

Santa Barbara City College
Special College Planning Council
Thursday, December 16, 2010
9:00 am – 10:00 am
A218C
Minutes

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, R. Else J. Friedlander, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Monda, K. Neufeld, D. Nevins, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: T. Garey

GUESTS: K. O'Connor, A. Orozco, A. Scharper, J. Schultz, M. Spaventa, D. Waggoner

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

Discussion Items

1. Opening of additional credit classes in Spring 2011 that are the most critical for graduation or transfer of students.

Superintendent /President Serban acknowledged Associated Student Senate President Atty Garfinkel on behalf of the College Planning Council for her leadership in the Student Senate. Dr. Serban said that Ms. Garfinkel has been a very effective and engaged Student Senate President. Dr. Serban informed everyone that Atty will need to temporarily step down for the next few months because she will be dealing with the arrival of her baby and other related issues. Ruby Limon, who is currently Vice President will take the role as President of Student Senate. Executive VP Friedlander said the Student Senate has flourished under Atty Garfinkel's leadership. Dr. Friedlander spoke about the Student Senate regional meeting that the SBCC Student Senate hosted and what the Dean of Student Life, Dr. Partee reported was that SBCC's Student Senate is looked to as a model of how a student senate should run, so Atty Garfinkel's work has been most appreciated. Dr. Serban thanked her and wished her well.

Dr. Serban handed out two attachments that serve as information for the one agenda item for today. Dr. Serban gave background information for those who do not know why this agenda item has come back to CPC.

The Academic Senate held a special meeting yesterday on the very same item and the handout that was passed around was prepared by Executive VP Friedlander based on information from Deans, Department Chairs and other individuals. Since this was discussed yesterday, Superintendent/President Serban asked that Dr. Friedlander and Academic Senate President Alarcon summarize what took place at the Academic Senate Meeting yesterday.

Academic Senate President Alarcon reported that he called a special meeting of the Academic Senate to discuss the opening of additional credit classes in Spring 2011 that are the most critical for graduation or transfer of students. Mr. Alarcon stated that there was a quorum, they needed 11 Senators and they had 14; this really speaks to the dedication of

Senators to come to an extra meeting when school is no longer in session or to take the time to attend by phone as ASB President Garfinkel did. Mr. Alarcon stated that the tone of the Senate Meeting went from mild irritation to complete frustration because we had discussed this two weeks ago. But it turned out to be a good discussion in terms of looking at this again. President Alarcon said that what is new now is that there are new Board Members who said that they wanted to discuss this.

Superintendent/President Serban explained why the special Academic Senate Meeting was held and this special CPC is being held, because she wanted everybody to have the same information.

Dr. Serban said an orientation for the new Board Members took place on December 9 and December 10. The primary purpose of the orientation was to inform the new Trustees about the college and who is responsible for what, but during this orientation, many questions were posed related to various other topics not necessarily on the agenda for the orientation.

One of the topics that garnered attention, although not part of the orientation itself, was the issue related to availability of classes. Trustees Croninger and Macker commented that they had heard from some students and faculty who had spoken to the Board Members directly about the fact that the demand for our classes is high. It was mentioned that even in the priority registration period some classes seem to be filling very quickly and we don't know to what extent the individuals who went to open registration would even have a space in some of the classes. There were some examples given by a couple of Board Members. One of the examples is the lack of space in the biology class that Board Member Macker mentioned because her son is enrolled in dual enrollment and wants to enroll in Biology 103. Because of this, Board Member Macker has very close knowledge of the fact that this is a highly impacted class, and is concerned about the issue of adding sections. But that was an example in the context of the larger discussion.

Dr. Serban explained to the Board that CPC did discuss this issue at length and that the Academic Senate and the Student Senate had expressed their opinions as well. Therefore because both groups recommended against adding sections, we at CPC did not even take a vote because we did not feel that it would make sense to go against what these two groups had already had a very strong opinion on. We also discussed the importance of honoring and following the internal governance processes because normally it would be very unusual for the Board of Trustees to unilaterally reverse a recommendation that was the same recommendation from Academic Senate, Student Senate and CPC. In this case again we did not even vote.

Then the discussion was broadened to a larger discussion and that is that the new Board Members want to understand how the decisions are made at the College, what is the process, who is involved, what is the flow, a legitimate desire on the part of the new Board Members. Particularly in such a key area as establishing our course offerings and especially when the demand is so high that we could easily enroll 2,000 to 3,000 students tomorrow if we opened more sections. The demand is that high at this point. So the discussion went into a larger area of interest in trying to understand the enrollment management process at the college. How does it work? How do we track and how do we gauge that students have the necessary courses to complete? What are the mechanisms by which we are able to

determine that information? Do we know exactly, for example, in any given year, how many exact students are there who, if the right courses are offered, would be able to graduate or transfer in a particular academic year? The discussion became much broader than this item per se. We tried to bring it back to something we can get our hands around and the discussion then came back to the concept of: If money was not an issue, or if there was the ability to allocate additional resources, what is the magnitude of the need for Spring 2011 and to what extent can this be done in a timely fashion to make a difference? Obviously the discussion was around the question of when is it too late to even add anything. There was discussion related to personnel issues, and finding the right instructors. Board President Dr. Haslund, for example, did comment that as a former Department Chair, there is a point-in-time where it is really difficult to find qualified adjuncts if you want to add sections at a late date.

Dr. Serban went on to say that for those CPC Members who looked at the Board Agenda for today (December 16, 2010), then you saw that it was worded fairly generally, because we did not end the orientation meeting for the new Trustees with clarity of what the discussion would entail per se, but Dr. Serban did stress the fact that the Board level of proper discussion is about the dollar amount rather than discussing or choosing particular sections. Choosing sections is an operational internal decision that is made by faculty, Department Chairs, Deans and Dr. Friedlander. But resource allocation is a concept of a budgetary adjustment of a certain magnitude certainly in the purview of the Board. Dr. Serban stated that this is a summary of an hour's worth of discussion on December 10 during the orientation session for new Board members.

Academic Senate President Alarcon reminded the CPC members that there is a recording of the orientation meeting for the new Trustees on the web. The Academic Senate had a discussion centered on the list that was part of the prior CPC meeting and they talked about whether some of these courses were really critical for graduation. Some of the classes Mr. Alarcon mentioned were classes such as ENG 103, ENG 100, Field Studies 104 that are normally not offered in the Spring. There was a motion that eventually passed. The motion was that we agree on this request but paring down the attached list to these sections that are critical for groups of students to graduate in the Spring or to transfer or to get a degree and not to exceed the \$97,000 of that is in the budget that was not encumbered because of savings from unfilled faculty positions. We agreed that we do not want to go over budget into reserves and then even that may not be the full amount. Also, part of the motion was that it will be very desirable that this situation does not occur again, this way of extraordinary meeting and all these things happening, that it is important to follow a process.

Executive VP Friedlander stated that in the very spirit of debate, most of the arguments that the Senators at the Academic Senate Meeting made regarding to not go forward with the motion were the same that were discussed at CPC last time.

Dr. Friedlander stated that he had some new information that was not presented at CPC or the last time the Senate discussed this. Dr. Friedlander reported that at the last Academic Senate Meeting he withdrew the request to even have a vote because there was no point because clearly at that time there wasn't adequate support to move forward. What Dr. Friedlander said at yesterday's presentation, was that #1) the amount that would be required to fund all the sections listed plus reader support would be \$148,000. The truth is that at this

late date, we would be hard pressed to find an instructor and/or room to even offer half of these. The amount of money that actually would be spent if this is approved would be somewhere realistically in the \$40,000/\$50,000 range, more so than even this, which would be money that, in the end it is all general fund dollars, but right now it would not be going to reserves at all or even coming close to that. It would be money that we had budgeted for full time faculty who, as Academic Senate President Alarcon said, for various reasons were not teaching this year and we hired adjuncts and that savings was \$97,000.

Some students are probably enrolling in courses that are not the best courses for them to take, so it is not like we are serving more students, they are just taking classes that it is not the most efficient way for them to complete their degree certificates and their transfer curriculum. What it does, it ties up seats. This Spring we have no way of knowing how many, but they will be back next Fall trying to get into these sections which they need which will compound the problem next Fall and then next Spring on and on.

Second point Dr. Friedlander made is that, although we will not come close to meeting the needs of students who are placed in basic skills, reading, writing and our math classes, these students are still enrolling in classes, so that just means that they are going to be enrolling in degree applicable courses for which we know they do not have the skills to succeed. So what happened at the end of the Spring semester is we can predict most of the students who will end up getting "W's" or some of those who go into academic debt when they come back for the Fall. We cannot serve all the students who place, but to the degree we serve 40 or 50 more of that number, there might 44 students who are not who we will see on probation because they are taking classes for which they are ill equipped to succeed. The number of sections that we asked for were what the departments felt they could reasonably offer even if that will be a struggle at this late date. But that is the rationale for those basic skills classes.

There are a number of students in certain areas that actually do have to have classes, for example in Culinary Arts. What happens in the Culinary Arts curriculum is that it is a highly sequential curriculum, so students cannot take classes in semester four unless they complete the courses in semester three. What has happened in Culinary Arts, over the years, is that a number of students do not complete the sequence, they get hired. They are already working and they get hired full-time and then their work dominates and they do not complete this curriculum. We implemented various strategies to increase persistence rates, we have worked with our employers, saying please, let the students finish. And this year, it worked better than last year. This Fall it turns out that these strategies worked out better than we predicted, so we have eight more students who must have these two Culinary Arts classes this spring in order to get their certificate in Culinary Arts. The Department has already taken more students in their labs than they normally would take and there is no room now to take even more students. Those cooking labs are too small. For these students, we know for a fact that it will delay them getting their certificates until the end of next Fall, plus, if we give them those classes next Fall, that means we will have the bumping effect of students who need those classes that are now needed who won't have those seats because these students will have priority on that. There are a few other situations that the faculty reported that they know that there is an X number of students who actually have to have a class in order to graduate on time.

One of the major factors that has guided SBCC's Title V grant proposal was "Time is the

Enemy". The more time it takes a student to complete the degrees or certificate programs; it is less likely that they will do it. Dr. Friedlander extracted a recommendation from University of California's Strategic Plan, they are saying how do we handle a situation where we have less money and more demand than we ever had in the past. One of the recommendations was to have students take courses more efficiently and that would enable them to serve X number of more students in a more timely manner and we would increase their degree completion rates. Same thing we have here.

The last factor that Dr. Friedlander did not share at the Academic Senate Meeting yesterday is what happened was after we developed the Spring schedule of classes, UCs and CSUs said because of budgetary constraints we are going to reduce by quite a bit the number of freshmen we accept and we are no longer accepting mid-year transfers, Community College students. What happened with students who wanted to be accepted to UCs or CSUs is that they are coming here as well as other community colleges as full time students. And then UCs and CSUs announced late in the Fall semester, we are no longer going to accept mid-year transfers. Those students now are here, where in the past they would not be, they would have done the mid-year transfer. It turns out that at the last minute, late November, CSUs, because they were able to raise their fees for the Spring, said we are now open to take mid-year transfers. By then, talked to Dean McLellan and the counselors, and they said very few of our students have transferred, it is too late. So they were here.

What has happened since is that both UCs and CSUs have fairly significant tuition increases and they are going to accept more students next year as a result of that. So it will take some of the pressure off Community Colleges and us next year. We had that extraordinary set of circumstances compounding in the Spring and it was not in our planning when we developed the Spring schedule of classes. For those reasons, what he asked the Senate yesterday and by the smallest of margins they supported was to work with the Deans and Chairs, look at the list, and open up those classes that rise to the top as being most essential. And that is what we will do with the best information that we have available and the counselors have done a lot of analysis. Probably, at best, it will be \$50 - \$60,000 worth and none of that would come as a new resource request to CPC.

What we are doing strategically to be more precise, for example, how many students actually need these classes to graduate, to make progress and in most cases, we don't know. We don't have the tools to measure that. But, the good news is that one of the goals of the Title V Grant is to build the tools to find out. Then we have programs for students to transition to who want to transfer or obtain an Associate Degree. But we are telling the students joining Express to Success (funded by the Title V grant) that they need to follow their educational plan and to the degree that that program expands we will know with more precision what classes students are supposed to take semester one, two, three and four to complete their goals in a timely manner.

In the Title V grant, we put quite a bit of money into IT for programming support and to purchase some products. One program we put in there called Degree Works, that combined with our existing tools and integrated into Banner and with our plan to require students every semester in order to take classes, they would have to upgrade their education goals and key points that help give us more accurate information as to what their goal really is. Plus you have these benchmarks where students say that by this time the student should have done

these 30 units, these 45 units/these courses, 60 units with these courses which would be in their electronic ed plan, which we built money into the grant to develop, plus get this product. We can, probably within a year or year and a half, depends on how fast we are able to move forward, implement and integrate this. We will be able to say with a lot more precision. We know now in building this Spring schedule whereas building the Fall schedule that x number of students they follow their ed plans, then these are how many will need these kinds of courses. We never had that before. At that point, if they can't get the classes because they did not take advantage of the priority registration, Dr. Friedlander will be a lot less sympathetic to students procrastinating or they did not know. Because at that point, there is no reason why they should not know. Also at that point having that information and the benchmark tools, the electronic ed plan integrated, we can be much more prescriptive in what we communicate to students and what we expect of them in their best interest. He thinks by a year from now as we build Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, they will have that extra intelligence going forward. CPC is being asked to reconsider this request with the parameters that were asked for by the Academic Senate and knowing that the amount asked would be at best half of the \$97,000 originally mentioned.

CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultation Group Liz Auchincloss stated that she recalled that at the last CPC meeting one of the strongest arguments against doing this wasn't money, but the fact that if we continue to do more for less at the State level we will not be reimbursed. She took classes in the 80s and did not always get the classes she wanted. This is not a first time problem; it is a continuing problem. You serve so many students and not everyone is going to get what they want and even at a four year school they don't always give the classes students need to graduate and they have to come back. So it is not that this is a new problem. She wanted to remind CPC of the strong argument that was made at the last CPC that was not the money it was the other issues involved with adding classes. And why didn't BIO 103 make the list. Executive VP Friedlander stated that Bio 103 was the one change he made. It was on the list yesterday, in consultation with others, it did not have the total support to move forward with that class and so how we work with faculty in terms of curriculum, we felt it would not be appropriate to keep it on the list since there was no support for it. It was more of a staffing issue, it wasn't that students didn't need the class; it was the impact on staff. Ms. Auchincloss asked if he checked the staffing for classes like Science classes, required labs etc. Dr. Friedlander stated that it came from the Department Chair in consultation with the Dean and that is one of the things we looked at.

CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultation Group Auchincloss said that she attended both the Board of Trustees Orientation sessions and she wanted to say that Superintendent/President Serban did a great job of getting these meetings going because the Board wanted to continue to talk about these issues no matter what. Ms. Auchincloss said that she thinks that Dr. Serban did quite a job and Mr. Alarcon also did a great job in the Senate Meeting so we could preserve our consultation process. Ms. Auchincloss stated that there was a point where she was not sure that the consultation process would be preserved if it had not been for Dr. Serban's efforts. Ms. Auchincloss stated that she listened to two days of Board Orientation and she is ready to make sure that our processes are preserved. She had some doubts, and reiterated that Dr. Serban did a great job getting this done.

Dr. Serban thanked Ms. Auchincloss. All Vice Presidents did a lot of work on their presentations for the orientation for the new Trustees and Mr. Alarcon and Ms. Auchincloss

stayed heroically throughout all of the meetings.

ASB President Garfinkel reported that the Student Senate had an email meeting telling everybody what was going on with the Academic Senate Meeting and with the CPC Meeting and asked if anyone had any input. The input that Student Senate has is that they have not changed their position; the only classes that they will support being added would be IGETC requirements and major requirements and the rest of the fluff needs to be cut out. That was that.

Executive VP Friedlander asked Ms. Garfinkel what she said yesterday about the English and Math classes. Ms. Garfinkel responded that she meant the English and Math classes being the IGETC major classes that the Student Senate was specifically looking at. She said she saw the English 100 on there and frankly if a student cannot take the English 100 class ahead of time, before one starts to get into classes that the student needs, then that student needs to see an Academic Counselor. She has no sympathy for the people that need the English 100 classes that have not already signed up for them with the exception of the incoming freshmen and if they have just completed them, they should be able to assess past the English 100 class.

VP HRLA Ehrlich asked how the Academic Senate in their meeting yesterday, addressed the issue that Ms. Auchincloss raised, of the Senate having taken a strong position initially which is that the College continually sends the message that we are able to find ways of doing more with less to the ultimate detriment of our ability to plan and how the institutions are perceived and what is now some modification of that apparently.

Academic Senate President Alarcon answered saying that is a concern all the time; at the same time, the reality is that we have the students here, how are you going to say no to the students that you are seeing face to face. That is a tension between those two arguments all the time. This is a concern all the time. Now we hear that the cuts are starting January 10th even further.

VP Business Services Sullivan expressed his concern. What are we actually going to vote on because when he looks at this list, we are voting on a list of classes that people put the argument for, but actually we are voting on some subset of this list and we don't actually know what that subset is and so to him it is kind of ambiguous in that context. It puts a difficult burden on Educational Programs to try to figure out who is actually going to get bumped and why.

Superintendent/President stated that we will not vote on sections. Dr. Serban said that she wanted to make that clear. Dr. Serban said we don't micromanage the section decision process. CPC only votes on an amount of money and on the agreement that we are ok to use up to x amount which normally would have fallen to the end-of-year balances to be used for this purpose. CPC will never get into the micromanagement of schedule development.

Academic Senate Vice-President Neufeld referred to Ms Auchincloss' earlier question regarding how the College manages to do more for less only to the College's detriment in terms of State funding and yes, Mr. Neufeld stated that the Academic Senate did discuss that

again. It is very present for us.

Mr. Neufeld reported the following. Library 101 is a graduation requirement and we have five sections, they all filled up immediately, they all have five people on the waiting list, so that is 25 students on the waiting list. We have heard from at least 8 students who say they needed it to graduate in the Spring at least. They beg, they plead, they do it every semester. This semester is no different than any other semester with that particular class. We could easily add a section and fill it and we would probably still have students contacting us in January saying I need this class to graduate. It is just a reality unfortunately.

In preparing our Spring schedules earlier this year, we were told to reduce TLU allocation for the schedule, for this whole entire year which departments did do. And we are also aware that there is mid-year budget cuts possible happening in January and yet we are here at the very last minute being asked to add sections to the Spring schedule given those circumstances even. The Senate had two meetings on this.

We probably spent several thousand dollars in meetings already. The arguments we had yesterday were virtually identical to arguments we had two weeks ago. Yesterday the vote was 50%, Academic President Alarcon broke the tie and what they did agree to is what Mr. Alarcon outlined. That was the compromise is what it was, given that we had been talking for an hour and a half already. It took ninety minutes to get to that point before we had that.

Mr. Neufeld thought that the primary concerns from the Academic Senate, at least from many of the Senators, had to do with process, the extremely short time-frame that we are being asked to respond to, the method in which these sections were selected, it was not as completely open as it could have been, whether it is truly wise to spend money at this point in time, given the mid-year budget cut potential and that we are well over our State cap already in terms of student enrollment. The problem is obviously much larger than adding a couple of dozen sections to this Spring Schedule and that has been highlighted with clarity by the Executive VP Friedlander, in the sense that we need to have better data to work with to make these decisions. Obviously the Library 101 students are going to benefit by adding a section; there will be students who will benefit by adding many of these sections, possibly all of them, we do not know.

He personally voted against the motion yesterday at the Senate primarily on the philosophical grounds of whether it is wise to spend money at this time and given that we are well over cap and we are looking at potential cuts in January. That said, we are not talking about a great deal of money. We are talking about what Executive VP Friedlander is now saying is about \$50,000, and we have spent several thousand discussing this. He will reluctantly support this motion; he still does not think it is necessarily the right thing to do. Clearly it will help some students, trying to look at both sides and it is a little bit frustrating to be at this point in time right now given that background from my perspective.

Academic Senate President-elect Nevins stated that he is not going to support this and there are a lot of reasons for that, some of them articulated well, already. One of the things that we have been working on very hard is to tie budget and planning. This blows that completely out. It does not do either. That is one of the reasons he does not support this kind of approach. Also, this is a result of teaching classes for free. We are stuffing the pipeline with

students by teaching these classes for free because the State has told us, we do not want to pay you to teach these classes and we are doing it anyway. We created this problem ourselves, so this does not solve the problem and also, this is going to continue.

This will happen this semester, we already know these new systems which he fully supports, they are great ideas and initiatives, but they are not coming alive until at least a year. So we are going to have this similar situation which will occur in the future, whether it comes to us or not it will probably won't because of the current reaction; it will still be there, but will be handled differently. This is not going to solve our problem. It violates our own processes. Also the Deans were asked to cut classes and not to ask for new allocations. Also, we have just a couple of classes that were a problem, you know we do cancel classes. That does happen on this campus. If it is just a couple of classes, why don't we re-allocate those TLUs and that solves the problem without doing this. If the problem truly is a few classes, that is contained within the slots that we normally have. There is no need to do this. My objection to this comes from if following the process doesn't solve the problem and we have a way to address the really super critical classes that are needed.

CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultation Group Auchincloss said she has the same question VP Sullivan had about what are we going to vote on today, but hearing the new Board Members at orientation, what is their part in this process? This topic is on their Board agenda for today's meeting. If they decide that they are going to allocate more money, does that require us to add more classes? Ms. Auchincloss does not understand exactly how, now that our process is all jumbled, what will happen if we say no and the Board says well we are going to allocate the money, will that force us to add classes?

Academic Senate Vice-President Neufeld stated that we don't have teachers to teach them.

Superintendent/President Serban stated that she thinks it is a learning process right now with the new Board members. They have good intentions in their concerns for how students are impacted and we all know that the demand is huge, we all know that for all the reasons we do not need to repeat, there are many students for whom we are literally their last frontier, their last chance to move forward. Ms Auchincloss was at the orientation for new Board members the entire time so she knows, that their intention is a noble intention which is how can we as a college can serve the most students. Dr. Serban's opinion from what she observed in this interaction is the need for the new Board Members to become familiar with how participatory governments processes work and what is the role of the Board vis a vis the internal college processes, meaning as it also relates to the ten plus one. Accreditation standard IV is very clear about what the role of the Board is supposed to be and how the Board really needs to rely on the internal processes and so it would be very unusual if the internal processes don't recommend something for the Board to unilaterally decide the opposite, it would have to be an extraordinary situation for the Board to reverse that. That being said, since you are there, you saw that it became very clear that it was a very strong desire to put something on the agenda to allow for this conversation to occur. Dr. Serban thinks about this in a positive way, this allows for understanding of the Board, of how we work, what our governance processes are and what is the expectation that these processes are honored and observed as they should. Dr. Serban's opinion is that it is a matter of learning. It is a matter of understanding; it is a matter of collectively trying to calibrate what their roles are.

CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultation Group Auchincloss said it is almost like we were pressured. Are they arm twisting or are they learning? She feels arm twisting.

Dr. Serban suggested that it is important for Ms. Auchincloss and Mr. Alarcon who are giving reports at the Board Meetings to express their own views as they relate to the process because she thinks that is an important learning piece here, that the sooner it happens, the better we are able to preserve the structure of a participatory governance, a structure that has always worked really well here. We can always improve, but it is important. And then going to Dr. Nevin's point, Dr. Serban said, we would all like to serve more students. The best thing we could do, talk about the Holiday gift, we are already 8% over cap, wouldn't it be nice to say, you know what, anybody who needs something, we will just give it to you; we would all like that. We would like to make students happy; that is greatest satisfaction for each of us internally to do that but we have a process and we need to adhere to the process.

Dr. Serban went on to say that the process is there for a reason and we also know that we have a very strong enrollment management process in place. Actually this college has been looked at as a model for enrollment management by many. In my prior life at this college, I was asked by many colleges to give workshops for others. Dr. Friedlander and the Deans have been asked how they do because you seem to do it much better than we seem to be able to do it. There is a lot of thought that is put internally in how things are scheduled, trying to be as responsive to student needs as we can. That is why we are here, but we also need to recognize that there are certain budgetary constraints and the great uncertainty.

The problem is much bigger, going back to your point, than these sections. What we really need to talk about in the Spring, and it needs to be talked about the policy recommendations that Dr. Friedlander and I have talked about. We need to really discuss what the maximum over cap percent that we at the College agree to be. Once that is agreed, we should not be in this position again, and that is also Board level decision because that is the underlying fundamental decision. If we agree that we want to be 10% over cap, for example, then we will stick to that and we will not need to constantly juggle and have this back and forth. We will not micromanage what is part of the 10%, that is the job of faculty, Department Chairs, Deans and Executive VP Friedlander. Our job is the overall resource allocation recommendations. The cost of being 10% over cap depends what classes make up the 10%. If most of it is classes under 25 students, it costs more so it is not only the cap in terms of FTES, but also the dollar amount. Dr. Serban believes that a body like CPC should not look at lists of sections offered; this is not our job.

Executive VP Friedlander said that what CPC takes to the Board is a dollar amount. We are not showing them sections. Dr. Friedlander stated that what Dr. Serban articulated is exactly what we should do and what we have been doing.

We knew going in this year, we are able with the software we have do simulations. With this schedule of classes that we initially developed, what cost would it incur and what would be the FTES if students enrolled in these classes in the same pattern as they did in prior semesters. So we knew in our processes, that we would be over cap, but in a budget amount that we established. Early on when we said this is what we need to have is TLU allocations cuts for credit, in Spring he came back to Dr. Serban and reported that Deans worked with the Department Chairs. We have cut some more but beyond this point, we are

really cutting into the bone and so what Dr. Serban did is she brought it back to CPC, and we discussed taking money out of reserves to make up that gap, and what was in our adopted budget and what we had planned to cut in credit. That decision was made early this Fall.

Dr. Friedlander said it wasn't until he listened to the Board Orientation tape and plus part of the session that he was there that in talking to Dr. Serban we decided to look that with respect to what the Board Members wanted was a budget discussion, not a class by class discussion. As Ms. Auchincloss said we are not going outside our governance process. That is what we did yesterday. That is what we are doing today and but that is the background. We built this schedule within our budget constraints, we knew what we were doing going in, everybody had a chance to have the courses, we worked at the faculty level, department level, so we did things the right way with what some of the people's concerns were two weeks ago.

Academic Senate, Planning & Resources Committee Representative Monda stated that she agreed with Ms. Auchincloss and Dr. Nevins' concerns. She said she has four points: 1) The new Board is trying to be effective Board Members and help their constituents. It is an educational opportunity. She would like to respectfully say we appreciate your concern, but we spent a lot of time discussing this over the semester and had meetings and determined that it was not a good idea. That is still what she would like to tell them. We made these special meetings to revisit this because of their request to discuss this issue, we had a process, we had a lot of reasons for this and we would like you to learn from that and then for the future if you want to consider this raising cap, there would be a chance to do it. That is a feeling of what Dr. Monda thinks we should say to the Board because we have been through all of this. Now if we go back and say yes let's spend more money, what we are really saying is, we are doing this out of respect for you. Maybe we do want to say that. You are new Board members, ok do it because you want it, but that is not what our process came up with before we had these extraordinary meetings.

Dr. Monda thinks this is an opportunity to revisit the prerequisite issue. She remembers hearing somewhere that requirements for pre-requisites had changed a little bit. It is really bad when students who should be in basic skills classes get into the upper level classes. It is a waste of money; it is destructive for them. It is a very easy thing to improve our entire system and save a lot of money and serve students more efficiently. She thinks this should be on the agenda for everybody. Dr. Friedlander stated that the Board of Governors is now considering a change in Title 5 that would give colleges much more flexibility in how they establish prerequisites. Dr. Monda said if that is a possibility she thinks is a really good idea. She feels we have had such an emphasis on student success that sometimes we pretend they succeed when they have not. It needs to be a real partnership towards success. The Library 101 case: students don't pass English 120 and then they have to stumble into Library 101. It is an easy class to pass. It is this final in the library that you can pass if you spend 10 minutes looking at the book and they just don't go. They needed to graduate. They messed up and she doesn't think it is so bad if they have to wait. It is a learning process. Mr. Neufeld reassured her that most of them are not that category. Most of them are transfer students. Dr. Monda said she would like to see the numbers on that.

Dr. Monda stated that she wanted the CPC members to think about the international students, that is the group she thinks we owe something to. We did have a plan for them and

keeping the sections for them. She thinks that is important. They spent money, they come here late and it is not their fault that they could not get classes. Dr. Friedlander said that they had addressed that.

Superintendent/President asked if there was a motion.

M/S [Alarcon/Friedlander] to accept extra expenditures not to exceed \$97,000 for extra sections that Executive Vice President Friedlander along with the Deans have decided as critical for transfer or graduation in the Spring. After a discussion there were 2 yays and 12 nays. The motion failed.

The discussion that followed the motion was as followed:

Mr. Neufeld stated that he was not at the orientation, but downloaded the recording and has not listened to it yet, but he did speak to the SBCC Board President Haslund last night and Dr. Haslund said that the Board was not requesting more sections to be added but they wanted a process to be discussed. That is one person who was there. Mr. Neufeld is reporting what he heard him say because he thought it was pertinent to the discussion. Everyone said listen to the recording of the orientation for the new Trustees, that is not what was said by the new Board members during the orientation.

Mr. Nevins said that at the Academic Senate Meeting, Dr. Haslund did in fact say that they wanted to look at process. He did not say anything about them wanting specific classes. The Board can only exert their power when they put something on the agenda and have a vote. They cannot just want to have something happen; that is not ok. Mr. Nevins said he is a Board member on an elected Board and each individual person does not have any power at all unless they act as a Board and vote. Other than that, they don't.

Interim PE Director O'Connor stated that there are four of them. Mr. Nevins said it does not matter.

Ms. O'Connor said that the other thing Dr. Haslund, President of the Board of Trustees, said yesterday, in spite of the fact of what he said at the orientation, is that if he was sitting at that table with us he would have voted it down. Superintendent/President thanked everyone and said the meeting is adjourned.

Next meetings:

Tuesday, February 8, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, February 22, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, March 1, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, March 22, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Working sessions on draft of College Plan 2011-2014 scheduled for March 11, 2011 9am-12pm A217 and March 18, 2011 9am-12pm A217