

RANKINGS OF PFE PROPOSALS

<i>Proposals</i>	<i>Workgroup</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Academic Senate</i>	<i>Student Services Advisory</i>
Assistant Dean/Occupational Ed. & Econ. Development	SOR	\$15,000	1	1
Lab Coord. For Journalism Dept.	SLA	\$15,921	2	10
Adjunct Counselor, Career Advancement Center	SLA	\$33,246	3	3
Computerized Assessment	SOR	\$25,241	4	4
Augmentation of General Tutorial Fund	SLA	\$30,000	5	5
Augmentation to College Reader Allocation	SLA	\$20,000	6	NR
New Faculty Training	ISR	\$13,350	7	19
SBCC/SBHS Eng. & Eng. Skills Collaboration	SOR	\$4,000	8	9
Replacement Funding for New Technology Initiatives	ISR	\$50,000	9	15
Faculty Advising for Student Success - General, ESL	SLA	\$37,271	10	8
Upgrade Existing FT Position in FRC	ISR	\$4,839	11	NR
Math Center - \$6,750 One Time and \$11,989 Ongoing	SLA	\$18,739	12	6
ICLC Coordinator for Multidisciplinary Labs	ISR	\$54,958	13	18
Academic Senate Development/CAC & TC	ISR	\$5,650	14	NR
Funding for Mentoring Program	SLA	\$12,000	15	NR
English Dept. Roundtable	SLA	\$7,064	16	20
Web-Based Instructional Support Specialist	ISR	\$50,626	17	2
Off-Campus Server Hosting for Online Resources	ISR	\$30,000	18	12
FRC Faculty Training	ISR	\$25,000	19	17
Added Online Instructional Aides	ISR	\$20,000	20	11
Clerical support for Counseling	SLA	\$19,748	21	14
Ongoing Online Course Expansion	ISR	\$30,000	22	16
Director of Applications Development and Support	ISR	\$98,850	23	22
Adjunct Online Advising Counselor	SLA	\$31,233	24	7
ADVANCE Program for Working Adult	SOR	\$42,462	25	13
Dual Enrollment & Professional Studies Coordinator	SOR	\$84,462	26	21
College-wide infrastructure	ISR	\$62,500	27	NR
TOTAL		\$842,160		

ACADEMIC SENATE

WorkGroup	Cost	Proposal																
SOR	\$15,000	1. Assistant Dean/Occupational	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	17	\$15,000
SLA	\$15,921	1. Lab Coord. For Journalism D	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	21	\$30,921	
SLA	\$33,246	2. Adjunct Counselor, Career A	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	23	\$64,167	
SOR	\$25,241	3. Computerized Assessment	3	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	24	\$89,408	
SLA	\$30,000	5. Augmentation of General Tu	1	1	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	3	26	\$119,408	
SLA	\$20,000	10. Augmentation to College Re	2	1	3	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	26	\$139,408	
ISR	\$13,350	8. New Faculty Training	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	3	1	3	3	26	\$152,758	
SOR	\$4,000	2. SBCC/SBHS Eng. & Eng. S	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	27	\$156,758	
ISR	\$50,000	6. Replacement Funding for Ne	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	27	\$206,758	
SLA	\$37,271	3. Faculty Advising for Student	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	27	\$244,029	
ISR	\$4,839	10. Upgrade Existing FT Positi	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	27	\$248,868	
SLA	\$18,739	4. Math Center - \$6,750 One T	1	3	1	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	1	3	28	\$267,607	
ISR	\$54,958	5. ICLC Coordinator for Multidi	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	28	\$322,565	
ISR	\$5,650	11. Academic Senate Developm	3	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	28	\$328,215	
SLA	\$12,000	9. Funding for Mentoring Progra	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3	29	\$340,215	
SLA	\$7,064	7. English Dept. Roundtable	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	29	\$347,279	
ISR	\$50,626	1. Web-Based Instructional Su	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	30	\$397,905	
ISR	\$30,000	2. Off-Campus Server Hosting	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	3	1	1	30	\$427,905	
ISR	\$25,000	4. FRC Faculty Training	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	33	\$452,905	
ISR	\$20,000	3. Added Online Instructional A	2	1	3	2	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	30	\$472,905	
SLA	\$19,748	6. Clerical support for Counsel	2	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	33	\$492,653	
ISR	\$30,000	7. Ongoing Online Course Exp	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	35	\$522,653	
ISR	\$98,850	9. Director of Applications Dev	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	36	\$621,503	
SLA	\$31,233	8. Adjunct Online Advising Cou	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	37	\$652,736	
SOR	\$42,462	4. ADVANCE Program for Wor	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	38	\$695,198	
SOR	\$84,462	5. Dual Enrollment & Professio	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	38	\$779,660	
ISR	\$62,500	12. College-wide infrastructure	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	42	\$837,198	

**LIST OF WORK GROUP RANKINGS ONGOING
FUNDING TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
IN THE 1999-2002 COLLEGE PLAN**

Ongoing Funding Request	Work Group	Amount Requested	Ranking													TOTAL
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1. Assistant Dean/Occupational Ed. & Econ. Development	SO&R	\$15,000	2	3	3	5	4	3	11	3	9	4	3	10	2	62
1. Web-Based Instructional Support Specialist	ISR	\$50,626	5	1	8	9	5	5	2	9	5	13	8	2	11	83
2. Adjunct Counselor, Career Advancement Center	SL	\$33,246	20	5	4	1	1	1	1	21	4	14	1	1	10	84
3. Computerized Assessment	SO&R	\$25,241	10	8	5	7	15	10	8	1	1	3	9	9	1	87
5. Augmentation of General Tutorial Fund	SL	\$30,000	8	15	1	4	10	12	7	4	11	1	12	7	5	97
4. Math Center - \$6,750 One Time and \$11,989 Ongoing	SL	\$18,739	18	12	10	2	9	11	6	5	3	7	6	6	16	111
8. Adjunct Online Advising Counselor	SL	\$31,233	7	19	12	16	3	4	5	17	16	5	2	5	6	117
3. Faculty Advising for Student Success - General, ESL	SL	\$37,271	19	11	6	15	6	6	9	7	10	6	7	3	15	120
2. SBCC/SBHS Eng. & Eng. Skills Collaboration	SO&R	\$4,000	9	7	7	6	13	13	12	2	18	10	13	8	3	121
1. Lab Coord. For Journalism Dept.	SL	\$15,921	13	4	11	10	8	18	13	16	2	18	5	4	9	131
3. Added Online Instructional Aides	ISR	\$20,000	4	6	14	17	18	8	17	10	6	9	17	12	8	146
2. Off-Campus Server Hosting for Online Resources	ISR	\$30,000	17	2	9	8	14	7	16	8	22	8	16	15	12	154
4. ADVANCE Program for Working Adult	SO&R	\$42,462	12	9	16	12	16	22	10	14	19	11	4	11	4	160
6. Clerical support for Counseling	SL	\$19,748	6	18	17	19	2	2	4	15	15	20	11	19	17	165
6. Replacement Funding for New Technology Initiatives	ISR	\$50,000	1	16	15	13	20	15	14	12	12	12	21	16	19	186

**LIST OF WORK GROUP RANKINGS ONGOING
FUNDING TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
IN THE 1999-2002 COLLEGE PLAN**

Ongoing Funding Request	Work Group	Amount Requested	Ranking													TOTAL
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
7. Ongoing Online Course Expansion	ISR	\$30,000	3	17	19	14	23	21	23	18	7	2	22	21	7	197
4. FRC Faculty Training	ISR	\$25,000	16	13	20	23	21	16	22	19	8	16	19	14	13	220
5. ICLC Coordinator for Multidisciplinary Labs	ISR	\$54,958	14	14	13	20	22	14	18	11	21	17	20	22	14	220
8. New Faculty Training	ISR	\$13,350	22	21	23	22	19	17	15	13	13	15	18	18	20	236
7. English Dept. Roundtable	SL	\$7,064	24	24	22	11	11	19	24	22	14	23	10	24	18	246
5. Dual Enrollment & Professional Studies Coordinator	SO&R	\$84,462	21	10	18	21	17	24	19	24	20	19	23	13	24	253
9. Director of Applications Development and Support	ISR	\$98,850	23	20	21	24	24	9	3	23	23	24	24	23	21	262
TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED (3 Groups)		\$737,171														
ISR- Institutional Support Revitalization Work Group																
SL - Student Learning Work Group																
SO&R - Student Outreach & Responsiveness to the Community Work Group																
Note: Two items that were not intended to be ranked were dropped from the analysis. As such, there may be variations in column totals. This does not change the row totals or the rank order of the reported items.																

Santa Barbara City College

TO: Dr. Jack Friedlander
Chair, College Planning Council
Ms. Lana Rose, Academic Senate President
Mr. Bill Benjamin, Ex Officio Member of Classified Council
Mr. Matt Riley, ASB President

FROM: Peter R. MacDougall

DATE: April 14, 2000

SUBJECT: March 10, 2000, Letter from Chancellor Tom Nussbaum Regarding District Involvement in Developing the System's 2001-02 Budget Package

Chancellor Nussbaum has started the development process for the 2001-02 system budget. To enrich this process, he is requesting that each district provide its ideas on the state budget. District suggestions will be used by the Board of Governors to develop the system's final budget proposal.

The Chancellor requested that the governing boards work through the college president and the local constituencies to develop budget recommendations and provide other input that will address systemwide priorities. Chancellor Nussbaum outlines two areas of focus. First, he is requesting a response to a number of system proposals that represent long-term, ongoing areas of need. Second, the Chancellor is requesting district suggestions regarding other budget priorities. The response from districts must be provided by May 5, 2000.

The purpose of this note is to request that your group's final recommendations be available for the College Planning Council's meeting on Tuesday, April 18. CPC's recommendation will be available for me to develop the final report for the SBCCD Board of Trustees' meeting on April 27. At that meeting I will inform the Board of the campus recommendations and finalize the proposal to send to the Board of Governors.

Unfortunately, the timeline is short. Your immediate attention to this matter and your communication to Dr. Friedlander for review by the CPC at their meeting on April 18, 2000, will be appreciated.

In regard to the Chancellor's outline of "longer term ongoing budget requests," my reactions follow. First, all eight proposals have merit. The first three access (system growth), cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) and equalization are fundamental to the system. The growth allows us to maintain enrollments and provide access to the state's growing population. The COLA ensures our funding base will not deteriorate. Equalization will benefit Santa Barbara City College because we are funded in the lower one-third of all districts in the state. COLA, growth and equalization are not budget augmentations. These three areas support or maintain what we are presently carrying out. They are fundamental and need to be included. We would support equalization because it is right. It will bring districts to an equitable level of funding vis a vis other community colleges in the state.

Number 5, Human Resources and Number 4, Partnership for Excellence represent high priorities. The Human Resources request for the 2000-01 budget is proposed at the \$50 to \$80 million level. Sixty percent will be used to improve the conditions of part-time employees. The remaining 40 percent can be used to support HR considerations for the district including salary increases. Our faculty and staff are not over paid. To attract and retain high quality individuals, these two budget items are of critical importance. Partnership for Excellence is an exceptional idea to strengthen programs and services and more effectively achieve the student success goals that we have. Continued funding for Partnership for Excellence will be critical to accomplish our challenging mission.

Telecommunications and Technology: On June 1, 1998, I wrote the following to Chancellor Nussbaum: *Development of a Technological Capability. For the California Community Colleges to be competitive in the 21st century, individual colleges need to leverage the power of technology to respond to issues of enhancing access to higher education, increasing our effectiveness in learning outcomes for all programs, and seeking greater efficiencies.*

Technological tools are seen as fundamental enablers in the creativity of faculty and staff being applied to meet those ends. It is toward that end the following budget item is viewed as critical:

Financial support for colleges to develop and sustain a technological infrastructure that will enable universal Internet access by staff and students, support the delivery of educational programs over the World Wide Web, and be applied on campus to enhance learning and support greater operational efficiency.

My feelings have not changed. Funding for technology is critical to our ability to attract students and to support their success. It needs to be recognized that most institutions of higher education support technology development through the application of a user fee. In the California Community Colleges no such fees are allowed. Support must come from the state. Such support is critical for us to advance in a manner comparable to other institutions of higher education.

Economic Development: Requested are system funds to expand economic development. I am very supportive of this area, however, the previous areas establish a foundation that is fundamental to our success. Economic development is a part of our mission. Certainly, targeted funding to support our efforts in that regard would be welcomed. Such support will be beneficial to the communities we serve. However, the previous funding areas are necessary to strengthen the infrastructure that will support economic development activities.

Student Outreach and Access: We do an excellent job through our EOPS, CalSOAP and other programs. Funding for these programs certainly needs to be continued at a level to support the present effort. Our focus and institutional needs are well represented by these areas.

Again, I will appreciate you expediting the discussion of these issues with your respective groups and providing the information to Jack Friedlander for the College Planning Council's April 18, 2000, meeting.


PRM:sjc

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-6511
(916) 445-8752
HTTP://WWW.CCCCO.EDU

March 10, 2000

TO: Presidents, Board of Trustees
Superintendents/Presidents
Presidents, Academic Senate
Presidents, Student Body Organizations

FROM: 
Thomas J. Nussbaum
Chancellor

SUBJECT: District Involvement in Developing the System's 2001-2002 Budget Package

We're just starting to advocate the system's 2000-2001 budget request through the legislative process and the season is upon us to develop the proposed 2001-2002 System Budget. We are requesting each district, by **May 5, 2000**, to participate in providing input and developing recommendations for consideration in Consultation and by the Board of Governors.

Each governing board is requested, through its shared governance process, to work with its chief executive officer(s), faculty, staff, students and local constituencies in the development of budget recommendations and other input that will address system program priorities. We are seeking your input in two respects: first, we seek your views regarding a number of system proposals that are longer-term or ongoing in nature--primarily because these proposals are tied to the system's 2005 Strategic Response or our Basic Agenda. In this regard, we seek your input as to whether we should continue, modify, or terminate the proposals which are summarized in *Attachment #1*. Second, we seek your input about new budgetary priorities for the system. As to new budget concepts, a form for your proposals will be posted on our web site (see address above) within the next two weeks.

To indicate how your input and recommendations will fit into the entire budget development process, we have attached the calendar for the development of the 2001-2002 budget (*Attachment #2*).

By providing a more direct opportunity to shape the system's budget package, we expect the system's budget requests will better reflect local and statewide needs. In addition, we expect you to be more able to support and advocate this package with your legislators and in the legislative arena.

We welcome your participation in the development of the 2001-2002 California Community Colleges proposed budget. Again, please remember that the time frame for this response is no later than May 5, 2000. If you need further information about the process or the budget, please contact Patrick Lenz, Executive Vice Chancellor at (916) 445-2738.

ATTACHMENT #1

LONGER-TERM/ONGOING BUDGET REQUESTS

With respect to the following requests, we would appreciate your views as to the issues that are identified:

1. **Access:** The system's 2005 Strategic Response calls for the system to restore a level of access to a participation rate of 73/1000, meaning that the system will have to grow in FTES by 4% per year between 1996-97 and 2005-06. This 4% has been requested each year, and during the last four cycles we have received funding for 4%, 3%, 3%, and 3 ½%, respectively. As to the 2000-2001 budget, we are again requesting 4%.

Issue: Should the system continue to seek 4% for growth in 2001-2002?

2. **Cost of Living Adjustment:** Statute (Education Code Section 84750) calls for the community colleges to be provided an annual inflation adjustment in accordance with an index specified in the statute. The system has regularly requested this statutory inflation adjustment, but there were four years during the first half of the 1990's that none was provided. The statutory COLA has been provided each year since 1995-96. As to the 2000-2001 budget, we are again requesting the statutory COLA.

Issue: Should the system continue to seek the current statutory COLA in 2001-2002? What other options/issues should be considered?

3. **Equalization:** With the implementation of Program-Based Funding in 1991, the system has regularly requested funding for equalization. In addition, funding regulations of the Board of Governors call for a portion of "program improvement" revenues to be distributed for purposes of equalization. During the past several years, the State has not funded the system's requests for equalization or program improvement. The system has continued to seek equalization funding, but, since the mid-1990's has not sought program improvement. For 2000-2001, the system is seeking \$15 million for equalization. During 1999, a funding formula task force developed a new method for distributing these revenues, with half of the funds going to improve the funding levels of the lowest revenue districts and half of the funds going for purposes of equalization in accordance with Program-Based Funding formulas.

Issue: Should the system continue to seek equalization in 2001-2002; and, if so, what should be the distribution formula?

4. **Partnership for Excellence:** The 2005 Strategic Response calls upon the State to provide additional funding to community colleges to enable us to move to within \$1500 of the national average in funding per student by 2005. In return, the system will make the commitment to improve its performance on the critical student outcomes within its mission. The system developed the "Partnership for Excellence" 1998-99, proposing that funding for this program be increased by \$100 million per year, compounded, until 2005-06. This infusion would increase the system's base revenues by \$700 million, a significant portion of the funding needed to close the gap on the

national average. For 1998-99, the State funded the Partnership at \$100 million, and for 1999-2000 it was funded at \$145 million. For 2000-2001, the system is seeking a \$155 million augmentation, to bring total funding to \$300 million.

Issue: Should the system continue to seek \$100 million per year, compounded, for the Partnership for Excellence?

5. **Human Resources:** Over the years, the system has proposed a number of different ways of strengthening its human resources. Early in the 1990's, program improvement funds enabled the hiring of more full-time faculty. During more recent years, the system has requested specific funding to enable the hiring of more full-time faculty. In addition, the system has requested large increases in the Staff Development Fund and the Staff Diversity Fund. The state has not funded these requests. For 2000-2001, the system has proposed an \$18.7 million effort to expand faculty and staff diversity and quality. In addition, the system proposed a "plus one" percent to be added to the system's COLA request. Recently, through Consultation, the system has developed an \$80 million proposal for a Human Resource Infrastructure Fund.

Issue: Should the system continue to seek funds to strengthen human resources in 2001-2002; and if so, through what mechanism(s)?

6. **Student Outreach and Access:** The system has regularly sought funding to ensure all students can succeed. In main part, we have sought separate augmentations for the various categorical programs: EOPS, DSPS, Puente, MESA, Matriculation, etc. For 2000-2001, we have combined a series of separate requests for these programs into a single budget proposal calling for a \$27.9 million augmentation.

Issue: For 2001-2002, should the system continue to seek funding for student outreach and access, and should it continue to combine separate requests into a single proposal?

7. **Telecommunications and Technology:** Since the mid-1990's, the system has been requesting funding to establish a telecommunications infrastructure. In addition, it has sought and received separate funding for instructional equipment, library resources, and technology. The 2005 Strategic Response calls for the development of a "Technology II Plan" that will guide the build-out of the infrastructure and support future budget requests. For 2000-2001, the system is seeking a \$16.3 million augmentation for telecommunications and technology funding, and one-time funds to augment instructional equipment funding.

Issue: For 2001-2002, should the system continue to seek funding for telecommunications and technology; and, if so, by what method(s)?

8. **Economic Development:** Since the early 1990's, the system has requested funding to expand its programs of economic development and workforce preparation. Major funding augmentations were provided in 1996-97 and 1997-98. For 2000-2001, the system is seeking a \$9.9 million augmentation.

Issue: For 2001-2002, should the system continue to seek funding for expanding its economic development and workforce preparation efforts?

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
2001-2002 BUDGET PROCESS AND TIMELINE**

PROCESS PLAN	2000
Chancellor's letter sent to system requesting Concept Papers	March 10
Report to BOG on 2000-2001 BCP process	March 13-14
District input and Concept Papers due	May 5
BCP Task Force to meet on development of 2000-2001 CCC system budget recommendations	April 17 thru June 30
Agency BCP recommendations due	May 1
Initial report to BOG on system concept papers	May 8-9
BOG and CCCT Discuss System Budget Priorities	June 1
BCP Task Force completes review of agency concepts	June 30
Concept recommendations submitted to Board of Governors	July 10-11
All proposed BCPs due for technical review by Chancellor's Office	July 31
Proposed 2000-2001 BCPs approved by Board of Governors	September 11-12
Final BCPs submitted to the Department of Finance	September 15
Chancellor's Office meets with Department of Finance on BCPs	September/October

SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL SERVICES RECOMMENDATIONS

To summarize there are a couple of different models being recommended by Technical Services to both the ITC and the DTC:

- **2yr/4yr Cascading Model** - This model updates certain labs on a 2yr basis to keep technology freshest, then cascades those computers after 2yrs use to other labs which don't need 'leading edge' technology where they can be utilized for another 2 yrs (4 total). Extra costs come in the form of monies needed to upgrade some/all the systems and to perform the cleanup, moving and rebuilding of the cascades. It does allow for a faster replacement of equipment in high technology area's, but also means keeping the machines for an extra year beyond their warranty. It also takes into consideration certain area's which would keep machines for an entire 4 years without being cascaded
- **3yr/4yr No Cascade Model** - This model updates most labs on a 3 year cycle, with some (Macintosh) labs on a 4 year cycle (both due to length of warranties). This model saves over \$90,000 in upgrade costs and balances the higher costs of replacing every 3 years instead of 2/4 years.

Both models use the recommendations of the ITC's lab replacements and augment other area's as well.

In addition, savings will be seen in long term replacements because monitors will only be replaced on an 'as needed' basis (once a 17" is installed) giving a savings of approximately \$50,000 per year or more in the future.

Savings will also be made in the "No Cascade" model in expenditures of the Emergency Replacement & Repairs budgets because equipment will be continually under warranty and replaced as soon as the warranty has expired. In addition, there will be great savings in Human Resources utilized for performing cascades, repairs and general downtime due to older equipment.

We believe it is our best option to go with the "No Cascade" model listed, and to institute it as soon as possible in order to take advantage of the long term savings.

NO CASCADE MODEL - Replace ALL PC Labs on 3yr and Mac's on 4yr Cycle

ITC Approved	2000	2001	2002	2003	3 yr Lab	Qty	Cost	Subtotal	Current Machine Type	4 yr Lab	Qty	Cost	Subtotal	Current Machine Type
*****	8			8	FRC Staff/Development	8	3000	24,000	MAC's					
		4			FRC Student MAC's	4	3000	12,000	MAC's					
*****	4			4	FRC Student PC's	4	1425	5,700	PC's 166/266					
		28			COMAP/CIS BC-301	28	2000	56,000	HP P2-350					
			31		COMAP/CIS BC-302	31	2000	62,000	HP P3-450					
*****	31			31	COMAP/CIS BC-313	31	2000	62,000	HP P-200					
			31		COMAP/CIS BC-314	31	2000	62,000	HP P-450					
*****	31			31	COMAP/CIS BC-315	31	2000	62,000	HP P-200					
*****	22			22	Computer Science Lab 3	22	2715	59,730	HP P2-233					
		22			Computer Science Lab 2	22	1425	31,350	HP P2-266					
			39				1425			Computer Science Lab 1	39	1425	55,575	HP Entria workstations
	25			25	Cont. Ed – Schott CIOF Lab	25	1425	35,625	HP P-166 NT					
			38		Cont. Ed – Wake Rm 6	38	1425	54,150	HP P2-400					
	26			26	Cont. Ed – Wake Rm 4	26	1425	37,050	P-133's					
		26			Cont. Ed – Wake Rm 5	26	1425	37,050	HP P2-266					
		25					1350			Cont. Ed - Wake Rm 3	25	1350	33,750	MAC 4400/200
	26				Drafting/CAD	26	2715	70,590	XI P2-300 & Integraph P2-333					
		5			Drafting/CAD Lab 2	5	2715	13,575	486's					
		36					1350			LRC/LSS CAT II	36	1350	48,600	MAC 7600/120
			12				1350			LRC/LSS Annex	12	1350	16,200	IMAC's
			8				1350			LRC/LSS Annex	8	1350	10,800	MAC 4400/200
			10				1350			LRC/LSS Service Computer	10	1350	13,500	10 MAC 4400/200
		34					1350			LRC/LSS Commons	34	1350	45,900	IMAC's
			36				1350			LRC/LSS CAT I	36	1350	48,600	MAC 4400/200
			8				1350			LRC/LSS Service Computer	8	1350	10,800	MAC 4400/200
	6			6	LRC/LSS PC Commons	6	1425	8,550	PC's 133/166					
		8		8	LRC/LSS PC Commons	8	1425	11,400	PC's 133/166					
			7		Communications	7	1425	9,975	HP P2-400					
		10			Foreign Language Lab	10	1425	14,250	10 HP P2-266					
		64					1350			Foreign Language Lab	64	1350	86,400	64 MAC 4400/200
*****	4			4	HRC STUDENTS	4	2000	8,000	NEC P-133					
		7		7	HRC STAFF	7	1425	9,975	HP P2-266					
*****	1			1	HRC STAFF	1	3210	3,210	NEC LAPTOP P-90					
			4				1350			Journalism	4	1350	5,400	IMAC's
			2				2000			Journalism	2	2000	4,000	MAC G3-350
		2					1350			Journalism	2	1350	2,700	MAC PPC-200/225
		13			Marine Tech	13	1765	22,945	DELL P2-400					
		31			Mathmatics	31	1425	44,175	HP P-200					
			132		MAT/DAC Labs 1,2,3,4	132	2715	358,380	SGI P2-350					
	25			25	Library	25	1425	35,625	NEC 486/66 & P133					
	23			23	DSPS	23	1765	40,595	P2-266					

NO CASCADE MODEL - Replace ALL PC Labs on 3yr and Mac's on 4yr Cycle

ITC Approved

2000	2001	2002	2003	3 yr Lab	Qty	Cost	Subtotal	Current Machine Type	4 yr Lab	Qty	Cost	Subtotal	Current Machine Type
	15			Physics	15	1425	21,375	P2-266					
	20			Electronics - Repair/tests	20	1425	28,500	P-90/133's					
	20			Electronics Lab	20	1425	28,500	P2-266					
		29		Allied Health	29	1425	41,325	HP P3-450					
223	366	343	278	=Yearly Subtotals									
				<i>Total Machines on 3yr Cycle = 709</i>					<i>Total Machines on 4 yr Cycle = 280</i>				
				<i>Total 3yr Cycle Replacement Costs =</i>				<i>1,371,600</i>	<i>Total 4yr Cycle Replacement Costs =</i>				<i>382,225</i>
				<i>Total Cost per year for 3yr Cycle =</i>				<i>457,200</i>	<i>Total Cost per year for 4yr Cycle =</i>				<i>95,556</i>
				<i>Total Replace Costs for ALL Labs =</i>				<i>1,753,825</i>	<i>First Year Replacement Costs</i>				<i>406,160</i>
				<i>Annual Costs for ALL Labs based on 3yr/4yr cycle =</i>				<i>552,756</i>	<i>Second Year Replacment Costs</i>				<i>572,015</i>
				<i>Annual Costs of Labs based on 4yr ONLY cycle =</i>				<i>438,456</i>	<i>Third Year Replacement Costs</i>				<i>694,475</i>
									<i>Fourth Year Replacement Cost</i>				<i>484,635</i>
				<i>Total Number of Machines =</i>				<i>989</i>					