

SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
General Fund - Unrestricted Sep 3, 2010

	2007-08 Audited Actual	2008-09 Audited Actual	2009-10 Unaudited Actual	2010-11 Tentative Budget	Changes	2010-11 Adopted Budget
REVENUES						
Federal	1,807	1,695	1,939	2,000	0	2,000
State General Revenue					0	0
General Apportionment	73,136,408	74,880,809	73,987,798	73,207,165	0	73,207,165
Other State Revenue					0	0
Part-time Faculty compensation	624,286	680,488	333,456	199,576	0	199,576
Lottery	2,038,971	1,977,517	2,072,104	2,011,000	0	2,011,000
Other	221,043	1,053,231	543,715	48,476	0	48,476
Local					0	0
Interest	725,722	479,945	309,667	300,000	0	300,000
International Student Fees	4,442,615	5,948,178	6,675,666	6,798,881	0	6,798,881
Non Resident Fees	2,916,150	3,236,684	3,341,925	3,255,783	0	3,255,783
Other	989,477	1,733,814	1,912,066	1,906,595	0	1,906,595
Total Revenues	85,096,479	89,992,361	89,178,336	87,729,476	0	87,729,476
EXPENDITURES						
Academic Salaries	39,650,106	41,465,814	40,735,841	39,573,342	772,434	40,345,776
Classified Salaries	19,605,622	19,976,004	18,640,606	19,796,667	168,386	19,965,053
Employee Benefits	12,774,374	13,201,662	13,307,127	14,060,471	191,947	14,252,418
Supplies & Materials	1,988,679	1,892,109	2,084,080	2,654,637	60,050	2,714,687
Other Operating Expenses	6,751,049	6,354,716	6,498,634	7,994,039	69,250	8,063,289
Capital Outlay	241,244	120,762	141,444	272,932	3,090	276,022
Other Outgo	35,047	55,774	203,380	216,385	0	216,385
Total Expenditures	81,046,121	83,066,841	81,611,112	84,568,473	1,265,157	85,833,630
Net Revenues & Operating Exp	4,050,358	6,925,520	7,567,224	3,161,003	(1,265,157)	1,895,846
Other Financing Sources (Uses) - TRANSFERS						
Intrafund In	84,993	0	49,275	0	161,864	161,864
Intrafund Out - Categorical Backfill		(106,046)	(480,199)	(825,173)	0	(825,173)
Interfund In - Auxiliary	119,919	4,446	0	0		0
Interfund In - Bookstore		127,084	250,000	250,000	0	250,000
Interfund In - Construction (Aspect)		41,000	41,000	41,000	0	41,000
Interfund In - Equip				186,670	17,180	203,850
Interfund Out - Equipment Fund	(1,800,000)	(500,000)		(1,200,000)	(3,700,000)	(4,900,000)
Interfund Out - Equip copiers	(233,909)	(117,909)		0		0
Interfund Out - Equip Banner & Moodle	(161,120)			0		0
Interfund Out - Construction Fund	(1,200,000)	(600,000)	(640,000)	(640,000)	(2,090,000)	(2,730,000)
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Energy Proj	(204,786)	(250,000)		0		0
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Loan Pymt			(191,846)	(197,065)	0	(197,065)
Interfund Out - Children's Center	(163,300)	(250,000)	(271,535)	(271,535)	0	(271,535)
	(3,558,203)	(1,651,425)	(1,243,305)	(2,656,103)	(5,610,956)	(8,267,059)
Excess of Revenues & Other Sources over (under) Expenditures & Other Uses	492,155	5,274,095	6,323,919	504,900	(6,876,113)	(6,371,213)
Beginning Fund Balance	10,716,965	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134		22,807,134
Ending Fund Balance	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134	23,312,034		16,435,921
Memo:						
Undesignated Fund Balance	5,848,367	3,138,325	7,281,004	7,577,704	(7,228,813)	348,891
Mandated Contingency (5%)	4,240,500	4,239,200	4,135,700	4,343,900	352,700	4,696,600
Designation for Banked TLUs	1,120,253	1,137,366	1,188,630	1,188,630	0	1,188,630
Deferred Payments	0	7,968,324	10,201,800	10,201,800	0	10,201,800
Ending Fund Balance	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134	23,312,034	(6,876,113)	16,435,921
Ending Fund Balance - Accrual Basis	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134	23,312,034		16,435,921
State revenue deferral	0	(7,968,323)	(10,201,800)	(10,201,800)		(10,201,800)
Ending Fund Balance - Cash Basis	11,209,120	8,514,892	12,605,334	13,110,234		6,234,121

Program Review Timelines for 2010-11

Sep 7, 2010

August 23, 2010 - Fall semester begins

October 4, 2010 - Program Reviews Need to Be Completed by All Departments/Units

All areas of the program review need to be updated, as needed, and new information added, as applicable. The completion of the program reviews includes:

- New resource requests (if needed)
- Update on the status of goals and objectives for 2009-10
- New/revised goals and objectives for 2010-11
- Update information in program reviews submitted in 2009-10

The information included in the 2009-10 program reviews for each unit/department with a completed program review was rolled over into the 2010-11 templates for editing and updating purposes.

October 18, 2010 – Reports on resource requests provided to EC, CPC, DTC, ITC and Academic Senate and P&R

December 1, 2010 - DTC, ITC and Academic Senate (via P&R) rankings submitted to EC

January 28, 2011 - EC ranking completed

February 8, 2011 - EC will provide its rankings to CPC

March 22, 2011 - CPC completes its rankings

College-wide priorities for 2010-11 – draft for discussion
August 23, 2010

Although there are many important activities and projects that will be tackled during this academic year, below are some key priorities proposed for the year, which will require significant involvement and support from all college constituencies:

- During spring and summer 2011, develop the college plan for 2011-14. In conjunction with the development of the college plan, define and commit to a few, well chosen BHAGs
- Develop and prepare for the implementation of the degree/transfer express initiative to start in Summer 2011
- Develop transfer and career technical education plans for 2011-14, integrated with the college plan for 2011-14
- Continue the deployment of, training in and integration of interactive and human presence technologies for teaching and learning activities
- Review and begin implementation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan – requirement of the State Chancellor's Office
- Emergency preparedness and disaster recovery/business continuity planning
- Planning agendas identified in the self study
- Selected objectives from College Plan 2008-11; District Technology Plan 2008-11

COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL SUMMARY
DRAFT NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION AT THIS TIME JUNE 22, 2010

Total membership = 16

Number of survey participant = 15 (94%)

What is your understanding of the purpose of this committee?

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. Advise the president; ensure representation from major groups on campus in issues related to budget planning, college mission, college priorities.
2. College strategic planning
3. CPC is the college's consultation body charged with college planning, budget, resource requests, policies, and other college-wide issues. It makes recommendations to the superintendent.
4. To plan the direction for the college and the dispersal of funds from the district.
5. This is a college wide committee with representation from all contingency groups of the college. The committee deals with most college business including budget and policies.
6. Serve as an advising arm to campus and/or president.
7. Top level committee for making/discussing college goals, priorities, and budget allocations supporting same.
8. Provide input and recommendations to the president regarding significant issues related to planning and budget for the district.
9. CPC is an advisory committee to the superintendent. CPC is the mechanism by which major campus groups are consulted.
10. Joint consultation of administration, faculty, and staff. Recommendations about budget issues.
11. To provide a consultative forum representing all consultative constituencies for the purpose of making planning and policy recommendations to the college president and trustees.
12. Main governance committee advisory regarding planning, budgeting, evaluation, resource allocation. Advisory on college wide decision making; develops and/or evaluates the college plan and other plans and regularly monitors progress towards college goals and objectives.
13. Provide advice/recommendations to the president and through the president to the board of directors.
14. College wide advisory board to Superintendent/President, on matters related to budget, planning, and policy.
15. Consultation body to advise college president. Resource allocation is topic of particular focus

Did you receive an orientation on participatory governance when you began serving as a committee member?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Yes	1 (7%)
No	14 (93%)
Other	0

If you did receive an orientation, was it valuable?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Yes	1 (7%)
No	1 (7%)
No Response	13 (86%)

If you did not receive an orientation, what would you recommend going forward in terms of helping new members learn more about SBCC participatory governance? (*Participants could mark more than one response; thus, no percentages are given here.*)

Item	Number of Respondents
Meeting Management	2
Parliamentary Procedures	6
Participatory Governance	9
Other	3 (*See below)

*(1) Budget principles and practices; (2) scope and purpose of CPC; (3) I would have benefited from printed material explaining the role of the committee; the components of the committee; a schedule of the years' meetings, the rules for conducting meetings.

How often do (did) you attend committee meetings?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Perfect attendance	6 (40%)
Regularly	9 (60%)
Occasionally	0

What have you learned that you could be called upon to share with prospective committee members?

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. Important to attend every meeting; be patient – takes about a semester to get how it works.
2. No response
3. All topics addressed by CPC
4. No response
5. No response
6. No response
7. How the program review resource requests wind their way through college committees and eventually become budget recommendations from CPC.
8. Role of district constituents in participating in budget planning and development, leading to resource allocation.
9. CPC is not really a body which decides things with finality. CPC advises the superintendent who consults with the board. The board is the ultimate authority.
10. Need to attend and participate in important discussions and vote on important matters.
11. History of governance practices at CPC. Related governance practices at other institutions.
12. It is important to understand what participatory governance means; what are appropriate topics for consultation. Members of CPC need to communicate back to the constituencies they represent; need to come prepared.
13. No response
14. Role of constituency groups in participating governance.
15. I have some history and understanding of the committee's role.

2010 EVALUATION OF PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE AT SBCC

Please Note: If total response is less than 15, one or more survey participants did not answer that particular question.

Task	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. Agendas and minutes were provided electronically prior to the committee meetings.	9 (60%)	6 (40%)			
b. In general, the objectives of each committee meeting were clear and understood	7 (47%)	7 (47%)	1 (6%)		
c. The discussions usually followed the agenda.	8 (53%)	7 (47%)			
d. The committee completed the agenda in an efficient and timely manner	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	5 (33%)	1 (6%)	
e. Action items were clearly articulated	9 (60%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	
f. Parties responsible for follow up action were identified	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	2 (13%)		
g. Action items were assigned and completed in a timely fashion	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	4 (26%)	0	0
h. The committee members had appropriate information to make informed decisions	5 (33%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	0
i. Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	0
j. Constituent groups had an opportunity to participate on College participatory committees	7 (47%)	6 (40%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
k. All members attended regularly	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
l. All members were encouraged to be actively involved	7 (46%)	4 (26%)	3 (20%)	0	1 (6%)
m. All members participated in the discussion and decision making process	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
n. Decisions were made by consensus	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	0
o. Different opinions and values were respected	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	0	1 (6%)
p. Participation in the committee was important and valuable to the college.	13 (86%)	2 (13%)	0	0	0
q. The committee charge was understood and the members worked toward fulfilling the charge.	9 (60%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
r. Committees acted in accordance with Board Policy 2510 <i>Participation in Local Decision Making</i> .	9 (60%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
s. I regularly communicated with the members of the constituent group I represented regarding key items discussed and actions taken during committee meetings.	9 (60%)	5 (33%)	0	1 (6%)	0
t. Overall, I am satisfied with the committee's performance	8 (53%)	4 (26%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	0
u. I was an effective participant	7 (47%)	5 (33%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0

Open ended written comments about participatory governance and processes in general.

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. SBCC prides itself, and rightly so, on the open, honest communication among its different groups. CPC is an important place to explore questions and concerns, and I am glad that this forum exists. I am not sure about some of the small decisions about budget priorities – it's hard to figure out a way

to allow for participation among all the groups on campus – but there are some decisions the president makes that could be shared more directly.

2. No response
3. No response
4. No response
5. This committee has considerably improved in all areas since the college president became the chair.
6. No response
7. No response
8. Congratulations to Dr. Serban for her effective leadership on CPC. She facilitated CPC effectively and with respect and open communication.
9. I think that sometimes questions are framed in such a way as to preclude truly effective decision-making.
10. No response
11. Consultative bodies that serve to advise particular individuals should not be chaired by the individual being advised. This is a basic principle of consultation, to insure candor and objectivity.
12. No response
13. The limited perspective from constituent groups. It is always the same representatives from CSEA, IA, Academic Senate, and management. This limits the input to a few individuals who seem to have their own agenda.
14. There is no feeling on campus that this is an effective committee. It is perceived as a rubber stamp of the president's wishes. I know this is not the case, but that is the general perception. We need more building of trust, so that hard questions may be asked without fear. More communication from CPC members to their represented constituencies is indispensable for this committee to be vital in the governance of the college.
15. The committee is significantly more efficient than in the past; I do wish that meetings always ended on time – in order to plan – but this observation is not in conflict with my assessment that overall efficiency has increased; This group should be headed by the college president as it is at present. This makes a significant difference.