

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, November 30, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

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

ABSENT: O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss,

GUESTS: K. O'Connor, M. Spaventa, J. Schultz, L. Stark, L. Vasquez, M. Wright

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of minutes of November 2, 2010 meeting (attached)

M/S/C [Guillen/Bishop] to approve minutes of the November 2, 2010. All in favor.

Information Items/Announcements

2. Vision 2020 Report (Attachment) – Andreea Serban
www.cccvision2020.org

The Vision 2020 report is the result of the work done by the members of the Commission of the Future. Dr. Serban stated that this group, of which she was a member, spent over a year talking about a variety of issues based on research that was the background for discussion that lead to some of the conclusions. Superintendent/President Serban recommended that CPC members read it because there are certain premises in the report that are relevant to SBCC and our work on development of the next three-year College Plan 2011-14. Dr. Serban stated that she would like to look at these recommendations and try to see to what extent we can embrace some of them. There were further discussions. Executive VP Friedlander stated that he thought these were very good recommendations, all based on research.

Academic Senate, Planning & Resources Committee Member Monda inquired about the hiring of a consulting firm to help with the proposed listening sessions in spring 2011. Dr. Monda was referring to the Oct. 5th CPC Meeting when Dr. Serban brought up the idea of holding "Listening Sessions" for business, education, civic and other community groups from the Santa Barbara, Goleta, and Carpinteria communities to give their input regarding the college and its programs. The information from this group would be valuable for the creation of SBCC's next College Plan which we will start to work on in

the new year. Dr. Serban stated that we need to make a decision soon about hiring a consulting firm. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.

3. Information from Community College League of California Annual Conference regarding course priorities (Attachment)

Superintendent/President Serban attended the CCLC Annual Conference. Dr. Serban stated that Chancellor Jack Scott was in attendance as were all the Vice Chancellors. Dr. Serban stated that there were many useful sessions but what was stressed was that given the budgetary challenges the California Community Colleges are faced with currently and in the future, it is of utmost importance to preserve and emphasize transfer, basic skills, and career technical education on the credit side. There was a strong emphasis on the proper use of taxpayers' money for what is the greater good of the state. That message has always been there, but never emphasized as much as it is now, especially as it relates to degree completion and transfer.

Dr. Serban also stated that there was much discussion about the non- credit area, as outlined in the attachment from the CCLC Conference. Except for a few districts like San Diego, North Orange, (City College of San Francisco's non-credit is mostly ESL; they don't offer varied non credit classes), the rest of the colleges that have smaller non-credit classes have totally or mostly eliminated state supported non-credit and have moved these classes to community service, fee-based. Discussions at the conference were to the point that unless the system self-regulates itself, which is always the hope of the State Chancellor's Office, then the legislative intent may go as far as not funding some of the classes offered, for example the PE classes for older adults are no longer funded by the State.

Dr. Serban reported that about five years ago there was an attempt from the State Chancellor's Office to create repeatability rules in non-credit the same way that we have in credit. For instance, the College would not be able to claim apportionment for anyone taking a credit course four or five times. The attempt failed then, but now it looks it has a high chance of coming back again because of the State's strong emphasis on the proper use of taxpayers' money and limited resources for what is the greater good of the state.

This will have a huge impact on our non-credit programs. It is very important for us to preserve non-credit FTES, but if any repeatability rule was in place, we would have a huge challenge. There are significant consequences in that regard.

There was further discussion regarding non-credit repeatability rules. Dr. Serban stated that when the debate is in times of a budget crunch it always swings on the side of what is the highest priority from the state perspective versus the local perspective. The Chancellor's Office wants to first allow districts to come up with repeatability rules for non-credit. If the Districts don't come up with numbers that the state feels are reasonable, then the legislature and the Board of Governors, may end up having a say.

4. Information from State Budget Workshop Nov 3 2010 (Attachment).

VP Business Services Joe Sullivan reported from the attachment, the 2010-2011 Budget Workshop Power Point Slides, starting with how the California State Budget gap of \$19.3 billion was closed. One of the ways was by the State borrowing significantly for the fourth year in a row. There was discussion of the different aspects of the state borrowing money and how repaying it will affect future budgets. Sullivan said that receiving Growth money is a wait and see situation. Sullivan stated that we also have a negative COLA.

Sullivan reported that the State owes Community Colleges under Proposition 98 funding which the state is to give the Community Colleges at some future date. At the same time, SBCC revenues could possibly drop by \$5 million next year because of not receiving the Proposition 98 money, which would have serious implications for us. Sullivan stated that this decrease could come about because the State projected higher revenues from property taxes actually collected.

5. Budget communications from Erik Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor, Chancellor's Office, Nov 12, 2010 and Scott Lay, CEO, Community College League of California, November 10, 2010 and November 22, 2010 (Attachment) – Andreea Serban

VP Sullivan continued from agenda item #4 about the Budget communications from President/CEO of the Community College League Scott Lay who spoke at the Budget Workshop about the deficit in more depth. Scott Lay spoke about the fact that the Community Colleges have been treated very well in the last couple of years, and if we continue to be treated very well, that is great, but we have to understand as funds get less, the probability of being treated as well diminishes. Sullivan stated that this means in order to be prepared, our spending needs to continue to be conservative. Sullivan reported that this was a theme at the Budget Conference: "Don't expect anything more than what you have already got."

Superintendent/President Serban referred to the one page apportionment revenue report prepared by SBCC Controller Griffin which puts what has happened in 2008 – 09 and 2009 – 10 in terms of state apportionment into perspective. Serban explained how apportionment funding works and that the final calculations for the fiscal year of 2009 – 10 won't be finalized until February 2011. This means that the unrestricted General Fund total can still be cut further if there is an additional deficit factor applied retroactively, similar to what we experienced in 2008 -09.

Dr. Serban stated that bottom line - between 2008-09 and 2010-11 the college had all together close to a \$9 million cut in unrestricted fund revenues. Dr. Serban continued to say that this is a huge and sudden cut in revenues that the College was able to absorb due to the combination of the tuition of international students and out of state students, plus the cuts in spending. If we did not take the measures that we took, this is a hard and sudden cut to absorb in such a short time. This report shows clearly which areas were affected and the magnitude of the reduction we have experienced. Dr. Serban

stated that it is possible that the college will have an additional deficit factor applied to 2009 – 10 retroactively.

Dr. Serban explained some of the details contained in this report and there was further discussion and clarification about the revenues reported in the handout from the last meeting and the handout from this meeting.

Prior to discussing Agenda Item number 6, Dr. Serban brought in a handout that explained the augmentations that were made to the tentative budget for 2010-11. In this tentative budget, the college had assumed that 346 TLUs were going to be cut from spring 2011. Instead 237 TLUs were cut, meaning that \$400,000 was added to the budget. Dr. Serban asked that this be remembered as we move forward on this agenda.

6. Spring 2011 Credit enrollments (Attachments) and Winter 2011 Non-credit.

Sr. Dir. Institutional Assessment, Research & Planning Robert Else reported on the most recent enrollment numbers. He stated that today the college is 11.6% ahead of the same day of the enrollment period last year in terms of unduplicated headcount and the units are up 11.6%. Dr. Serban pointed out that even though the college made cuts in sections, in terms of units enrolled, we are higher. This is very significant. More and more students are enrolling sooner. Executive VP Friedlander stated that the word is out among the students to not procrastinate; otherwise there will be no room in the classes the students want. This is why more and more students are enrolling earlier.

7. Funding for additional credit sections in core areas for Spring 2011.

Executive VP Friedlander reported that he has received emails and phone calls from some Deans, Chairs and Counselors stating the challenges students are facing in getting classes they need to complete their degrees and lower division transfer requirements and certificates. Dr. Friedlander handed out a list compiled by the Deans and Chairs identifying the most critical classes to be considered for addition this Spring 2011. The list included the classes plus the estimated costs. Dr. Friedlander pointed out that even if the college tries to add all these classes we probably could not because of the classroom space issues, faculty availability and cost issues. Even though this is what we need, it is highly unlikely that we will be able to respond. Some of them may be able to be added.

Academic Senate, Planning & Resources Member Monda brought up the point that when the College adds courses, it costs the College because it lowers how the state calculates our reimbursement. Dr. Friedlander clarified that it lowers how the state calculates the system-wide reimbursement. Dr. Serban stated that this is a valid point and a big issue.

Dr. Friedlander stated that it comes down to a choice we have to make about how we spend funds, and where our priorities are. We recognize that anything we add now we

will not get paid for. There was further discussion regarding this point.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the request would be for CPC to consider funding the addition of these critical classes. The Grand Total would be 156.46 TLUs x \$1,500 (hourly TLU average) which equals \$234,690. Further discussion took place about TLU allocations, increased caps, what happened last Fall when faculty took in more students and the unintended consequences drove up large class sizes, provisions for additional readers, and tutors.

Academic Senate President-elect Nevins stated that this is not really solving the problem. Nevins said that by adding sections that we will not be reimbursed for helps a few people at one particular time, but it does not actually solve the problem and it never will until we get more resources. Dr. Friedlander stated that we are not able to solve the problem here and now because it is larger than us. Dr. Friedlander said he looks at the consequences of students not being able to get the courses they have to have in order to progress and so it is really weighing a difficult set of circumstances. So, it is about our priorities and what we can do.

Dr. Monda stated that she thinks this issue needs to go to the Academic Senate because there needs to be more discussion and debate to look at this more closely.

Superintendent/President Serban stated that the college has only about \$97,000 saved from faculty positions that became vacant and we could not or choose not to fill this year. We have adjuncts in those faculty positions. We could use these funds for adding sections, but to go above and beyond would be going into reserves. Dr. Serban spoke about the time sensitivity, that we need to make a decision to whether add the classes or not by the next week. There was further discussion regarding the list of classes that have been requested to be added, the idea of combining classes or not, opening new sections rather than overcrowding a classroom, new international students arriving a week before the semester starts being able to sign up for 12 units, and longer wait lists. There was a clarification that we would not go above the \$97,000 to pay for opening new sections and if we did we would ask for an additional \$30,000 to \$40,000.

This will go to the Academic Senate for discussion at its next meeting.

Academic Senate President Alarcon stated that when he talks to people from other colleges, such as Santa Monica and San Diego, they have told him that they wish they had not done the cuts that they did several years ago because it is difficult to recuperate the confidence of students. He stated that he thinks this is the right decision at this time. Academic Senate Representative Garey stated that he shares the other concern, that we are reducing the apparent need for funding well below what we need to actually deliver these classes adequately; we are eroding quality of instruction for the students who are here and who are being funded and he thinks that has got to be the first priority. Garey stated that since this has just been presented to CPC, he is reluctant to add support to what could be a significant expenditure without really having a chance to think about it and discuss it and take it back to the Academic Senate.

Since there is one more meeting of the Academic Senate and one more meeting of the College Planning Council, it was decided that this item would be taken to the next Senate meeting, and then bring it back to CPC.

Academic Senate Vice President Neufeld stated that he would feel more comfortable if we limited it to the \$97,000 that we have. He stated that he would feel uncomfortable approving anything beyond an existing budget that we already have.

Superintendent/President Serban stated for the record that this \$97,000 is not really in the budget; it is not like it is money sitting there. She stated more precisely it still is a reduction in reserves. Academic Senate representative Tom Garey asked if we do this, would it be a one-time solution. Superintendent/President Serban stated that this is a good point, will this be a one-time only solution to this particular problem or will it become an expectation for next year? Dr. Serban reminded the CPC members, that the college has not reduced sections as originally planned and now we are adding and remember that in the interim we were 1,158 FTES above cap in 2009-10. The 2.21% growth for this fiscal year is not clear at this point whether it is going to be funded. Dr. Serban stated that we do need to consider the fact that we are going to continue to be over cap and that it is a significant decision to perpetuate being so over cap for all the reasons. On the other hand, we don't want people to be here an extra year if they could be helped out. After more questions and discussions there was a motion.

M/S/C [Garey/Garfinkel] to approve bringing the topic of funding for additional credit sections in core areas for Spring 2011 to the next Academic Senate for discussion and bring it back to the next CPC Meeting. Majority in favor.

Academic Senate P & R Representative Monda stated that she wants to tell her students about the \$19 billion dollar deficit, that if they are not going to stay in the class, they should drop now because there are five people waiting to get in. Dr. Monda wants to stress that people are suffering all over the state, and students do not realize what a privilege it is to take these courses for the price they are taking them. Dr. Monda asked that that to be added to the Senate Discussion because if we all do that as a faculty it could change the culture. There are too many students who withdraw at the 9th week or who fail the class because they do not do the work. It is a waste of resources. There was further discussion and support of this idea. Executive VP Friedlander stated that he thinks it is a good idea to ask faculty the first day of class to remind students. We have a long wait list and a lot of students are enrolled the first two weeks of classes.

Discussion Items

8. Through the 2009-2010 program review process, Admissions & Records was approved to purchase the hardware required to implement Hershey document imaging. However, the request for the accompanying software was not funded because the software was mistakenly not assigned priority 1 within the Educational Programs internal review and

ranking. The software component was included in the 2010-2011 program review in the amount of \$10,861. This includes:

Singularity Capture Module License
Singularity Capture Module License Maintenance
Singularity Concurrent Users Licenses
Singularity Concurrent Users Licenses Maintenance
Singularity Archive Administrator Training

-Implementing Hershey document imaging will significantly reduce the handling and filing of paper documents in Admissions & Records.

-It will also improve our ability maintain college student faculty/course records in compliance with Title 5 Regulations, Board Policy and FERPA.

-We expect increased efficiency in retrieving documents needed for student petitions, faculty requests and other service functions.

-We anticipate improved safety and access issues in the Admissions & Records secured vault which is currently over capacity.

-We anticipate cost savings on becoming less reliant on a paper based environment (folders, labels, human resources for filing, etc.).

The request is to fund the software within this fiscal year.

M/S/C [Monda/Nevins] to approve Admissions and Records purchase of the accompanying software component for the Hershey document imaging in the amount of \$10,861.00. Everyone in favor.

9. Clarification regarding non-routine equipment updates and status of routine equipment augmentations made in fiscal year 2009-10.

Superintendent/President stated that she wanted to clarify that at this point the only requests that need to be updated are the non-routine equipment. There was further explanation about the process of routine and non-routine equipment replacement. Dr. Serban stated that there is a contingency budget in place for equipment that breaks, but that is generally a non-routine item. Routine equipment is more about supplies, items needed every year. Dr. Serban said she would send the non-routine equipment request form again, which will be due February 10.

10. Changes in state allocation for categorical programs for 2010-11 and updated allocation for EOPS (Attachments)

Superintendent/President Serban announced that the college received a letter from the State stating that the SBCC EOPS Program has \$10,000 more added to their budget. Executive VP Friedlander announced that EOPS Director Wright said she will share the excess with the other categorical programs which is very generous.

- a. Additional information received after the November 2, 2010 CPC meeting

(attachments)

EOPS - this year the allocation is \$748,321, a \$10,001 increase from the advanced apportionment amount. The district match requirement is \$196,877. We have already exceeded our book service expenditure requirement of \$62,268.

11. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual unrestricted general fund expenditures and 2010-11 adopted budget by cost center (Attachment) – continued discussion from Nov 2, 2010 CPC meeting. – Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin

Superintendent/President stated that this will be discussed at the next meeting.

12. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual revenues and 2010-11 adopted budget revenues (Attachment) - – continued discussion from Nov 2, 2010 CPC meeting - Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin

Superintendent/President stated that this will be discussed at the next meeting.

13. Feedback on Santa Barbara City College Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Draft (EEO Plan Draft) (attachment provided at the October 19, 2010 CPC, attached again)

VP Ehrlich provided a short history of the development of the evaluation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Draft (EEO Plan Draft) and what districts were charged to do as of 2008 from the Chancellor's Office. Because of the concerns of people in the field about this labored approach of looking at availability data, etc., a task force was created consisting of HR representatives, State Academic Senate, CSEA and the Chancellor's Office. This task force has proposed significant modifications to the Title 5 sections which are the basis for this model plan. VP Ehrlich said that after reviewing the proposed Title 5 changes, she thinks from the College's standpoint, and from an HR standpoint the changes are very good. They are legislatively compliant; they are conduct driven, not numbers driven. They are looking at what specific actions, what particular training, and what particular efforts districts are making to eliminate bias, and to educate people on the value of diversity. In a sense, it is the same as many of the things that the College has already been emphasizing.

In terms of a timeline on the State level, the proposed Title 5 regulations ("regs") have gone to the Consultation Council and from there will go to the Board of Governors in January 2011; then they will be reviewed by the Dept. of Finance and if they are approved they would be passed by the Board of Governors by March 2011. At that point, the College would be given the proposed new regulations with a year to do a plan. VP Ehrlich proposed that the College wait to work on the EEO Plan Draft after the changes in title 5 have been approved by the Board of Governors and forwarded to the College to work on with a year's deadline.

Executive VP Friedlander supported the recommendation made by VP Ehrlich.

Superintendent/President asked for a motion to adjourn. Academic Senator Representative Garey so moved, Associated Student Body President Garfinkel seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

Next meetings: Tuesday, December 7, 2010, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C – last meeting of the fall 2010 semester

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