

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

March 19, 2002

3:00-4:30 PM

Room A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: L. Fairly, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, B. Fahnestock, A. Serban, K. McLellan, L. Rose, T. Garey, K. Hanna, R. Launier, Nyla Blasdel [Student Senate]

EXCUSED ABSENCE: J. Friedlander, J. Chase

1.0 Call to Order

Lynda Fairly, in the absence of Chairperson Jack Friedlander who is attending a conference in Boston, called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the March 5th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Rose/McLellan] unanimously to approve the minutes of the March 5, 2002 CPC meeting.

1.2 Announcements

Lynda Fairly announced that Betty Pazich has accepted the position of Assistant Dean of Vocational Education. She will assume the duties July 1st.

2.0 Information Items

2.1 Reorganization of Continuing Education Division (CE)

Lynda Fairly distributed a detailed and thorough recommendation for a reorganization of the administrative and support functions in the Continuing Education division. The opportunity to reorganize has been created due to the vacancy in the current dean's position and growth dollars being available to Continuing Education. She indicated that the \$51k in growth funds [allotted to CE] reflects an amount reduced by the Chancellor's Office a few days ago. The budget for the reorganization is detailed as follows:

Budget:

Growth dollars: \$51,111

Dean's position: \$103,050 (with single benefits in the budget)

Hourly Comp App Assistant: \$24,000

Total: \$178,161

Proposed Budget:

- Create a Coordinator I Technology position – Step 3 (max) - \$59,284 (with benefits from the current Dean's position- Could need an additional \$5,678 if individual needed family benefit plan)
- Upgrade the Coordinator II (Purdie) position to Dean - \$21,961
- Upgrade the Coordinator I (Power) position to Dean - \$32,938
- Increase the four Parent Child Workshop Directors (faculty positions) from 80% to 100% - \$41,248 (includes 6% increase)
- Convert three hourly clerical positions to half-time permanent with half-time benefits - \$11,670
- Faculty salaries for growth: \$11,060

The job descriptions for the Program Coordinator – Technology (Coordinator I); the Parent Child Workshop Director; Dean for Wake Center, Student Services and Vocational Development; and Dean of Continuing Education for the Schott Center as well as the change in responsibilities for the Vice President, Continuing Education were included with the proposal for reorganization.

Keith McLellan commented that Lynda's plan is very thorough in its explanation of the reorganization. He also added that it is important to note that the dean positions *did* exist at one time in CE. The enrollment in Continuing Education continues to grow as do the scope of programs since it last had dean positions. This would not be a growth in administration but a recapturing of what was in place several years ago. Bill Hamre added the importance of creating the technology coordinator position within CE will make it easier to coordinate our resources with CE rather than trying to work with numerous programmers and their technical needs. Lana Rose said she appreciated the respectful effort that the reorganization plan demonstrates.

Karolyn Hanna indicated her support for the proposal but asked the question when position titles are changed, are we obligated to recruit. Lynda responded that there is a provision in *Title V* that says that if a position was upgraded from a single position utilizing the identical person, there is no requirement for recruitment.

Ray Launier asked, in terms of the comment made that the coordinators have an overload particularly with regard to the new construction, how does the change of the title from coordinator to dean free up time for them to deal with that overload. Lynda responded that in the capacity of dean they will be working many more hours above and beyond their current 40 hours. They will be required to address any issues that might arise at the campuses 24/7. By being in the position of dean, they will be compensated for this additional time.

Ray questioned why it would not make more sense to hire a third person to minimize burnout or stress overload. Lynda responded that these people are so well trained, they know how to handle problems and, they are willing to do so. Presently CE has 80 off-campus locations and with increased compensation, they [deans] will be more willing to address needs in these locations. Lynda asked the council to contact her if any questions arose or if there was any additional feedback.

3.0 Action Items

3.1 Approval of the proposed Measures of Institutional Effectiveness

M/S/C [Rose/Launier] to approve the Measures of Institutional Effectiveness.

Andreea Serban distributed the final draft of the Measures of Institutional Effectiveness and commented that the Council was very effective as a group in developing these measures. She said Bill Hamre's and Brian Fahnestock's areas have been greatly improved. This report will be the most comprehensive in content without being a voluminous document.

Tom Garey remarked that the measure of criteria in technology addresses itself to the amount of money spent. He questioned whether that is truly a measure of institutional effectiveness. Bill Hamre responded that the annual expenditures for replacement are in relation to our total inventory. This is a valid measure because it indicates the length of our replacement cycle is and whether it is extending or contracting. Tom questioned whether age of the inventory would be a better measure of efficiency than the measurement in isolation of dollars. Andreea answered that technology has so many components, not just computers. Bill said as a Board policy, we want to have a 4-year replacement cycle within technology because of how our inventory is distributed. Bill suggested a utilization analysis of the instructional labs. However, we haven't had resources to devote to that measure.

Keith McLellan, in commenting on measures for assessing technology, said that utilization becomes at least a proxy for whether students, and which students, are accessing it. His concern is that we do not disenfranchise certain populations from these technologies whether it is by income or location of service. If there is a way with existing data to look at utilization and aggregating by student type, we can begin looking at the impact this has on students, and second, is there any differentiation in those students' success patterns. Andreea commented that the impact of the implementation of Campus Pipeline is part of the institutional research agenda for next year.

M/S/C/ [McLellan/Hanna] unanimously to amend the motion to add the measure of “average age of computer inventory” under the area of Applications of Technology in the Measures of Institutional Effectiveness report.

The main motion was carried unanimously.

3.2 Positions identified by Cabinet for funding with growth funds

Brian Fahnestock distributed an information sheet summarizing the fiscal year 2001-2002 salary increase calculation, effective January 1, 2002; the use of growth dollars, FY 2001-02; the cost of district compensation proposals; and expenditures from the projected fund balance.

Use of growth funds for fiscal year 2001-2002, revised January 30, 2002, were listed as follows and discussed in the context of his detailed explanation to the Council from the handout:

Growth Funds

FTES	\$979,728
Space	<u>18,618</u>
Total	998,346

Uses

New faculty			
Credit	468,949		
Non-credit	51,111		
Salary increase			
Faculty (55%)	<u>91,582</u>		
Total faculty		\$611,642	68%
Staff (45%)	74,931		

New positions requested to be added from growth:

Custodian	41,000
Technology	50,000
HR tech staff	52,000
Dan Watkins	25,000
LSG lab coordinator	50,000
TOTAL	\$904,573

M/S/C [Hamre/Serban] and passed to approve the positions identified by Cabinet for funding with growth funds.

4 yeas [Ehrlich, Hamre, Fahnestock and Serban];
 4 nays [Tom Garey, Lana Rose, Ray Launier and Karolyn Hanna]; and
 1 abstention [McLellan].
 Lynda Fairly, as acting Chairperson, voted yea to break the tie.

Tom Garey informed the Council that his opposition to the motion was because the application of growth dollars is a subject of active negotiation and mediation at this point and the allocation of growth dollars is preemptive.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 District Review and Recommendations regarding the system's 2003-2004 budget.

The Council reviewed and discussed the following areas for recommendations submitted by the Chancellor's Office regarding the system's 2003-2004 budget. The issues for consideration are:

1. Should the system continue to seek 4% for enrollment growth in 2003-2004?

The consensus of the Council was "yes".

2. Should the system continue to seek funds for "Compensation, Goods, and Services" (including part-time faculty compensation), or should some other approach be pursued?

Tom Garey commented that the COLAs in general tend not to reflect reality even on a statewide basis, much less on a local basis for communities such as Santa Barbara and compounded by the funding inequities on FTES apportionment. I think we should demand the Chancellor and the Legislature address that issue because of the substantive problems it is creating for our district and districts like us.

3. Should the system continue to seek equalization/ensuring student success statewide funding in 2003-2004? Should equalization be on the basis of per FTES funding, or should it be on the basis of program-based funding regulations?

The Council concurred with Dr. MacDougall's written comments regarding the budget issue that it does not want any additional program-based funding. Tom emphasized that the problem with program-based funding is the amount that is appropriated on the basis of the program funding does not reflect real costs. Carolyn Hanna asked what could be recommended in the alternative. Tom replied, equalization based upon the actual cost. Lana Rose commented that funding at a real-cost level would be such that it would take dollars that the state is not willing to fund.

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

Lana Rose suggested that rather than the PFE augmentation she would like to have these dollars go into areas such as staff development and not have cuts to existing programs. She went on to say it is ideal to have the funding system-wise but if you fund an area but cut funds in another area, there is nothing to gain. Carolyn supported the request to seek

funds to apply a COLA to existing PFE funds. Lana felt that the success for obtaining the additional \$100m for PFE is so slim that it might make sense to seek funding in other areas where there might be more of a chance for success.

5. Should the system continue to seek funds to strengthen human resources and if so, through what mechanism(s)?

Lynda commented that the college was fortunate to obtain an augmentation to funds for adjunct faculty this year. Sue Ehrlich indicated that staff development for faculty and classified staff is critical especially with rapidly developing technology. Even without the technology, we have been behind in recognizing the importance to provide absolute training for a variety of functions. Some of the training that is most critical is not necessarily what we would immediately identify as important. Yet, as we look at the loss of money and the downtime in dealing with the problems that result from our failure to provide training, we realize the need. Sue indicated she had previously informed the Council that when HR completed the last analysis of what was spent by the college on faculty and staff development, we were asked to go beyond the needs of the budget. We were astronomically beyond our ability to obtain compensation in terms of what the college spent on staff development. Lana questioned how successful we would be in this area in asking for \$67m in a climate where \$5m has already been cut. Tom said the issue isn't so much being successful getting the money, the issue is would the system be successful in what it does? For the system to be successful, the Legislature has to allocate sufficient money. Tom advocated the faculty and the administrative counterparts system-wide communicate to the Legislature that in order to have a quality community college system, they need a system that pays its faculty adequately, has adequate facilities and adequate staff development. The \$3,300 average per FTES doesn't cover these areas.

Sue Ehrlich asked if it had been identified [e.g. by state Academic Senate] what the most successful strategies are likely to be and then try to identify whether we can get support for those strategies across broad groups and then organize a single but effective action. Tom suggested a system to organize and mobilize our students. Lana echoed Dr. MacDougall's expressed frustration throughout the system of the inadequacies and misinformation the legislators and analysts have regarding the actual needs of the college system.

Andreea Serban stressed the importance placed on student outcomes and at a minimum a symbolic sum which would show a commitment that outcomes are important. Brian Fahnestock said, in his view, one of the reasons we are as unsuccessful in getting more money is that we are successful at doing our task. As an organization we need to articulate what the role of community colleges should be and the dollars to make it such. That is what I see as our greatest avenue for funding. Sue Ehrlich praised the creativity of the college in implementing programs without the support of adequate funding.

6. Should the system continue to seek funding for student outreach and access, continue to oppose any reduction in base funding for these programs, and should it continue to combine separate requests into a single proposal?

The Council indicated "no" to this issue of combining separate requests. They felt that the pool of funds as well as the programs would be diminished. Brian Fahnestock added that SBCC does exceptionally well in our categorical programs and we would not want to equalize that funding.

7. Should the system continue to request funding for technology consistent with the adopted Tech II Plan?

Bill Hamre said that it is important to ask for the \$95m that had been identified in 2001-2002. Lynda indicted it is crucial that we continue with our growth in this area.

8. For 2003-2004, should the system continue to seek funding for expanding its economic development and workforce preparation efforts, including the "Ladders of Opportunity" initiative?

Keith McLellan informed the Council that he has not found this initiative to be a noteworthy new effort. It is advocating and funding initiatives that are already in place.

9. Should we list additional program areas that should be considered?

The consensus of the Council was that there are so many programs that are currently under-funded and our objective now should be to adequately fund the programs we currently have before we create more programs. Bill Hamre suggested that we request to raise the base revenue per student. Brian suggested, as an institution, we should have a goal to reduce the amount of reliance we have on our apportionment.

Ray Launier suggested putting a system into place district or system-wide to mobilize student interest that would communicate to the Legislature a need that spans our district to develop a systematic approach to help us obtain equalization. Why can't that be identified as a real budgetary need, which transcends what any particular district can do on its own?

The Academic Senate will not be reviewing these issues for recommendations until their April meeting.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

By motion [Rose/Garey], the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM by acting Chairperson Lynda Fairly.