

**Santa Barbara City College**  
**College Planning Council**  
**Tuesday, November 3, 2009**  
**3:00 pm – 4:30 pm**  
**A218C**  
**Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, K. Molloy, K. Monda, D. Nevins, N. Ridgell, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: A. Garfinkel,

GUESTS: B. Bell, P. Butler, L. Stark, L. Vasquez, K. O'Connor, A. Scharper, S. Wiley, M. Wright,

1. Approval of minutes from the October 20, 2009 CPC meetings (attached)

**M/S/C [Monda/Molloy] to approve the minutes. All in favor. Academic Senate Member T. Garey abstained because he had not had a chance to read them.**

**Information Items**

2. Wrap up accreditation visit – Andreea Serban
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban said that now the accreditation visit is completed, it does not mean that we stop working on what was started in preparation of the self-study. We need to continue to work on the recommendations the Accreditation Team gave, which need to be fully addressed by the time of the mid-term report in three years, the planning agendas, and continue the documentation of discussions of evaluations of the college plan and the updating of our tactical plans, which we now have in place. Serban stressed that the college must continue with the written documentation of the college planning process, evaluation component and evidence that we have discussed, and improvements have been made as a result. These things all need to be ongoing.
  - b. Superintendent/President Serban said that one of the recommendations the team made was that the college needs to integrate more closely the allocation processes for faculty hiring with program review and other planning processes. Although this procedure is in place, it is not part of the program review administrative procedure for instructional departments, we do not have the documentation. This recommendation will be addressed quickly by adding this component to the program review administrative procedure. Executive VP Friedlander stated that this will be taken to the Academic

Senate for discussion resulting in a written procedure in addition to the current procedure that will make it very clear.

- c. VP Ehrlich, Academic Senate Member Monda and Interim Director of PE K. O'Connor all spoke to the Superintendent/President Serban's statement of the need to continue documentation. There was further discussion on how the documentation will be organized so it can be found easily by everyone as we move forward. Superintendent/President Serban noted that she is developing a procedure for checking and following-up on the self-study documentation/information. Diane Rodriguez-Kiino and Robert Else, the new Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning, will be responsible for assisting with this.
- d. Superintendent/President Serban concluded this item with stating that the Accreditation Team visit ended with an exceptional outcome. She said she was very happy about this outcome which was due to the tremendous effort given by all those involved. She thanked everybody again.

3. Appointment of Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning effective November 9: Robert Else

- a. Superintendent/President Serban announced the above information and spoke about the fact that Robert Else has worked for the SBCC IT Department for a number of years in various roles. He has great knowledge of SBCC's data structures systems which will be tremendously helpful as the college works to rebuild, enhance, improve and expand its decision support structures. Mr. Else will continue to be involved with the other areas he has been working on as well as with Curricunet, and eLumen as that is part of the role of the Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning Institutional to begin with. We are very happy to have him in this role.
- b. Superintendent/President Serban asked Academic Senate Member K. O'Connor to give an update on Curricunet. O'Connor reported that the training will start tomorrow and continue through the next week for the Administration Group, the Deans, Scheduling and Faculty. This means there will be a savings in the use of paper. The Faculty Resource center will continue to provide training and webinars plus there is a help manual on site. Superintendent/President Serban thanked O'Connor for her diligence, as this is a 10 year dream coming true.
- c. Superintendent/President Serban reported from the hand out: Student Profiles Summary: Final Census Counts For Summer Semesters 2005 – 2009. Serban stated that this report is being reinstated from years past. The data shows how the percentage of online students over a five year time span has shifted and this shift has implications about what we will offer in the future. It is a significant development in terms of the demand. Executive VP Friedlander reported that at the Deans Council they will be looking at summer enrollment patterns, FTES and the mix offered in the summer to make sure more core courses will be offered and courses that will serve a larger number of students than we have in the past. He continued to state that with the class cuts made in the fall, and with the cuts that will have to be made in the spring along with the

offerings due to workload reduction and add that to the increase in enrollments, the college could have many more students who are dependent on summer to fill the core GE transfer and career tech degree certificates. Friedlander stated that first this discussion will take place with the individual deans before we develop the summer schedule. We have enough of a running start on this aspect of the summer programs and the next aspect is changing the pattern of faculty teaching these classes. Other details relevant to the scheduling summer classes and the meaning of other data was further discussed and clarified.

4. Results of a recent survey regarding budget actions taken by other California Community Colleges (attached).
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban reported from the attachment: Survey on Actions Taken by Other California Community Colleges that was recently conducted by the CCC Chief Business Officers. Serban stated that although the scale used to measure did not elicit detailed information, it is still informative because of the response rate: 49 districts out of the 72 responded, which Serban stated is a pretty good response rate. This information had the potential to give us some helpful ideas that we may not have thought of. However, Serban went on to say, we had either thought of most of the same ideas or are doing some of the same things that other colleges are doing. The college is fortunate in that we do not have to do what other colleges have had to do because of their budgetary circumstances.
  - b. The cuts in categoricals elicited a discussion around whether colleges back-filled their categoricals or not, and, if so, how much did they back-fill. Superintendent/President Serban had spoken to other college Presidents who held the position that if the categoricals are backfilled, it sends the message to the legislature that the colleges really do not need that categorical money. Some were of the mind that now is the time to send a message that when 50% of the budgets for categorical programs are cut, and the colleges no longer can afford to backfill, the services to the students will have to be cut, showing the legislature that significant consequences do occur. That is what they are going to continue to do this for the next three years or however long it takes the funding to come back. Academic Senate Member Garey stated that he understands the philosophy, but in adopting that philosophy, the cuts are on the students who are least able to respond to them positively or at least able to find alternative services and who are least visible. Academic Senate Member Monda said that this is something to consider; however, she is of the same mind as Garey. Superintendent/President Serban agreed and said it is information about why other colleges have chosen not to backfill. There was further discussion about the colleges who have chosen not to backfill and the different reasons why.
5. Update from the Association of College Business Officers' (ACBO) meeting.

- a. VP of SBCC Business Services Sullivan reported on the highlights from the most recent meeting of ACBO held in Sacramento.
- i. The President/CEO of the Community College League of California, Scott Lay stated that the projections for 2009-2010 state revenue is already down \$1.1 billion.
  - ii. ACBO members discussed the 50% law, the problems with the law and what needs to be cleaned up.
  - iii. The discussion around Physical Education Courses touched topics as: who is getting served by these classes and how does it fit into a college's mission, putting a cap on percentage of PE credit classes and the FTES they generate, open entry and open exit classes being fee based, football, and older adult recreation classes being fee based as they are used more as social classes, not physical education classes that are being used for transfer.
  - iv. There was discussion about program proportionality for example in several districts a Theater Arts program is producing more FTES than English.
  - v. Data on students who originally enrolled in a California Community College was presented: 42% of people who registered had a goal to obtain a degree (either 2 or 4 year degree); only 42% complete the first year and this is system wide; 1 in 6 transfer successfully; 3% completed a certificate and 8% completed a degree; 29% complete 4 years of college within 7 years; the 18 – 24 year olds are not as successful as the older returning students who are successful; and that is an issue. There was further information about how unprepared students are coming in to college and the obstacles they face: 80% of the students work; 30% of our students have dropped a class because they could not afford the books; 62% chose class schedule based on text book costs and 42% have never seen a financial aid counselor.
  - vi. CCLC President/CEO Lay brought up the fact that US President Obama has stated that we should increase the percentage of our college grads from 34% to 41 % by 2025.
  - vii. Then Eric Skinner, Vice Chancellor of California Community Colleges System Office's College Finance and Facilities Planning Division gave a talk stating that the total potential problem could be as much as \$20 billion shortfall over the next two years. More details were given regarding reasons for the shortfall and the results.
  - viii. On categoricals, Skinner stated that we are at a cross roads for categoricals and the flexibility ends in 2012-13, so they need input on the policy for the long term. One proposal was to turn categorical into one big block grant, however it does not seem that will happen.
  - ix. Superintendent/President Serban stated: The Chancellor's Office is trying to make the case for the 2010 – 11 budget. At the CEO's meeting, the CEO Board and other boards have requested from the Chancellor's Office that restoration should be the first priority the Chancellor's Office should fight for and then other issues like COLA, then Growth. (Restoration, COLA, Growth) Serban stated that

unfortunately the Physical Education issues will continue, especially for the Districts that have too many FTES from PE.

### Discussion Items

6. Updated Draft of Interim Educational Master Plan 2009-11 (handout)
  - a. Executive VP will bring the draft of this plan to the next CPC Meeting.
  
7. Approach to Funding for Partnership for Student Success (PSS) (attached).
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban referred to the attached memo she wrote to the CPC members regarding the reasons for making a sustainable level of funding for PSS part of the ongoing annual budget, as a line item for \$460,000, plus release time for Gateway Co-Director, Sheila Wiley, and the same way other ongoing expenses are budgeted. Serban referred also to the PSS Funding chart prepared by the PSS Steering Committee, Academic Senate President Alarcon and Academic Senate Vice President Nevins.
  - b. Serban stated that the purpose of the PSS Funding chart is to understand what the source of money was, how much it was and how much we will need to continue the PSS related programs.
  - c. Serban referred to the Basic Skills Initiative summary in her memo, which is also reflected in the chart, explaining that this money is a separate issue because it was repurposed money given by the State and it is doubtful that this money will continue. It served the Partnership for Student Success very well for the three years the college received it and was used to expand tutoring to second year courses. She stated that we will not count on it in the future. Gateway tutoring is for assistance with first year courses which a student needs to complete to be successful. Year one courses are the priority and since we, most likely, will not be receiving money from the Basic Skills initiative, we will not continue the second year course tutoring.
  - d. Superintendent/President Serban discussed the range of money from the General Fund and the Foundation, \$386,000 a year to about \$435,000 a year, not including the release time and budget item for the Gateway Co-Director Sheila Wiley. The budget for the Gateway Co-Director is not included in the amounts listed above. Serban stated how the General Fund and Foundation money was disseminated amongst the Partnerships: Gateway Tutoring, the Writing Center, the Math Lab and the Academic Achievement Zone.
  - e. The Foundation for Santa Barbara City College has worked hard to raise funds for the Partnership for Student Success and has encountered difficulty in selling the PSS concept. Donors relate well to scholarships, child care support, book grants, and internships. It has taken three years to raise \$145,000 for PSS. PSS is now a core fundraising priority for the Foundation.
  - f. Because the Partnership for Student Success relates directly to the College Mission: "SBCC is committed to the success of each student, providing a variety of ways for students to access outstanding and affordable higher education programs that foster

- lifelong learning.....” and because the students who are directly served by PSS and experience successful results, there has to be a commitment of support. The question is what can we afford and how much do we feel is important to commit to this?
- g. Superintendent/President Serban stressed that Partnership for Student Success is not a categorical program the same way EOPS, DSPS and other programs have had categorical funding. Serban clarified and stressed again that the Basic Skills Initiative money was not categorical money. Serban stated that if the CPC members acknowledge that PSS supports the SBCC mission and have agreed to support it by funding, then it has to become part of a funding mechanism to which the college commits by building it into our budget for 2010 – 11 and it has to be recognized as such through the budgeting process. This will formalize PSS as something that is part of our ongoing budget commitment.
  - h. Executive VP Friedlander reminded the group what was said at ACBO by Scott Lay and Erik Skinner that the California Community Colleges are, at the state and federal level, even more accountable for the success of students in terms of obtaining degrees, certificates and transfer. There was further discussion about the success of PSS programs, and the data collected, reported in yearly evaluations, which are can be found in the Self Study CD.
  - i. CSEA President Auchincloss pointed out that if we do this, we are not going to be able to do something else, e.g. restoring the seven classified positions that are currently frozen. Serban acknowledged Auchincloss’s question, then stated that the managers of these departments agreed that those seven positions will not be filled this year, and they are not being eliminated. Serban said this is a time to discuss our mission and what takes priority. Rather than restoring travel money, consultant money and other money, this is a restoration of funds of what we consider is more core to the college’s mission. Further questions and discussion around this proposal ensued.
  - j. Superintendent/President Serban said she wants everyone to understand what kind of money is needed to have a reasonable level of service that still has an impact and makes a significant difference on students’ success.
  - k. VP Sullivan stated that this is a proposal for funding of valuable programs that serve many students’ success. At this point we are discussing putting it in our budget as a line item, then we prioritize it in the budget review, if it does not float then we will have to rethink it. He pointed out that categoricals are going to come back with this same kind of discussion this year. CPC will discuss, then decide where to draw the line for each of them. After this we will put it in the budget, then figure it out when we have the whole picture. There are many steps to finalizing the budget and this is just the beginning. Sullivan stated the budget process further. CPC takes all these programs into consideration, what they contribute and try to get to the level of budgeting that works. He went on to say that it is necessary to look at how do we serve our mission today, and work up with that in our minds. Associate Professor, English Department, Barbara Bell spoke on behalf of her division. Bell stated that her division is in full support of putting the funding for PSS into the budget. Bell went on to say how much her division appreciates the careful consideration of these programs; they have been so useful to

her students. Even though it would be nice to restore sabbaticals, Basic Skills takes priority right now.

- I. Academic Senate Member Monda spoke to VP Sullivan's explanation of how the budgeting of this works that the baseline of items will be in the budget then CPC negotiates until the group gets to the point of approval. Monda stated that since we feel this is essential and core to what we are doing, she asked if CPC can move to approve the proposal at this point or not. Academic Senate Member Garey stated that we can make a motion and second it, but it cannot be voted on now. Traditionally, we defer our actions for at least one meeting. But that gets it on the table as a motion to approve. Superintendent/President Serban stated that since this is such an important conversation, we need to allow it the time to really think about and digest all the implications. We don't want to use the parliamentary rules to push anything right now. Serban continued to say that we are at a difficult moment as a college, we need to move to a whole conversation about categoricals, frozen positions, and more, so she wants to allow us as a college to have a meaningful conversation which is much more important than motions and moves. We have at least a three-year budget problem, so we need to force ourselves to think three-years for all areas.
  - m. Academic Senate Member Garey stated that the Academic Senate has approved this proposal. He said that in light of all the hard work and success of the program in serving the most vulnerable students, it has been shown that they can succeed and move on to a better life, this is a modest amount of money to commit. Academic Senate Member Molloy reminded the group that these discussions have been going on for some time here and the amount is around \$207,000 or \$208,000 restored money that was cut last year from the hourly tutorial that goes to mainly fund students to do this work and it is money that we need to have in the program if we are going to maintain it. If we don't have the money, then there will be no program. Molloy continued to say that we are grateful it is being proposed but without it in the fall we could not continue to doing all of this. The evaluations that have been put out in the last couple of years and have come to CPC, show the impressive gains the students have made, but where it is most successful is in the basic skills students. According to the last evaluation, the gains the basic skills students made are up to 6% over other students and these are students at the lowest level compared to students at higher levels.
  - n. No motion was made and the discussions of budgeting for all areas will continue.
  - o. Discussion took place around Program Reviews which will be discussed in more detail with more time at another meeting.
8. Approach to Funding for Categorical Programs 2010-11 and beyond – Andreea Serban, Jack Friedlander, Joe Sullivan. This will be discussed at the next CPC meeting.
  9. Status of program reviews and resource requests report – Andreea Serban. This topic will also be discussed at another meeting.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meeting: Tuesday, November 24, 3:00-4:30pm A218C**