MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
November 4, 2010
SPECIAL MEETING/STUDY SESSION
Room A218
4:00 pm
MacDougall Administration Center
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive

The Office of the Superintendent/President, Room A 110 in the MacDougall Administration Center is the location where documents that are public records relating to any item under discussion on a Board agenda (including documents distributed with the agenda and those distributed to all or a majority of the members of the Board within 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting or within 24 hours prior to a special or committee meeting) are available for public inspection.

Board agendas and supporting documents are also posted on the College website at http://www.sbcc.edu/boardoftrustees/.

1. GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.1 CALL TO ORDER

President Dobbs called the meeting to order.

1.2 ROLL CALL

Members present:
Dr. Kathryn Alexander
Dr. Joe Dobbs, President
Mrs. Sally Green, Vice President
Mr. Des O’Neill
Mr. Luis Villegas
Ms. Nicole Ridgell, Student Trustee

Members absent:
Ms. Joan Livingston
Mr. Morris Jurkowitz

Others present for all or a portion of the meeting:
Dr. Andreea M. Serban, Superintendent/President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Alarcón, Ignacio, Pres Academic Senate Blum, Marty
Dr. Arellano, Ofelia, VP Continuing Ed Ehrlich, Sue, VP HRLA
Auchinloss, Liz, President CSEA Dr. Friedlander, Jack, Exec VP Ed Prgms
1.3 WELCOME

President Dobbs extended a cordial welcome to all.

1.4 HEARING OF CITIZENS

No citizen expressed an interest to address the Board.

1.5 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF OCTOBER 14, 2010

Upon motion by Mr. O’Neill, seconded by Mrs. Green, the Board approved the minutes of the special meeting/study session of October 14, 2010.

Upon motion by Dr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, the Board approved adjourning to study session.

2. STUDY SESSION

2.1 Adjustments to the SBCC state general apportionment for 2010-11 based on the 2010-11 state budget enacted on October 8 (Attachment 1)

Superintendent/President Serban provided an update on the latest information available regarding allocations from the State for the California Community College System and how it affects us at the college. Attachment 1 is about the State General Apportionment component, which is unrestricted general fund revenue only. The base allocation is related to two things, the size of the college in terms of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and the additional allocation is related to whether we have a center or not. This is an allocation related to the concept that there are certain basic operational expenses that any district has regardless of the size. Base allocations are for the main campus, Schott and Wake centers, for all operational expenditures. The base revenue is generated and calculated based on the funded FTES and it was noted that the base revenue between 2008-09 and 2009-10 declined and this was related to the overall cuts the community college system experienced. In 2008-09 there were adjustments made to the allocation because once the fiscal year closed and the system and the state found that they did not receive the funding expected, all colleges were cut proportionately and this was noted as a deficit factor of 1.2% or almost $1 million. In 2009-10 the base allocation was down to $73 million and this was because of the $2.6 million reduction that was the workload reduction that is an ongoing cut to our base apportionment. The preliminary calculation of the general apportion for 2009-10 was $73.4 million and the final calculation will occur in February 2011 based on what the other districts report and based on the final revenue that the State receives. For 2010-11 there are two versions, one is the adopted budget that is based on the Governor’s proposed budget because this is all of the information available at that time and now that the State has enacted a budget for 2010-11, the information shows the differences for 2010-11. Superintendent/President Serban noted that there was a negative COLA of .38% that would have reduced the on-going general base funding by $280,000 and this amount has disappeared in the enacted budget as there is now no COLA. Also the enacted budget now is allocating growth at 2.21% that translates for SBCC to $1.5 million, this growth money will not come during the fiscal year, if it does materialize it will come in July 2011. We have a good practice in place at the college that has served us well and that is we do not budget growth until the money is actually received. This amount is being shown because it is part of the enacted budget but will not be added into the actual budget until it is received. As has been discussed at prior meetings this 2.1% funded growth, if it will actually hold, barely helps as in
2009-10 we enrolled 7.5% more FTES than our funded level.

In January the State will look at what revenues were actually received, they will reconsider what they can fund and what they cannot and midyear adjustments will probably occur, especially if federal funding does not materialize and if the property tax revenue does not materialize. We also don’t know what Governor Jerry Brown will do regarding the budget deficit the State is facing and how they are going to handle it come January.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that the college made certain funding restorations through the adopted budget for tutoring, counseling, student service hours, and scheduling significantly more sections for Spring 2011 than what was projected in the tentative budget in June. If there are no major budget cuts or no major budget adjustment in January we should be in good shape and can sustain some cuts.

2.2 Changes in state allocation for categorical programs for 2010-11 (Attachment 2)

Superintendent/President Serban noted that the State allocations for categorical programs were cut overall by 50%. What was presented was the allocation from the State for 2009-10, for 2010-11, originally we were told certain amounts would be allocated and when the advance apportionment was received, it was noted that the State had reallocated some of the funding which was the result of some strong lobbying that had taken place in the State legislature for EOPS and CalWORKS. Since there weren’t any funds available to cover these changes, funding was reduced among the other programs to cover the increases provided to EOPS and CalWORKS. Superintendent/President Serban reported that a commitment had been made in 2008-09 when cuts were made to categorical programs to off-set those cuts as much as we can from the general unrestricted funds to ensure that critical programs such as Disabled Student Programs, EOPS and Matriculation, both in credit and non-credit could continue operating. The discussion that now needs to take place internally is whether to continue to provide the same support as was allotted for EOPS and CalWORKS, or reduce the general support to EOPS and CalWORKS and redistribute that amount to the other programs to help with the cuts they received. Categorical programs should receive more precise information by early next week as to what precisely those changes will be and those changes will be taken into consideration when discussions are taking place.

2.3 College-wide priorities for 2010-11 (Attachment 3)

Superintendent/President Serban reported that in Fall 2008 it was agreed that a process would be put into place to bring to the Board the outcomes of the internal discussions that have taken place regarding the college-wide priorities for the academic year.

Highlights of the key college-wide priorities for the year were presented and the major one was the development of the college plan for 2011-14 and this was done through the college’s governance groups. An initial draft will be produced and will be brought to a study session sometime in April and the hope is to bring the final plan to the Board for approval at the June Board meeting. What is exciting and different this year, in terms of the development of the college plan, relates to both the work on the Title V grant and the concept of pushing us at the college towards some “big audacious goals”. Incremental improvement is solid and we have had incremental improvements in many areas. However, with the work on the Title V grant and some of the concepts that have been put in place through the effort of many people on this campus, it is our desire to make some fairly significant improvements in degree completion and transfer completion requirements, as well as improvement in the completion of the basic skills sequence. This will be the major focus in this bigger than normal incremental improvements that we would like to see happen by June 2014. In addition to the Title V grant is the concept of the degree transfer acceleration for which we will use a combination of existing resources from
the college budget and some additional funding from the Foundation for SBCC and discussions with other foundations, in addition to pursuing other grants to help with this effort.

The Distance Education Workgroup was formed because one of the accreditation standards requires that similar services should be provided to students in distance education instruction as are provided to students who receive traditional face-to-face instruction. Part of our institution's accreditation self study was to look at and to develop a very in depth analysis and compare what resources we have for the face-to-face student vs the distance education environment. The findings of this group will be presented at a future study session, so that we may take some of their recommendations and incorporate them into the 2011-14 college plan.

The development of a new college plan is always an excellent opportunity to take a more in-depth look at other significant efforts taking place at the college. A Transfer Task Force was created and its mission is to develop a new and more specific transfer plan for the college. This would have a more holistic look at transfers at the college as it relates to instruction and to other services that are specifically targeted towards the transfer effort. This group will be looking at the transfer efforts at the college as it relates to developing more transfer agreements with out-of-state and in-state private institutions, because, as we know, due to the recent changes made to the transfer admission procedures and timelines and the massive increases in fees, the transfers to UCs and CSUs have dropped.

Two other areas that are important are the emergency preparedness and the concept of the comprehensive disaster recover/business continuity plan. It will take a lot more planning to have an infrastructure in place to be able to recover from a natural disaster, such as an earthquake. There are entities available to help institutions plan for these types of disasters and we will be researching them.

Work needs to continue on the planning agendas that were identified in the institutional self-study for re-affirmation of accreditation. Our mid-term report will be due by October 15, 2012 and we need to show that we have dealt with the issues we identified.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Plan draft is currently being discussed among the internal governance groups and is a requirement of the State Chancellor's Office and it will come to the Board once input has been received from the various groups. Dr. Alexander requested that this draft be presented to the Educational Policies Committee so that it can be reviewed by them. Dr. Alexander suggested that this be placed on the agenda for the Board Retreat.

2.4 Full-time faculty obligation for Fall 2010 and projection for Fall 2011 (Attachment 4)

Superintendent/President Serban reported that the full-time faculty report obligation is due on November 30. It was pointed out that our final figure required for 2010 was lower than the previous year and that was due to the reduction in our base funding. The Board of Governors has the authority to waive the full-time faculty obligation if the State funding is not sufficient and this did occur in both Fall 2008 and Fall 2009. The Board of Governors is expected to meet next week and it is expected that this obligation will be waived again and that means that our expected obligation for Fall 2011 will remain the same as in 2010.

2.5 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

2.5.1 BP 2015 Student Member(s) (Attachment 5)

Superintendent/President Serban reported that this relates to the compensation of the student trustee. Our student trustee traditionally received a stipend of $250 per semester. While attending a student trustee workshop, our student trustee Nicole Ridgell learned that she is paid
less than other district student trustees. Board members receive $400 a month for attending the Board meeting and the study session. Other districts pay their student trustees half of what the Board members receive and some districts pay their student trustee the same amount as their Board members. The recommendation was made to the Board that the student trustee should not receive the same amount as the Board for the following reasons:

- Student Trustee does not participate in closed sessions
- Does not have the same obligation of availability as the Board members.
- Does not have the same levels of responsibility as the Board members.
- Only has an advisory vote.
- Is not required to attend standing committees of the Board.

The recommendation is to pay the student trustee half of the amount paid to the Board members.

Consensus of the Board was that the student trustee should receive $200 per month and in addition to that a stipend of $250 per semester. This item will be brought to the Board for approval at the November board meeting.

2.6 Overview of 50% law and SBCC's standing (Attachment 6)

The 50% law requires that at least 50% of the college expenditures need to be for instructional expenditures. This would be the compensation of the instructors as well as the compensation of the lab teaching assistants that directly relate to lab work. Where this law hurts us is in the area of the EOPS counselors, academic counselors, and librarians who are not considered in this calculation as instructional expenditures. We are in compliance with this law and we have actually gone up in this percentage because we have had a lot more direct instructional expenditures, as a result of the reduction in the operational expenditures we have had over the last two years.

2.7 Discussion of proposed items for future agendas of Board meetings (regular meetings, special/study sessions, or committee meetings). This agenda item is for the members of the Board to discuss proposed or potential items for future Board meetings.

2. Student Trustee Policy – revisions should be made and presented at the November board meeting.

Upon motion by Mr. O'Neill, seconded by Mrs. Green the Board approved adjourning out of study session.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion by Mr. O'Neill, seconded by Dr. Alexander, the Board approved adjourning this meeting. The next Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on Thursday, November 18, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in A211.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON January 13, 2011

[Signatures]

President, Board of Trustees
Superintendent/President
Secretary/Clerk of the Board