

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
July 22, 2004
9:00 to 11:00 a.m.
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Sullivan, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, A. Serban, K. McLellan,
P. Haslund, E. Frankel, J. Schultz, T. Garey, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson,
R. Ladanyi

EXCUSED ABSENCE: L. Fairly, K. Molloy

GUESTS: P. Naylor, L. Griffin, S. Coffield

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 The approval of the minutes of the June 28th CPC meeting were tabled until the next meeting.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that we do not have a state budget. CCLC, through the Chancellor's Office, has convened a group of Chief Business Officers (CBO). Their agenda would be a new approach to budgeting for community colleges which Vice President Friedlander said could work to our favor. What CBO is proposing is a different way of funding colleges so that every college would get a base percentage regardless of their FTES to operate their institution. Beyond that, community college's would get money on a FTES basis. Their argument is that whatever the size of the college, there is still an infrastructure to support and that should not fluctuate. Also, as you approach equalization, FTES would be distributed in an equal amount beyond the basic allocation. Dr. Friedlander said that he and his fellow CIO colleagues made the point that the only source of new funding is COLA and growth. As more colleges become more mature they are going to be stymied and in a budget cutting mode because the funding model is based on growth. Dr. Friedlander said the CBO study will be released at the end of August. It is critical for the college to monitor this process in terms of our future funding.

2.2 The CPR [California Program Review?] is completed. The governor will release it when the state budget is passed. One of the recommendations is to do away with the Board of Governors and put community colleges under K-12 and the Secretary of Education. However, there is no support for that in the Legislature. This will be used as another model for consideration for governance of community colleges.

2.3 Chancellor Drummond will be making recommendations in September on an organizational structure for the Chancellor's Office including job descriptions and announcements to fill positions.

2.4 Jack Friedlander said that we are close in selecting a new director for the Foundation.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Annual FTES for 2003-04 *and*

3.2 Update on the summer credit and non-credit enrollments

Andreea Serban distributed the 2003-04 Annual Apportionment Report (Final Annual FTES). She said it is important to note on both the credit and non-credit side that the final FTES is actually significantly higher than what we reported in April. On the credit side, the main reason for the difference is that in the fall the dual enrollment offerings were frozen and then reopened in the spring. Since these are all positive attendance which is not properly captured in the April report, it is one of the reasons for not being able to properly forecast in April what FTES we will have from positive attendance. On the non-credit side, even though the offerings were greatly reduced, we had better utilization of the sections that were offered which resulted in 200 more FTES than what was requested to produce. Dr. Serban went on to discuss the report and the handout she distributed. Dr. Friedlander added that what happens in the fall semester will determine whether we need to augment the spring offerings. This strategy will not necessitate having a second summer session next year. He said his goal is to achieve the FTES cap so that we don't have to add a second summer session. Dr. Friedlander said that the fee per unit will go to \$26 and there will be no \$50 differential fee.

3.3 Update on the state budget and its impact on the college

Leslie Griffin said that the Governor's May revise was used for our adopted budget although we will be reacting to whatever comes out of the enacted legislation for the budget. She said we do know that there have been a few changes in the complexion of that budget. One is that a portion of the growth is going to be earmarked for districts, as SBCC, that were over cap at P2. There is going to be an increase in the rate system-wide for non-credit courses which will be earmarked for non-credit matriculation making it restricted dollars. She said we would wait until we have an enacted budget to look at the revenue side of the budget. Dr. Friedlander said that the COLA for categoricals would be 1.66 percent. Keith asked the question of how would the difference in COLA be backfilled?

3.4 Update on progress being made toward achieving goals & objectives in the College Plan 2002-05.

Jack Friedlander said the identification of the progress being made in the College Plan needs to be updated. Each Vice President has been asked to update what was submitted last year based on what has changed as a result of this year's achievement. Andreea Serban will release this year the *Measure of Institutional Effectiveness Report* which will be utilized to determine where we are in terms of college goals. Last fall CPC looked at

each area and indicated the objectives in the College Plan that would not be achieved unless there was an infusion of additional resources. That information will be included as well in that progress report. He said that this coming year we will need to rewrite our college plan for 2005-08. Dr. Friedlander indicated he would be doing a workshop for CPC for the incorporation of new accreditation standards of which its major focus is student learning outcomes. He will bring this back in the fall to CPC.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Proposed methodology for identifying budget reductions by department/unit

Joe Sullivan discussed the revisions to the SBCC 2005-06 and 2006-07 Budget Reduction Methodology that was presented by John Romo at the last meeting and discussed by the Council. The templates for the program review of instruction units, units in support of instruction, student support and operations units will be distributed to the deans on August 2nd so that they may begin their review and work. Faculty members of the Council expressed concern that the timeline for completing this work is not realistic considering that faculty will not be working during the month of August and that the department chair responsibilities during the first two weeks of the semester preclude their having time to address and complete the information required. The timeline for summer will be to “generate and collect data”. Any department chair will be welcome to come to CPC to discuss their review.

The revision in the timeline for completing the 2004-05 thru 2006-07 budget reduction process is as follows:

Summer:	Data collection and analysis Data Collection
Fall 04:	CPC meets weekly to begin development of 2005-06/2006-07 recommendations to President. <u>Data analysis. Return of completed forms.</u>
January 05:	Recommendations to President
February 05:	Report to board on progress toward achieving 04-05 budget reduction target. Mid- year expenditure report with projection for balance of the year
March 05:	President 05-06/06-07 budget reduction recommendations to the Board

The Council concluded that adequate time for discussion and consultation needs to be allowed in this process before any final decisions are made. The process needs to be very clear prior to starting this process. This process with a healthy back and forth dialog will stimulate these great ideas on gaining efficiencies as well as informing faculty that the process that the college is beginning this process prior to their receiving the program review forms in their mailboxes. Keith McLellan said that this process may offer insights that CPC and EC has not considered and that the framework presented is flexible. There could be criteria that would make sense that are not on the template and he hopes that there would be room to add to this criteria when we have the final discussion. It is important that any qualitative information from the departments reinforces existing guidelines or qualitative information may provide an additional guideline that CPC needs to consider. This needs to be communicated. Joe Sullivan stressed that each department will be welcome to come to CPC to discuss their respective reviews.

Tom Garey expressed concern that this process was not going through the consultation process for an outcome that could shape the college. Joe Sullivan responded that the intent is not to reshape the college. He said the intent is to get a benchmark for each of the units as to where we stand based on internal and external criteria and the qualitative issues that drive a particular function or unit. The recommendations to be made by the President to the Board from this information will come out of the consultative process of working with CPC and the department heads as well as the consultative bodies. Peter Naylor expressed concern that the timeline for this process does not leave enough time for that consultation.

Andreea Serban said this process is to be able to balance the budget within two years. The process is suppose to lead us to some suggestions, possibilities and/or options to see if it is even feasible to achieve a balanced budget within this timeframe. Joe Sullivan said we do not know whether we would even be able to balance the budget and accomplish the goals we have for our college. Jack Friedlander said that John Romo would be providing the full context of this process at All-Faculty Days. He said that we need to refine the details of our overall timeline to allow for an adequate process and that President Romo, when talking to the college community, would need to provide some context of what we are trying to achieve and why. Dr. Friedlander said the rationale and context needs to be explained before any request for information is distributed. Liz Auchincloss asked how classified staff is going to be involved in this process as they don't have the input of a department chair. Further, she said that this process is going to affect morale of the college. Peter Naylor said we need a coordinated strategy across the college to deliver a careful, deliberative consultative process where there is no intent to harm any current employee positions. If the perception is that it seems to be driven by a short timeline or short-cuts consultation, bad decisions may be made and the process won't work.

Jack Friedlander discussed the handout on the methodology of the budget reduction quantitative measures for instructional units, budget reduction qualitative information for instructional units and the budget reduction qualitative information for instructional units. Keith McLellan suggested it was important to include operation costs of facilities, e.g., the sports field, as a unit in support of instruction. The budget reduction questions for evaluating units in support of students as well as the operations units were also discussed. Operational units will begin their work in the summer. Liz Auchincloss stressed that staff need to be notified of this process.

Dr. Friedlander said he would share the points made today with John Romo so that he may set a framework for his college-wide and faculty inservice discussion.

5.0 Other Items

CPC will meet on Tuesday, September 7th. CPC will look at the impact of the state budget and will bring back a revised proposed methodology.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.