

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, March 22, 2011
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;	R. Limon, President Student Senate;
I. Alarcon, President, Academic Senate;	K. Monda, Academic Senate
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;	Representative, Chair Planning and
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;	Resources Committee;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;	K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA	Representative;
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;	D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect
T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative	J. Sullivan, VP Business Service
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;	

ABSENT:

R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning	C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative
--	---

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;	S. Saenger, Adjunct Instructor, Continuing Ed
L. Blackburn, Cont Ed Instructor., Parent Child Workshop	and Co-President Cont Ed Instructors'
M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;	Association
J. McPheter, Classified Consultation Group	A. Scharper, Dean, Ed Programs
J. Meyer, Biology Professor	L. Stark, President, Instructors' Association;
K. O'Connor, Interim Director, PE;	L. Vasquez, Instructional Technology Committee Chair

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order, and then acknowledged the efforts of the SBCC International Students Program Support Team, who with other student groups have coordinated a campus-wide fundraising effort to raise money for the Japanese affected by the recent earthquake and tsunami. President of the Student Senate Limon reported that in the past three days they have collected almost \$5,000 from faculty, staff and students and they are half-way to their goal of \$10,000.

Information Items/Announcements

1. The State Chancellor's Office informed us that our Open Source Human Presence Learning Environment was awarded the Technology Focus Award for 2010. Congratulations to Dr. Dough Hersh, Dr. David Wong and the Faculty Resource Center! (attachment 1)

The Technology Focus Award recognizes excellence that evolves out of a comprehensive planning process closely linked to the institution's mission and vision for the future. The

award commends strategic and integrated, uses of technology that empower faculty and/or students through sources within reach of all campus constituents, and often the wider community. Dr. Serban acknowledged Dr. Doug Hersh, Dr. David Wong and those at the Faculty Resource Center for the work they have done on this project. Dr. Serban stated that this award is highly competitive.

Other Announcements:

VP Friedlander reminded everyone that there is a Human Presence Tools Symposium this Friday where Faculty will be showing how they are using these tools in their classrooms. Dr. Friedlander also announced that the Channels received state-wide recognition for excellence in a community college publication.

Dr. Serban announced that she had just been chosen as one of the top 50 Business Women in the Tri-Counties. President, Instructors' Association Stark said she just received an award as the Part-Time Faculty Member of the Year from the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, FACCC. K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Representative and Director of SBCC's Luria Library was elected the President of the Council of Chief Librarians for the California Community Colleges.

Discussion Items

2. Budget development for 2011-12 and preparing for 2012-13 and 2013-14 – continued from March 18, 2011 CPC meeting.
 - a. Preliminary recommendations to and questions for the Board of Trustees from the Superintendent/President and Executive Committee – discussed with the Board of Trustees at the February 16, February 23 and March 10 study sessions (pages 1- 4)
 - b. Cost of FTES 2008-09 and 2009-10 (pages 7 – 12)

Dr. Serban handed out 2007-08 Cost of FTES Analysis Report showing how much the College had available to spend on FTES that year and compared it to the other two reports, 2008 – 09 and 2009 -10. Dr. Serban pointed out that 2007-08 is the last year where the College had more money than in 2008-09 and 2009-10 and in terms of expenditures had spent more.

Dr. Serban stated that in 2007 – 08 non-credit was a deficit operation and in the red by \$1.6 million. That deficit went down in 2008-09 to an \$800,000 deficit and in 2009-10 it was about \$145,000 deficit. Dr. Serban explained how the deficit was lowered by significant cuts in non-credit as well as credit. She said that in the two year period from 2007-08 to 2009-10 that the college is down \$600 per credit FTES expenditures but only about \$200 for non-credit.

This information is to provide clarification for some of the questions that have arisen concerning how much we actually spent per FTES (not how much it cost). The 2007 -08 information is important is because it gives a benchmark showing the last year

that we had significant expenditure (support) in all areas of the college, like hourlies, tutors , readers, and sabbaticals that we have since reduced and have not restored it to that same level. Another benchmark is the comparison of the 15,107 total CA resident FTES we served in 2007-08 to the 16,522 served in 2009-10. The College served 1,400 more FTES credit in 2009-10 than in 2007-08 with the expenditure per FTES down by \$1,335 meaning that we served many more students with less money. Further discussion took place about the 2009-10 Workload Reduction which is where \$2.6 million was cut. We did reduce the FTES on both the credit and non-credit sides. We did reduce non-credit: 90 sections canceled in Fall of 2009 and then in Spring 2010 we converted 20 classes to fee based that were not eligible for State apportionment. There was a clarification regarding Interfund Transfers Out.

- c. FTES as reported in the CC320 report (page 13)
- d. FTES 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 ; Summer 2008-Summer 2010; nonresident tuition revenues by cost center (pages 14 – 18)
- e. Cash flow analysis 2009-10 actual; 2010-11 part actual and part projected (pages 19-20)

Dr. Serban reopened the discussion from the Friday March 18th Planning Meeting regarding the minimum amount of reserves that CPC will endorse. She reviewed the concept that we should have enough reserves for those times when there are more expenses than revenues and make up the difference when the deferred money comes from the state and that amount is \$18 million.

Dr. Serban presented the other concept which is ideally the college should have enough money in savings for six months, if the State Funding does not come through for any reason. For example the only funding that came through in the six months from July to December was one deferral in October 2010 because of the late budget enactment. It is common for many organizations to have a six month emergency fund, should there be a crisis of any kind.

The other concept that Dr. Serban put forward is that the construction and equipment funds should be considered separate from what would be a minimum cash reserve fund.

Dr. Serban stated that she would like to get agreement on this by the end of April and then the meeting was open for discussion and clarification.

From the program review, we will know what we need for equipment and we have a sense of some of the things that we need to spend money on for construction.

There was further discussion on the pattern of spending. VP Bishop stated that on the equipment side, about $\frac{3}{4}$ of it gets spent, summer and fall semester, leading into

the new year and a quarter of it at the end of the year. This is a good argument for not counting these funds to offset the cash flow. Superintendent/President Serban said we have to start having more consistency in how we deal with the amount of money we need to run the college. We need to acknowledge that it takes money to have infrastructure in a college of this size. They looked at ending balances and transfers out of the construction and equipment funds to further understand the need that Dr. Serban was talking about. Interim PE Director O'Connor suggested the assignment of certain dollars based on the requests to these funds and keep them there and spend them as we need them. If we are always in a crisis we might have to go back to those funds but we should budget ahead. We have the information we need to be able to do this.

Dr. Serban stated that there is so much that cannot be predicted anymore, not only the deferrals but the cuts like the basic skills cuts, so you need a safety net that is substantive if we do not want to be caught in a very difficult position.

Academic Senate Representative Garey stated that his concern is that if we continue to shovel into reserves more than we need, that means that we are cutting services more than we need. Dr. Serban said that we are cutting into reserves already. What will help us these next three years will be the reserves which is going to help us phase our implementation of reductions. Academic Senate Representative Garey asked how much is really needed. Are we unnecessarily cutting services? He thinks this is where the discussion needs to go. Further discussion took place.

Academic Senate Representative Neufeld said that if we going to be spending \$8.5 million to \$ 14.5 million from our reserves, significant cuts will have to be made on the expenditure side. Executive VP Friedlander opened the discussion about when should we start making these cuts, about postponing the cuts in sections until Spring or Summer 2012 and what would be the result if we do. VP Sullivan said that if we postpone making the cuts for a year, and we move this model back one year, then we increase the amount we will need to cut in outer years. We have to calculate that once we have the budgets in place and how we budget is going to be based on the assumptions, which is what we need to get to in our budgeting process because it will tell us if we are going to continue to fill positions as they become vacant or what are we going to do as far as next year goes and are we going to reduce expenditures. That is what the discussion is about is how to get to the budget assumptions. There was more discussion and reassurance that this information will be discussed at the next Academic Senate Meetings.

Executive VP Friedlander reminded the members that the discussions around the Spring 2012 offerings need to conclude before everyone leaves for Summer break because August is when we build the schedule for Spring 2012. If we are going to delay any course cuts for Summer or Fall, then we have to reach a conclusion about how we are going to do it by December 2011. The reason for this is because we start building Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 at the end of January 2012. This will be a significant discussion at the Senate because there is an immediacy to what are we

going to do about Spring 2012 in terms of the instructional costs. Further details of deadlines were discussed. It was stated that the topic of the cuts should be a focus of In-Service. Academic Senate Representative Neufeld reported that faculty were willing to take the cuts, they wanted the phased in approach but they wanted to have the first year to have the discussions to figure out how to do it. What we need to do is figure out how to speed that up for faculty to have that happen. VP Sullivan spoke to the problem of delaying the cuts.

Dr. Serban stated that the phased in approach recognizes that we will have unfunded FTES. That is what the phasing approach does. Every year we will have a certain amount of unfunded FTES that we are willing to fund from reserves. We are already allowing for a fairly large amount of unfunded FTES in this phased approach, unless we get some agreement on the workload reduction we are going to circle around forever because you have to make a decision of how to implement this workload reduction. There is no way around it. Bottom line is that unless we agree and have a clear direction about this split of the workload reduction between credit and non-credit, this is an endless conversation and we will never get anything done.

President Instructors' Association Stark requested that perhaps make the cuts to the non-enhanced, non-credit, classes as slowly as we can economically and fiscally responsibly as they have taken the brunt of so many cut classes. Dr. Serban reminded the members that some of the classes, such as Physical Education for older adults, were not funded by the state anymore, they were not cut because of the college wanted to cut them or transform them to fee-based. The State decided not to fund them anymore.

Discussed what information regarding Continuing Education is still needed for the Academic Senate Meeting.

Instructors' Association C. Alsheimer and VP, Business Services J. Sullivan discussed and clarified details about the numbers in the spreadsheet. Dr. Serban explained one of the points from this discussion which was the fact that the Full-Time Faculty Obligation number is based on the last year's funded CA resident credit FTES, so if the last year's FTES goes down, you see that in the reduction in next year's Full Time Faculty Obligation. So in two years you will see an impact in the number of Full Time faculty required which will go down.

Adjunct Instructor, Continuing Education Saenger thanked Mr. Neufeld and Dr. Monda for organizing such a good faculty forum on the budget. Ms. Sanger stated that she thought it would be smart to learn from the reaction the community had to so many cuts that had been made to Continuing Education in the past several years and that we get more bang for our buck at Continuing Education. Dr. Serban stated that she agreed that the emotional impact was strong and it is a variable that needs to be looked at; however, the data shows that it costs the College a lot of money to produce non-credit FTES as was pointed out earlier. The calculations have been done by the Controller of the College. Dr. Serban thanked her for her input and since

the meeting was running late, the discussion went to the routine and non-routine and program review requests.

- f. Computer and server refresh costs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011—12 projected (page 21)
 - g. Unrestricted General Fund Revenues and Expenditures 2001-02 to 2010-11 (pages 22- 23)
 - h. Unrestricted general fund transfers out history (page 24)
 - i. Ending fund balance history (page 25)
 - j. Interest revenue 2001-02 to 2009-10 (page 26)
 - k. Budget projections – scenarios for 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 (pages 27 - 30)
 - l. Equipment fund 41 expenditures 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 (pages 31-49)
 - m. Bond fund expenditures 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 to date (pages 51-54)
 - n. State capital projects expenditures 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 to date (page 55)
 - o. State maintenance projects expenditures 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 to date (page 56)
 - p. District construction projects funded from the general fund construction expenditures 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 to date (pages 57 – 58)
 - q. Brief background information about the Continuing Education Division (pages 60-66)
 - r. Brief overview of the relationship between SBCC and the Parent Child Workshops (pages 67-70)
 - s. Memo from Chancellor Jack Scott dated Oct 28, 2010 regarding priorities in class scheduling (page 71)
 - t. Budgeting for the 4000 and 5000 accounts
3. Status of program review resource requests; and routine and non-routine equipment requests – Next steps
- 3.a Routine equipment replacement - Educational Programs – there seems to be confusion in what was requested under this category; this round of requests was supposed to give departments one more opportunity to augment their existing supplies account if they did

not request a sufficient augmentation last year. However, the requests submitted are the type that should be funded by the current supply accounts; the requests this time around were supposed to be for exceptional cases where the current supply account budget is not sufficient for routine type of equipment used every year – Ed Programs routine requests augmentation amounts to a total of \$148,000 for 2011-12 in addition to the current supply accounts. We need to use existing supply accounts first.

Executive VP Friedlander to verify with the deans and the department chairs who made the requests how these requests fit within their current supplies accounts. Some of the departments who made large requests under this category already received significant augmentations (which are ongoing) to their supply accounts last year.

Also need to cross check these requests with the requests included in the non-routine equipment replacement requests as some of the items requested are non-routine (i.e., are not replaced every year) rather than routine (need to be replaced or refreshed every year).

- 3.b Non-routine equipment replacement requests received for 2011-12:
- i. Ed Programs total \$637,620 – need to check whether these are not also included in the program review resource requests
 - ii. Business Services total \$533,504 – need to check whether these are not also included in the program review resource requests
 - iii. Continuing Education total \$13,905
 - iv. President's Office total \$20,000
 - v. Human Resources total \$2,000
 - vi. Information Technology \$10,000

TOTAL \$1,216,129. Last year the total requested under this category was \$701,322

3.c Approach to dealing with program review resource requests

Superintendent/President Serban stated that on the routine equipment replacement there has been some confusion on what is supposed to happen. She reiterated what is written in the Agenda Item 3a (above) regarding the next steps. Executive VP Friedlander stated that his office is double checking for any overlaps in departments' routine requests and program review requests. The final analysis will get back to the deans tomorrow, and after this information is cleaned up resulting in a more realistic number, it will be brought to CPC. Dr. Serban stated that the VPs are also looking for duplications in non-routine. Further clarification took place.

Dr. Serban stated that there will be one list with the #1 rankings that have come from the Deans, VPs and Managers for the CPC members' perusal. This is a change from last year when the entire CPC looked at every item and ranked it, this is a more effective use of the members' time. The bottom line is that it comes down to how much we can afford to allocate. Everyone was in agreement that this is a good approach.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next CPC meetings:

Friday, March 25, 2011, 9am-12pm A218C NOTE we are back in A218 for this meeting – special meeting preparation for developing the 2011-14 college plan

Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Friday, April 8, 9am-11am (NOT 12pm as previously stated) A217 – special meeting preparation for developing the 2011-14 college plan

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C