

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, April 13, 2010  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

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

ABSENT: P. Bishop, R. Else

GUESTS: C. Alsheimer-Bartel, M. Croninger, L. Griffin, K. McLellan, J. Meyer, K. O'Connor, B. Partee, A. Scharper, J. Shapiro, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez, M. Wright

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 6, 2010 CPC Meeting (attachment)

**M/S/C [Ehrlich/Sullivan] to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2010 CPC Meeting with one correction. All in favor. Dean Nevins abstained because he was absent at that meeting.**

**Information Items/Announcements**

2. Senate Bill 1143 introduced by Senator Liu proposes changing the funding for community colleges (attachment)
  - a. Superintendent/Serban reported that Senate Bill 1143 has been recently introduced to the California State Legislature, stating that it is reflecting a significant trend and shift at the system and legislative levels regarding how Community Colleges are perceived as a system and what the expectations are of us moving forward. Community Colleges are seen as having done an excellent job in terms of access as we serve 2.9 million students per year state-wide, but this bill indicates that the Legislature has become more interested in student achievement rather than focusing primarily on access. Student success, from a system perspective, has been defined as degree completion and actual transfer to a four year college or university, among other performance measures. The bill indicates that the system needs to refocus. Serban stated that this bill is the first attempt to try to change the Community College funding model to link at least part of the funding to performance. Further discussion took place regarding the unclear details of this bill. The bill was discussed at the second meeting of the

Commission on the Future that Superintendent/President Serban attended last weekend in Fullerton. The discussion resulted with the idea that it would be beneficial for this Commission to propose some reallocation of Community Colleges current funding to be linked to institutional performance. There was further discussion about the lack of clarity in this bill and what this bill actually means. Executive VP Friedlander pointed out that this bill is the first crude attempt of moving Community Colleges in the direction of changing funding and sees this bill as a placeholder where the discussion will take place to eventually shape the funding into some kind of performance based model.

## **Discussion Items**

### **3. Budget Development for 2010-11 – continued discussion**

- a. Ranking of program review requests for new equipment (hardware, software, non-technology) and facility improvements not scheduled to be funded from Measure V (revised formatting per discussion at the March 23 CPC meeting – attachment provided on April 5 – print only the summary worksheets in each of the attached four spreadsheets) – discuss only those items where there are differences between EC ranking and P&R or ITC rankings (Kim and Laurie – please come prepared to point out differences).
  - i. Academic Senate Representative and P&R Chair Monda opened the discussion from the handout: The P&R Response to Executive Committee Rankings on the Facilities, Technology and General Equipment Summaries. She presented justifications for the few different item numbers that P&R would like ranked higher or lower. Each item was discussed, clarified and decisions made about what will be budgeted.
  - ii. ITC Chair Vasquez provided a copy of their review and rankings of Program Review Items and discussed as compared to the EC rankings. Several of the requests were taken off the list because they had been taken care of. Committee also reviewed items for possible cost reductions.
  - iii. Superintendent/President Serban asked that since there is only one item in Facilities that is different, pending checking the exact cost from Facilities, are we ready to move the items ranked #1 by EC and also ranked high by P&R forward to be funded from the Construction Fund. The result was that after finding out the total cost, then a motion will be made.
- b. Once again updated information regarding budget data for 2009-10 and need for 2010-11 (handout)
- c. Continued discussion on current program requests for general fund support
  - i. Additional funding raised by the Foundation for PSS for 2010-11 \$72,000

ii. Programmatic requests

1. Repeat presentation from categorical programs regarding request for additional augmentation from general fund ending balances.

a. Superintendent/President Serban reported from the hand out, *Additional General Fund Allocation Request for categorical Programs for 2010-11*, which is a summary Controller Griffin prepared. The summary and attached proposals were discussed in the Executive Committee (EC) yesterday. Serban went through the numbers on the cover sheet. In 2009-10, 31% of the funding for the four categorical programs came from the District's General Fund. For 2010 – 11, the proposal for General Fund funding for all four programs is 41% of their total budget - \$1,573,336.00. Serban stated that this is a three year problem minimum and could be a five year problem. Serban stated that the additional general fund allocation for each categorical group will be coming from the College reserves because there are no other resources available at this point. The additional general fund allocation would be for permanent employees, so of the proposed \$825,173 about ½ is to cover permanent employees and \$385,000 would be to do other things. For EOPS also, EC assumed that the additional \$10 million system wide cut would occur, which for us would mean an additional reduction of \$121,179. EC is looking at the worst case scenario, so if it does not happen, then our budget will be better. Serban stated that next each program will describe the rationale for the additional requests from the General Fund support.

b. DSPS Director Shapiro spoke of three major challenges for SBCC's DSPS. The first challenge is attempting to project what the income for DSPS will be from the state and she outlined the reasons. DSPS's second challenge is estimating exact expenses because of the seasonal labor costs which include all the auxiliary aids and hourlies that work in the classrooms, tech labs providing access to the different students who need assistance and others. The expenses change depending on the disability and how many units that person takes. Shapiro stated that her Department has cut down to the absolute minimum in order to handle the increase of the student population on campus. Through the Foundation for SBCC, \$8,000 has been available to pay for the Braille equipment, because for the first time in years we will have 3 blind students using Braille in the fall. The Foundation money is unpredictable. Shapiro's final point was that the three areas of DSPS, EOPS and Matriculation work cooperatively

together. There were further questions about funding and clarification.

- c. EOPS Director Wright requested that staffing money which comes from EOPS State funding and from the District General Fund continue to come from them as it has been in for the last number of years. EOPS needs the funding to provide the services for the students and those services are for remedial instruction and support services which help students succeed. Wright stated that EOPS has cut everything to the core and listed those areas. Wright also stated that she, Dean McLellan and Director Shapiro work very well together and are willing to share resources. Wright gave an example of an EOPS student who took six years to graduate from SBCC, and this June he will graduate from UCLA and has been accepted to Columbia and USC for grad school. That six years does not matter to us, he got there. It was pointed out that 98% of the EOPS students start SBCC taking below college level courses and are able to work up from there.
  - d. Dean McLellan said that the Matriculation Committee has requested \$258,000 and that this proposal was made after they had made cuts, for example one of the cuts represents over 1,000 hours of academic counseling. There was discussion of cutting sections, lower enrollments, versus higher enrollments and faculty adding more students to their classes. Executive VP Friedlander said that the Deans Council has talked about putting a cap on faculty taking on extra students. The cap is that they can take extra students up to the point that kicks them into the higher TLUs level for a large section. McLellan stated that there has already been an increase demand on Counseling Services as classes are scarcer and students are more concerned. McLellan said that there is a decline in transfers due to the cuts put in place by UCs and CSUs which results in an increase in the students coming for counseling. He reported that right now there is an increase of 50% in assessment from last year. He anticipates that the amount on counseling could increase from 10% – 25% next year and with the 1,000 hours less there will be some consequences. Academic Member Molloy stated that not only are Student Support Services needed more now, but the outreach that was done in the past is no longer offered - a tremendous loss for our students. Molloy said that the students are not able to get the direction they need in order to get the classes they need.
- iii. There was further questions and discussion about DSPS. Superintendent/President Serban stated that many colleges have cut

categorical programs between 25% up to 50%. Our College's General fund support of categorical programs is going up in spite of the fact that the College's Funding has been cut significantly. Serban stated that she doesn't think there is a debate among any of us that we value and want to support our categorical programs as much as possible.

- iv. Proposal for readers, OAs, Committee on non-teaching compensation
- d. Funding decisions for:
  - i. New equipment and facility improvements identified in program reviews
  - ii. Program requests (i.e., categorical, readers, PSS, etc)
- e. Next steps
  - i. Superintendent/President stated that these discussions will continue next week along with discussions about the changes in the budget assumptions and the General Fund unrestricted budget work in progress.
  - ii. Superintendent/President Serban reported that the Foundation for SBCC has been able to raise \$72,000 for PSS for the next year. There will be further discussion on this at the next meeting.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meetings: Tuesday, April 20, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, May 4, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, May 18, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C – last meeting of the semester**