

**Santa Barbara City College**  
**College Planning Council**  
**Tuesday, November 2, 2010**  
**3:00 pm – 4:30 pm**  
**A218C**  
**Minutes**

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

ABSENT: K. Neufeld

GUESTS: C. Alsheimer, M. Croninger, L. Griffin, K. O'Connor, A. Scharper, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez,

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of minutes of October 19 meeting (attached)

**M/S/C [Guillen/Bishop] to approve corrected minutes of the October 19, 2010. CSEA Consultation Group member, C. Salazar abstained.**

**Information Items/Announcements**

2. Chancellor Jack Scott communication regarding course scheduling priorities (Attachment)
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban emphasized the importance of reading this attached communication from Chancellor Jack Scott regarding the state recommendations on course scheduling.
3. Adjustments to the SBCC state general apportionment for 2010-11 based on the 2010-11 state budget enacted on October 8 (Attachment).
  - a. VP Sullivan reported from this attachment, the SBCC State General Apportionment which tracks apportionment from 2008 -09; 2009 – 10 and 2010 – 11 as well as the SBCC adopted budget and State enacted budget. VP Sullivan pointed out the differences in the base amounts received in 2008 -09, 2009 – 10 and in 2010 – 11.
  - b. Superintendent/President Serban clarified further how the funding of the College works starting with the sources of funding that comprise our State General apportionment. It is the California Resident FTES that we report and it is funded by the State that determines the base revenue. It is not what we report; it is what the State actually funds. In 2009 – 10, 1,158 FTES that we reported did not get funded. So the \$66,828,494, base revenue, is the FTES that the State had money to pay us. The reduction of \$2.6 million is the difference between the \$76 million and \$73 million and that \$2.6 million is the workload reduction that was put into effect in 2009-10. All community college districts experienced large reductions from their budgets which meant reducing the enrollments that the college is funded for. The base allocation relates to the number of FTES that the District has which was established by SB36. If a college has fewer than 10,000

FTES there is a certain base allocation, then if a college is between 10,000 and 15,000 FTES the base allocation is higher and so on. The funding model established by SB 361 which went into effect starting with the 2006-07 fiscal year is a recognition of the fact that regardless of the size in terms of FTES, there is a certain support and operational structure that every college needs to have such as financial aid office, admissions office, etc. In addition, SBCC has two centers, Schott and Wake, and there was a recognition of our operational costs needed to have those centers operating. There has been a misunderstanding that the allocation for centers is for facilities only when it is actually for operational costs and it is an unrestricted allocation to the college. Dr. Serban explained in further detail how the revenue from the property tax comes to the college, the enrollment fees for California Residents, Out of State Residents and International Students all work. Dr. Serban explained the timing for the State recalculation and how it affects our budget and why the college may actually retroactively get cut. This is not new; this has happened before. There was further questioning, clarification and discussion about mid-year cuts, the deficit factor, FTES and apportionment.

4. Faculty positions to be recruited for Spring 2011 and Fall 2011
  - a. Superintendent/President stated that the college is hiring to fill vacancies that are due to retirements or resignations; there are no new faculty positions at this time. The following are the positions for which recruitment will occur for Spring 2011 and Fall 2011(in alpha order):

American Ethnic Studies	Associate Degree Nursing
Automotive Technologies	Cancer Management
Cosmetology	Dance
Library	Radiography
Theatre Arts	

5. Full-time Faculty Obligation (FTFO) Fall 2010 Actual and Fall 2011 Projected (Attachment)
  - a. The attachments included the Basic Principles of the Full-Time Faculty Obligation and a chart of California Community College Districts and their Full-Time Faculty Obligation. Superintendent/President Serban reported first on the recent background of the situation with the Full-time Faculty Obligation (FTFO) given the budget cuts, the Board of Governors, the body that has the authority to waive the FTFO, has waived the FTFO new positions twice now and will most likely waive them again. When a college is funded for growth, the number of Full Time Faculty positions should go up. Dr. Serban gave the example that in 2008-09 the College was funded 2.27% growth, which was then reduced by the deficit factor. On average for every 1% of growth, two more full time faculty positions should be added for the next year. The FTFO was waived by the Board of Governors because of the huge cuts in the base apportionment funding throughout the state. Again in Fall 2009, the FTFO was waived state-wide. There was no growth funding in 2009-10, but, what was waived for Fall 2008 doesn't go away; it remains as an obligation that eventually will come back. Reporting from the California Community Colleges FTFO chart for all districts, Dr. Serban pointed to the Fall 2010 column; the Santa Barbara Community College District shows our final FTFO is 240.4. The number went down compared to what was calculated at

P2 (245.4) because our funded FTES went down. Dr. Serban reiterated that the FTFO is calculated on funded FTES, not actual reported FTES. Dr. Serban pointed out that the College's projected Fall 2011 FTFO is 240.4 again.

## Discussion Items

6. Changes in state allocation for categorical programs for 2010-11 (Attachment)
  - a. SBCC Controller Griffin reported from the attachment, a chart showing comparisons in funding for categorical programs, which are listed. The 2009-10 state allocation for categorical programs was reduced significantly compared to the prior year. Additional reductions occurred in 2010-11. The most recent change occurred in the state deciding to give more money to EOPS and CalWORKS and CARE at the expense of the other categorical programs.
  - b. Controller Griffin reported that the District has dealt with the cuts and since these programs have been deemed so important, the College has provided additional funding for them from the unrestricted general fund in order to maintain essential services to the students served by these programs. This last year before the adopted budget, we considered offsetting state cuts for several of these programs and in fact our budget has \$825,000 of money from unrestricted funds going into these restricted programs.
  - c. Now with this new information from the state about the funding forthcoming, the college needs to determine what the essential level of funding for our programs should be and how can we make sure that they all have an essential level of funding for providing services to students.
  - d. Superintendent/President Serban stated that while it is great that EOPS got \$85,000 more, CALWORKS got \$29,000 more, the other categorical programs suffered a \$100,000 cut. The College has committed a significant level of funding from the general fund of \$825,000 additional funding to support and offset the State cuts to categorical programs. There was further discussion and clarification about the different options of how to deal with these changes. More information is to come from the Chancellor's Office this coming Friday regarding allocations, so nothing definite can really be planned until the College knows more about the revised State allocation to categorical programs. Controller Griffin stated that the final estimates will be coming out in the middle of this month. This will be discussed further at the next CPC Meeting.
7. Overview of 50% law and SBCC's standing (Attachment).
  - a. Superintendent/President stated that the College is doing well with this requirement as noted in the attached report and we are in compliance.
8. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual unrestricted general fund expenditures and 2010-11 adopted budget by cost center (Attachment)
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban stated that this agenda item will be carried forward to the next meeting.
9. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual revenues and 2010-11 adopted budget revenues

(Attachment)

- a. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out the important information that shows the changes we have experienced in terms of state priorities, in some initiatives, workload reduction, categorical program cuts, etc. The Revenue Report also shows the overview of the type of revenues that the college gets. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out why there are significant changes in revenues in parts of the report. Further clarification and discussion took place.

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

Dates for Program Review deadlines were discussed.

President Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meeting: Tuesday, November 30, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C**