community colleges “are integral to California’s economic success.” Board of Governors President Catherine L. Unger echoed the Chancellor’s sentiments: “The May Revise is a clear indication of Governor Schwarzenegger’s continued support for community colleges even during these very difficult fiscal circumstances.”

Reflecting the Governor’s commitment to the community colleges and a more optimistic fiscal forecast for the state, the community college share of Proposition 98 funding would increase from 9.53 percent in the current year to 10.25 percent in 2004-2005. Overall, the May Revise provides a year-to-year increase of \$325 million in program funding for the community colleges for a total of nearly \$5.3 billion, which includes revenues anticipated from property taxes and student fees.

The May Revise provides:

- \$80.0 million for equalization of the per-student funding rate among community college districts

- \$106.5 million additional funding for a 2.41 percent COLA for general apportionments and selected categorical programs (the January budget did not propose a cost of living adjustment for the system; the May Revise provides the statutory K-14 rate)
- \$121 million for growth, which would allow enrollments to increase by three percent
- \$4 million for noncredit enrollment growth in targeted districts
- \$28.4 million in one-time funds to augment spending for instructional equipment, facility maintenance and hazardous materials abatement.

Board President Unger said: "These budget proposals go far in helping the system to effectively serve California's educational and training needs" and expressed her hope that there can be continued discussion regarding the proposed fee increases. On May 3, the Board of Governors reaffirmed its long-standing policy that calls for any proposed fee increases to be "gradual, moderate and predictable with fee revenues enhancing student education." Unger reiterated the Board's opposition to a differential fee for students who possess a baccalaureate or other advanced degrees due to the financial hardship such a fee would create for students who return to community colleges for retraining and upgrading of career skills.

The community colleges lost an estimated 175,000 students in Fall 2003 and currently enroll more than 14,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) for whom the system does not receive any state support. "The three percent increase proposed for enrollment growth next year will certainly help the system to offer the necessary courses and supportive services to bring back some of these students," said Drummond. "We expect to work closely with the Administration and Legislature this spring to address adequate funding levels for our colleges to support greater numbers, including UC and CSU-eligible students referred to the community colleges next fall."

The California Community Colleges is the largest system of higher education in the world with 109 colleges and 72 districts providing educational, vocational and transfer programs to over 2.8 million students each year.

###



COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA
ON THE WEB: WWW.CCLEAGUE.ORG/LEGINFO/BUDGET/

S TATE BUDGET UPDATE

UPDATE #8 • MAY 21, 2004

A status report on the actions, discussions, and rumors in Sacramento related to the community colleges' state budget for fiscal year 2004-05. This update is distributed to all chief executive officers for distribution to trustees, administrators, faculty, classified, public/governmental relations officers and student leaders.

Legislative Subcommittees Wrap-up; Minor Differences Await Conference Committee

This week, the subcommittees writing the education budget in each house completed action, another sign that it's likely that California will see an on-time budget this year. The subject-area reports will next be incorporated into Budget Committee reports in each house, which are expected to be approved next week. After procedural votes, the two different budgets will be sent to a conference committee charged with reconciling the differences between the two houses. The Assembly and Senate subcommittees largely agreed on community college items, leaving only minor differences for the Conference Committee to resolve. The Conference Committee is expected to include Senators Wes Chesbro, Dede Alpert and Ross Johnson, and Assembly Members Darrell Steinberg, Judy Chu and Rick Keene.

The spending plans for community colleges are largely similar between the two houses, with the Assembly actions providing \$40 million less than the Governor's proposal. This is because the Assembly "bought down" the enrollment fee to \$22 by using funds within the proposed community college budget (instead of outside funds), thereby reducing a community college revenue source by \$40 million. In contrast, the Senate's action rejecting the differential fee was funded using other Proposition 98 funds, resulting in no net reduction to the community college budget.

Both plans would result in modestly less funding per student than the Administration, as they would fund around 7,200 more students. As enrollment growth is marginal (applied to the general apportionment), this results in a slight decline in funding per student. Regardless, funding per student would increase by at least 3.5% in the budget plans, with a 7% increase in total state-determined funds for community colleges.

Major Issues for Conference Committee

Equalization: The Senate approved the Governor's \$80 million proposal for equalization, with the methodology to be determined by SB 1875 (Alpert). The Assembly, however, approved \$40 million, of which \$20 million would be considered discretionary funds, with the remaining \$20 million characterized as program-improvement funds (therefore triggering the full-time faculty hiring obligation). The Assembly used the other \$40 million to reduce the student enrollment fee to \$22 per unit.

Partnership for Excellence fold-in: Both subcommittees approved the fold-in of the Partnership for Excellence (and rejected fold-in of other categorical programs). The Senate approved system language to continue systemwide reporting of accountability goals and assurance that self-supporting/basic aid districts keep their allocation levels. The Assembly approved the Governor's language, which requires a new system of district-specific goals and accountability, and which does not explicitly protect self-supporting districts.

Student Fees: Both houses rejected the differential fee for students with baccalaureate degrees. The Senate approved the Governor's proposal for a student enrollment fee of \$26 per unit, while the Assembly used \$40 million from the equalization line-item to reduce the fee proposal to \$22 per unit.

In UC/CSU Standoff with Legislature, Students Left Hanging

This week, as the University of California Regents and the California State University trustees were voting to increase students for this fall, both budget subcommittees voted to restore funding to make the fee increases unnecessary. Similarly, while thousands of families are deciding whether to accept UC's redirection offer (CSU's letters are reportedly being sent out next week), both subcommittees rejected the Governor's proposal, restoring funds and specifying the UC and CSU must enroll these students.

The conflicting actions demonstrate the conflict between the academic and legislative schedules and the ongoing frustrations that have built between the higher education segments and the Legislature. After UC and CSU sought long-term guidance from the Administration by establishing a compact for current and future year funding, they were quickly chided by the Legislature for assuming that the Governor's budget cuts would become a reality. The Legislature reacted by essentially overruling the compact, and by providing up to \$500 million (Assembly) to reverse nearly all of the negotiated budget cuts. This put UC and CSU in the unenviable position of supporting the Governor's proposal, which cuts enrollment in the systems, increases fees and eliminates specified programs. In the end, the higher education budget will likely look more like the Governor's proposal, but the Legislature will likely continue to remind UC and CSU that two houses play a roll in the development of the state budget. In the meantime, students and families will stand on the sideline.



Item	2003-04 (as enacted)	2004-05 Governor's May Revision	Senate Sub 1	Assembly Sub 2
General Apportionment				
Apportionments: General Fund	1,589,149,000	1,973,547,000	1,978,347,000	2,013,547,000
Apportionments: Local Property Tax Revenues	2,121,398,000	1,771,857,000	1,771,857,000	1,771,857,000
Apportionments: Student Fees	260,138,000	338,181,000	333,881,000	298,181,000
Programs folded into the base apportionment (below)		352,819,000	225,000,000	225,000,000 (a)
Cost-of-living adjustment (categorical COLA incl. below)		100,164,000	100,164,000	100,164,000
Equalization		80,000,000	80,000,000	40,000,000 (b)
Total General Apportionment (incl. 59.8 for equalization)	3,970,685,000	4,616,568,000	4,489,249,000	4,448,749,000
Categorical Programs				
Academic Senate for the Community Colleges	467,000	467,000	467,000	467,000
Basic Skills and Apprenticeship	40,552,000	42,219,000	42,219,000	42,219,000
California Virtual University	1,347,000	1,347,000	1,347,000	1,347,000
Disabled Students Programs and Services	82,583,000	85,977,000	85,977,000	85,977,000
Economic Development	35,790,000	35,790,000	35,790,000	35,790,000
Extended Opportunities Programs and Services	82,671,000	86,069,000	86,069,000	86,069,000
CARE	12,221,000	12,723,000	12,723,000	12,723,000
Faculty and Staff Diversity	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000
Foster Care Education Program	1,754,000	1,754,000	1,754,000	1,754,000
Fund for Student Success	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000
Growth for Apportionments	57,900,000	121,120,000	147,520,000	147,520,000 (c)
Hazardous Substances	4,404,000	4,404,000	4,404,000	4,404,000
Instructional Equipment and Library Materials	12,471,000	24,940,000	12,470,000	12,470,000
Instructional Improvement	312,000			
Matriculation	54,307,000	Folded into base.	56,539,000	56,539,000
Noncredit Growth		4,012,000		
Noncredit Rate Enhancement			6,012,000	6,012,000
Partnership for Excellence	225,000,000	Folded into base.		Folded into base.
Part-Time Faculty Compensation	50,828,000	Folded into base.	50,828,000	50,828,000
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	1,000,000	Folded into base.	1,000,000	1,000,000
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	7,172,000	Folded into base.	7,172,000	7,172,000
Scheduled Maintenance/Special Repairs	12,470,000	24,940,000	12,470,000	12,470,000
Special Services for CalWorks Recipients	34,580,000	34,580,000	34,580,000	34,580,000
Student Financial Aid Administration	46,447,000	47,757,000	47,757,000	47,757,000
Teacher and Reading Development Partnership	3,700,000			
Telecommunications and Technology Infra.	22,025,000	22,025,000	22,025,000	22,025,000
Transfer Education and Articulation	1,974,000	1,974,000	1,974,000	1,974,000
Miscellaneous (Non-program) Items				
Health Fee Mandate Reimbursement	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Lease-Purchase Bond Payments	55,039,000	57,381,000	57,381,000	57,381,000
Lottery	140,922,000	140,922,000	140,922,000	140,922,000
Total State-Determined Funding	4,966,849,000	5,352,851,000	5,366,556,000	5,326,056,000
Funded FTES	1,104,030	1,137,150	1,144,327	1,144,327
Funding per FTES	\$ 4,495	\$ 4,707	\$ 4,690	\$ 4,654

(a) Because of the effect of the deferral, \$175 million of the Partnership is being folded in in 2004-05, with an additional \$50 million being folded in in July 2005. Programmatically, districts will have the benefit of the \$225 million in their 2004-05 budgets.

(b) The Assembly subcommittee used \$40 million of equalization funds to provide for a student enrollment fee of \$22 per unit, with no differential fee. Both houses rejected the differential fee.

(c) The Assembly and Senate provide 3.65% enrollment growth, funding an additional 7,200 FTES.

(d) Of this amount, \$28.4 million would be allocated as a block grant of one-time funds and credited to the 2003-04 Proposition 98 guaranteee.