

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Friday, March 25, 2011
9:00 am – 12:00 pm
A217
Minutes

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;
I. Alarcón, President, Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research
and Planning
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;

T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative;
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;
R. Limon, President Student Senate;
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative,
Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect
J. Sullivan, VP Business Service

ABSENT:

C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;
M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;
L. Griffin, SBCC Comptroller
L. Macker, Board Member
K. McCammon, Co-Pres. ACES
Dr. J. E. Meyer, Biology Professor

K. O'Connor, Interim Director, PE;
A. Scharper, Dean, Ed Programs
J. Schultz, Academic Senate Member
L. Stark, President, Instructors' Association;
L. Vasquez, IT Committee Chair

Special session – preparation for the development of the College Plan 2011-14

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Overview of today's session: approach, desired outcomes (9am – 9:10am)

Dr. Serban passed around the agenda and the seven hand-outs and gave background information and reviewed what had been done so far in collecting data for the preparation for the College Plan. She reviewed the process of developing a draft of the college plan reminding us that last time around there were 22 drafts before it was finalized. She emphasized that we take the College Plan seriously and focus on accomplishing all that the College Plan has set out to accomplish and she reminded us of the evaluation given by the Accreditation Team:

- 2) The Team commends the college for developing a College Plan which effectively incorporates goals and measurable objectives. Further, the college annually reviews its progress toward achieving the stated goals and objectives in the College Plan, and disseminates the results widely.

2. Review and discussion of Year Two Evaluation of College Plan 2008-11 – handout (9:10am – 10:20am) – All

On the handout, each goal is listed with objectives in one column, then the current status column held the data done by Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning Else, next a comment section column of salient points, a column for stating if the objective was met and the last column for stating if this Objective was to be carried forward to the 2011 – 14 College Plan or not.

Mr. Else reported on the data he researched for the objectives, followed by questions, explanations, and discussions on the data presented in each goal objective from the VP overseeing the area and from the members. A copy of the Year Two Evaluation was projected from Dr. Serban's computer and the report was filled in to be used as information for further discussion about the goals and objectives that will be carried forward. In some instances the objectives were met and do not need to be carried forward and in some instances, a lot of work had been done on the objective and the work needed to be continued. An example of what was done for every goal with the objectives is as follows:

3. Highlights from the Credit Student Profiles – handout (10:20 am – 10:40 am) Robert Else
This will be talked about at the next meeting.
4. Highlights from the Economic Impact Study done for us by the UCSB Economic Forecast Project – handout (10:40 am – 11 am) Robert Else
5. Assumptions, Challenges and Priorities for 2011 – 14 – handout (11am – 11:50am) – All
Dr. Serban referred to the handout, a DRAFT for discussion about the Major Overarching Challenges and Priorities for the College 2011 – 14, and she stated that when talking about the new initiatives we need to keep in mind the significant cuts to our budget and think about how we can fund them. We will be applying for more grants (private, state and federal). This points to the need that we need to keep our equipment fund alive and going because there will not be a source of funding other than that.

The members discussed the challenges and priorities listed starting with the 1) Fiscal Reductions the College is facing; 2) Student Learning, Achievement and Development; 3) Outreach, Access and Responsiveness to the Community; 4) Faculty, Staff and Administrators; 5) Governance and Decision Support; 6) Support Services, Technology and Fiscal Management; 7) Facilities, Capital Projects and Maintenance.

6. Agenda for April 8 special planning session (11:50am – 12 pm) Andreea Serban
An additional meeting was proposed for working on the College Plan, April 22nd at 9am – 12noon.

Meeting adjourned.

Next CPC meetings:

Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Friday, April 8, 9am-11am, A218C (A218C meeting) – special mtg. - 2011-14 college plan

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, April 5, 2011
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;	R. Limon, President Student Senate;
I. Alarcon, President, Academic Senate;	K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative, Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;	K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Representative;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;	D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA	J. Sullivan, VP Business Service
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;	
T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative	
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;	

ABSENT:

P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;	C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning	

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;	K. O'Connor, Interim Director, PE;
M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;	L. Stark, President, Instructors' Association;
J. McPheter, Classified Consultation Group	L. Vasquez, IT Committee Chair
J. Meyer, Biology Professor	

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

Information/Announcements

1. Presentations to inform the development of the College Plan 2011-14

Thursday, April 7, Room A211, 2:30 pm- 5:00 pm

Dr. Peter Rupert, Director UCSB Economic Forecast Project 2:30pm-2:55pm
Dr. Glenn Russell, Director Planning and Development, County of Santa Barbara 2:55pm-3:20pm
Steve Cushman, Executive Director, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce 3:20pm-3:45 pm
Paul Casey, Assistant City Manager, City of Santa Barbara 3:45pm-4:10pm
Dr. Davis Hayden, Dir. Research, Evaluation and Technology, SB School District 4:10pm-4:35 pm
Dave Durflinger, City Manager Carpinteria 4:35pm-5:00 pm

Superintendent/President Serban invited everyone to attend these presentations.

2. Draft of criteria to consider for reducing credit course offerings.

Mr. Alarcon reported that the Academic Senate has not discussed the issue of reducing classes yet and it is on the agenda for the next meeting. So far the Academic Senate has not taken a position about reductions this year in the Spring. Some members feel strongly that we need to start right away, some feel very strongly that we should not. Since the classes need to be reduced no matter what, the Senate will start at their next meeting.

Dr. Friedlander stated that at some point, based on what we know now about the budget, we have to cut classes that are not getting funded. This draft handout is to put out an approach that would give everyone the same set of agreements and guidelines to go about cutting sections. We want to preserve, at all costs, courses that are essential for students to have the basic skills preparation, state approved certificates, degrees and/or transfer requirements. He went through the highlights of handout.

Dr. Friedlander shared some of the latest information on what the State is discussing regarding what the Community Colleges can do to save money such as limiting repeatability, putting an upper cap on number of students units a person can accumulate before they have to pay out of state, and looking at changes in who has access to priority registration.

In trying to provide some leadership in terms of coming to consensus on how we are going to do this is very difficult. Academic Senate Member Garey pointed out that we need to be clear on our definition of what is essential.

Dr. Friedlander reported on the record number of transfer oriented students coming to the college in the fall. One of the reasons is because of the declining numbers of seats in classes at the UCs and CSUs who also have a record number of freshmen applicants, and those rejected freshmen applicants are the ones applying to the community colleges. Secondly some of our students who have applied for transfer to the UCs and CSUs who have not been accepted want to stay at SBCC.

The College transfer center is already overwhelmed because these students want to stay engaged in college while they reapply again, plus they want their financial aid, and their health insurance, so they are coming back full time. This new dynamic has impacted our fall registration and mostly likely will not go away for a while. In our course planning for spring going forward, we will need to take those variables into account. Dr. Friedlander stated that we need something agreed upon prior to the summer break because when we come back to school in the fall we start to build the spring class schedule.

Superintendent/President Serban stated, as she passed out the second handout (a work in progress) produced by EVP Friedlander, VP Sullivan, and VP Arellano and herself, that it provides further data showing why it is important to start cutting in spring of 2012. This spreadsheet explains why it will be hard to reduce the \$10.5 million dollars that we have to reduce. The spreadsheets show the 3 scenarios:

Scenario 1) cutting \$10.5 million through cutting only CA resident credit FTES,

Scenario 2) Reduction in revenue through cutting \$9 million in revenue from credit FTES and \$1.5 million from non-credit non-enhanced and

Scenario 3) Reduction in revenue through cutting \$9 million in revenue from credit FTES and \$1.5 million from non-credit non-enhanced and enhanced non-credit FTES.

There was further discussion regarding Scenario 1). Dr. Serban clarified that we cannot cut more than 2300 FTES because then we will receive less revenue. There was further discussion around the challenge of identifying \$5.2 million worth of non-instructional reductions no later than June 2014.

Superintendent/President Serban reported the details of the reductions in classes from Scenario 2) Reduction in revenue through cutting \$9 million in revenue from credit FTES and \$1.5 million from non-credit non enhanced FTES. This scenario will reduce the number of sections that will need to be cut to credit from 766 sections to 657 sections, meaning that 110 more credit sections could be preserved cumulatively. This will mean the cut in credit FTES of about 1,971, 329 less. This is the equivalent of \$9,000,000 and non-credit non-enhanced FTES reduction of 546.45 FTES the equivalent of \$1.5 million in revenue reductions. In terms of direct easy to quantify reductions in expenditures, the number of full time positions would go down from 34 to 28. On the credit side, the simple-to-quantify expenditures would be \$4.5 million and a rough estimate of the total expenditure reductions from non-credit would be about \$960,000 for a cumulative reduction of 5.4 million, with a remaining \$5 million expenditure reduction to identify.

Superintendent/President Serban reported the details of the reductions in classes from Scenario 3) Reduction in revenue through cutting \$9 million in revenue from credit FTES and \$1.5 million from non-credit non-enhanced and enhanced non-credit FTES. This scenario will again preserve 110 more credit sections with a reduction of 657 sections resulting in a \$9 million expenditure reduction. The \$1.5 million reduction is divided between non-credit non-enhanced FTES Reduction and non-credit enhanced FTES reduction of \$750,000 between each.

Dr. Serban pointed out that with either option we clearly need to start reducing sections in Spring 2012; however the difference between scenarios is that 50 more sections for credit for Spring 2012.

Further discussion took place about the seriousness of cutting such a significant number of classes and that we cannot count on eliminating very many classes in Fall. Our Summer and Fall 2011 Schedule is already out, so we will not be cutting from those classes. But we are already late compared to other colleges that have already cut some of their summer classes.

Dr. Serban reiterated how looking at these three scenarios brought the harsher reality into focus: the \$5.2 million non-instructional expenditure reductions. Instructors' Association President Stark thought that maybe if we were able to give ourselves a little time, because the suspension of Proposition 98 is unlikely, and perhaps we would have a better idea of what the actual cut will really be. Ms. Stark stated her concern that by cutting so much, we may never come back. Dr. Serban stated that the actual cut will most likely still be millions of dollars and that it would be unwise to not start to cut at this time. EVP Friedlander stated that we are buying time by not starting until Spring 2012 when we will have a little more clarity with respect to the state budget.

Dr. Serban stated that by laying out the three scenarios, she is looking for feedback and wants to present CPC's recommendation to the Board as it relates to the workload reduction.

There was further discussion regarding the three scenarios, and the non-enhanced courses.

VP Sullivan stated that the college has good reserves, but we do need to be conscious of the fact that the longer we delay and the longer we take to implement the change, the more it will reduce those reserves and limit our options in the future and we do not know how long this is going to last and how much further it is going to go.

There was more discussion on: 1) needing to allow ourselves flexibility without doing permanent damage until we know better what we will be facing, 2) needing to improve our flow through basic skills courses and 3) looking more at cutting classes earlier on in the sequence, as there are too many students flowing through the system and then there is a log jam which is also a state-wide issue.

Superintendent/President Serban said that in the end the college has to be realistic about how many students we can absorb when revenues have been cut to this point, we would like to serve all students who apply. The postponing syndrome mentality, really denies the huge number, \$5.2 million, of cuts to find somewhere. Dr. Serban stated that this is the time where the really responsible action is what we need to do in order to provide the commendation to ensure the fiscal stability of the college. Dr. Serban said that we need to have the draft of the tentative budget by the beginning of May.

Discussion

3. Budget development for 2011-12 and preparing for 2012-13 and 2013-14 – continued from March 18, 2011 CPC meeting – please bring materials provided at the March 18 and March 22, 2011 CPC meetings
 - a. Preliminary recommendations to and questions for the Board of Trustees from the Superintendent/President and Executive Committee – discussed with the Board of Trustees at the February 16, February 23 and March 10 study sessions
4. Continuing Education FTES that cannot be claimed for apportionment (handout)
5. Update on status of program review resource requests; and routine and non-routine equipment requests – Next steps

Discussion/Action

6. Budgeting for the 4000 and 5000 accounts
Superintendent Serban said that she wanted to vote on budgeting for the 4000 and 5000 accounts at the April 22 meeting. President Student Senate, Limon stated that the Student Senate voted for the way that these accounts have been budgeted in the past as they see that as the best for the college. Ms. Auchincloss stated that the Classified Consultation group has the same recommendation.

Further discussion took place about alternative ways to budget these two accounts and whether we will we use the savings from the 4000/5000 accounts help in reducing expenditures in non-instructional costs. There was further discussion about cutting the hourly workers budget and instituting a hiring freeze. Dr. Serban is opposed to a blanket hiring freeze, as each open position has been looked at thoroughly, what impact it would have on the particular department and how it would affect direct support to students. Dr. Friedlander talked about identifying programs the college needs to preserve and focusing on what we are excellent in and maintain that excellence.

Academic Senate, Planning & Resources Committee Monda stated that the college community is pulling together to save more money by making all the sacrifices we can, but we have to be careful to do it in a way that allows us to feel like we are working together as opposed to losing programs. Ms. O'Connor spoke about how important it is to get this message out the faculty, staff and students.

CSEA President/Chair Classified Consultation Auchincloss acknowledged SBCC Controller Leslie Griffin for the excellent job she did of presenting the budget material to the classified staff.

Superintendent/President Serban reminded the members to be ready to vote on April 22. We will start looking at how to deal with the cutting in \$5.2 non-instructional areas. Dr. Serban asked that CPC members email her any suggestions, she adjourned the meeting

Next CPC meetings: Friday, April 8, 9:15 am-11am A218C – special meeting preparation for developing the 2011-14 college plan
Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C
Friday, April 22, 9:00 am-12pm A218C – special meeting preparation for developing the 2011-14 college plan
Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C
Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Friday, April 8, 2011
9:00 am – 11:00 am
A218
Minutes

Special session – preparation for the development of the College Plan 2011-14

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;
I. Alarcón, President, Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research
and Planning

J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;
R. Limon, President Student Senate;
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative,
Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect

ABSENT:

T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative;
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;
C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative;

J. Sullivan, VP Business Service

GUESTS:

M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;

Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Overview of today's session: approach, desired outcomes (9am – 9:10am)
This agenda has been carried over from March 25th.
2. Review and discussion of Year Two Evaluation of College Plan 2008-11
handout (9:10am – 10:20am)
Dr. Serban pointed out the three documents about Continuing Education that were
requested at the last CPC Meeting.

VP Continuing Education Arellano explained the spread sheet *FTES No Longer Eligible for State Funding by Category*. There was a request to understand as to why there may be some reductions in FTES reported for 2010-11. Dr. Arellano explained how she set up the spread sheet, and went through them one by one, enhanced and non-enhanced classes, explaining in more specific detail the comments from the spreadsheet. Dr. Arellano stated that FTES has been added in other areas, so this is not a straight loss of FTES.

Dr. Arellano explained the second spreadsheet handout that came from a request for a comparison of Summer of 2009 and Summer 2010. For Summer 2011, she and her staff are producing a similar schedule to 2010 where they will not be scheduling non-enhanced courses. Also there will be fee-based courses offered. There was a question in terms of

understanding the total number of sections that were not scheduled. There was further discussion about the use of nomenclature to differentiate between non-credit and credit because they do not mean the same thing: sections vs. hours.

Dr. Arellano said that they are doing a major compliance review in Continuing Ed that these hours may change because we are re-submitting over 600 course modifications.

Dr. Arellano explained the third handout entitled *The Importance of Maintaining Enhanced Funded Certificate/Diploma Programs During Challenging Fiscal Times*. Dr. Arellano pointed out the background which came from Senate Bill 361 Noncredit Enhanced Funding. She pointed out why these are so critical; they must lead to improved employability or job placement opportunities or certificate of competency in a recognized career field, articulation with college-level coursework, completion of an associate of arts degree or transfer to a four-year program. There is an aim to transitioning the non-credit students to becoming credit students. She pointed out that she listed all the approved certificates.

Dr. Arellano reported on the results of the Continuing Ed Goal that was in the College Plan for 2008 -11 which was to establish specific goals and objectives to increase the number of high school diplomas, GED and the vocational certificate. Some of the courses have advisory committees composed of several Santa Barbara Employers, whose input is valuable in terms of hiring.

Last week they received approval for the modified older adult courses, we continue to receive reminders of the State priorities from the Chancellors Office. There was further discussion and clarification of the costs of community service classes and the extra hidden costs, such as advertising and marketing, schedule of classes and operational costs. The Ed Code says that these classes have to be self-supporting and at the moment only the direct costs are covered.

Dr. Arellano and Mr. Else are working on ways that they can track how many students transfer from noncredit to credit.

VP, IT Bishop gave a run through of the District Technology Plan. The handout is done by goals and objectives within the plan, it is modeled after the College Plan. The goals are really the College Plan Goals 1 through 6 and the objectives and a brief update as to where we are. Some of those accomplished goals are: wireless set up has been completed across all areas with multiple access points even in the Luria Press Box, e-books in Bookstore and Library, increase use of campus debit card, increased online forms, provide online support services equivalent to those on campus – this is a big goal but it is being looked and, an in-house training plan has been implemented. Dr. Bishop said that the Banner implementation is almost at an end and they are under budget.

Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning Else gave a quick update from his area, reporting that they have explored the use of Argos for some advanced reporting capabilities that are more like what we used to have in the decision support system that Dr. Serban had in place before Banner. He explained how this works and how important it is. As part of the Title V initiative, especially in the early years of that, picking the right tools, doing the right kind of analysis and talking with users is an early part of the grant.

There was discussion regarding the success of the college's program review resource request and the need to continue to keep funding it where some colleges are afraid to use it, online assessment testing viability and the problems with assessment testing, inserting objectives regarding assessment into our objectives, register from ipad and smartphones within a year, and ideas for creating more money for renting wireless space in the library conference rooms in conjunction with local hotels.

3. Highlights from the Credit Student Profiles – handout (10:20 am – 10:40 am) Robert Else
Mr. Else reported the Fall headcount; we had the first slight drop in Fall 2010 after 11 consecutive years of going up, this is the first time we dipped down a little bit. Dr. Serban said the drop was done on purpose. Mr. Else pointed out an interesting trend: many more online students but the ones that are fully on line just dropped a little bit from last Fall. Executive VP Friedlander stated that it was because of dropping the HIT program. He said that the number of full-time students is increasing a little bit, we are up to almost 40%. Dr. Friedlander said that his prediction, going forward in the next couple of years we will see that number go up to the degree that we can accommodate them because of what is happening with the CSUs and UCs turning away more students and the cost. He stated that another thing that is happening is our transfer center is overwhelmed already because students are getting rejection notices from CSU and UCs. Because of this the students want to stay at SBCC and attempt to enroll in another school or try again at the UCs and CSUs. Dr. Friedlander said that in our transfer effectiveness plan and Title V grant that we are writing, it is expanding those opportunities but also one of the recommendations that will come out is setting up a scholarship center, so students can start looking up ways to help fund to go to state or out of state colleges. This adds a whole new degree of complexity to transfer advising now.

Mr. Else said we are almost 30% over on Hispanic students. There was a discussion on ethnicity data collecting.

Mr. Else said that we are now seeing an increase in students setting their goal of getting a degree and the same with a goal of transferring.

4. Highlights from the Economic Impact Study done for us by the UCSB Economic Forecast Project – handout (10:40 am – 11 am) Robert Else

There was a discussion regarding the presentations to inform the development of the College Plan 2011-14 that took place April 7th with Dr. Peter Rupert, Director UCSB Economic Forecast Project; Dr. Glenn Russell, Director Planning and Development, County of Santa Barbara; Steve Cushman, Executive Director, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce; Paul Casey, Assistant City Manager, City of Santa Barbara and Dr. Davis Hayden, Director Research, Evaluation and Technology, Santa Barbara School District.

Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning Else gave a quick update of the presentations given on April 7th. Mr. Else first pointed out one unexpected piece of information. The background to this is that the conventional wisdom has that our local high school (our feeder schools) enrollment is shrinking. Dr. Hayden predicted that enrollment might drop by 50 students or so a year for the next couple of years, but he expects enrollments to go back within three years. Mr. Else said that is not even 800 students from grade 7 to 12. Dr. Serban stated that in the Fall after graduating we usually get 25% of that

and within two years 65% enroll in SBCC. No one is really sure why after two years. There was a discussion around why this happens.

Mr. Else stated that the report SBCC commissioned from Dr. Peter Rupert, economist from UCSB, probably the biggest surprise that came out of this report was that their model, given the data that we gave them from all of our capital and operational expenditure and payroll and how much students pay and all the numbers we gave them. They put those numbers into their model, turned the crank and reported: the multiplier effect on the local economy for every dollar that we spend for all of the above is about \$1.5. What that means is that for every dollar we spend that generates an additional .55 cents in the local county economy, most of that in South County.

Dr. Serban said she was surprised about the data relating to Faculty and Staff who commute to work because it was lower than she thought. She stated that the reason this is an important finding is because in the last two plans we had goals and objectives about increasing help for commuters and it turns out that not that many commute. We should maintain what we have because we know it is being used. We have four vans: 1 for Lompoc, 2 for Ventura, 1 from Ojai. There was further discussion about commuting. On commuters, there are 86% are in SB County and 14% in Ventura County. We have this data, so we will do our own research.

5. Assumptions, Challenges and Priorities for 2011 – 14 – handout (11am – 11:50am) – All Dr. Serban said that in planning for the next three years, we need to think about our assumptions will be of what the next three years will look like. That needs to drive the goals and objectives that we have. There was further discussion about framing the college plan, the budget, and who gets served and gets served under the worst case budget scenario. Dr. Serban stated that this is important and part of our assumptions for the College Plan, under the section on the first section, defining some prioritization. Dr. Serban said that she fully supports the new proposed priority registration that is being discussed now.

Dr. Friedlander spoke about tying in the electronic Ed Plan into some kind of mechanism that would link to the registration process. This could be in the challenges and objectives. Dr. Serban shared her thought that when they want to register to have a sort of message pop up prompting them which classes they should sign up for according to their customized Ed Plan. Then those who adhere to their Ed Plan would be given priority registration and then we would be able to schedule much more effectively and serve more students more effectively. There was further discussion on the pros and cons of this idea as well as how the budget cuts and scarcity in classes are changing the student culture. The changes that are taking place need to be communicated.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next CPC meetings:

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Friday, April 22, 2011, 9:00am – 12pm A218C

Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;	T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative
I. Alarcón, President, Academic Senate;	M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;	R. Limon, President Student Senate;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;	K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative, Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;	K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Representative;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA;	D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect;
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning;	J. Sullivan, VP Business Service
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;	

ABSENT:

C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;	K. O'Connor, Interim Director, PE;
M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;	A. Scharper, Dean, Ed Programs;
L. Griffin, SBCC Controller;	L. Stark, President, Instructors' Association;
J. Meyer, Biology Professor	L. Vasquez, IT Committee Chair

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

Information/Announcements

1. Grant applications under development – Jack Friedlander
Executive VP Friedlander gave an update on the current eight grant proposals. Dr. Friedlander stated that the first three concept papers were submitted through the Santa Barbara Foundation and one concept paper through the Hutton Foundation basically asking for additional support for the Express to Success Program (ESP) and for ESP degree transfer program development.
Two proposals are Title V grants that focus on specifically increasing the number of low income Hispanic students in particular who get degrees in Science and Engineering, and Math. These are 5-year grants, worth several million dollars. Academic Senate President Alarcón will be the project director for these two Title V grants. SBCC is partnering with CSUCI, who is running the grant. This partnership will provide a lot of benefit to our students who will learn of the various opportunities available to them. There are two FIPSE grants that have been submitted: 1) to more fully develop and implement our Eco-Entrepreneurship Program and 2) to develop and implement the ESP: Degree/Transfer initiative. The last grant is the Department of Labor's Trade Adjustment Assistance/Training Grant competition: the title of our proposal is "Going Global: International Logistics and Supply Chain Management Training Program".

There was further discussion on the details of the grants. Dr. Serban reminded the members that they had spoken before about no longer hiring for full time positions that will

be paid by grant money. It does not matter what the subject of the grant is we are not creating permanent positions anymore. Individuals will be paid as hourlies or as consultants or we will reassign time for our own faculty. We will not add positions that we then have to absorb once the grant is over.

Superintendent/President acknowledged Dr. Friedlander, the Deans, the faculty and staff for the significant amount of work going into these grants. It is a new record for us to have this many grants going out at the same time.

Discussion

2. Report from the Academic Senate – Ignacio Alarcón

Academic Senate President Alarcón reported from the last Senate meeting the several action items: 1) the reaffirmation of support for the Partnership for Student Success funding. Also it would be beneficial to have this funding and to have it visible in one single spot in the budget instead of the different centers where it is; 2) Recommendations for Budget 2011 – 12, the scenario that got consensus was Scenario 5. The only difference was there was a divided vote about when to start, Spring 2012 or Fall 2012. There was a motion not to start reductions until the Fall but that was defeated. 3) The other items that had the Academic Senate consensus were:

- maintaining center status for the Schott and Wake Centers, possibly through a combination of credit and non-credit
- maintaining the commitment to employment of all regular employees
- avoiding borrowing and maintain minimum fund balance of 5% contingency, cost of TLU liability, and the estimated deferrals of about \$13 million
- Transfers to the construction fund of a minimum of \$2 million and to the equipment fund of \$1.5 million.
- Bottom line starting in the Spring with modest reductions that were proposed.

3. Report from Classified Consultation Group – Liz Auchincloss

President, CSEA Auchincloss reported that the Classified Staff had consensus after much discussion at their budget forum and afterwards. The consensus is that the least amount of cuts should be made, starting with the Spring 2012 semester, as after that it would be detrimental to the college. They were all in agreement, of course, with not laying off permanent staff.

Dr. Serban reported that she was invited by Student Senate President Limon to speak at the Student Senate Meeting where she described the six scenarios. The Student Senate will take a formal vote this coming Friday.

4. Budget development for 2011-12 and preparing for 2012-13 and 2013-14 – continued from March 18, 2011 CPC meeting – please bring materials provided at the March 18 and March 22, 2011 CPC meetings - Preliminary recommendations to and questions for the Board of Trustees from the Superintendent/President and Executive Committee – discussed with the Board of Trustees at the February 16, February 23 and March 10 study sessions (Attachment 1)

Dr. Serban stated that at this point instead of following the agenda she wanted to look at the logic of certain things.

Dr. Serban referred to the handout, the “Plan for Ongoing Reduction in Expenditures 2011 – 12”. She explained in detail how the reductions will be implemented using Scenario 5, if there is to be a \$6.8 million permanent reduction in revenue and using Scenario 2, should there be a \$10.5 million permanent reduction in revenue.

Dr. Serban pointed out that regardless of the reduction, a \$6.8 million reduction or a \$10.5 million reduction, the \$2 million first year (2011 – 12) reduction target was the same for both cases.

Dr. Serban then went through the 2013-14 Scenario 5 plan, the \$6.8 million permanent reduction in expenditures. She explained in detail and pointed out just exactly how the college will arrive at reducing expenditures by 2013-14. Dr. Serban stated the proposal is to reduce \$500,000 in hourly expenditures. Hourly is the nomenclature which includes: short term hourly workers, student workers and overtime paid to classified staff. The reduction in the 4000 and 5000 is \$993,000.

Dr. Serban explained in further detail what this all means and referred to a hand-out “Expenditure Balances in Hourlies in unrestricted and restricted funds”. She pointed out how the areas would be cut then referred them to 2011-12 Expenditure reductions in hourlies and 4000/5000s accounts which showed how these areas would be cut. She said that the important point is to go back to look at what was spent. If you look at what was spent, then look at what is left after applying these reductions, it is actually still significantly over what was spent.

Dr. Serban explained in detail her reasoning for this which bottom line ends up adjusting down the budget and lessens what goes into ending balances.

Dr. Serban reported on the next spreadsheet representing the details of the reductions of expenditures phased over three years starting in 2011-12 as related to Scenario 2, the \$10.5 million permanent reduction in revenue. With the \$10.5 model there are more reductions in sections up front. The main difference in 2011-12 between \$6.8 model and \$10.5 model is that the \$6.8 model *operations* takes a harder hit up front rather than *instruction*. That is just the first year of reductions, but bottom line over time we still need to get to that higher amount, whichever one it will be.

5. Assumptions for budget development 2011-12 (handout)

Dr. Serban stated that this handout, “Assumptions for Projections 4/19/2011”, is a much more refined work on projections as it shows the impact on ending balances, because we are now including in 2011-12 what we expect to be increases (such as health benefits and PERS etc.) that we already know about, as there will be more that we do not know about. Scenario 1 has been dropped, because it is no longer an option.

After going through the details of this spreadsheet, Dr. Serban stated that the summary she is drawing from this, as she looks at the numbers, is that it is her strong conviction right now is that it is imperative to start reductions in 2011-12 and it is imperative to reach the \$2 million reduction and if you put that phase implementation that we talked about and even with that we don’t maintain enough reserves.

Dr. Serban stated that the discussions about the Assumptions for 2011-12 will be postponed, because it is time to vote on items 10 – 18.

- 6. Projections of impact on ending balances and reserves (handout)
- 7. Updated cash flow for 2010-11 (Attachment 3)
- 8. Update on status of program review resource requests; and routine and non-routine equipment requests
- 9. Updated timeline for development of college plan 2011-14 (handout)

Discussion/Action

Dr. Serban stated that the following items 10 through 18 have been discussed many times and initiated voting on the items.

10. Implement the ongoing cut to base funding in a three-year phased approach as follows:

	2011-12	2012-2013	2013-14
If cut is \$6.8 million	\$ 2 million	\$ 2 million (\$4 million cumulative)	\$ 2.8 million (\$6.8 million cumulative)

M/S [Sullivan/Alarcón] to implement item 10 as it is stated here with a phased-in approach beginning in 2011-12.

Discussion:

After discussion, Academic Senate Representative Monda stated that she is not ready to vote on the \$10.5 cuts. The motion was modified to include each cut separately.

M/S [Sullivan/Alarcón] to implement the ongoing cut of \$6.8 million in reductions, with a target of \$2 million in reductions starting in 2011-12, \$2 million in reductions in 2012-13 and \$2.5 million in 2013-14.

Yes: 12; No: 1; Abstain: 0

	2011-12	2012-2013	2013-14
If cut is \$10.5 million	\$ 2 million	\$ 4 million (\$6 million cumulative)	\$ 4.5 million (\$10.5 million cumulative)

M/S [Friedlander/Alarcón] to implement the ongoing cut of \$10.5 million in reductions, with a target of \$2 million in reductions starting in 2011-12 and with a provision that each year going forward, CPC revisit the State revenue.

Yes: 12 ; No: 1 ; Abstain: 0

11. Budgeting for the 4000 and 5000 accounts.

Dr. Serban stated that this will be discussed further at the next meeting, Friday, April 22nd.

She stated that she wanted to have a sense whether there is support for these targets as outlined with the cuts in hourlies, and the 4000 and 5000. This is fundamental in building the 11/12 tentative budget so that is an important conversation and by then you will have time to read the draft.

12. Scenarios for reducing expenditures over three-years (Attachment 2)

M/S [Alarcón/Friedlander] to implement Scenario 5 if we are faced with reductions of \$6.8 million.

Yes: 10; No: 2; Abstain: 1

M/S [Alarcón/Sullivan] to implement Scenario 2 if we are faced with reductions of \$10.5 million.

Discussion: There was clarification that for planning purposes, CPC needs to commit to a broad conceptual framework by voting on these different scenarios for each reduction amount. There was further discussion about cutting sections and how difficult that will be if we have to cut 650 sections rather than 440, and in terms of operations, there is the need to look at all of our services and what we can do without, and the importance of reduction in expenditures by cutting sections by Spring 2012 and start to plan for cutting operating costs as soon as possible.

Yes: 9 No: 3 Abstain: 0

13. Maintain center status (minimum 1,000 FTES per center) for Schott and Wake through a combination of non-credit and credit FTES

M/S [Nevins/Alarcón] to maintain center status (minimum 1,000 FTES per center) for Schott and Wake through a combination of non-credit and credit FTES.

Yes: 13 No: 0 Abstain: 0

14. Maintain the commitment that all regular employees of the college will be employed – no layoffs of regular employees due to budget reductions

M/S [Nevins/Bishop] to maintain the commitment that all regular *current* employees of the college will be employed – no layoffs of regular employees due to budget reductions.

Discussion:

The discussion about a hiring freeze versus not automatically replacing any position took place, meaning that each open position will be reviewed in terms of the needs of that department. CSEA President Auchincloss asked if this means that there will be no layoffs of current positions. *Current* was added to the motion that passed. Not added to the motion, but understood was that not every vacancy will necessarily be replaced and we will not put hourlies in those positions.

Dr. Serban stated that she wanted to be clear that in order for us to make this happen, we need to take the measures previously outlined to make the reductions that will keep us solvent to keep everyone employed.

Yes: 11 No: 1 Abstain: 1

15. For 2011-12, maintain the same total additional support for categorical programs (EOPS, DSPS, matriculation) from the general fund as in 2010-11 \$825,173

M/S [Friedlander/Nevins] that for the year, 2011-12, maintain the same total additional support for categorical programs (EOPS, DSPS, matriculation) from the general fund as in 2010-11 \$825,173.

Yes: 11 No: 1 Abstain: 1

Discussion:

VP Sullivan stated that he thought categorical were being treated better than everyone else. Dr. Serban said this commitment is for 2011 – 12 only, and we will revisit as we build the 2012 – 13 budget. If we cut enrollments, their needs not be the same. CSEA President Auchincloss asked if those in categorical funding will have their hourlies staying the same. Dr. Serban said that each VP will deal with their targets internally

16. Continue effective and prudent fiscal management to ensure that the college does not need to borrow

M/S [Nevins/Guillen] to continue effective and prudent fiscal management to ensure that the college does not need to borrow.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Yes: 11 No: 1 Abstain: 1

17. Maintain a cash fund balance equal to 5% + cost of TLU liability + annual deferrals paid into the next fiscal year. This is the minimum level of cash needed to ensure that we meet cash flow needs throughout the year without the need to borrow. Minimum cash reserve of \$19 million

M/S [Alarcón/Nevins] to maintain a ~~cash~~ fund balance equal to 5% + cost of TLU liability + annual deferrals paid into the next fiscal year. This is the minimum level of cash needed to ensure that we meet cash flow needs throughout the year without the need to borrow. Minimum cash reserve of \$19 million.

Discussion:

Academic Senate President Alarcón made the motion stating that this item read as “fund balance” rather than “cash fund balance” as there is a significant difference. Dean seconded the motion, there was a short discussion about the change.

Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 2

18. Transfer at least \$ 2 million/year into the construction fund and \$1.5 million/year into the equipment fund.

M/S [Monda/Neufeld] to transfer at least \$2 million in 2011-12 into the construction fund and \$1.5 million in 2011 – 12 into the equipment fund.

Discussion: Academic Senate Representative Monda reported on the faculty budget forum. Further discussion about the fact that the district would not start a project without adequate funding for a project, the flexibility to make funding decisions to augment the construction fund as needed, the fact that we need to make certain commitments and make an effort towards them no matter what the budget will be in the future, revisiting where we are in terms of Measure V funds, the \$ 2 million and \$1.5 million transfer will come off the top of next year's revenue because it would be in the budget.

Yes: 13; No: 0 Abstain: 0

Dr. Serban suggested that the next two meetings end at 5pm instead of 4:30pm. Everyone was in agreement. The meeting was then adjourned.

Next CPC meetings:

Friday, April 22, 9:00 am-12pm A218C – special meeting preparation for developing the 2011-14 college plan
Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C
Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C
Suggest to extend these last two meetings until 5pm.



CSU Channel Islands, SBCC Partnership Brings New Degree Programs to Santa Barbara

Students can earn bachelor's degrees in psychology and early childhood education, as well as an MBA

CSU Channel Islands and Santa Barbara City College have partnered to offer students in the Santa Barbara area three new bachelor's degree programs — one leading to an MBA.

The two institutions will formally kick off their expanded partnership with a news conference featuring students, faculty and administrators at 1 p.m. Monday, June 18 in the Luria Conference and Press Center on the SBCC campus.

Beginning this fall, students will be able to work toward a CI bachelor of arts in psychology on the SBCC campus. In fall 2013, the campus will also offer a bachelor of arts in early childhood education and a bachelor-of-science-to-MBA program in which students can obtain a bachelor's degree in business and an MBA in as few as 3½ years. A dedicated office space, where CI advisers and faculty will meet with current and prospective students, is now open.

The three new degrees expand on existing opportunities for students in the Santa Barbara area to obtain a CSU degree without the need to commute, relocate or enroll in an online program. CI has offered a bachelor of science in business at SBCC and an MBA in Goleta since fall 2011. It recently expanded its nursing program to Goleta in a partnership with Cottage Health System.

"We at CI have an institutional commitment to serve the citizens of the Santa Barbara region and are building academic programs and an infrastructure

to do so for years to come,” said Dr. Gary Berg, associate vice president for Academic Affairs, Extended University/International Programs. “By holding CI bachelor’s completion programs on the SBCC campus, we are reaching SBCC graduates who would not ordinarily be able to attend CI.”

“In these challenging economic times, institutions must work together to ensure that students in our respective communities have the best and most affordable access to higher education,” said Dr. Jack Friedlander, acting president/superintendent at SBCC. “Providing these programs on our campus will enable a large number of people in the Santa Barbara region to pursue a bachelor’s degree and/or MBA from a CSU campus. If these programs are successful, we will identify additional CI bachelor’s degree programs on our campus.”

The programs in psychology, early childhood education and bachelor-of-science.-to-MBA were selected based on high demand from SBCC students. About 25 to 30 students would be accepted into each program annually. Courses are taught by CI faculty and are scheduled primarily on Saturdays, with some optional course work on Friday evenings.

SBCC and CI also are collaborating on a federal grant to offer accelerated programs for SBCC students majoring in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) to transfer seamlessly to CI and complete their four-year degrees. [Click here for more information.](#)

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
ASSUMPTIONS USED TO DEVELOP THE 2012-13 TENTATIVE BUDGET
Board of Trustees Study Session June 14, 2012

The budget revenue assumptions are from the governor's May Revise published on the Community College League of California website on May 18, 2012. The revenue assumption for the state includes the passing of tax legislation in the November 2012 election. This is Scenario A "Governor's Budget and Tax Package" and Scenario B "Governor's Budget with Failure of Tax Package".

If the voters do not approve the temporary taxes, the budget would likely change as follows:

- *The \$380,000 in new money for the mandates block grant would be cut.*
- *An additional unspecified base cut of \$4.0 million, resulting in a 6.4% workload reduction.*

Summary of estimated 2011-12 cuts for Santa Barbara CCD

Enacted Budget Cut:	\$-4,261,000
January "Triggered" Budget Cut:	\$-1,381,000
February Budget Cut:	-\$1,993,000
Total 2011-12 Est. Budget Cut:	\$-7,635,000

The potential \$4.0 million workload reduction that could take place after the November 2012 general election is the greatest unknown and the most difficult to budget for. An estimate of the total budget reductions for the college includes all of the above. The original estimate for budget cuts was \$4.2 million in support services and \$2 million in instructional expenditures. Due to the change in recording of plus hours the revised estimate is approximately \$5.6 million, all of which must come from college operational and support services. Approximately \$2.45 million is included in the tentative budget for 2012-13. This leaves approximately \$3.15 million that needs to be reduced to fund the deficit from 2011-12. If the workload reduction from the governor's tax increase measure not being passed is included, the total amount of expenses that would need to be reduced to achieve a balanced budget in 2013-14 is over \$7 million. The revenue assumption below does include the potential \$4.0 million workload reduction and assumes a \$1 million deficit factor.

REVENUE

1. Any reduction in state apportionment revenues for 2012-13 will result in a "workload" reduction applied to the unrestricted General Fund. Workload reduction means a reduction in the number of full-time equivalent students funded by the state.
 - ✚ **The 4.0 million workload reduction will be applied to non-credit non-enhanced then to credit.**
 - ✚ **None of the risk from the redevelopment funds is included in the tentative budget beyond the deficit factor.**

2. For the 2012-13 budget non-credit non-enhanced (NCNE) FTES will be reduced by converting all class sections, except the Parent Child Workshop (PCW), from free (state-supported) to fee-based. The estimate for revenues from the courses converted to fee based is included in the tentative budget. Of the NCNE courses converted to fee based the assumption is that 50% will have the required enrollment to take place. The revenue and expense will be tracked in the general fund.
3. Part-time faculty compensation was \$333,456 for 2011-12 and is projected to remain at the same level in 2012-13.
4. The enrollment fee is increasing from \$36 to \$46 per unit effective July 2012. This is reflected in the reduction to state allocation and does not increase revenues.
5. There is no system-wide growth funded and is not budgeted.
6. It is assumed there is a \$1 million deficit factor to cover the shortfall of property taxes, RDA transfer payments and student fees collected.
7. Nonresident student enrollments from international and out-of-state students are based on 2011-12 actual. The out-of-state and international tuition increase from \$210 to \$212/unit is effective starting Fall 2012. International FTES is capped at 8% of total FTES.
8. Interest revenue is conservatively estimated based on declining interest rates and earning cash balances.
9. Lottery revenue is assumed to remain flat.

EXPENSE

1. \$2.3 million in budget reductions were identified by the budget managers and incorporated in the tentative budget.
2. The over cap FTES will be addressed by converting non-credit non-enhanced (NCNE) courses to fee based. Additional workload reductions will be applied to credit and NCNE as required.
3. Of the NCNE courses converted to fee based the assumption is that 50% will have the required enrollment to take place. The instructional costs of courses that do not have sufficient enrollment are subtracted from the general fund. All CE administrative costs are assumed to continue in the tentative budget.
4. Base salaries and wages are budgeted for the year at pay rates that were effective January 1, 2008 except for longevity, step and column increases. The Budget assumes the following:
 - a. The reduction in full time faculty positions is based on the workload reductions and will be listed by organization. The current assumption has 1 additional faculty position from retirement not replaced, resulting in savings of approximately \$50,000.
 - b. There will be a "Best Estimate" based on vacancy savings for academic and classified salaries as based on the prior year for the tentative budget.
 - c.
5. The severance expense for the former president/superintendent is a one-time expense for 2011-12 and will not reoccur in 2012-13. Some of this was moved into other expense categories in the President's cost center resulting in a net reduction of \$???.
6. The State Unemployment Contribution Rate will decrease effective July 2012 from 1.61% to 1.10%. The impact on the Unrestricted General Fund is a decrease of approximately \$259,400.
7. Employer contributions toward health benefits will not increase.

8. The increase for fixed and mandated expenses is based on actual or trends. Fixed and mandated expenses consist of increases in maintenance agreements, utilities, postage, rent etc. The projected net increase is \$103,942. This will be finalized in the adopted budget.
9. Workers compensation insurance has increased statewide. The projection is the current rate of 1.58% and it is increasing by an estimated 1% to 9%, 5% will be used to estimate the expense increase of approximately \$58,000. This will be finalized in the adopted budget.
10. Sabbaticals are not budgeted.
11. The CalPERS Board recommended an increase to the employer contribution rate from 10.923% to 12.123% estimated rate, which will result in an additional cost of approximately \$187,400 for general fund. Other funds will also be affected
12. Program and program support for Oracle was increased \$238,610.04, retroactively resulting in payments of \$47,772 per year for 5 years. This is recorded in the fixed cost changes, offset by any increase or reduction in software licenses (e.g. the dropping of GroupWise).
13. Reduction in short term or substitute employees (hourly) is 50% for wages and related benefits. This will be in the tentative budget as a pro-rata distribution reducing the budget from 2010-11 after the reductions from the template (\$2.3 million) were applied. Adjustments can be made for the adopted budget to transfer funds within the VP's area.

TRANSFERS

These are the transfer of funds to and from the General Fund Ending Balances.

1. To offset the state cuts in categorical programs (EOPS, DSPS, matriculation), there is \$825,173 contributed from the General fund in 2011-12. The adopted budget will reflect a reduction of at least 50% of the backfill. The balance of the backfill will be eliminated in 2013-14.
2. Transfer to the Children's Center Fund is \$295,000 for 2011-12. This will be reduced to \$49,000 in the 2012-13 tentative budget with the balance eliminated in 2013-14.
3. Transfer to the Construction Fund for ongoing campus maintenance of \$2.0 million. **The transfer will be made at year-end to conserve cash flow within the unrestricted general fund through the year.**
4. Transfer to the Construction Fund for loan payments to the California Energy Commission for the photovoltaic system loan was \$191,846 for 2012-13 and will continue for the life of the loan.
5. Transfer to the Equipment Fund is \$1.5 million for equipment replacement and \$155,000 for copier replacement. **The transfer will be made at year-end to conserve cash flow within the unrestricted general fund through the year.**
6. The transfers in to the GF consist of the Administrative portion of the "I Can Afford College" State Financial Aid Media campaign grant of approximately \$80,000 in the tentative budget. This is a pass through of funds that the College manages for the chancellor's office.
7. The transfer from the construction fund of \$41,000 for Kaplan Instruction Center custodial is covered by the lease payments from Kaplan.

FUTURE ACTIONS for the ADOPTED BUDGET

1. The implementation of the reductions identified in the spreadsheets will occur in the 2012-13 fiscal year as labor contracts and agreements and procedures for program reduction allow.
2. If programs are reduced resulting in layoff notices for classified and faculty. The latest the faculty notices can be given is March 15, 2013 to be effective July 1, 2013. Enrollments must be stopped effective for fall, no new students can be enrolled into the programs that are to be reduced, or the deadline will be extended another year. This is based on the requirement that the college provide a reasonable opportunity for the students to complete the program.
3. There will be a reduction in credit course sections for summer 2012 and fall 2012 and/or spring 2013. This will be reflected in the adopted budget.
4. NCNE FTES will be reduced by converting all class sections, except the Parent Child Workshop (PCW), from free (state-supported) to fee-based. This will result in about \$1.4 million in reduction for administrative expenditures. This will be reflected in the adopted budget.
5. The revised rate for PERS is 11.417% and will be adjusted in the adopted budget.
6. CPC recommended to the president that only 80% of NCNE be converted to fee based.

Faculty Vacancies by Year

ORG	Department	HOLD 2011/12	HOLD 2012/13
1600	Bio Sci (BioMed)		
1630	Chemistry		
0206	Accounting		
0606	Art (Drawing)		
0606	Art (Painting/Design)		
0848	HIT/CIM	HOLD	
0636	Theatre Arts		
1806	Amer Ethnic Studies	HOLD	
4012	DSPS		
1648	Earth & Planetary Sci		
1600	Bio Sci (Botany)		HOLD
1842	Psychology	HOLD	HOLD
1830	Philosophy		HOLD
0230	COMAP	HOLD	HOLD
0406/0412	English Skills	HOLD	HOLD
0236	School of Culinary Arts	HOLD	HOLD
0818	Assoc Degree Nursing	HOLD	HOLD
0406	English Comp	HOLD	HOLD
0830	Cosmetology	HOLD	HOLD
0224	Computer Info Systems		HOLD
	Number of Holds	9	10

POTENTIAL ITEMS IN THE COLLEGE BUDGET WHERE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS
IN EXPENSES COULD BE MADE

Targeted amount to be reduced by 2012-13 \$ million.

1. Conduct analysis of proposals for increasing revenues.
 - a. Increase out-of-state students.
 - b. Increase international students.
 - c. Increase Food Services revenues.
 - d. Increase revenue from renting campus facilities.
 - e. Increase student parking fee from \$30 to \$40.
 - f. Charge parking fee at CE Centers.
 - g. Charge parking fee for faculty/ staff at main campus.
 - h. Short term rentals to summer programs.
 - i. Go-Print campus wide.
 - j. Charge for student materials when possible.

2. Small, relatively easy, actions to cut costs.
 - a. Warn department and units when exceeding budgets and then freeze budgets.
 - b. Offer voluntary contract reduction for full-time staff (12 months to 11 or 10) where feasible. (must be negotiated/can't backfill with hourly)
 - c. Re-examine marketing (cost of printing schedule of classes for credit and non-credit; number of catalogs)
 - d. When adding additional sections, add sections students need that also yield a high WSCH/FTES ratio.
 - e. Review all software contracts to determine if they are still worth their annual fees.
 - f. Computers on campus:
 - i. Remove some computers from the replacement cycle. Have a pool of computers for just-in-time replacements.
 - ii. Replace computers with thin clients where possible, especially in labs.

3. Reorganizing for efficiency (cost savings)—may require giving up work we are used to getting done.
 - a. Institute a hiring freeze. Focus on internal moves when possible for administrative, management, and staff positions. Identify work we can do without as vacancies provide opportunities for examination of potentially wasteful, or at least less essential, work we currently do.
 - b. Examine need for current number of administrators and staff.
 - c. Analyze ways to reduce costs through shared administration and space for tutoring services.
 - d. Reduce short-term classified and student hourly workers: Each VP will conduct an analysis of reducing short-term hourly hours in their respective areas. Using 2010-11 as the baseline year (\$650K)
 - e. Consolidate computer labs. (There are over 25 labs.)
 - f. Examine areas of duplication between CE and credit.
 - g. Assess all ongoing non-teaching stipends.

4. Reduction of valuable, but technically “extra,” services. Assess the effectiveness of academic and student support services in contributing to student success.
 - a. Reducing or eliminating readers.
 - b. Reducing or eliminating tutors.
 - c. Re-examine categorical backfills (DSPS, EOPS, Credit and Non-Credit Matriculation). (current budget \$825K)
 - d. Reduce general fund contribution to Partnership for Student Success.
 - e. Consider elimination of summer school.
 - f. Consider outsourcing Child Development Center (currently subsidized at \$285K from general fund.)

5. Special efforts to lower costs of high-cost programs & examine programs with low or declining enrollments.
 - a. Analyze high cost programs to identify strategies to reduce their costs.
 - b. Analyze programs that offer classes with low and/or declining enrollments to consider program discontinuance.

SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
2012-13 TENTATIVE BUDGET

	Page
GENERAL FUND	
General Fund (Includes Unrestricted & Restricted Funds)	1
Unrestricted General Fund	2
Restricted General Fund	3
Fund Balance	4
Interfund Transfers	5
BOND INTEREST & REDEMPTION	6
BOOKSTORE FUND	7
FOOD SERVICE FUND	8
CHILDREN'S CENTER FUND	9
EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND	10
BOND CONSTRUCTION FUND	11
REHABILITATION/CONSTRUCTION FUND	12
INSURANCE FUND	13
FIDUCIARY FUNDS	14
APPENDIX	
Equipment Replacement Fund Projects	15
Rehabilitation/Construction Fund Projects	16

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Feist, Paul** <pfeist@cccco.edu>
Date: Thu, Jun 14, 2012 at 1:30 PM
Subject: Budget Update
To: PIO-ALL@listserv.cccco.edu

Colleagues,

I'm passing along some budget news from VC Dan Troy.

Regards,

Paul Feist
Vice Chancellor for Communications
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

From: Troy, Dan [<mailto:dtroy@CCCCO.EDU>]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 12:50 PM
To: SQ2CBO@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET
Subject: Budget Update

Colleagues,

I thought it important to inform you of changes to the size of the deferral buy down if the ballot initiative passes and to the size of the trigger cut if the ballot fails. Unfortunately, the news is not positive.

Under the latest scenario, if the ballot initiative passes, the CCCs will receive \$212,997,000 to pay down the system's inter-year deferrals. If the initiative fails, we will lose those funds and take an additional base reduction of \$338,589,000. This reduction would be implemented as a workload reduction of approximately 7.5%. Previously, it had been estimated that our deferral buy down figure was about \$313M while our trigger reduction was \$286.5M.

The rationale provided for the change is that the CCC deferrals amount to 9.2% of the total deferred within K-14, and \$213M represents 9.2% of the total dollars dedicated to buying down the deferrals. The \$338.6M base reduction reflects 11% of the K-14 reductions that would be triggered by the failure of the November ballot initiative.

I'll keep you posted on any other major developments, though I suspect that most of the significant CCC budget issues are settled at this point.

Regards,

Dan Troy

Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy
Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges
dtroy@cccco.edu<<mailto:dtroy@cccco.edu>>

**2012-13 FTES Projection
6/14/2012**

Funding Per FTES	
Credit	\$ 4,565
Noncredit Enhanced	\$ 3,232
Noncredit Nonenhance	\$ 2,745
Tax Increase	\$ 4,012,000

Assumptions, Scenario A:

1. Credit: Reduce Summer/Fall 2012 by 100 sections at 3 FTES each = 300 FTES
2. NCNE: With exception of 110 PCW FTES, convert 80% to fee-based

	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Totals	Equivalent Credit FTES
1 Projected 2012-2013 FTES (based on 2011-12 P2)	13,133.26	717	1,095.60		
2 - 2012-13 FTES reductions from above assumptions	-300.00	0.00	-788.5		
3 2012-13 FTES after assumed reductions	12,833.26	717.00	307.12	\$ 61,742,003	

Tax Package Fails; 7.5% Workload Reduction

4 Projected 2012-13 Cap	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	\$ 63,375,358	
5 - 7.5% workload reduction in FTES	(954.31)	(56.24)	(78.37)		
6 Workload reduction in dollars	\$ (4,356,272)	\$ (181,766)	\$ (215,114)	\$ (4,753,152)	
7 2012-13 FTES cap after workload reduction	11,769.86	693.60	966.53	\$ 58,622,206	
8 2012-13 FTES (Line 3 above)	12,833.26	717.00	307.12		
9 2012-13 FTES Over (Under) cap	1,063.40	23.40	-659.41		
10 2012-13 \$\$ Over (under) workload-reduced cap	\$ 4,854,227	\$ 75,615	\$ (1,810,044)	\$ 3,119,797	683

Tax Package Passes; No Workload Reduction

11 Projected 2012-13 Cap	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	\$ 63,375,358	
12 2012-13 FTES (Line 3 above)	12,833.26	717.00	307.12	\$ 61,742,003	
13 2012-13 FTES Over (Under) Cap	109.09	-32.84	-737.77		
14 2012-13 \$\$ Over (Under) Cap	\$ 497,955	\$ (106,151)	\$ (2,025,158)	\$ (1,633,355)	-358

Assumptions, Scenario B:

1. Credit: Reduce Summer/Fall 2012 by 75 sections at 3 FTES each = 225 FTES
2. NCNE: With exception of 110 PCW FTES, convert 40% in Fall 2012, 40% in Winter 2013, 100% in Spring 2013

	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Totals	Equivalent Credit FTES
21 Projected 2012-2013 FTES (based on 2011-12 P2)	13,133.26	717	1,095.60		
22 - 2012-13 FTES reductions from above assumptions	-225.00	0.00	-590.0		
23 Projected 2012-13 FTES after assumed reductions	12,908.26	717.00	505.60	\$ 62,629,184	

Tax Package Fails; 7.5% Workload Reduction

26 2012-13 FTES cap after workload reduction (Line 7)	11,769.86	693.60	966.53	\$ 58,622,206	
27 Projected 2012-13 FTES (Line 23 above)	12,908.26	717.00	505.60		
28 2012-13 FTES Over (Under) workload-reduced cap	1,138.40	23.40	(460.93)		
29 2012-13 \$\$ Over (under) workload-reduced cap	\$ 5,196,588	\$ 75,615	\$ (1,265,225)	\$ 4,006,978	878

Tax Package Passes; No Workload Reduction

31 Projected 2012-13 Cap	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89		
32 Projected 2012-13 FTES (Line 23 above)	12,908.26	717.00	505.60		
33 2012-13 FTES Over (Under) Cap	184.09	-32.84	(539.29)		
34 2012-13 \$\$ Over (Under) Cap	\$ 840,317	\$ (106,151)	\$ (1,480,339)	\$ (746,173)	-163

Recommendation for Converting Non-Enhanced Non-Credit Classes to Fee-Based Offerings in 2012-13

In order to allow for an orderly transition of converting non-enhanced non-credit classes to fee-based offering in 2012-13, I am recommending that we:

1. Convert 40% of the non-enhanced, non-credit fee-based classes (not including the PCW classes) to state supported courses in the Fall 2012 and Winter 2013 quarters. The direct instructional cost of offering 60% of these non-enhanced non-credit classes as state supported courses is approximately \$560,000. The instructional support costs associated with these classes is approximately, \$40,000.
2. Convert all non-enhanced non-credit classes (except PCW classes) to fee-based offerings in the Spring 2013 quarter to coincide with the opening of the Center for Lifelong Learning.

Discussion of Discontinuing Offering Enhanced Non-Credit Classes at the Ventura County Jail beginning with the 2013 Winter Quarter (60 FTES)

At a time when we are reducing core credit classes and converting non-enhanced non-credit classes to fee-based offerings, should the college continue to offer non-credit classes for inmates in the Ventura Jail? Since the Ventura Jail is in Ventura, either the Ventura Community College District or one of the high schools in Ventura responsible for adult education for their community should be responsible for offering non-credit classes for the inmates in this facility.

Estimated Cost Savings of Discontinuing Offering Non-Credit Enhanced Classes at the Ventura County Jail Beginning in the 2013 Winter Quarter: \$85,500

Proposal to Restore in Fall 2012 up to 25 Credit Class Sections Students Need to Complete their Degree and Transfer Requirements

We have reduced 101 credit sections from the 2012 Fall Semester Schedule of Classes. As a result of these reductions, a significant number of students will not be able to enroll in courses they need to complete their degree and/or transfer requirements in a timely manner. We are proposing to provide the Administration flexibility to open (add) up to 25 class sections to accommodate student demand for essential credit courses.

Estimated District Instructional Costs:	\$142,500
Estimated Instructional Support Costs:	<u>\$ 35,000</u>
Total Estimated Costs	\$177,500

Cost Reductions Not Included in the Tentative Budget to Off-Set Increase in Expenses to Pay for Restoring Credit Sections for the Fall Semester.

We will be reducing the amount of District backfill for categorical programs by \$150,000 in 2012-13. These savings, along with those from discontinuing offering non-credit classes at the Ventura Jail, will help off-set much of the increased cost of reinstating core credit classes in Fall 2012.

Summary of Estimated Costs of Recommendations

Cost of Offering 60% of Non-Enhanced Non-Credit Classes as state supported courses:
\$600,000

Cost of Reinstating Up to 25 Credit Sections of Essential Courses in Fall 2012: \$177,500

Cost Savings to Help Off-Set Increased Costs to Implement Recommendations:

Discontinue Classes in Ventura Jail beginning in Winter 2013:	\$ 85,600
Reduce \$150,000 of District backfill for categorical programs in 2012-13:	<u>\$150,000</u>
Total Estimated Savings	<u>\$235,600</u>

Summary of Cost Estimates

Total Estimated Costs:	\$877,500
Estimated Savings:	<u>\$235,600</u>
Net Increases in Expenses:	\$641,900

Additional Information: If the governor's proposed tax increase is approved, the additional FTES from converting non-enhanced non-credit classes to fee-based and reinstating some of the credit sections in Fall 2012 will generate approximately 195 FTES. This would reduce the number of under cap FTES we would need to generate in spring 2013 to achieve the college's funded FTES cap from 358 to 163.