

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, February 23, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes

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

ABSENT: T. Garey, K. Molloy,

GUESTS: K. O'Connor, A. Orosco, A. Scharper, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez,

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

Superintendent/President Serban welcomed and introduced Student Senate Member Eve Charbonneau during item 6. Charbonneau, a Criminal Justice major with a goal of becoming an attorney and an intern for Project Hope, sat in for Student Senate VP of Senate Affairs Garfinkel, who was unable to attend.

1. Approval of Minutes from the February 2, 2010 CPC Meeting (attachment)

M/S/C [Guillen/Bishop] to approve the minutes of the February 2, 2010 CPC Meeting. Consultation Group Member Salazar abstained as she was absent from the last meeting, due to illness.

Information Items/Announcements

2. Re-affirmation of our accreditation (attachment)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban noted our successful reaffirmation of accreditation.
3. ACCJC January 2010 actions (attachment)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban referred to the attachment, which was the list of the actions taken at the January meeting of the Accreditation Commission (ACCJC). Serban pointed out that only nine colleges received re-affirmation of accreditation without sanctions and SBCC is one of those nine colleges. It is important to see where SBCC stands in relation to other community colleges. Serban pointed out that some colleges have received a clean re-affirmation one year, and then several years later have been put on warning or probation due to one or more of the three problems: Governance, SLOs, Program Review and Planning. The attached report shows how well the College

has done and how important it is to continue to do the things that the College got commendations for and address the recommendations that the College did get.

4. Congratulations to Dr. Nick Arnold for receiving the prestigious 2009-2010 Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award of the statewide Academic Senate!
 - a. The Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award seeks to honor champions of students. It publicly acknowledges the individual who performs in an exceptional manner to advance intercultural harmony, equity, and campus diversity by making exceptional contributions to the college beyond usual obligations. Each college may nominate one faculty member to receive this prestigious honor, which includes a cash award of \$5,000. All faculty, both inside and outside of the classroom, are eligible for consideration. The award recipient will be honored at the 2010 Spring Plenary Session on April 16, 2010, in San Francisco. Academic Senate President Alarcon stated that Dr. Arnold is the College's second Stanback-Stroud Award Winner; Dr. Manou Eskandari was the 2002 Stanback-Stroud Award Winner. Alarcon continued to say that Butte College and SBCC are the only two colleges that have been awarded the Stanback-Stroud Award twice; many colleges have never received this award.

5. CCLC Commission on the Future First Meeting February 26-27, 2010 (attachment)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that she will be attending the first meeting of this newly formed Commission on the Future. This statewide Commission on the Future is charged with recommending effective policies and practices that will enable the system to increase the number of students who are able to complete degrees, certificates and transfer to four-year colleges and universities. The Commission is scheduled to meet three times in 2010, with its work culminating in a report expected in September 2010. Superintendent/President Serban stated that it is important to use this as an opportunity to make suggestions, on behalf of the college, that the Commission may want to consider. Funding sometimes emerges for initiatives produced by such commissions, so it is important to have a voice at the table. Superintendent/President Serban asked for suggestions to take to the meeting. Academic Senate Representative Monda asked what Superintendent/President Serban hoped to bring up at this meeting. Serban said that she wants to present examples of the programs and initiatives that work well at our college and examples from the work she did directing two major transfer related grants. Serban expects that with the brainpower of the thirty five plus members of this commission, that there will be ideas that will be put into action. Superintendent/President Serban and others stated some ideas: 1) Take a percentage of the membership fees paid to CCLC by all the 112 Community Colleges and use that to fund initiatives or particular efforts of some of the community colleges. 2) Academic Senate President Alarcon suggested that perhaps funding could be done through the Foundation for Community Colleges. Serban agreed and reiterated that it is something that can go back to the Colleges. 3) Executive VP Friedlander suggested allocating a certain portion of money to train trainers of best practices. CCLC can then use the results of best practices as leverage to acquire Foundation Funding, Federal Funding, and/or private funding and the money could more than pay for itself in terms of giving money back to the colleges. Support Best

Practices through a Consortium Effort. This would help the League to enhance itself in terms of being of value to us. 3) Interim PE Director O'Connor suggested that funding could go towards a concentrated, year-round PR effort in California towards sending consistent messages in the media about what the Community Colleges do, with the goal of educating the public. An educated public can have a positive impact on the California Community Colleges by starting to pressure the state legislature to send more funding to the Community Colleges. Serban stated that anytime the members have an idea to take to this commission, please e-mail or call her.

6. Enrollment update – Spring 2010 credit census - Robert Else, Winter 2010 non-credit - Ofelia Arellano
 - a. Sr. Director, Institutional Assessment, Research & Planning, Robert Else gave an enrollment update. Else reported that on February 8th the headcount was 17,778, down 1.5% from a similar point in time the previous spring, the total headcount as of today is 20,450, up compared to last year. Else continued to say that it has been up and down since the priority registration opened and on that day the count was up 40% from the year before, then it started to decline. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the college will end up with over 20,400 again when in reality we should have been down in our headcount. Academic Senate Representative Monda asked why it went up so much from the 17,000 on February 8th. Else stated that was due to the late starting classes and dual enrollment students who are entered in the system later. There was further discussion about the affect the higher headcount has on our budget and what will be done about it in the future. Executive VP Friedlander stated that for summer and spring there will be more reductions and students will be more vociferous about it. Academic Senate Representative Monda asked how much money it costs the college. Superintendent/President Serban said the cost will be tracked by payroll figures. In fall 2009, the college ended paying \$280,000 more in adjunct pay than was budgeted. Serban stated that at a very simple level, if our revenue is cut by \$2.6 million on a permanent, ongoing basis, then we should reduce our expenditures by 2.6 million. Serban said that we have not decreased expenses but rather the opposite. Academic Senate Representative Monda asked if cutting classes would help decrease expenses. Serban noted that the answer is positive if we do not pay more because of large class sizes. Executive VP Friedlander explained that to cut costs, offer fewer sections and limit the class load so that basically the college will not have to pay increased TLUs. The college aims to be sensitive in terms of having a balanced curriculum, giving students what they need without being overly aggressive in cutting sections. Friedlander reported that some colleges have become much more aggressive than our college has. The college payroll costs went up also because there were people who moved up on steps, aside from the increase in class sizes, which was a large expenditure. There was further discussion. Sr. Dir. Else is developing a report which he will bring to a future CPC meeting. Friedlander reported that changes are being made to give more time for our continuing students to get the classes they need before we open it up to the public or for dual enrollment students. VP Arellano stated that due to working on item number 7 below, she will bring her report to the next meeting.

7. Non-credit courses not approved by the state to be converted to fee-based starting in Spring 2010 (handouts) – Ofelia Arellano
 - a. VP Continuing Ed Arellano reported on Continuing Ed’s process of looking at what non-credit courses were not approved by the state and why they had to be converted to fee-based courses. Arellano stated that she and her staff identified 20 courses which do not have a course outline to be converted to fee-based for spring 2010. Arellano reported that the state requested that Continuing Ed look at their course offerings to make sure they have course outlines because the state is putting everything online. Arellano and the Continuing Ed staff started the task of reviewing all 2,711 courses that are in the state inventory to make sure they are current, remove those not offered in a long time, and ensuring that they have approved course outlines. There were some courses they identified that had no course outlines, so those courses are not approved by the state. Arellano went through the state requirements for approval of courses. The courses had to not only have course outlines, but they have to be over six hours. Arellano reported that they did identify a variety of courses that were not approved by the state: arts and crafts, hiking and other types of classes as well. Since those courses would not be funded by the state, there have to become fee-based to be able to continue them. There was further detailed explanation and Arellano reported that they have been meeting all last and this week with faculty, whose classes are affected, to look at associated costs, how many hours the class will be taught, how many weeks, and how many students will be expected as a minimum in the class. Arellano has been working with instructors to decide what fees to charge, since the fee also depends on the limit in terms of them agreeing to have 20, 25 or 30 students for those 20 courses only. Arellano stated that they have a lot more homework to do and the other 2,000 plus courses to evaluate. There were questions and further discussion and Superintendent/President Serban stressed that it is difficult for the community to understand two issues in funding Continuing Ed: 1) that SBCC cannot continue to subsidize courses that are not eligible for state funding; the college cannot claim them for apportionment and 2) the funding may not be available to us even if the course has been approved by the state. Serban explained that it is the same issue of the cutting FTES that needs to also be done with the credit courses. The college cannot afford to subsidize classes that it does not have money for. Serban went on to say that she and VP Arellano are proposing to the Board the maximum flexibility that any college would be ever willing to consider, and that is, a fee based on number of enrollments and number of weeks the class will be held decided in consultation with each instructor teaching in the affected classes. VP Arellano met with the 20 instructors whose 20 classes are affected and based on mutual agreement they committed to how many students can take the class and that is how the fee will be established. If the enrollment is lower than what they mutually agreed, the class needs to be cancelled. If the enrollment is higher, we have established a scholarship fund for Continuing Ed Students who cannot afford the fee. This is a fund that needs to be grown through fundraising. Serban initiated this proposal that if the enrollment exceeds the minimum required to pay for the direct cost of the course, rather than return the fee, allow this fee to go to the scholarship fund as a way to be able to fund people who will not afford this fee. If it works well in spring, this may be a model to continue in the future. The State

Chancellor's Office is not going to consider for approval new courses for at least 3 more months.

- b. VP Arellano reported that the other major change that will be seen in the schedule of classes as a result of consulting again with the Chancellor's Office is that courses for older adults need to be entitled that way, for example it needs to say ceramics for older adults. The Chancellor's Office has asked that a section in the catalogue state that it is for older adults and that the courses are open to all qualified students - meaning that the student's identification will not be checked but that the public will know that these courses are intended for this particular population and that instruction may be different. This is what the Chancellor's Office has asked VP Arellano to do to ensure that it is very clear to the public why these courses are eligible since the majority of our courses are under the category of older adult.
- c. Superintendent/President Serban commended VP Arellano for the countless hours she has spent making herself available, whether it is during the evening or weekends, to meet with Continuing Ed students and instructors.
- d. Interim Director of PE O'Connor asked what is the comparison in percentages of courses cut between credit and non - credit? VP Arellano said that in Fall 2009 about 90 class sections had been cancelled. For winter, the number of weeks that classes were held was reduced, and low enrolled courses were cancelled. For spring, the number of weeks was reduced from 8 weeks to 7 weeks and the only change will be those that are fee based, so CE will not meet their goal of reducing 300 FTES for 2009-10.
- e. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that when the State approves a course that describes the course as meeting for 30 hours, whether it is credit or non-credit, then it has to meet for 30 hours no matter in how many weeks. Cutting weeks will no longer translate in cutting FTES, in the end it is the sections that have to be canceled. The level of scrutiny and expectations from the Chancellor's Office it is a lot higher now than in years past.
- f. VP Arellano stated that she will be working on an online catalogue as soon as she is able to reduce and delete a lot of classes that have not been offered for the last six years thereby reducing the inventory plus making sure that CE is following the guidelines of the State. Interim Director of PE O'Connor stated that CurricUnet will be extremely helpful in sorting out the Continuing Ed classes and an online catalogue can be produced right out of CurricUnet.
- g. Academic Senate President Alarcon reported that the *Evening with the Stars*, the Saturday night fundraiser for Continuing Ed, was quite a success. Arellano reported that over 200 community members attended and there were about 10 - 12 different acts. The *Evening with the Stars* committee has decided that all the proceeds will go to the scholarship for lifelong learners mentioned earlier to help pay for course fees for those students who cannot afford them. Arellano reported that the staff and performers donated their time and did a great job.

Discussion Items

- 8. Budget Development for 2010-11 - continued discussion

- a. Prior to continuing the discussion on the Budget Development for 2010, Superintendent/President Serban asked if VP Sullivan would report on the budget update email from Erik Skinner, Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy that Serban sent out campus wide regarding the delay of the March payment to Community Colleges. VP Sullivan referred to the first bullet point which talks about the additional deferral will delay the March payment except for \$12 million system-wide. The \$12 million would be allocated to districts that show the need for it. So this is restricting cash flow to the colleges. Sullivan stated the State is projecting a cash flow that is approximately up 1.4 or 1.7 billion. In about a week, the Chancellor's Office will report where the positive cash flow is coming from and if they think it is sustainable. Sullivan stated that the college has enough reserves to get us through it, but just enough. If the state keeps deferring more payments, then it will start to impact us. Sullivan reported that some institutions are already not able to meet their cash flow requirements and do not have the ability to borrow. There are three institutions that have gone to the Chancellor's office with this problem.
- b. Updated overall amounts requested for routine and non-routine equipment by areas (handout) – VPs
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban explained how the VPs reviewed the Resource Requests identified in the program reviews. Serban explained in detail how the Facilities not Funded by Measure V Resource Request Spreadsheet evolved and items were ranked: 1, 2, and 3. Those ranked as 1 are more immediate needs, the 2-s can wait for a year and the 3-s can wait longer. Serban reported on the money the college may get from Lottery and how it can specifically be used for some of the items. Further discussion, questions, and clarification took place about ranking and how the different groups ranked their requests.

Serban reminded everyone that this is the first time for the college to use this process and the college will become more accustomed to it. There were questions about how once all the rankings are accumulated how we will organize them. When ranking items, Serban clarified, that the actual item requested should be not be deleted from the Master Sheet, instead comments need to reflect decisions made one way or another in the comment column. Then Serban reviewed the analysis of the rankings done by the VPs and Executive Committee. There was further discussion about this and how different departments and areas did their ranking. Serban pointed out the relevance of one of the first handouts CPC looked at: The Funding Model for Equipment (2/23/10) and showed its relevance to the discussion about reserves. The spreadsheet shows the different ranking totals and subtracts that amount from the Balance of the Equipment Fund and it shows what will be left in reserves. This means the discussion at the CPC level can take place around the larger picture; we will not debating each individual item. Further discussion took place regarding how each department will go about the actual purchase of items, consequentially or not, and how to make sure the important items are purchased prior to running out of

money. Serban pointed out that it is now becoming evident that the next discussion will be about budgeting for the support and upkeep of these items.

- c. Requests for new equipment (hardware, software, non-technology) and facility improvements not currently scheduled to be funded from Measure V – prioritization from VPs and EC (handout)
- d. Current program requests for general fund support (handout) – Andreea Serban
- e. Next steps
 - i. Receive ranking from Academic Senate (including ITC and P&R), Classified Consultation Group – by March 12, 2010
 - ii. Overall CPC ranking completed at the March 23 meeting
 - iii. Recommendation on overall level of funding for the various needs identified

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meetings: Tuesday, March 16, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C;
Tuesday, March 23, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C**