# College Planning Council Tuesday, May 20, 1997 Peter MacDougall

## Agenda Item 2.1: Update on Project Redesign

Background Beginning: April 1994

- A. Why:
  - 1. Budget Uncertainties
    - \$400,000/year
    - No salary increase for 3 years
    - Long-term improvement in fiscal situation unlikely
  - 2. Increased Competition Technology
  - 3. Institutional Renewal
- B. What:
  - Best approach determined by CPC to enable SBCC to respond to present and future challenges
    - Project Redesign (Reengineering)
- C. How:
  - 1. ID <u>Core</u> College Processes
  - 2. Apply reengineering methodology through teams. Results improve instructional/ student programs by applying technology. This will yield greater efficiencies and money can be saved and distributed to meet College needs.
- D. Process:
  - 1. <u>CPC</u> April 1994-December 1994
    - Developed approach
      - ⇒ ID vision
      - ⇒ Define Project goals and expectations
      - ⇒ Understand reengineering principles
      - ⇒ Select key processes ID 100; selected 20
  - 2. January 1995
    - Pilot Proiect
    - Position Paper: "Faculty Redesign at Santa Barbara City College -Increasing Student Learning and Faculty Satisfaction" given to all faculty. Paper jointly prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President of the Academic Senate and other faculty.

- 3. January June 1995
  - Developed a complete training team approach
  - Support structure for teams was developed
  - Tech Team was formed to provide project management
  - A few teams were underway
- 4. Summer 1995 Summer 1996
  - Approximately 18 teams completed Redesign Projects
- 5. Fall 1996 February 1997
  - Development of Phase I Implementation Plan
  - TMI Summer/Fall
- 6. January 1997 Present
  - TMI Team
  - Conversion of College data systems. The conversion of the College's data systems is viewed as central in enabling Project Redesign's <u>in-depth</u> implementation to take place.

#### E. Present - Summer 1997

- Conversion Begin the process. Implementation of Phase I. Implementation of the Phase I Project Redesign projects will proceed concomitant with the conversion
- 2. TMI Refinement—cost analysis—identification of next steps
- 3. Identification of Phase II Projects
  - Proposed team to redesign the College's organizational structure (from functional-based to a process-based organization).
  - TMI related teams
  - Other teams
- 4. Enhance fiscal analysis methodologies

#### F. Future

- 1. Follow through on the conversion Project Redesign and implementation with support of strategic partners
- 2. Proceed with Phase II projects
- 3. Provide fiscal analysis to measure financial benefits
- 4. Conduct a thorough project evaluation

# College Planning Council Tuesday, May 20, 1997

## A. <u>Budget: General Fund, Unrestricted</u>

- 1. Roll Over General Fund Budget (Unrestricted) \$35 million. Exception--Mgrs. have the right to reallocate within 4000 5000 (Supplies) other expenses.
  - a. 4000 = \$1 million
  - b. 5000 = \$3.7 million

Also, if a position becomes vacant, department/college can evaluate and determine whether to replace or reallocate. Restrictions regarding full-time faculty (legal requirement full-time faculty).

- ♦ 1000 Certified Salaries
- ♦ 2000 Classified Salaries
- ♦ 3000 Benefits

Total expenditures for (1000 - 3000 = 86.57 percent of the budget, \$30.3 million).

- 2. C.O.L.A.
  - a. 86.57 percent committed to contract to upgrade salaries and benefits.
  - b. 13.43 percent of C.O.L.A. is available to:
    - Spread among 4000 5000 (this was done in 1996-97).
    - Meet step increases or other major increases not anticipated.
    - ◆ Use for special; e.g., 1996-97 C.O.L.A. = Approx. \$1 million. 13.43% \$134,300
- 3. Growth At Present

Contract commitments minus obligations to fund additional FTEs. Funding needs include: additional full-time faculty (required by law); TLUs to fund growth; additional marketing costs; student support and services (counseling, tutoring, etc.) to maintain service level; and, periodically costs for increases in administrative costs. Other than funds to support growth, <u>all</u> growth funds are applied to salaries and benefits.

There is a year plus "buffer" in applying these funds, thus, growth in the first year is used to meet immediate expenses to cover additional FTEs <u>and</u> one-time funding needs.

State funding other than C.O.L.A. and growth is almost always "categorical"; e.g., one-time or multi-year block grants that can only be expended for specific purposes.

**Conclusion**: If current contracts stay in effect, there is little, if any, available for <u>ongoing</u> expenses other than as noted above. Some funding is available for one-time purposes.

B.	Commitments	of One-Time	Funds
<b>U</b> .			1 41140

1. \$670,00 - Building and Maintenance

This figure is a minimum to meet basic requirements. It is increased annually by the C.O.L.A.

2. \$800,000 - Non-Technological Equipment

This fund is used to replace non-technical equipment (inventory = \_\_\_\_\_. The lottery fund is the primary source. When the lottery is insufficient must come from one-time. (Lottery income projected as \$1.2 million - 550,000 (Salary commitment) - 650,000.

3. 850,000 Technology Equipment Replacement

One-time money and others (\$1,670,000).

- 4. Project Redesign
  - a. Conversion Estimated Cost: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Implementation Estimated Cost: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Annual Cost: \_\_\_\_\_\_

#### C. College Needs

- 1. College Plan
- 2. New
- D. Unanticipated Expenses or Income Shortfalls, e.g.,
  - 1. Basic Skills Loss of Funding (\$558,000)
  - 2. Property Tax Shortfalls (In recent years this has been as much as \$1 million plus.)
  - 3. Cost for Temporary Buildings for the LSG Remodel
  - 4. Necessary Construction Space for Information Technology Division