

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

July 22, 2004
9:00 to 11:00 a.m.
A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Sullivan, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, A. Serban, K. McLellan,
P. Haslund, E. Frankel, J. Schultz, T. Garey, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson,
R. Ladanyi

EXCUSED ABSENCE: L. Fairly, K. Molloy

GUESTS: P. Naylor, L. Griffin, S. Coffield

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 The approval of the minutes of the June 28th CPC meeting were tabled until the next meeting.

2.0 Announcements

- 2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that we do not have a state budget. CCLC, through the Chancellor's Office, has convened a group of Chief Business Officers (CBO). Their agenda would be a new approach to budgeting for community colleges which Vice President Friedlander said could work to our favor. What CBO is proposing is a different way of funding colleges so that every college would get a base percentage regardless of their FTES to operate their institution. Beyond that, community college's would get money on a FTES basis. Their argument is that whatever the size of the college, there is still an infrastructure to support and that should not fluctuate. Also, as you approach equalization, FTES would be distributed in an equal amount beyond the basic allocation. Dr. Friedlander said that he and his fellow CIO colleagues made the point that the only source of new funding is COLA and growth. As more colleges become more mature they are going to be stymied and in a budget cutting mode because the funding model is based on growth. Dr. Friedlander said the CBO study will be released at the end of August. It is critical for the college to monitor this process in terms of our future funding.
- 2.2 The CPR [California Program Review?] is completed. The governor will release it when the state budget is passed. One of the recommendations is to do away with the Board of Governors and put community colleges under K-12 and the Secretary of Education. However, there is no support for that in the Legislature. This will be used as another model for consideration for governance of community colleges.

2.3 Chancellor Drummond will be making recommendations in September on an organizational structure for the Chancellor's Office including job descriptions and announcements to fill positions.

2.4 Jack Friedlander said that we are close in selecting a new director for the Foundation.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Annual FTES for 2003-04 *and*

3.2 Update on the summer credit and non-credit enrollments

Andreea Serban distributed the 2003-04 Annual Apportionment Report (Final Annual FTES). She said it is important to note on both the credit and non-credit side that the final FTES is actually significantly higher than what we reported in April. On the credit side, the main reason for the difference is that in the fall the dual enrollment offerings were frozen and then reopened in the spring. Since these are all positive attendance which is not properly captured in the April report, it is one of the reasons for not being able to properly forecast in April what FTES we will have from positive attendance. On the non-credit side, even though the offerings were greatly reduced, we had better utilization of the sections that were offered which resulted in 200 more FTES than what was requested to produce. Dr. Serban went on to discuss the report and the handout she distributed. Dr. Friedlander added that what happens in the fall semester will determine whether we need to augment the spring offerings. This strategy will not necessitate having a second summer session next year. He said his goal is to achieve the FTES cap so that we don't have to add a second summer session. Dr. Friedlander said that the fee per unit will go to \$26 and there will be no \$50 differential fee.

3.3 Update on the state budget and its impact on the college

Leslie Griffin said that the Governor's May revise was used for our adopted budget although we will be reacting to whatever comes out of the enacted legislation for the budget. She said we do know that there have been a few changes in the complexion of that budget. One is that a portion of the growth is going to be earmarked for districts, as SBCC, that were over cap at P2. There is going to be an increase in the rate system-wide for non-credit courses which will be earmarked for non-credit matriculation making it restricted dollars. She said we would wait until we have an enacted budget to look at the revenue side of the budget. Dr. Friedlander said that the COLA for categoricals would be 1.66 percent. Keith asked the question of how would the difference in COLA be backfilled?

3.4 Update on progress being made toward achieving goals & objectives in the College Plan 2002-05.

Jack Friedlander said the identification of the progress being made in the College Plan needs to be updated. Each Vice President has been asked to update what was submitted last year based on what has changed as a result of this year's achievement. Andreea Serban will release this year the *Measure of Institutional Effectiveness Report* which will be utilized to determine where we are in terms of college goals. Last fall CPC looked at

each area and indicated the objectives in the College Plan that would not be achieved unless there was an infusion of additional resources. That information will be included as well in that progress report. He said that this coming year we will need to rewrite our college plan for 2005-08. Dr. Friedlander indicated he would be doing a workshop for CPC for the incorporation of new accreditation standards of which its major focus is student learning outcomes. He will bring this back in the fall to CPC.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Proposed methodology for identifying budget reductions by department/unit

Joe Sullivan discussed the revisions to the SBCC 2005-06 and 2006-07 Budget Reduction Methodology that was presented by John Romo at the last meeting and discussed by the Council. The templates for the program review of instruction units, units in support of instruction, student support and operations units will be distributed to the deans on August 2nd so that they may begin their review and work. Faculty members of the Council expressed concern that the timeline for completing this work is not realistic considering that faculty will not be working during the month of August and that the department chair responsibilities during the first two weeks of the semester preclude their having time to address and complete the information required. The timeline for summer will be to "generate and collect data". Any department chair will be welcome to come to CPC to discuss their review.

The revision in the timeline for completing the 2004-05 thru 2006-07 budget reduction process is as follows:

Summer:	Data collection and analysis <u>Data Collection</u>
Fall 04:	CPC meets weekly to begin development of 2005-06/2006-07 recommendations to President. <u>Data analysis</u> . <u>Return of completed forms</u> .
January 05:	Recommendations to President
February 05:	Report to board on progress toward achieving 04-05 budget reduction target. Mid- year expenditure report with projection for balance of the year
March 05:	President 05-06/06-07 budget reduction recommendations to the Board

The Council concluded that adequate time for discussion and consultation needs to be allowed in this process before any final decisions are made. The process needs to be very clear prior to starting this process. This process with a healthy back and forth dialog will stimulate these great ideas on gaining efficiencies as well as informing faculty that the process that the college is beginning this process prior to their receiving the program review forms in their mailboxes. Keith McLellan said that this process may offer insights that CPC and EC has not considered and that the framework presented is flexible. There could be criteria that would make sense that are not on the template and he hopes that there would be room to add to this criteria when we have the final discussion. It is important that any qualitative information from the departments reinforces existing guidelines or qualitative information may provide an additional guideline that CPC needs to consider. This needs to be communicated. Joe Sullivan stressed that each department will be welcome to come to CPC to discuss their respective reviews.

Tom Garey expressed concern that this process was not going through the consultation process for an outcome that could shape the college. Joe Sullivan responded that the intent is not to reshape the college. He said the intent is to get a benchmark for each of the units as to where we stand based on internal and external criteria and the qualitative issues that drive a particular function or unit. The recommendations to be made by the President to the Board from this information will come out of the consultative process of working with CPC and the department heads as well as the consultative bodies. Peter Naylor expressed concern that the timeline for this process does not leave enough time for that consultation.

Andreea Serban said this process is to be able to balance the budget within two years. The process is suppose to lead us to some suggestions, possibilities and/or options to see if it is even feasible to achieve a balanced budget within this timeframe. Joe Sullivan said we do not know whether we would even be able to balance the budget and accomplish the goals we have for our college. Jack Friedlander said that John Romo would be providing the full context of this process at All-Faculty Days. He said that we need to refine the details of our overall timeline to allow for an adequate process and that President Romo, when talking to the college community, would need to provide some context of what we are trying to achieve and why. Dr. Friedlander said the rationale and context needs to be explained before any request for information is distributed. Liz Auchincloss asked how classified staff is going to be involved in this process as they don't have the input of a department chair. Further, she said that this process is going to affect morale of the college. Peter Naylor said we need a coordinated strategy across the college to deliver a careful, deliberative consultative process where there is no intent to harm any current employee positions. If the perception is that it seems to be driven by a short timeline or short-cuts consultation, bad decisions may be made and the process won't work.

Jack Friedlander discussed the handout on the methodology of the budget reduction quantitative measures for instructional units, budget reduction qualitative information for instructional units and the budget reduction qualitative information for instructional units. Keith McLellan suggested it was important to include operation costs of facilities, e.g., the sports field, as a unit in support of instruction. The budget reduction questions for evaluating units in support of students as well as the operations units were also discussed. Operational units will begin their work in the summer. Liz Auchincloss stressed that staff need to be notified of this process.

Dr. Friedlander said he would share the points made today with John Romo so that he may set a framework for his college-wide and faculty inservice discussion.

5.0 Other Items

CPC will meet on Tuesday, September 7th. CPC will look at the impact of the state budget and will bring back a revised proposed methodology.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.

c:/Ed Programs/Word/CPC/CPC Minutes 07-22-04

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**June 28, 2004
9:00 to 12:00 PM
Room BC 214**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Romo, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, L. Fairly, K. Molloy, T. Garey,
E. Frankel, J. Jackson, L. Auchincloss, R. Ladanyi

ABSENT: P. Haslund, B. Hamre, K. McLellan, A. Serban

GUESTS: P. Buckelew (for McLellan), M. Borchers (*for Serban*), P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the June 16th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Frankel/Auchincloss] to approve the minutes of the June 3rd CPC meeting.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Resignation of David Dietrich

President John Romo announced to the Council that David Dietrich has resigned his position as Executive Director of the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College and has taken a position at Cottage Hospital to assist with its capital campaign. He indicated that the announcement to fill this position has closed and that strong candidates have applied.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on the state budget and its impact on the college

Jack Friedlander indicated that he anticipates knowing more about the state budget by the end of the week. What isn't known is how equalization will be divided, our growth rate, and the amount of the per unit student fee. Dr. Friedlander predicts that the \$50 differential fee will not be approved.

3.2 Update on the summer credit and non-credit enrollments

Jack Friedlander reported that as of yesterday the summer credit enrollment headcount is up 1.1 percent. He said a lot of the enrollments in summer are not census classes such as the late enrollments for professional development courses. The enrollment growth target is 2.5%, which we had hoped to make this summer, will have to be made up in the fall and spring. Lynda Fairly indicated that summer enrollment for non-credit is "positive attendance". So far very few classes have been canceled. VP Fairly indicated that CE's

goal is to reduce the non-credit enrollment. She said non-credit had 2375 FTES for last year which is about 250 more than targeted for non-credit. The goal for fall is to reduce the program. However, the FTES produced by non-credit could be adjusted to achieve the college's enrollment target for 2004-05. Dr. Friedlander said that one of the decisions that will have to be made as we approach the start of the fall semester is whether we want to pursue the option of having two summer sessions this year, one of which would count toward meeting the college's 2004-05 FTES cap. The second 2005 summer session would be part of the 2005-06 academic year. Dr. Friedlander said that he would have a more specific recommendation for the summer Academic Senate meeting after the July 22nd CPC meeting.

4.0 Discussion Items

- 4.1 Review criteria, timeline and method proposed by EC to identify reductions to the college's General Fund budget for 2005-06 and 2006-07 needed to bring it into balance by the start of the 2007-08 fiscal year.

John Romo led the Council through the proposed methodology for dealing with the budget challenge that the college will be facing in the next couple years and what approach would be taken to identify budget reductions within the units of the college. Work would be done as much as possible this summer in preparation for the budget development process. President Romo gave an overview of the 04-05 budget issues and impacts:

▪ Operating budget is out of balance by at least	\$ 1Million	
(before growth and Basic Skills: \$2.2m)		
▪ Ending balance beyond 5% contingency	\$ 700K	
(If ending balance funds transferred to equip and construction)		
▪ Sabbaticals reinstated	\$ 128K	
▪ Equipment fund commitment	\$1.8 Million	From 03-04 ending balance
▪ Construction fund commitment	\$1.2 Million	
▪ Classification study implementation	\$?	
▪ Negotiations (w/ CSEA & IA)	\$?	
▪ CE OSS implementation	\$?	

John Romo indicated expenses that are presently being paid from reserves need to be shown as operating expenses and not funded from reserves. Among those are \$500,000 for ongoing classroom maintenance. There is \$1.2m in ongoing licensing agreements for various software programs and servers. President Romo said he made a commitment to the Board to balance the budget in two years.

President Romo said that each unit of the college was placed into one of four categories: (1) Instructional Units and Programs (non-categorical funded); (2) Units in Support of Instruction; (3) Units in Support of Students; or (4) Operations Units. He discussed the groups with the Council and will make adjustments in the methodology based on recommendations from the Council. The changes identified by the Council will be incorporated into the document and distributed to members of CPC at its next meeting.

(1) Instructional Units and Programs

Credit Program

- Instructional departments
- Dual Enrollment [tech prep grant]/Middle College [categorical] – delete?
- Gateway to Success
- Honors
- MET/CAP
- On-line instruction
- Professional Development Center
- Study Abroad
- Work Experience

Continuing Education (FTES and Community Services)

(2) Units in Support of Instruction

- Credit/Non-credit Academic Program Administration
- Faculty Resource Center
- Marketing/Publications

(3) Units in Support of Students

Admiss/Reg/Recs	Alumni Association
Career Advan Cent	Children's Center
Counseling	DSPS
EOPS/CARE	Financial Aid
International	Learning Services
Library	Matriculation/Assessment
School Relations	Student Activities
Transfer Center	

(4) Operations Units

- Accounting
- Administrative Services
- Facilities and Operations
- Food Services
- Human Resources & Legal Affairs
- Information Resources
- Institutional Research and Planning
- President's Office
- Purchasing
- Security
- Public Information Officer

John Romo said that for each of the units and for the consultation process, the Council would receive a notebook containing all the agreed-to information which would be represented in a common format worksheet. The department chairs and the deans would have a major role in providing the information. Andreea Serban and Melanie Borchers, as well as Joe Sullivan and Leslie Griffin, will provide data required to complete the worksheet.

The timeline for completing the 2004-05 thru 2006-07 budget reduction process is as follows:

Summer: Data collection and analysis

- Fall 04: CPC meets weekly to begin development of 05-06/06-07 recommendations to President.
- January 05: Recommendations to President
- February 05: Report to board on progress toward achieving 04-05 budget reduction target.
Mid- year expenditure report with projection for balance of the year
- March 05: President 05-06/06-07 budget reduction recommendations to the Board

John Romo said that we should be able to come up with a half-million dollars in 2004-05 in reductions of ongoing expense that could be presented to the Board in January.

With respect to the budget reduction methodology for 2004-05 and 2005-06, President Romo said we should be able to collect the quantitative information into some sort of useful format for each of these areas. The analytic information would have to be done in the fall. Peter Naylor indicated there should be a second phase of the analytic phase; the first phase asking, "what is the role of the unit/department and is it being accomplished?" Second, "how could the unit/department do its job differently or more efficiently"? President Romo said that in some areas a short-term infusion of dollars might result in a better efficiency. This question should be asked for each unit. Jack Friedlander asked if it was realistic to complete this task in the fall. John Romo replied that he would hope that at least the proposals on how to increase the efficiencies would be done. The expectation is that by next spring we will have the 2005-06 recommendations. To the extent possible, we will be able to make specific budget proposals to the Board this spring on what will be done in 2006-07.

Joe Sullivan indicated that in areas where we provide services, it is also a question of what level of service is desired as opposed to whether or not the service would be provided. He cautioned that to go through the analysis being proposed would be very difficult without clear guidelines. John Romo said it would be appropriate to give people some opportunity to identify the repercussions in cuts to their respective areas. He felt that it is a question that is appropriate for all units/departments.

Liz Auchincloss asked if the EC has considered the impact on morale this process is going to have. John Romo said that it is important to have an accurate flow of information to the college community. It will require the leadership at the VP level to engage in this difficult and sensitive project in the least disruptive way as possible. He indicated there is the question of the cost of the classification study as well as the outcomes of negotiations. It cost \$800,000 for every one percent increase in salaries.

Pablo Buckelew asked if there was any value in asking department/units to identify their likelihood of generating growth in FTES and/or in income. President Romo responded that this was an excellent suggestion.

John Romo said that for emergency situations, we know that the Construction Fund is still sizable. We are not going to compromise health and safety concerns or facilities required to provide a proper work and educational environment for employees and students.

President Romo said that he and Dr. Friedlander have agreed that achieving the budget reduction target within a two-year period will be a difficult process. He will be working through the CEO group to put as much pressure as possible on the Chancellor to obtain greater flexibility on the full-time/part-time faculty obligation for a period and to allow appropriate kinds

of flexibility on an ongoing basis. He said we are slowing down replacement positions as opposed to instituting a freeze. He said we should continue to operate under the budget principal that we will avoid layoffs if at all possible. Whether or not it can be achieved, he did not know.

Esther Frankel said as we look at our individual departments we should look from all perspectives to also determine how it works with the rest of the college community within the targeted units. For example, the overlap between credit and non-credit should be looked at more globally.

President Romo asked that it be noted that when this is discussed within the constituency groups that the second slide on page six is incorrect. It was rewritten extensively and was inadvertently not incorporated in this document. A revised document, which will also incorporate the suggestions, made by the Council, will be sent out to CPC.

4.2 Other items pertaining to planning and budget

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion [Fairly], chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.