

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, April 6, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, R. Else, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, K. Molloy, K. Monda, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan,

ABSENT: O. Arellano, D. Nevins, A. Garfinkel

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

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of Minutes from the March 23, 2010 CPC Meeting (attachment)

M/S/C [Guillen/Alarcon] to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2010 CPC Meeting with one correction. All in favor.

Information Items/Announcements

2. Superintendent/President acknowledged all those who worked on the recent Banner upgrade over the Spring Break. VP Bishop stated that many people put in a year's worth of effort to bring about this update so efficiently. Bishop stated several of the major areas where there is now added functionality: wait listing, bigger memory space, enhanced reporting capability and improved performance all around. Else, Senior Director, Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning congratulated Dan Watkins, Director of Technology on his work on this upgrade.
3. Credit Student Profiles Fall 2005-09 (attachment) – Robert Else
 - a. Senior Director, Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning Else stated that the report is also posted on the website under Institutional Research. Else reported that the main highlights in the report include the Fall 09 Student Headcount of 20,448 up 4.6% from the previous Fall. Else

said that online student and full time student headcounts are up. We have more students and less money.

- b. Executive VP Friedlander spoke about major points from this report:
 - i. There is a significant increase in the number of full time students;
 - ii. There is an increase in number of transfer students who are coming at a time when UC and CSUs are becoming more challenging to get into because of the rising costs and the increase of their GPA requirements. Friedlander stated that there are fewer slots and opportunities at the UCs and CSUs for transfer students. Of all the students who said they want to transfer only 123 want to go to CSU Channel Islands compared to over 5,000 who want to go to UCSB;
 - iii. Friedlander stated that another change that will continue is the decrease in SBCC's evening enrollment due to the fact that those students have gravitated to online classes.
- c. Superintendent/President pointed out the California Education Code Section 66010.4 which defines the mission of California Community Colleges is included on the first page of the Credit Student Profiles Fall 2005 – Fall 2009 Report.
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out that the mission of California Community Colleges established by the Education Code is important for everyone to know because this is that what we are expected to do. The individual missions that each college develops, and we have our own individual mission, need to be within the framework established by law and what each college does needs to, regardless of the wording we have locally developed, follow what is in the Education Code. These are the priorities established by the State for California Community Colleges and we are actually the only community college system in the country that has a mission established by law. Superintendent/President Serban wanted to mention this because over time there have been questions about what takes precedence and Superintendent/President Serban wanted to be clear that the law takes precedence over locally developed mission statements. While there may be various initiatives or certain groups in the community who may want the college to do certain things, we need to make sure that we comply with the Education Code.
 - ii. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the college periodically receives directives from the State Chancellor's Office, as to what the priorities for community colleges should be at various points in time given the financial challenges and the latest directive from the State Chancellor's Office regarding the priorities of California Community Colleges relate to credit: general

education, transfer, basic skills and career technical education. The State directed colleges to ensure that they preserve courses in these areas first and foremost and that everything else is a second tier priority, meaning that colleges need to make efforts to sustain credit general education, transfer, basic skills and career technical education above other credit and non-credit courses. It's important to know this in terms of achieving the \$2.6 million reduction in 2010-11 in instructional expenditures because of the on-going reduction of funding from the state. Credit is already looking at cutting \$1.6 million worth of teacher load units and non-credit needs to cut \$800,000 from their instructional expenditures. Cutting credit at this level is very difficult because these cuts are coming on top of cuts that have already taken place gradually this year, and the cuts are bringing the credit program to a level that is starting to significantly impair the ability of our students to complete degrees on time or to be able to complete the courses needed to transfer in a timely manner. Superintendent/President Serban reiterated that the State priority right now is for credit, general education, transfer, basic skills and career technical education. Non-Credit is a second tier in terms of State priorities and within non-credit, enhanced non credit is first priority for the State because enhanced non credit is directly related to workforce development.

Superintendent/President Serban continued to say that this is very important because it shows what actions the college will be taking for the 2010-11 tentative budget and the priorities in terms of preserving the college. We have a very large reduction to achieve and we have not even started making a dent in that direction. Superintendent/President Serban stressed that the college is starting to build in some of these assumptions in the preliminary budget and it is imperative that the college achieve these assumptions. This will be very difficult for all involved.

- iii. There was clarification about what these cuts really mean for the college and Executive VP Friedlander stated that basically it means fewer sections.

Discussion Items

4. 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 last CPC meeting – attachment –print only the summary worksheets in each of the attached four spreadsheets)
- b. Updated information regarding budget data for 2009-10 and need for 2010-11.

- i. VP Sullivan reported from the updated budget assumptions handout, focusing on changes and additions: 1) The \$282,000 for four open positions which is not yet in the preliminary budget because we are still discussing whether some of these positions will be fully or partially filled, 2) The \$800,000 for reductions in non-credit hourly instructors' salaries, which is also not in the attached preliminary budget and 3) the deficit factor, which is not included.
- ii. Sullivan then reported on the changes from the updated preliminary unrestricted general fund budget reiterating the changes/additions that were not yet included which would be explained later.
 - 1. Sullivan explained the additional \$815,922 of revenue to the General Fund was due to no deficit factor meaning that our general apportionment revenues will not be reduced as the state has done these past 6 years due to property taxes not being collected at the rate that is projected by the counties. The state is saying the property tax projections look good for next year, so no deficit factor is in here. Sullivan said that as time progresses the projections could change, by the time we get to our adopted budget in September we will have a much better idea of how the property tax collections are going.
 - 2. The next change in revenues is \$133,880 reduction to the Part-time Faculty compensation that was imposed by the state. The budget has gone from \$680,488 to \$199,576 over the last two years. Superintendent/President Serban stated the significance of this in that according to this reduction, we should reduce the part-time compensation accordingly, but we have not done so. We are absorbing from general fund ending balances these reductions from the state.
 - 3. International Student fees /Non Resident Fees – There is a reduction in revenues because the college had a tuition decline for the coming year that comes from the state. There was a short discussion regarding the proposal that was made by various groups to change the method by which the tuition rates for out-of-state and international students are calculated.
 - 4. Sullivan went through the each of the changes in expenditures.
 - 5. Sullivan stated that with all the assumptions and disclaimers that he put out, we end up with a negative \$122,300 at the end of the year in the budget. Sullivan pointed out the negative undesignated fund balance: a negative \$50,360, the lowest in the history of the school. Sullivan further discussed the 5% mandated contingency, the required

maintenance of the designation for banked TLUs, and the deferred payments which has significantly affected our cash flow in the last couple of years.

6. There was a question and discussion regarding the “Other Outgo” Return to Title IV. Serban explained that as the economy worsens, more students enroll in 12 or more units to receive federal financial aid but then immediately drop some or all of the units. The college is responsible to return to the federal government the difference in financial aid that was disbursed based on the higher number of units once students drop. Dean of Student Life B. Partee stated that the College has never attempted to get those funds from the students and this amount of about \$260,000 is a relatively small amount in relation to the \$14 million that is given out yearly to students. However, in difficult times we could use that money to fund different programs. There was further discussion about recouping these dollars.
 7. Further discussion took place regarding Continuing Education reducing its instructional expenditures by \$800,000, maintaining the FTES in order to maintain the center status for the Schott and Wake Centers, and the need to keep the balance between the enhanced and the non-enhanced.
 8. Superintendent/President Serban reiterated as she has many times before that the college is committed to keeping permanent employees employed while we work out way through this financial crisis.
 9. Superintendent/President Serban stated that at this point it is not a wise move to commit any more money from the General Fund given the state of our ending balances. Serban reiterated that this is the first year in the history of the college where the undesignated fund balance is negative. We need to see the reduction of \$1.6 million in credit instructional expenditures materialize; if it does not then the assumptions for this budget will not work. We still need the analysis regarding Continuing Ed to see if we can materialize the \$800,000 reduction without hurting the centers status.
- c. Continued discussion on current program requests for general fund support
- i. Programmatic requests
 1. Repeat presentation from categorical programs regarding request for additional augmentation from general fund ending balances.
 - a. Controller Griffin reported that she is working with categorical managers to provide more information

regarding the backfill needed and that information will be provided at the next CPC meeting.

- ii. Proposal for readers, OAs, Committee on non-teaching compensation.
 - 1. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out that the College is fortunate to have a fiscally sound Bookstore as opposed to most college campus bookstores that lose money and she acknowledged Bookstore Manager Lorelli for that success. Serban said that since the bookstore is used primarily by the students, it seems only right to use whatever contribution the bookstore provide be used for direct support of the students. Serban stated that since there is no money for Partnership for Student Success (PSS), readers or other activities being included in this budget, she proposed using the \$250,000 from the bookstore for those programs. The Academic Senate will discuss this and will come back to CPC with their recommendation on the usage of these funds. Further discussion took place about this.
 - 2. Money to offset state cuts for categoricals is at least a three year problem. We will need to continue to fund categoricals due the reduction of money from the state. The College will have to dip into reserves to continue the maintenance of categorical programs at some level. We cannot dismantle the categorical programs as that would hurt so many students.
 - 3. In response to CSEA President Auchincloss' question regarding how much money has been saved by not filling positions right away, Serban stated that the college only has four vacant classified staff positions, all other positions that became vacant over time were filled. There is money in the budget for several of the positions opening due to retirement etc. and the people in those positions are still at the college. The four open positions which are not yet in the preliminary 2010–11 budget are positions that the Executive Council has not made decisions on yet. And these positions are not gone.

- d. Funding decisions for:
 - i. New equipment and facility improvements identified in program reviews
 - 1. After looking at the new Program Review Request summary spreadsheets, there were discussions and suggestions as to ways to move forward on making the decision of what to include in the 2010–11 preliminary budget. For the most part EC's rankings and CPC's rankings are in agreement,

there are a few items that were ranked higher than EC. Rather than going through all of the items, concentration should be placed on those where there was disagreement and make a decision. The end result was that all CPC members were to take the information, review it and point out discrepancies and only discuss those at next week's meeting.

ii. Program requests (i.e., categorical, readers, PSS, etc)

e. Next steps

5. Evaluation of Participatory Governance Structure at SBCC (attachments)

As discussed at prior CPC meetings over the past two years, accreditation standards require that **“the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement” (Standard IV.A.5)**. To address this accreditation standard, we developed two associated objectives in the College Plan 2008-11 and we have two Planning Agendas we identified in our 2009 Institutional Self Study for Re-affirmation of Accreditation. In addition, this is one of the recommendations we received in the Accreditation Team Evaluation Report. A workgroup of CPC members was formed in September 2009 and has worked on a proposed approach to help us address this issue. The attached drafts are the result of the work of this CPC sub-group and are presented for discussion. We will need to make a decision about them at the next CPC meeting.

VP Human Resources and Legal Affairs and Chair of this sub-committee of CPC Ehrlich thanked the sub-committee who worked so diligently on this project: Ignacio Alarcon, Academic Senate President; Dean Nevins, Incoming Academic Senate President; Liz Auchincloss, President of CSEA; Paul Bishop, VP, IT; Nicole Ridgell, Student Trustee with support from Diane Rodriguez-Kiino, Director of Campus Diversity. VP Ehrlich stated that the sub-committee discussed and developed the attached three draft documents: Statement of Participatory Governance (a guideline for people), a timeline and a survey. Ehrlich stated that the critical document is the Evaluation that we are proposing. Before the end of this Academic Year the intention is to take to this to Governance Committees, ask all members of every governance committee to complete the evaluation survey, then Diane Rodriguez will collate this data and produce a report. We will make the results public in order to come up with some suggestions that are appropriate for what we need to do going forward. Ehrlich stated that the one thing that is extremely important is that if an individual serves on more than one governance committee that they need to fill out an evaluation with respect to each of the governance committees in which they have participated. Ehrlich requested that the members of CPC look this material over

and bring it back at the first CPC in May with their questions and suggestions, then we can move forward with the evaluation survey.

There was further discussion and clarification. VP Ehrlich clarified that the results coming back from this survey is the documentation that gives the College the rationalization to pursue different issues and it also raises the issue to people about different aspects and allows them to decide what they need and want.

In response to a question about the terminology “Shared Governance”, Superintendent/President Serban stated that the term “Shared Governance” does not exist in any law or in accreditation standards. Superintendent/President Serban reported that the California Community League has issued documentation that clearly states “Shared Governance” is nowhere to be found in any legal document in the State of California. It is unclear where this terminology came from; however, Title 5 talks about “Participatory Governance” and Accreditation Standards talks about “Institutional Governance”. Academic Senate President Alarcon stated that the State Academic Senate prefers “Participatory Governance” because it relates to the law. Superintendent/President Serban stated we need to go back and use the legal term, stated in Title 5: “Participatory Governance.”

Superintendent/President Serban thanked this group for the hard work they did.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next meetings: Tuesday, April 13, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, April 20, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Introduced by Senator Liu

February 18, 2010

*Sponsored by
Mr LA Chambers*

An act to add Section 84502 to the Education Code, relating to community college funding.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1143, as amended, Liu. Community college funding.

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, as one of the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. *Existing law establishes a system of funding community colleges pursuant to which calculations based on the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) enrolled in classes at the colleges are a major factor.*

~~This bill would express the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to establish a framework for allocating state funds to community colleges in a manner that provides incentives for community colleges to assist students in completing coursework in which they enroll and coursework that is required to earn a certificate or degree. The bill would also express legislative findings and declarations relating to the rate of degree completion among community college students in this state.~~

~~*This bill would require the board of governors to calculate FTES using the average active enrollment in a course as of a specified census date and at course completion. The bill would authorize the board of governors to adopt an alternative and equivalent calculation method for designated types of courses. The bill would require that a decrease in FTES in a district that is due solely to a change in calculation*~~

required by this bill shall not result in a reduction in the general apportionment made to that district prior to the 2012–13 fiscal year.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~-yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the
2 following:

3 (a) The low rate of degree completion among community college
4 students is threatening California's economic future.

5 (b) In order to reach the education levels of the most competitive
6 economies, the number of students earning college degrees in
7 California each year must increase by more than 50 percent.

8 (c) Over 70 percent of public undergraduate enrollment in
9 California is in the community colleges.

10 (d) Only 24 percent of degree-seeking students complete a
11 certificate or associate degree or transfer to a four-year college or
12 university within six years.

13 (e) Under current law, community colleges receive most of their
14 annual funds based on student enrollment in the third week of each
15 semester.

16 (f) This method of allocating funds creates an incentive for
17 community colleges to enroll students, but no fiscal incentive for
18 those colleges to help students complete their courses and earn
19 degrees. Currently, only about 60 percent of community college
20 courses are successfully completed.

21 (g) Many of today's community college students require
22 extensive academic and student support services to remain enrolled
23 and succeed. Community colleges lack the resources and the
24 incentives to invest in this level of student support.

25 ~~SEC. 2. It is the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation~~
26 ~~to establish a framework for allocating state funds to community~~
27 ~~colleges in a manner that provides incentives for community~~
28 ~~colleges to assist students in completing coursework in which they~~
29 ~~enroll and coursework that is required to earn a certificate or~~
30 ~~degree.~~

31 *SEC. 2. Section 84502 is added to the Education Code, to read:*
32 *84502. The rules and regulations prescribed pursuant to*
33 *Section 84500 shall calculate full-time equivalent student*

1 enrollment using the average active enrollment in a course as of
2 the census date at the one-fifth point and at course completion.

3 (a) The board of governors may adopt an alternative and
4 equivalent calculation method for the following:

5 (1) Short term credit courses.

6 (2) Irregularly scheduled credit courses.

7 (3) Open entry/open exit courses.

8 (4) In-service training courses.

9 (5) Noncredit courses, except for distance education courses.

10 (6) Apprenticeship classes of related and supplemental
11 instruction.

12 (7) Tutoring courses.

13 (b) The board shall adopt one or more weighting factors for
14 the full-time equivalent students (FTES) calculation in order to
15 ensure that districts do not have a disincentive to enroll students
16 from demographic groups with historically lower rates of course
17 completion.

18 (c) A decrease in the FTES of a district that is due solely to the
19 change in calculation required by this section shall not result in
20 a reduction of revenue apportioned to that district pursuant to
21 Section 84750.5 prior to the 2012–13 fiscal year.