

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

Present:

J. Friedlander, (Chair), Acting
Superintendent/President
I. Alarcón, Past-Pres, Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, Pres, CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA;
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research &
Planning;
J. Englert, ASB President;

M. Guillen, Classified Staff Rep;
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative,
Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President;
K. O'Connor, Academic Senate
Representative;
M. Spaventa, Acting Executive VP Ed
Programs;
J. Sullivan, VP Business Service

ABSENT:

C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative

GUESTS:

J. Morris, Information Systems Specialist,
Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning;

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;
L. Vasquez, ITC, Committee Chair

Announcements

Acting Superintendent/President Friedlander opened the meeting stating that the agenda and attachments will be projected on the screen during the meeting in an effort to save paper. It was decided that future agendas and attachments will be put on Xythos and the link to the Xythos file will be emailed to all members.

Dr. Friedlander gave a quick update on enrollment, as of the morning of August 30. Total head count by 2.63%, 18,000 students and cumulative units is up about 2%. For California resident students, the total units were up less than 1%. He anticipates that our final enrollment (FTES from resident students) will be down by 1 – 2 % from last Fall. Our resident FTES is likely to be 3 to 4% lower this spring compared to last spring due to reductions in sections.

Dr. Friedlander introduced Jeffrey Englert, the new Associated Student Government President. Mr. Englert will be representing students at CPC Meetings. Mr. Englert apologized for being

late; his Tuesday afternoon class ends at 3:20pm, and he will continue to arrive late if it will not be disruptive. Mr. Englert stated that this year the series of events the Student Senate has lined up are going to be fantastic. There are eight pending applications from more students interested in being involved with the Student Senate.

Dr. Friedlander said the main thing that Mr. Englert can do by attending the meetings is to bring information and issues from the CPC Meetings to the Student Senate so that the Student Senate is aware of and can provide input on items as President of the ASG, Mr. Englert can provide CPC the student perspective on issues that CPC is discussing. Dr. Friedlander said that Mr. Englert's role in representing the students is important in that it enriches CPC discussions.

Information Items

1. Intent to replace the Dean of Educational Programs: Student Development position that Keith McLellan is retiring from at the end of December, 2011. Goal is to fill this position in January, 2012.
 - A. Dr. Friedlander pulled this informational item from the agenda because he did not want to take any action with the position Dean McLellan will be vacating until all different options have been explored. He will be receiving information from Acting EVP Spaventa after her meeting with all the chairs and managers of the departments Dean McLellan supervises.
2. Status of the process to determine new districts for the election of SBCC Board members.
 - A. Dr. Friedlander described the redistricting process. The census data comes out every 10 years and all elected officials are required to do a redistricting study.
 - B. Step one of the process is to determine new districts for the SBCC Board members took place at the August 25th Board Meeting. The consulting company specializing in redistricting studies, who works through the Community College League of California (CCLC), made the attached presentation to the Board.
 - C. The key factor for SBCC is on the page that addresses Traditional Redistricting principles. It delineates the boundaries for the Santa Barbara City College School District (SBCCSD) and states the population goal for each area. Our districts of Carpinteria and Montecito have a population under the number required. Regardless of the redistricting option selected, these districts will have to be combined. There was further discussion and questions regarding redistricting as well as the process.
 - D. The next step: the consulting firm will present several options to the Board at the September 22, 2011 Regular Board Meeting. They will go through the

pros and cons of the options, listen to public feedback and then provide the college with three options they think that meet the legal requirements.

- E. The Board has to take action on the redistricting option for future Board Seat elections at the November Board Meeting.
 - F. The last step: the Consulting Company takes the option approved by the Board and does all the filing with the county regarding the district changes. We then have our new districts.
 - G. There was further discussion about some of the questions asked regarding the different Board Members' term expiration dates in areas that are combining their districts and the pros and cons of voting for Board members just in their district or voting for Board members at-large as they have in the past.
3. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)
- A. Jack Pond's letter of August 25th 2011 (Attachment # 2) giving the college 30 days to respond to the complaint it received about the Board of Trustees violating Title V, California Educational Code requirements and several ACCJC accreditation standards; July 1, 2011 letter of complaint sent to ACCJC (Attached to #1 Jack Pond's August 25th 2011 letter); ACCJC's Complaint Policy, (Attachment #3).
 - a. Dr. Friedlander gave a synopsis of the situation regarding the letter that was received in the President's Office in July regarding a visit in September from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Dr. Friedlander spoke with the President of ACCJC, Dr. Barbara Beno, to discuss the situation and pointed out that according to ACCJC's Complaint Policy, we were not being given our due process. Dr. Beno checked with her staff and attorney and agreed. A revised letter came from Mr. Jack Pond, VP, ACCJC, who handles complaint issues, stating that the college has 30 days to respond to the letter of complaint and he included a redacted copy of the letter of the complaints as we had never officially received it. The redacted confidential letter just shows what was material to the investigation and protects names of those mentioned in the letter that ACCJC did not have evidence that they had permission to include their names since the letter was sent to them as a "Confidential" document.
 - B. Process and Timeline for responding to the complaint by Friday, September 23.
 - A. In my role as Acting Superintendent/President, I will coordinate the college's response to the complaints. Individual responses are to be submitted to me by Tuesday, September 13th, 2011.
 - B. I will prepare the draft of the college's responses to the allegations in the letter.

- i. Dr. Friedlander outlined the college's due process: 1) to compile and collate responses to the allegations into a draft report that will be brought to the September 22nd Board meeting.
 - C. Draft of letter will be placed on the September 22, 2011 Board agenda for review and approval as the college's response to the allegations in the July 1, 2011 complaint letter submitted to ACCJC.
 - i. Dr. Friedlander stated that whether the Board endorses and approves it or not, he will reflect that in his cover letter and make his responses on behalf of the institution back to ACCJC.
 - ii. Dr. Friedlander explained that in terms of the Board members response, it is not to repeat what the information was in the letter of complaint, but what documentation is at hand that would either verify or not verify the accuracy of the allegations. Dr. Friedlander said in his response he will take item by item and report the responses to each allegation.
 - iii. WASC then receives the response and determines at that point whether they will visit or not.
- 4. Update on the Superintendent/President Search Process
 - A. VP Ehrlich, HR/LA gave an update and timeline for the search process for the new Superintendent/President.
 - i. A request for proposal has been sent out to search firms that range from focusing on Community College high level administrators to those that do searches but not limited to Community Colleges or public sector agencies.
 - ii. The deadline for the search firms to submit proposals is September 19, 2011.
 - iii. The proposals will be reviewed at the September 22, 2011 Regular meeting of the Board of Trustees, enabling the public to be able to respond as well as the Trustees. From the series of presentations the Board will select a firm to work with us, advise us and carry out various components of this process.
 - iv. Dr. Friedlander remarked that the process is similar to what the college did the last time a Superintendent/President search was held. Part of the process was to hold an open forum and invite the public. When the public is invited, the interview process is no longer confidential; thereby weakening the candidates' positions on their own campuses. At the same time, there is a great value for the SBCC college community in listening to the finalists who are being considered.
 - v. VP Ehrlich stated that another element that might be discussed in evaluating these processes is whether to engage a firm that goes out

does the search, reviews the applications, then makes the selections and presents the Board with the names of those to go through the final interview process, which would include all the representatives from the College community.

- vi. Dr. Friedlander stated that the goal is to have a job announcement out in December or earlier, the applications due in early January and have the new Superintendent/President start as close to July 1st as possible.
- vii. Dr. Friedlander remarked on the current transition in his new role and how differently his time is spent. He said he is appreciative to those who have volunteered and stepped up to assist him in this transition making it more manageable in trying to do what is in the best interest of the institution moving forward.
- viii. Dr. Nevins has offered to provide assistance with various projects where he has time to do so. Dr. Friedlander stated that from time to time he will ask Dean to assist him with various projects

Program Review

Dr. Friedlander stated that before going over details of items on the program review, he wants Jordan Morris, Information Systems Specialist from Institutional Research Department, to present the new template for rewriting program reviews first.

1. Status of last year's ranking of program review and non-routine resource requests to be funded from this year's budget (Attachments #4 - #10)
2. Identification of the process to identify the highest priority general equipment, software and hardware requests that can be funded with the \$1.5 allocated to pay for new resource requests.
3. Proposed time line for completing this year's program review process. This is the year when all programs reviews need to be re-written (Attachment #11)
 - a. A Program Review Workgroup was formed: Dr. Monda, Dr. Nevins, Ms. Vasquez, Dr. Scharper, and Mr. Else to look at a more reasonable timeline and to go over the design of the Program Review and the guidelines for Program Review that would allow for SLO information, curriculum etc.
 - b. Dr. Friedlander suggested scheduling a meeting with Dr. Monda and Mr. Neufeld to go over the latest spreadsheets and rectify any differences. Mr. Sullivan's office will take all items that are approved, assign budget numbers and get that out to everybody before the next CPC Meeting which is September 20th.
4. Presentation by Jordan Morris, showing the changes that have been made in the templates for submitting program reviews and resource requests.
 - a. Before Mr. Morris presented the new program review template, a discussion took place about what date should be on the title label and a decision was made that the title label will reflect the year they are working on the program review and it is understood that it is for the next budget year, eg. 2011-12 date is for the 2012-13 year.

- b. Mr. Morris presented the draft of the new template that will reflect the beginning of a new 3 year cycle, so the question came up about whether to roll all previous information into the new templates or leave them blank. After discussing the pros and cons, the idea of a hybrid was agreed upon. The information in the first three tabs would be rolled over and the rest would be left empty allowing for the chair or department head filling it in to give more thought to what will really be needed.
 - c. It was pointed out that there are many new chairs and department heads who have never filled out a program review, because of this it was suggested that they be given very clear instructions.
 - d. Dr. Friedlander pointed out several times that when looking at the needs of a department, the question to keep in mind is “What do we need in order to offer a quality program and to stay current?”
 - e. VP Sullivan pointed out that the program review will be different this year because we are looking at reducing and not growing.
 - f. The question came up about putting in requests year after year so that the request is not forgotten when the more abundant years come, then we can actually order it. The answer for the time being is that each department needs to look at what they currently need to operate a quality program in an environment where the college is reducing expenditures. Ask for what is critical and essential for your program.
 - g. There was a long discussion regarding how to set up the program review templates to reflect Scenario 5, the 5% reductions and the current budgetary environment. It was decided that a Program Review Workgroup would meet to discuss the questions that came up at this meeting and that their guidelines be very clear.
 - h. There was further discussion on buying a new item, would it then become routine or non-routine.
5. Next steps for completing the program review and non-routine resource requests processes.

Budget

- 1. Review of Fixed and Variable Costs Analysis (Attachment#12).
VP Sullivan went through his attachment, “Background for Budget Development” which outlines exactly what the college is currently facing.
 - a. Some of the highlights from his talking points on the document are that 90% of our expenditures are for salaries and 10% are for operating costs. There is over a \$1M increase to the benefits, primarily from health and welfare and the state unemployment contribution rates, which contribute to increasing the percentage of employee benefits for all full time employees. The analysis of the average increase in the benefit rates has climbed from 21% to 23% over the last 3 years while salaries have gone down.

- b. Using Business Services Dept. as an example, he pointed out that there is nowhere near the department's share of the \$2.5 million reduction left to cut in supplies and operating expenses. This leaves only salaries and benefits for virtually all of the cuts to expenditures.
- c. Where will the \$2.5 M reductions come from and VP Sullivan's analysis leads to the following conclusions:
 - a. The College will have to reduce positions, hourly and full-time, in order to meet the necessary budget reductions. The reductions need to begin now in order ensure that any full-time positions not filled will come from attrition. (re-organization will become a by-word here on campus)
 - b. Dr. Friedlander interjected that this is where we need to look at our priorities as an institution, on the areas where we need to maintain a high degree of excellence. We need to look at everything more creatively.
 - c. As positions are eliminated, the services provided will need to be reduced, modified or eliminated. This will result in reallocations as services are prioritized.
 - d. In order to reduce the "BIG HAMMER" in year 3 the attrition will need to start as soon as possible.
 - e. VP Sullivan pointed out that program review could be different this year because we are looking at reducing and not growing. After further discussion, there was consensus in the group that this was not the appropriate intention for program review.
 - f. Further discussion took place on consequences of the increase of tuition from \$36 to \$46 and the fact that the delay in implementing this fee increase from spring to summer session will result in a further reduction in state support of approximately \$1M.
 - g. In answer to someone's question regarding the severance pay for the Superintendent/President Serban; it is included in the adopted budget.
- 2. Review of proposed Adopted Budget for 2011-12 (Attachment #13)
 - a. CPC members need time to go through the adopted budget prior to the Fiscal Committee meeting and the upcoming Study Session. An unofficial CPC meeting was scheduled for Friday, September 2 at 11 a.m. in A218C to discuss the adopted budget.
- 3. Review of balances for the Construction and Equipment Funds (Attachment #14): Joe Sullivan.

Agenda items for next CPC meeting

- 1. Review of goals and objectives for CPC for 2011-12.

- a. Dr. Friedlander stated that we may have to schedule special meetings to get caught up.
- 2. Identification of projects/tasks CPC needs to complete this year and time line for doing so.
 - a. Dr. Friedlander will bring this list to the next meeting.

Additional Items

- 3. Additional items
 - a. Dates for the CPC Meetings need to be finalized due to conflicts for P&R. This is in process. We will meet the 13th of September, and check the other dates to make sure CPC will meet the 1st and 3rd Tuesday of each month. (P&R is always on the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of each month).
 - b. Dr. Friedlander said we need an extra meeting because we have so much to do.

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned.

Next 3 CPC meetings: September 20; October 4; October 18

**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 1st and 3rd 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 2nd 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 2nd 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