

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

September 30, 2003

3:00 – 4:30 PM

Room SS240E

Minutes

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, P. Haslund, T. Garey, G. Carroll, E. Frankel, A. Serban, J. Jackson, J. Jackson and L. Rose

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

Jack Friedlander announced that the auditors were at the college last week. Joe Sullivan reported that the audit went well.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on credit and non-credit enrollment, college's growth cap for 2003-04 and implications for scheduling classes for the balance of the year

Andreea Serban reported that enrollment is up by 4.6%, 772 more full-time students, compared to fall 2002. Estimated FTES for credit is 12,240 for California residents, which is 4% more than we can get funded. She said Lynda Fairly and Jack are working to try to cut enrollments in credit/non-credit. Jack said the 16-week calendar and enrollments up on the credit side [772] contributed to the increase. This year our growth has been reduced by half system-wide. Schools, because of the budget cuts, continue to cut back on the FTES they are serving but are still over cap. Community colleges cannot now afford to serve unfunded FTES the way they have in the past because of the cuts. Jack said the Chancellor's Office did a survey this fall on anticipated enrollments after the first two weeks of school. We have not received that analysis. Jack said that John Romo asked Lynda and himself to look at where, in non-credit for fall 03 and spring 04, and in credit, spring 04, we could reduce FTES as a way of saving dollars in the budget.

Lynda said that in Continuing Education they were able to identify approximately 261 FTES, which is about 10% of the program that could be cut. She said all of the physical fitness classes would become non-FTES and would be community service and enrollment fee classes. The winter and spring term will be reduced by one week. All of the programs will be reduced by about 15% except basic skills classes. Some of the computer application classes will become credit resulting in fewer offerings in non-credit. She said there would be about 100 classes that will not be offered but

they would not be reducing the basic skills programs, ESL, the programs in the jail, the adult high school and adult basic education. Jack said the deans, in working with the department chairs, are consolidating class sections where it makes sense to do so and possibly not considering new FTES-generating initiatives where in the past we would have pursued to capture growth. We would not be cutting core courses students need to fill a degree or transfer requirements. It would be more cutting and realigning because we have 772 more full-time students which we would not want to turn away. In regard to international students, Jack acknowledged the phenomenal effort of Derrick Banks and his staff to maintain and even increase the international enrollment from 484 to 487. The goal by next fall is to be at 500 and eventually up to our goal [and cap] of 600.

Jack explained the college's partnership with ASPECT. It is a private language school that offers short-term intensive English training. They recruit individuals from different countries and starting this fall for a two-year period, have one of their 10 sites in Santa Barbara on our campus. The college receives \$40 per week for every student they enroll. The college offered, short term, the ECC buildings that are not being used for two years until the Physical Science building is remodeled. ASPECT upgraded those facilities at their expense and provides computers for the students. They gave the college a minimum guarantee each week of revenue per student which goes into the general fund. The students are home-stay and none have cars. Jack feels it is also a wonderful way to recruit international students into our program. Jack indicated that this is a win-win for the college. At any given time, there would be a maximum of 40 students.

3.2 Update on the college's anticipated full-time faculty obligation (FTFO) for Fall 2004

Jack reminded the Council that last year the college received from the Board of Governors a one-year deferral for six full-time faculty positions. The Board has now passed new regulations that more clearly define the state fiscal conditions when colleges are not obligated to fill AB1725 full-time faculty positions resulting from funded FTES. Regardless, our base fall 2003 FTFO is 226. The 226 includes the six for which we received a one –year deferral for this year. For fall 2004, that deferral is gone and we are obligated for the 226 positions. Based on the retirements and the departures of faculty, we need to fill 16 full-time faculty positions. We have 15 vacancies and will be adding one new. Jack anticipates that the Fall 2004 obligation will not include any growth for this year [02-03]. This year we were allowed to grow 1.65%, which translates into three positions. However, the Chancellor's Office believes that with the new regulations in place defining the financial conditions that have to exist before requiring colleges to add full-time faculty positions due to growth, districts will not be required to add new faculty positions as a result of this year's funded FTES growth. Therefore, we are going on the assumption that for fall 04 the FTFO will be 226, which is the same as this year. The announcement went out to faculty to submit proposals for new and replacement faculty positions. The Academic Senate will deliberate as to the priority it will give in ranking its recommendations for filling replacement versus new positions.

3.3 College-wide Budget Forum: Tuesday, October 21st from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. [*instead of CPC*], to be held in PS101.

Jack Friedlander informed the Council that the IA has formally requested their option for re-openers on their contract for 04. What has been done in the recent past, prior to any negotiation, has been a college-wide budget workshop to go over the college budget and invite questions. This workshop, led by John Romo, will be October 21st from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

3.4 Funding of instructional equipment, library materials and scheduled maintenance

Jack said that at the last CPC meeting he announced that the Executive Committee (EC) would come back with a proposal to either ask for a transfer of funds from our General Fund to help meet the needs for equipment and/or critical technology replacement. He shared the feedback from that CPC meeting with John Romo and the EC. Given all the uncertainty about next year's budget, EC decided to put any funding on hold until at least January when the Governor releases the first budget. More intelligence about this year's and next year's state budget for community colleges is needed before we proceed with budget recommendations.

Jack said that each year we get from the state a "block" grant for instructional equipment. This year our allocation of \$310,654 is about 25% of what it has been in past years. That money is earmarked, with guidelines, to be spent for instructional equipment, library materials and deferred maintenance. There is a 3:1 district match that the college has matched from dollars it is already spending on equipment. We will be allocating the \$310,654 for instructional equipment, replacement items, and scheduled maintenance. Jack said we are not prepared to discuss how we are going to allocate those dollars but said that is would be a percentage of what was previously allocated. The funds will be allocated following the same processes as used in previous year.

3.5 Update on funding equipment, technology and construction funds

Addressed in 3.4

3.6 Recommended funding of new technology initiatives recommended by DTC

Jack indicated that Laurie Vasquez put together the justifications of all the new technology initiatives for which funding was requested and presented at the last CPC meeting. The EC has since decided to freeze funding of these new technology initiatives at least until we look at the budget in January. Jack disclosed to CPC that he learned last Friday that through a miscommunication, Kent Richards ordered the computers for the bunkered classrooms and they have been delivered to the campus. The cost of \$60,000 for these initiatives will have to be paid out of the technology reserve account. Basically the items on ITC's list that came to CPC are frozen, other than the purchases already made.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 2002-03 annual review of the College Plan for 2002-2005

Jack reminded the Council of their discussion at the last meeting that the College Plan should be used in guiding deliberations about the budget. He said that Andreea and the vice presidents have put a lot of work into a comprehensive evaluation of where we are after year one and in identifying areas where we not on target in achieving. Andreea distributed the “blue” sheet that identified each goal and objective in the College Plan and the status at the end of year one (i.e. “on target”, “moderate progress”, “no progress” or “not addressed” based upon the information/data identified by Andreea and the vice presidents).

Jack said that at the time the College Plan was created, the college was in a relatively positive economic climate. However, going into years two and three, we know that we are in very tight times and do not have the resources or staff to achieve all goals and objectives in the Plan. He said, keeping that in mind, the one outcome we want to have is to look at the Plan and determine which objectives to focus on in years two and three. Keith added that, from his perspective, it would be helpful to not only look at goals and objectives that are not on target or in trouble but ascertain to what degree we have control over influencing the attainment of those objectives by our policies, our resources and our focus. Similarly, because we have had major changes from the time we wrote the College Plan to now in terms of our budget allocation, the question is, what objectives that we are “on target” for achieving are at risk because of the changes we made as a result of the budget crisis. Keith said he is not as interested in knowing what the specific strategies are about what is being done. He also asked what our role as CPC is in terms of ensuring that we have resources, policies, etc., that keep these things moving forward.

After some discussion, Jack suggested that the vice presidents come back with recommendations of those objectives in the College Plan that are high priority and need additional resources to achieve as well as those objectives that are lower priorities and as such will not be given as much attention in achieving. Keith said that we also need to identify items that may have emerged since we developed the College Plan which are requiring us to spend a significant amount of time and energy to address. If, in part, the reason we are not accomplishing some of these goals is because we have redirected our energies to areas not identified in the plan, it should be noted. Jack said that we are not critiquing the Plan but rather seeking to identify the critical items which demand CPC’s focus.

5.0 Other Items

The next meeting of CPC will be Tuesday, October 28th where there will be a discussion of the College Plan. The focus of this discussion will be to review the priority objectives identified by the vice presidents that will require additional resources to achieve, as well as to identify those objectives that need to be modified or put on hold. There will be no meeting on October 7th.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.

c:/Ed Programs/Word/CPC/CPC Minutes 09-30-03