

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

September 16, 2003

3:00 – 4:30 PM

Room A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, B. Hamre, J. Sullivan, E. Frankel,
T. Garey, P. Haslund, L. Rose, A. Serban, L. Auchincloss

ABSENT: K. McLellan, J. Jackson, G. Carroll

GUEST: L. Griffin, P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the May 20th and May 27th CPC meetings.

M/S/C [Frankel/Fairly] to approve the minutes of the May 20th meeting with the correction that Lynda Fairly was present.

M/S/C [Fairly/Ehrlich] to approve the minutes of the May 27th meeting.

Abstentions: E. Frankel, J. Sullivan and Tom Garey

2.0 Announcements

Dr. Friedlander introduced Joe Sullivan as the new Vice President of Business Services saying that Joe will be a great addition to the college.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on credit enrollment and college's growth cap for 2003-04

Andreea Serban cautioned that her report does not include input from the no-show rosters as they could not be processed over the weekend because the scanner was not operational. She reported that as of census there is an increase of 5% but once the no-show rosters are processed, it will be much lower. The growth in the 12+ units load has increased by nearly 13% (800 unduplicated students). Based on the summer session and fall enrollments, we are going to be way over the college's funded growth cap for 2003-2004. The college's growth cap has been substantially reduced and we do not want to have unfunded FTES to this degree. The 16-week calendar produces by itself at least a 3% increase in credit FTES.

Jack Friedlander said that he and Lynda Fairly are looking at where adjustments can be made in the credit and non-credit programs. Jack said his challenge is that there are many more students taking core classes that demand the next course in the sequence. The deans are looking at the course offerings in their areas to determine where they can hold the line in adding sections. Lynda will be meeting with her staff tomorrow to determine where they can cut their program. She indicated that her area has a lot of flexibility. Her goal is to reduce, as much as possible, any of the smaller classes, the classes that can be combined, and transferring a lot of their computer application classes to credit. Jack said that if credit enrollments for next year are the same as this year, the college would achieve next year's expected funded growth cap without needing to serve additional students.

3.2 Review of state budget 2003-04 and its implications for SBCC

Leslie Griffin provided as an attachment a worksheet developed from the 03-04 state budget workshop held by the Chancellor's Office to learn what our share of the statewide funding would be. The worksheet provided a chronology of when budget information is provided to colleges based on reports submitted to them. Our advanced apportionment is approximately 12 percent. From the budget workshop, the college was informed that we will have more money than what we were anticipating. Leslie informed the Council that when the budget was adopted in June, we used the worst-case scenario using the Governor's May revise figures. When the budget was enacted in August, we were able to estimate that we would receive about \$1.4m more than expected. Now, in September, we know that we will have more than the \$1.4m allocated to the college. We will receive approximately \$.5m more in apportionment than we had estimated but that is going to be reduced by about \$100,000 as a result of the concurrent enrollment penalty that the college must pay even though all of its Dual Enrollment courses were in compliance with state regulations. The state general revenue to the college based on the state budget workshop would be approximately \$47,780,500. Leslie also discussed threats/concerns relating to the funding of the budget. She added that the college is projected to receive \$400k from growth and basic skills from 02-03.

Leslie then discussed the 2-year comparison of the unrestricted General Fund from 2002-03 to our projection for 2003-04. It is projected that we will have a fund balance of \$5,034,652 for 03-04. This is approximately what we had at the end of last year. Leslie indicated that a number of the sources of funds are one-time as opposed to ongoing funds. She said going forward into 2004-05 this kind of mitigation would not be available to us. There will be increased costs in our health insurance premiums and the PERS contribution rate is going to increase again (\$1m in 03-04 and another three-quarter million dollars next year). The fund balance will be what is available to us should we have a property tax shortfall and/or an enrollment fee shortfall and to help us in 04-05 in dealing with our basic fund imbalance that we have. We do not have ongoing revenues to cover ongoing expenses. Jack indicated that in building this budget, there is no money going into the equipment and construction fund balances.

Jack Friedlander said that at the next CPC meeting the Executive Committee may ask the Council to consider some adjustments in this year's expenditures, including the recommendation to allocate funds to the equipment and/or construction fund[s].

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 2002-03 annual review of the College Plan for 2002-2005

Jack reported that the vice presidents worked with Andreea to develop the review of the College Plan as to what the major objectives are and highlights of what we have accomplished to date as well as future directions in areas that need work. John Romo prepared for the Board a summary of the review which was provided to the Council. Jack said the Board reviewed the report and felt it was an excellent way to educate and to engage them at the level they should be engaged. He said the focus of the discussion here is to provide a quick update on where we are after year one and to look at the issues on which we need to focus for years two and three. Andreea will provide a document at the next meeting that will further identify how the college is meeting the goals and objectives in the College Plan.

Jack Friedlander indicated that the Council will spend the first hour of the next meeting on the College Plan to begin to identify the major areas of focus for the next two years. This will enable us to better identify how to prioritize budget-related requests.

4.2 Budget [*discussion under 3.2*]

4.3 Backfill for Categorical

The Council was provided with a spreadsheet of the 2003-04 Budget Reduction for Core Programs which indicated backfill needed for categoricals in the amount of \$680,980. This amount is built into the budget as presented under 3.2. Leslie indicated that now that we know the budget, some of this backfill is no longer needed. As we continue our discussion of the 03-04 budget and what we would like to see as an adjustment to budget now, this backfill isn't needed.

5.0 1st Hearing

5.1 DTC's recommendation for funding of computer technology request submitted for 2003-04 academic year

Bill Hamre indicated that ITC had completed their rankings of new technology issues in May. There are two issues before the Council. The first is the one-time money needed to fund these recommendations ranked as "High" and "Medium" priority. Currently there are no funds budgeted to fund these one-time expenditures. One source of one-time funds to purchase these items is the college's technology equipment replacement reserve account. The second issue is to secure on-going revenue to replace these initiatives over a 4-year period [25 percent of cost]. Bill indicated that there was discussion in DTC about whether it made sense to put forward recommendations for new technology initiatives. The committee felt strongly that we cannot say that we are not identifying any new initiatives. The issues when this becomes an action item are: (1) do we support using additional 03-04 funds on a one-time basis to fund any or all of these initiatives; and (2), do we commit the ongoing funding for one-fourth of whatever amount we authorize to be a permanent addition to our renewal of instructional technologies. Lana recommended, from a perceptual standpoint, that if we are looking for items to be reinstated into the budget, that we do it college-wide, at one time. Jack said that at our

next CPC meeting, he might be in a position to present EC's list of its top recommendations. Bill Hamre indicated that in the past we have used the General Fund ending balances to purchase new initiatives and then transferred one-fourth of the amount of the new initiatives into equipment replacement. In the past we have never purchased new equipment from equipment replacement money. These items were ranked in 02-03 to be purchased from ending balance (02-03) to buy equipment going forward. Because the budget was unknown, these purchases were not funded but put on hold.

Lynda said that we should look into 04-05 and see our projections with some of the new costs over a 2-year period. She stated the importance of seeing the full picture of the budget before we make any large expenditure. Tom Garey echoed Lana's sentiment and said we need to be mindful that the state budget is still in flux and we could be looking at mid-year adjustments. Liz questioned some of the justifications for the requests for technology initiatives. After some discussion, Lana commented that we have to rely on ITC's and DTC's judgment on technology initiatives. Liz indicated that it is appropriate to question these initiatives. In regard to the urgency of this decision, Bill said they need to be taken in the context of our overall budget decisions. This request will be brought back with the college-wide requests. Leslie added that some departments are having a very difficult time now living within their budgets and we are only in the first months of the fiscal year. There is a need to consider setting aside money just to accommodate operations this year.

6.0 Action Items

There were no action items.

7.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

8.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.