

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL and  
DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

**March 7, 1999  
3:00-4:30 PM  
A218C**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** J. Friedlander, B. Fahnestock, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, B. Cordero, L. Rose, K. Hanna, A. Serban, K. O'Connor, J. Kruidenier, J. Lynn, M. Ferrer, L. Vasquez, A. McKenzie (representing Kent Richards) and Alex McKee, Student Representative

**EXCUSED ABSENCE:** B. Hamre, K. McLellan, G. Smith and T. Garey

**GUEST:** Katie Sweeney

**1. Call to Order**

1.1 Chairperson Dr. Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

2.1 The approval of the minutes of the February 15, 2000 CPC meeting and the December 21, 1999 DTC meeting was tabled until March 21, 2000 to give the members an opportunity to review them.

**3. Information Items**

3.1 MTD bus pass renewal

Bill Cordero advised CPC/DTC of the increase in fares for a bus pass from \$11.50 for part-time students and \$12.50 for full-time students to \$14.50 and \$15.50 respectively. These rates will be locked in for three years. Fifty cents of the cost to the student reflects administrative costs. The new rates reflect a 24% increase over three years. The student election to approve the MTD bus pass fee will take place the week of March 27.

3.2 CalWORKS reorganization

Vice President of Continuing Education Lynda Fairly distributed a new organization information sheet for CalWORKS. The Student Services proposal is

to move the CalWORKS structure to Continuing Education. The reorganization as outlined was discussed as well as funding for the positions. Vice President Fairly indicated there would be no additional dollars needed. The reorganization will allow Continuing Education to maximize its resources. The objective is to create a better efficiency for the students so that they won't have to seek different counselors on the main campus and adult high school.

- 3.3 The following language in the memo dated February 4, 2000 entitled *Procedure for Submitting Proposals Requesting Funds to Support the Attainment of the Goals and Objectives in the College Plan for 1999-2002* should be amended on **page 5** to read:

*May 2000: Dr. MacDougall reviews the proposed plan and resource rankings. The President is responsible for the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees. If he accepts the recommended plan, he will place it on the agenda for the June meeting of the Board of Trustees. CPC will be informed of any substantive changes in its recommendations.*

It is the Superintendent/President who takes the recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

## **Presentation**

4. **Superintendent/President Peter MacDougall joined the meeting at 3:40 p.m. to make a presentation and clarify issues relating to:**

- A. Allocation of a percentage of PFE funds for Continuing Education

Dr. MacDougall emphasized that it is appropriate for Continuing Education to submit non-credit proposals to CPC for review. The review will focus on how the proposals will contribute to the attainment of the goals and objectives in the College Plan as well as the potential impact of the proposal on the intended audience and other units of the college. These proposals will not compete for PFE funds that remain after Continuing Education's allocation.

Dr. MacDougall emphasized that it is inappropriate for Continuing Education to have its proposals ranked and approved by CPC. Further, Continuing Education should receive no more PFE funds than what they are entitled to based on the percentage of FTES it generates minus college-wide expenses funded with PFE dollars. That percentage will change each year depending on their contribution to the college's FTES.

B. College-wide priorities

Dr. MacDougall voiced concern about the recommendations for PFE funding which may provide a deeper level of support for some areas prior to addressing the basic levels of needed support for other areas of the college. Dr. MacDougall would like to address CPC when the council receives the recommendations from the three work groups as well as the recommendations of the Academic Senate and the Student Services Advisory Committee.

C. Update on **state budget** for community colleges. (*Att. #1, Agenda*)

Dr. MacDougall's memo of March 1, 2000 (*Att. #1, Agenda*) would enlist all consultation groups to support the set of recommendations for the budget.

Dr. Friedlander spoke to the memo dated March 3, 2000 to Chief Executive Officers from the Community College League which sets forth the agreement of a state budget request to submit to the Governor for consideration for funding community colleges for the next year. The Human Resources Infrastructure Fund at 80 million dollars statewide will be distributed to colleges on a per FTES basis. SBCC's share of this fund would be about one percent (\$800,000). The use of this fund is outlined in the memo.

**Noncredit enhancements:** Lynda Fairly clarified the use of funding for "noncredit enhancements". The noncredit program is under-funded in comparison to the state funding provided to secondary school districts that offer noncredit instruction. There is an attempt to bring the areas of ESL, adult high school, literacy, citizenship and vocational education closer to the same reimbursement rate. There is a proposal for each college to identify the number of FTES accumulated in those individual categories and to increase their compensation by \$320 per FTES. That would vary each term or college year to make it more similar to what K-12 receives for offering the same courses in these areas.

Jack Friedlander explained that a number of districts FTES reimbursement rate established at the time of Prop 13 are below the state average. It is the intent of the proposed budget proposal submitted to the state to increase their FTES to a more equitable level. SBCC may benefit in that area in terms of our FTES reimbursement from the state. This will establish a statewide minimum FTES level of reimbursement.

**Prop 98:** Dr. MacDougall addressed the question regarding the implications of the proposed budget for community colleges exceeding the limits established by Proposition. 98 and the proportion of those funds allocated to community colleges vs. K-12. He noted that the argument advanced by the system is that the goal is to bring the FTES reimbursement rate for California community colleges closer to the national average for community colleges.

**Equalization for credit:** Last year it was discovered that some districts were getting a considerable amount more per FTES than they were entitled to under the program-based funding plan. Whatever SBCC is receiving per FTES should be the sole basis for equalization. Fifty percent (50%) of the equalization is based on FTES and 50% is based on the formula system. The total allocation is approximately 15 million for equalization with 7.5 million going for formula-based funding and 7.5 million for FTES equalization.

**Tech II:** Tech II differs from Tech I in that Tech II recognizes that individual community colleges have a problem in supporting the development of the technological infrastructure for the campus. The Tech II initiative needs to develop a larger support base through the statewide Academic Senate, statewide CEOs and other groups that can help influence the development of the budget. It is anticipated that Tech II will be considered for funding in the 2001-2002 fiscal year.

**4:1 match.** Bill Hamre's submission of a proposal for a 4:1 match of district funds to PFE funds for new technology is Work Group Three's top rankings of PFE proposals. This proposal seeks \$50,000 of ongoing PFE funding to enable the college to replace \$200,000 of new technology equipment purchased in 2000-2001. Dr. MacDougall stressed that at a minimum, the college should determine how to support its own infrastructure development for the next two years and determine the best use of dollars to that end.

**Noncredit equalization:** Dr. MacDougall summarized the issue of noncredit equalization. The first year PFE money was received in a lump sum with no distribution to credit or noncredit. Year two the issue of equalization for noncredit, i.e., a state effort to increase the level of funding for noncredit to the level appropriated to K-12 districts that offer noncredit instruction was considered after the funding for PFE was allocated to the base of noncredit. The decision was made, based on that interpretation, to take the money and allocate it based on the FTES to Continuing Education minus the noncredit contribution to college-wide activities supported with PFE funds.

The Continuing Education Division is expected to operate within the expenditures available to them both in terms of contributing to their portion of the central cost as well as meet their direct expenses. Dr. MacDougall further stated that the use of the K-12 funding level for non-credit instruction as a means of reaching a decision of when equity occurs is no longer considered as a criterion for equity funding at the state level.

Dr. MacDougall argued that allocating PFE funds on a proportional basis of FTES, would result in maintaining equity in the percentage of the budget allocated to the credit and non-credit divisions of the college. He went on to note that requiring Continuing education to compete for PFE funds would likely result

in its getting a disproportionately low percentage of these dollars. To the extent that this occurs, it will widen the gap in resources provided to the credit and Continuing Education divisions of the college.

Dr. MacDougall stated that the statewide goal at one point was to get Continuing Education on par with the other Continuing Education programs that are funded through the high schools. However, this is no longer the statewide goal. In summary, Dr. MacDougall made the following points:

1. The goal of the system is to increase California community college funding for credit courses to at least the national average FTES reimbursement rate for community colleges.
2. There is a rationale for giving Continuing Education PFE funds based on the percentage of FTES generated by non-credit instruction minus a proportion of dollars to pay for college-wide expense funded from PFE.
3. The goal of the system is to continue to increase the FTES reimbursement rate or non-credit instruction to a level that provides adequate resources to effectively conduct its business.

Dr. MacDougall was invited to attend the Academic Senate meeting on March 15 to explain these concepts.

## **Hearing Stage**

### **5. Reorganization of Information Resources Division (IRD)**

- 5.1 A concern was expressed by Dr. MacDougall and other CPC/DTC members that the reorganization chart for Information Systems Division did not reflect the immediate and actual needs of that division. The proposals for funds will have to be more accurately articulated prior to being heard by CPC/DTC.

### **6. Academic Affairs/Student Affairs Reorganization**

- 6.1 The updated charts were distributed. Dr. Friedlander informed the members that any questions on the new reorganization could be directed to him.

## **DTC MEETING**

### **7. Options for student portals**

- 7.1 Web Master Katie Sweeney spoke regarding providing students with e-mail accounts. She will attend a future meeting and demonstrate the portal after a decision has been made on out-sourcing the student portal program which will provide an interface on the Web for students.

**8. Purchasing agreement with Dell Computers**

- 8.1 Brian Fahnestock, Vice President of Business Services, spoke to the proposed agreement with Dell Computers, which has not yet been contracted. It is the intent to cease using our existing contract with HP and participate in the state contract the university system has with Dell Computers.

**9. Status of technology replacement items that were approved in December**

- 9.1 The new technology initiatives that were approved will be ordered once an agreement with Dell is contracted.

**10. Status of requests for 4:1 match to purchase new computer technology**

- 10.1 Bill Hamre submitted the 4:1 match proposal [district funds:PFE funds] for consideration to the Institutional Infrastructure/Revitalization work group. It was ranked #6 by the work group. The Instructional Technology Committee has unanimously passed a motion to support that concept.

**11. Review of timeline for ITC activities this semester**

- 11.1 Laurie Vasquez, chairperson of the Instructional Technology Committee, distributed a timeline for future computer replacement requests. She will coordinate the timeline with the Academic Senate.

**12. Agenda items for next meeting of CPC/DTC meetings**

- A. Discussion on the selection of a student portal
- B. Update on the purchase of replacement technology equipment
- C. Reorganization of IRD (hearing stage)
- D. Contract with Dell Computers

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Dr. Friedlander.