



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

3375 Camino del Rio South
San Diego, California 92108-3883
619-388-6500

Office of the Chancellor
Room 300

CITY COLLEGE – MESA COLLEGE – MIRAMAR COLLEGE – CONTINUING EDUCATION

DISTRICT GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MINUTES

March 17, 2010

Present: Allen, Avila, Beebe, Burgess, Cepeda, Cressy, Davis, Dittbenner, Figueroa, Gade, Harris, Hess (for Lee), Hinkes, Hsieh, Matthew, Myers, Richard, Umstot and Watkins

Absent: Carroll, Lee, Neault

Guests: Nancy Crispen, Jim Mahler, John Nunes, Sharon Rhodes and Peter White

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of March 3, 2010, were approved.

2. **REVIEW OF TENTATIVE BOARD AGENDA FOR MARCH 25, 2010**

The tentative agenda for the March 25, 2010, Board Meeting was opened for review by Executive Vice Chancellor Davis. Each item was discussed and satisfied.

3. **MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS & EQUIVALENCY**

Kim Myers, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, shared a draft copy of the District procedure regarding minimum qualifications and equivalency determination based on guidelines determined by the State Chancellor's Office and inline with the statewide academic senate. This procedure is required for accreditation and will be brought back for further discussion at the next DGC meeting.

4. **PROPOSAL FOR CENTRALIZATION OF EVALUATORS**

Daphne Figueroa, Academic Senate President of Miramar College, opened discussion regarding a proposal to centralize evaluators, indicating that Miramar College faculty is not in favor of it. Vice Chancellor Davis stated that the proposal is under review by District governance bodies. The proposal has emerged during the budget process from both campus and District administrators as a way to possibly continue with efficient services while reducing costs. College presidents have been asked to communicate and review the proposal at the campuses in order to get input so that all ideas can be part of a broader discussion regarding the philosophy, benefits and disadvantages of either centralizing or decentralizing various operations in an effort to address the budget. City College President Terry Burgess asked that the item be tabled to allow time to gather information for further discussion.

5. 2010-2011 PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Executive Vice Chancellor Davis distributed copies of several pages of a PowerPoint presentation he will be presenting to the Board on March 25 related to the 2010-11 Preliminary Budget. As this is not a legal requirement, the presentation is an information item. The first legal requirement is to get Board approval of a Tentative Budget by the end of June, and an Adopted Budget by September 15. Mr. Davis reported that the purpose of the Preliminary Budget was to provide the Board with sufficient notice to make budget adjustments as deemed appropriate prior to July 1, 2010.

Mr. Davis reminded the group that the budget reduction goals were originally established in late 2007-08, when the state's structural budget problems became public while the housing market was crashing with major declines in the stock market. At that time, it was predicted that the full force of the fiscal problems would be felt by 2010-11, which appears to be accurate. Therefore, the report reflects the results of efforts made over the past three (3) years. The handouts addressed several issues, including:

1. The purpose of a Preliminary Budget;
2. The assumptions upon which the Preliminary Budget is based;
3. Projected revenue and expenses for 2010-11, and the projected "budget gap";
4. The level of deficit spending for the past two years;
5. A summary of the District's structural budget challenge and the level of reductions still required to avoid deficit spending in 2010-11;
6. The fact that \$26.35 million (87%) of the budget reduction goal has been achieved through non-bargainable areas, and that \$3.92 million in cuts are yet to be identified for implementation by July 1, 2010; and
7. Depending on the accuracy of the revenue and expense projections, and the completion of the \$30.28 million reduction goal, if the District wants to avoid deficit spending in 2010-11, then the "best case" scenario is to cut an additional \$1.3 million, and the "worst case" scenario would be to cut an additional \$7.0 million.

The last page of the handout listed the various budget challenges still facing the District, including the elimination of the structural budget problem, funding for the continuous maintenance costs for the Prop S & N projects, and restructuring of expenses to be in compliance with the 50% law.

Adjourned 3:30 p.m.

Martha Strong

Chancellor's Office & Board of Trustees