

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, September 13, 2011  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
A218C  
Minutes**

**PRESENT:**

J. Friedlander, (Chair), Acting Superintendent/President	K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative, Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
I. Alarcón, Past-Pres, Academic Senate;	K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;	D. Nevins, Academic Senate President;
L. Auchincloss, Pres, CSEA;	K. O'Connor, Academic Senate Representative;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;	C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research & Planning;	M. Spaventa, Executive VP Ed Programs;
J. Englert, ASB President;	J. Sullivan, VP Business Service
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Rep;	

**ABSENT:**

S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA

**GUESTS:**

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;	L. Stark, President/Treasurer, Instructors' Association;
M. Moralis, Counseling Dept.	L. Vasquez, ITC, Committee Chair
L. Castro, Counseling Dept.	
A. Scharper, Dean, Ed Programs;	

**Information Items**

1. United Way Day of Caring, Saturday, September 17, 2011 - 8 a.m.

Dr. Friedlander announced that VP Bishop is coordinating the United Way Day of Caring for the college.

VP Bishop reported that there are 100 volunteers, of which 70 are International Students. He stated that the only records we have to break are the ones we set last year, which was about 104 people. He announced that if there is anyone else who wants to participate in the Day of Caring, we need a few more people on campus to work in the Environmental Horticulture Garden.

2. Special recognition for SBCC of state and national significance
  - A. Tuesday morning's celebration-

Dr. Friedlander reported on the celebration for SBCC being named as one of the 10 finalists of the 1,200 or so community colleges in the nation by the Aspen Institute's College Excellence Program. SBCC was the only community college in California to be named as one of the 10 finalists; Dr. Friedlander reported that there was a good turn-out at the celebration and that Kathy Molloy and the student presenters were inspiring.

Dr. Friedlander announced that he had just been invited to go to the White House a week from tomorrow, September 20 to a round-table discussion. The discussion is being convened by The White House Champion of Change Series, one of President Obama's initiatives that fits into his goal of helping the nation lead the world in college graduates by 2020. Those invited are a variety of Community College leaders from different states who are doing innovative work in their communities to advance President Obama's goal of having the best educated, most competitive work-force in the world. Dr. Friedlander said that the 2 hour round-table discussion will be streamed live and there is a blog that the finalists have been invited to post information on about their institution. A confirmation letter will be sent with more detailed information

- B. Next steps in process (Hand-Out)
- C. Addendum of new initiatives and accomplishments

3. Intent to replace Dean of Educational Programs: Student Development that will be vacant as a result of Keith McLellan's retirement.

Dr. Friedlander reported that we are down three Deans and in the spirit of trying to do everything we can to cut expenses; he wanted to look at all of the different options. Acting EVP Spaventa took the leadership role and met with all those who report to Dean McLellan and the other Deans.

Acting EVP Spaventa reported on her findings stating that some of the Deans were coming forward again with ideas and opportunities to absorb the responsibilities that have been under Dean McLellan. After looking at the ideas, they found that there were problems with some of those proposals. When Ms. Spaventa met with the Faculty who report to Dean McLellan, they made it very clear that they want a Dean with a background in Student Development and Matriculation because that voice is very important and can get lost.

Ms. Spaventa said that after considering all the different proposals, she strongly agrees with them. It is not realistic to keep spreading things out among the remaining deans.

Dr. Friedlander stated that we did more than our due-diligence in looking for options to not fill this position and concluded that we need to move forward to replace this position.

Next steps are to advertise and fill it. We cannot function well without this position being filled. If we are unable to fill that position due to unqualified applicants, Dr. Friedlander has a fallback plan.

4. Dates for CPC Meetings in 2011-12. (Att. 1)  
The CPC Meetings will now take place every 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of the month for the rest of the year. If we have extra meetings we will hold them on Fridays. These dates were attached and are also on the webpage.
5. November 17 Board of Trustees meeting rescheduled to November 10.
6. Budget related items
  - A. Review of new expense items included in the Adopted Budget for 2011-12 that was presented to CPC at its August 30, 2011 meeting. (Att. 2)
    1. VP Sullivan reported that CPC also had the opportunity to meet informally on Friday, September 2<sup>nd</sup> to discuss the tentative to adopted budget changes that Acting President Friedlander sent to the members. There was a good discussion and VP Sullivan wanted to know if there were any comments or questions on this budget that we need to relay to take into consideration for the adopted budget. VP Sullivan pointed out the highlights:
      - 1) The State Apportionment column which shows that we end up with \$455,000 is different from what was in the budget last time because it includes a \$1M in deferrals. It is the biggest difference because we accumulated \$735,000 for the loss of revenue from the increase of fees from \$36 to \$46. (See B for more detail)
      - 2) The community college system lost \$25M on the fact that the BOG waivers were not taken into account. SBCC's share of that is the loss of \$300,000.
      - 3) The only other change is for Certificated Administrators; that number used to be \$522,000, because \$300,000 was our original estimate to pay for the Acting Pres., Executive VP and stipends and now the increase is only about \$100,000.
      - 4) The college deficit is now up to about \$5.6M instead of \$4.8M.
  - B. Proposed revisions to Adopted Budget: 2011-12 that reflect the loss of revenue due to the delay in collecting the additional \$10 per unit fee if trigger 2 takes place.
    1. VP Sullivan said that we had assumed that because one of the triggers from the state was the increase of fees for we would have received was revenue that came from the \$10 increase of fees (\$36 to \$46) for the spring 2012 semester. The California Community Colleges Chancellor Jack Scott had issued a statement on September 8, 2011 regarding the California Legislature's decision to delay implementation of a mid-year student fee increase to summer 2012 if state revenues fall more than \$1 billion below projections and trigger cuts are executed. VP Sullivan stated that the Legislature passed a bill that defers the increase until summer.

- C. Implications for college budget if the State does not receive \$200 million dollars from the “Amazon” tax.  
VP Sullivan stated that in reality the above is part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> trigger – reinforces the fact that we are probably going to get hit by the triggers.
- D. Proposed dates for budget forums to explain Adopted Budgets for 2011-12.  
The two budget forums are usually held in the middle of October, one at lunch time and a little later in the day given by the Acting Superintendent/President and the VP Business.
- E. Budget related Items brought back from previous agendas.
- a. In response to President CSEA Auchincloss’ question regarding transferring money from the general fund into a fund for ESP (Express to Success Program) Dr. Friedlander said he wanted to address that budget item as well as two other items taken out of the budget.
  - b. Dr. Friedlander stated that the three items taken out of the budget, funds from not replacing two Deans were to be reallocated to support ESP (\$117,000) and \$100,000 for the Transfer Express Program. The other issue was the \$60,000 augmentation for the Continuing Education budget for certificated coverage for CE computer lab classes. VP Arellano will address the \$60,000 additional monies for Adult Education first and then Dr. Friedlander will address the \$117,000 and \$100,000.
  - c. ADULT EDUCATION:  
Dr. Arellano explained that Continuing Education (CE) has two labs where we offer a course called Computer Skills bi-lingual and that particular course is part of an approved certificate program called Basic Computer Applications that is currently under review due to some compliance issues.

Dr. Arellano reported the background to this situation. Many years ago the Schott Center did not hire Minimum Qualification (MQ) faculty in terms of offering these courses. They hired an instructor of record and this individual was hired as a professional volunteer. The instructor was not MQ’d and was assigned to the lab for which we collected apportionment at the Schott Center. Two years ago it was brought to her attention that she could no longer continue to submit this individual as the instructor of record and we had to assign the appropriate faculty that met MQ’s.

We did make the correction; however, there was a gap of about \$60,000 that did not cover the cost of providing certificated faculty coverage of the same courses. This is not a new request, but a result of a balance that was always in arrears, so we are trying to correct it in order to continuing claiming the appropriate apportionment for these courses. These computer courses are

approximately 100 FTES (96.5) and the enhanced reimbursement rate is about \$3,200 per FTES, so the revenue for these courses is about \$311,765.00. The cost for faculty is about \$199,000, so the budget was only adjusted for \$144,000 leaving a negative of about \$56,000. \$60,000 was to offset this negative.

Dr. Friedlander explained that this budget item was running a deficit, and was made up from end of year balances to cover the deficit, so it is not new money but money that we have always been spending. It is now an expense that we are recognizing for that program. Now we are in compliance with a MQ faculty member.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON CONTINUING EDUCATION:

Instructors' Association member Alsheimer commented on the calculations mentioned by VP Arellano saying that she understood that 100 FTES formerly brought in about \$310,000. The cost for faculty is \$199,000. Ms. Alsheimer said that this revenue can only be counted as full revenue under the assumption that we don't have too many FTES anyway. One FTES equals \$3,100 and it only is received if we don't exceed our funded cap. We have to be careful in making these calculations. The other thing is there is \$199,000 that are costs for faculty. I think we spent tons of hours of discussion in calculating the cost of a class is actually including more than just the cost of faculty even if we only calculate the direct cost.

Ms. Alsheimer summed up that she wanted to make this point that we have to be careful when we talk about the cost of these numbers, that we are actually looking at the correct numbers. Number one that the revenue is actually not as high and number two that the cost is probably lower than we are talking about.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the revenue is what don't you count if you go over cap, and it could be any course and the second point you made was, if you have a staff person assisting with technical support for the lab that is a cost associated with running those courses as well as the computers and all other things as well. The cost is over and above the direct cost of the faculty.

Ms. Alsheimer went on to say we have to pay attention that the revenue coming in for FTES is supposed to be covering the direct cost and the overhead cost of the class. She wanted to make sure that numbers are correct before we make a decision.

Dr. Friedlander stated that her point is well taken and will be read in the minutes when we are doing costs. It is in making any calculation, it is saying let's realize the full cost of support and other things that go into supporting courses. *(After meeting Robert Else sent an email on the funding rates per FTES. There are three types of state apportionment funding rates per FTES for the 3 kinds of*

*FTES we generate: Non-credit enhanced: \$3,232; Non-credit non-enhanced: \$2,745; Credit: \$4,564).*

d. EXPRESS TO SUCCESS PROGRAM (ESP) MONEY IN THE BUDGET

Acting Superintendent/President Friedlander gave a short history of how the ESP would be supported. Initially, when a Dean's position came up it was decided by all college committees (CPC, Deans, Academic Senate and Dr. Serban) that rather than replacing the two vacant Deans' positions, the deans and EVP Friedlander would make a sacrifice internally to have those ongoing funds to support the Express to Success Program. All groups felt it was that important to students and to the college. These monies paid for counseling and ongoing staff that wasn't built into the grant as ongoing funding. Sometimes you don't know until you do things what actually operates a program. We were up front about that and where the source of the funding was coming for that program and we had source money to transfer from the vacant dean positions.

Then as we started working on the Express to Degree Transfer Program, Dr. Serban and I agreed to use some of the remaining money from the vacant deans' positions to provide the infrastructure support for that program. That gave us the money to build the program and to support it in case we did not get the grants we applied for. Support for this program to increase transfer rates is a top priority for the college. That was the initial arrangement we had.

Later, in looking at the projections of ending year balances in Ed Programs, Drs. Serban and Friedlander decided that there was enough money left over that Ed Programs was not projected to spend from the hourly 4000 and 5000 accounts to pay for these programs rather than moving the money budgeted for the vacant Deans' positions into the Ed Programs budget. Based on this projection the funding for the deans positions was removed from the proposed budget for 2011-12.

When end of June came, we realized that all the money that we thought would not be spent was in fact spent within Ed Programs; that money to pay for these initiatives was not there and the dean's positions had already been removed from the budget.

Deans Spaventa and Scharper, who provide the leadership for the Express to Transfer Program (ETP) took a closer look at the cost of running this program, assuming we get none of the grants we applied for, and found it can run on \$50,000 a year. They had reported that the ETP can get by with that one time cost and ongoing and if we get these grants we can let the other money drop to the bottom line/end of year balances.

The \$117,000 to keep the ESP program built up and running was identified early on and we had a mechanism paying for it. That is where we are in the budget so we would be reducing the \$100,000 to \$50,000 in the budget to support the Express to Transfer Program.

Dean Scharper reported that in a one page projected time line and budget for what would be needed for one time funding (\$84,000) for this year in order to get the seed started for the Express to Transfer Initiative, the total for ongoing we are estimating at \$50,000.

Dean Scharper also reported that with the help of the Foundation for SBCC, a \$75,000 grant proposal was submitted Santa Barbara Foundation and we will know in December whether we have been granted that money

By the end of September we will know if we have received money from the Title V Stem Grants we submitted on our own and the one in conjunction with CSUCS. Dr. Scharper stated that there is optimism that we may get one or both of these grants that would certainly cover the one-time costs.

There was further discussion regarding the budget for the monies from the Title V grant that is to pay for the student support system and tracking system. Our ability now to move forward as a college is dependent upon having the proper infrastructure and technology.

There was also further discussion regarding the cost for the start-up which includes faculty stipends to work on curriculum and to get courses through the curriculum committee and to develop the pathways. The ongoing cost is for hourly SPA assistance in the Transfer Center because that is where we would be locating the ETP rather than starting another center like the ESP CASA Center.

The Foundation for SBCC launched the Campaign for Student Success and it raised close to \$700,000. This money is allowing our students to attend college full-time and get through their courses and requirements in a shorter period of time. You need that kind of structure to raise those kinds of funds that go into direct support to our students. The Foundation plans to make the Campaign for Student Success an annual fundraising event.

There was further discussion in response to what is really being taken out of the budget and the impact on our total hourly budget, which has been cut quite a bit and not as much as it should have been according to what the budget projections were. It was clarified that the hourly for the Express to Success are being paid from the grant and the \$117K from the general fund is being taken out of the budget. Only \$50 has to be put into the current budget for the Express to Transfer Program. We need to plan to restore the \$117K for the ESP

in future years. The MacDougall Fund for Excellence is going to make up the difference between the \$50 to the \$80K for the ETP for 2011-12.

Dr. Friedlander will confirm with regarding the transfer of the \$117K and the \$100K which is now down to \$50K being a transfer from the general fund instead of the monies taken out of the budget from not replacing the deans to pay for these programs.

There was further discussion about Express to Success budgeting details and Dr. Friedlander mentioned that we are waiting to get the results from several grants that we applied for and he also said he would email the CPC members the information from the Title V Grant Director Molloy about exactly what is being funded through the Title V Grant.

CSEA President Auchincloss brought up the concerns she has heard others express regarding the adding of programs like this and then on the other hand we have to cut \$2.5M from our budget. Dr. Friedlander said he understood these concerns and that is why he went into great length to explain how there was never any intent to add expense to the budget and that this program is being paid for through grants, money from the Foundation and what was to be reallocated funds from not replacing the dean positions.

Dr. Friedlander spoke about the advantage to having this conversation and clarifying information because we are all on the same team with the intent to reduce costs.

## **Program Review**

### 7. Program Review.

- A. Proposed instructions, guidelines and FAQs (Att. 3)  
Members identified edits to the guidelines and clarified what was unclear. An example was the question: what if we need something that we put in Program Review that is new that actually needs to be replaced yearly? The answer was: if you are approved from Program Review, it is noted that it is ongoing expenses and then it is approved for ongoing. It will be added to the budget automatically. (Fact #2 on P.3)
- B. Proposed timeline for completing program review process (Att. 4)  
Dates were readjusted to give more time for discussion and rankings and will be distributed tomorrow.
- C. Guidelines needed for replacing instructional media.



- D. What is considered “Technology”? Is the primary factor network connectivity?  
There was a decision to discuss the details of the language in the Program Review Guidelines with Robert Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research & Planning, after the meeting.
- E. Process for classifying items that could be regarded as either Hardware or General Equipment (Att. 5)

- 8. Review of CPC Priorities for 2011-12 ( Att. 6 )  
This will be first on the next agenda for CPC.

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned.

**Next CPC Meeting: September 20**