

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

**PRESENT:** A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

**GUESTS:** M. Lin (for C. Avendano), S. Coffield, B. Partee, K. O'Connor

**ABSENT:** C. Avendano, S. Knotts

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

**Information Items**

1. Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) (attached) – VP Sullivan reported from this document. He pointed to the core of this plan on page 4, TDM 1, which includes modifications and updates on what the Coastal Commission had SBCC agree to when the Long-Range Development Plan was submitted. This section includes what SBCC is currently committed to. At Superintendent/President Serban's request, VP Sullivan explained the history of this document and why we cannot change it.
  - a. The history, current status and proposed modifications to the Long Range Development Plan are in the document that was provided in advance to each member. There was further discussion concerning this issue and the document.
2. Status of Foundation funds supporting scholarships – Superintendent/President Serban reported that the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College has lost a significant amount of money from various funds that support scholarships. At this point many scholarships will not be able to be funded because there is a shortfall of about \$150,000 in scholarship money that normally would have been there and is not. Next week we will have the final numbers on what can be funded. These shortfalls are now actually starting to hurt students.

**Discussion Items**

3. Implementation of parking permits for Continuing Education at the Wake & Schott Centers (attached) – VP Sullivan reported that the desire is to implement parking fees for Continuing Ed starting in January 2010. There are many reasons for this: it will give

more time to get more feedback from the students, get the word out, and get it into the schedule. When implemented, it will enable SBCC 1) to provide two full time security guards, one for each of the two centers which we have been requested long ago, 2) to maintain the lots from allocated money since there is no State money to cover this. We will not depending on ending balances to keep up the parking lots.

- a. There was further discussion regarding various aspects of implementing the buying of parking permits for Continuing Ed.
  - i. CSEA President Liz Auchincloss brought up the fact that the Facilities Personnel at the two centers have “providing security” in their job descriptions. VP Sullivan said that is true, however they do not have as yet appropriate training and/ or support. That they will be additional security to the two full time security guards.
  - ii. CSEA President Liz Auchincloss expressed concern about the loss of goodwill in the community and the bad PR problems that could be caused by this action.
  - iii. CSEA Member Ramirez questioned the cost of the project. VP Sullivan explained the situation in regards to the electricity, the wiring and that the parking machines on the main campus recouped their total cost very quickly.
  - iv. Academic Senate Member O’Connor asked if it might be possible to have lower fees for Senior Citizens. VP Sullivan reported that every exception costs money, time and effort plus the situation has to be policed. The fee will be \$20 for a 6 month period, from Jan 1 – June 10<sup>th</sup> because that is the first two quarters in Cont Ed, then it would be from June 20<sup>th</sup> until the end of the year. The reason we would have to do it that way is because we wanted it to coincide with the credit semesters because we do have Continuing Ed students who take classes on the Main campus at night. The Main campus now has an “Evening Only” permit which is going to be \$20. This would mean that they would not have to buy both of those.
  - v. VP Arellano asked if we have a “forgiveness week” at the beginning of the semester. VP Sullivan stated that we forgive first time offenders and figure that was their lesson, after that they need to pay. .
  - vi. Superintendent/President Serban stated that CSEA President Auchincloss’ point about community good will is a good one. There will be an Open Forum for the Community on April 22<sup>nd</sup> at the Schott Center where it will be discussed and on May 21<sup>st</sup> there will be a meeting o the Continuing Education Advisory Committee.
  - vii. VP Sullivan pointed out that we might not sell very many parking spots for the Schott. We will evaluate as the process takes place. At the Wake, there is ample parking, so there is a benefit there. At the Schott, we will have to see what the response is.
  - viii. Academic Senate member O’Connor mentioned that what if you pay for your permit and there is no parking.
  - ix. CSEA President Auchincloss said some people may not attend any longer.

It was mentioned that the cost of going to other community college continuing ed courses it is much more expensive, ie. Ventura there wasn't a course below \$75. VP Friedlander pointed out that if you charge a fee you cannot get FTES. Ventura Adult Ed is part of their K-12 School System. Superintendent/President Serban said that CE can only collect material fees for something that the student can take home.

- x. VP Ehrlich stated that she thought this would encourage people to carpool and that instituting parking fees seems like an ideal time to remind people that another way to save is to carpool.
4. Process for allocating funds for program reviews resource requests (handout) – Superintendent/President Serban stated that by the last CPC Meeting, May 19<sup>th</sup>, CPC would have discussed, considered and agreed on the concept presented here on the Sources and Allocation of Funding. She presented and discussed the information from both handouts she passed around to everyone.
- a. Sources of Funding for Program Review Resource Requests:
    - i. Growth Funding: Superintendent/President Serban reported that we get growth funding almost every year. Growth is one of the few resources of funding that becomes part of our on-going funding, part of our base. That is what we use to pay for new faculty positions and some increases in costs associated with growth, such as hourly adjunct instructors. There is usually a certain amount of money left over. Should we get the growth money we are entitled to this year, and assuming that the deficit factor is not too high, which we will not know until later, we are entitled to 1.7 million. Let's say with we have to hire 12 new faculty positions for Fall 2010,  $12 \times \$80,000 = \$960,000$ ; we are still left with about \$700,000 after we pay for these positions. Then, we can decide collectively here at CPC, come July or August when we first meet in the next fiscal year how to use the remaining amount. We will know what growth funding for 2008-09 we have received and we will know by then how many new faculty positions we need to fund and we will have a sense of the allowable growth rate for 2009 – 10. So we are left with several hundred thousand, then, the idea would be to allocate this 700,000 between these categories: #1 Revert budget cuts that we have already put in place. #2 A percentage will go to setting money aside so that we can actually hire some of those new classified staff positions that have been identified through the Program Reviews. #3 Some would go to the Equipment Fund. #4 Some to the Construction, and #5 some to a miscellaneous fund, because there have been other resource requests identified through Program Reviews such as marketing, other needs that are not Equipment, Construction nor positions. In normal years, year after year we had this growth money, of course the amount would vary and assuming that we don't get cut further, this would be the mechanism to deal with the growth money.
    - ii. There was a question about the Basic Skills Initiative- for one time expenses within established guidelines: Superintendent/President Serban

- pointed out that Basic Skills money was never assumed to be for on-going expenses. If we don't get that money, then positions hired using this money are no longer available.
- iii. Growth Funding was discussed in further detail. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that part of the Growth Money from this year needs to be set aside to pay for those faculty whom we will hire for Fall 2010 because this will be the cumulative faculty positions that were waived, that were supposed to be hired for Fall 09, plus the Faculty positions that are the result of Growth in 08-09 as well as positions that resulted from the mistake the Chancellor's Office made for the Fall 2008 FTFO.
  - iv. Student Senate Member Lin asked about the prospects of receiving Federal Stimulus money. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that there are very few categories that Community Colleges in California actually can apply for. One is Work Force Training and there will be some money available through the Workforce investment Act and the local Workforce Investment Boards. Both credit and non-credit will try to get some of that. In terms of money going directly to students, there is an increase of Pell Grants, but many of our students don't qualify for Pell Grants because our tuition is so low. Vice President Friedlander stated that there will be an increase in Federal Work Study Funds to Community Colleges. Student Senate Member Lin asked about the possibility of receiving funding for sustainability measures taken on campus. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the funding does not come to Community Colleges. That money goes to the State for overall State Allocations. VP Bishop stated that Growth Funding being used for ongoing expenses makes a lot of sense. The issue is how it gets operational. How it actually works
  - v. VP Friedlander stated that it heightens the importance of our capacity to continue to grow and something we have to stay focused on because it is our only source of new ongoing money. Growth becomes extremely important. He went on to report that we have not gone about this in a systematic way in terms of how we think about growth and what it costs to support growth. He thinks that we need to do an analysis of what are our costs associated with growth. Academic Senate Member Kathy O'Connor agreed with VP Friedlander that we have never had a process on campus where we had a systematic way to add staff, to add equipment costs for new programs. We approve these programs at curriculum, but there is no guarantee that those new programs are going to get any money and so then they start up and they have no money. She thinks this is a coordinated approach as to how we can actually support what we are growing. If we don't do that, then these programs just struggle and our staffing situation just gets worse. So as long as we are coordinating growth in programming etc. with growth funding, that is a logical way to go. Academic Senate Member Garey stated that he agreed with that, particularly in the cost element that needs to be included in the curriculum consideration process. They discussed further more specific details of looking at costs to support

new programs concluding that if the funds aren't there, then you don't move forward. Superintendent/President Serban noted that many grants start programs without setting aside the money from the General Fund to continue these programs once the grants end. MESA is a good example. We need to discuss implications for General Fund budgeting before creating programs and hiring individuals through grants, if we want these programs to continue after the grants end. CSEA President Auchincloss said that we may have to turn down a grant because we don't have ongoing money to support it.

- vi. CSEA President Auchincloss asked the cost of computers, supplies, etc... if it is taken into account when hiring new faculty or staff. Superintendent/President Serban agreed that we need to start doing that again, as we used to.
- vii. VP Ehrlich spoke in support of potential for a portion of the remaining Growth Funding to be allocated to new Classified Staff and Management positions. She reported that she can speak with more experience dealing on a daily basis with the multiple consequences of the lack of adequate staffing whether it be in a Faculty Department, for providing necessary support for the education of work there, or whether it be in one of the non academic areas in the college. There is a huge cost to us to have inadequate staffing. Management is impacted because if you don't have staff properly supervised and properly evaluated you have lost some of the value of your investment.
- viii. VP Ehrlich would like to discuss at an earlier level some of the issues around hiring staff that will be processed through HR and paid with grant money. As well as the cost of the Administration of the Grant.
- ix. VP Arellano requested clarification on new requests and initiatives. CSEA Member Guillen stated that all these other items that are reverting budget cuts and the new staffing are all in the program review. Superintendent/President Serban said that the staff, new equipment and other resource requests identified in the program reviews are guiding us through the budget allocation process.
- x. The Block Grants were discussed and clarified.
- xi. Process for allocation of funds for routine, non-routine and new equipment draft for discussion was the second handout from Superintendent/President Serban. This handout reflects discussions with VP Friedlander and Academic President Alarcon. a) 2009-10 There is some money to fund some things in new equipment requests that can be funded from existing money that departments have in the 41000 accounts. B) 2010 – 11 and beyond. Superintendent/President Serban explained that the concept was that the money needed for Routine Equipment Needs, equipment needed on a routine basis, will become part of the base budget for each department. We need to estimate what is needed to be spent per year; no one expects 100 % accuracy. In Fall 2009, departments will estimate their routine needs. Of course, the issue is when we do not have money. In

case of a revenue shortfall in any given year, the VPs, in consultation with deans, department chairs and managers will make decisions about the distribution of available funds. For now, departments can carry forward unspent routine funds. The process will be evaluated in Spring 2010 and again in Spring 2011 to see how is working and whether adjustments are necessary.

- b. The two years will give us time to calibrate the routine needs, to understand what it is that they truly spend for routine expenses. Discussion continued about equipment costing \$5,000 or more which is Non-routine and what is inventoried and what is under \$5,000 is bought on a regular routine basis. The idea is to avoid carrying forward large amounts of money. The money needed to replace non routine equipment should be set aside in the Equipment Fund.
- c. VP Friedlander stated that what Superintendent/President is presenting takes into account all the feedback we have gotten. Ignacio and I have been working with the President and they all have taken into consideration the Senate Resolution and the conversations heard in multiple places. VP Friedlander thinks this is an excellent resolution. I believe this will work much better than what we have ever had before if it works according to plan. What is nice, you don't know until you do something, but I think going out the gate, this is a solid shot. It has a great chance of succeeding and it makes a lot of sense to me. It does reflect all the dialog we have had and I think we have come up with a better method.
- d. Academic Senate Member Garey said he is inclined to agree. He thinks it is a reasonable middle ground to what was proposed at the Senate and with the evaluation, which I think is perfectly reasonable. The one question he had was about what criteria will be used for evaluating this process in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. Superintendent/President Serban noted that we will develop the criteria together in CPC. Academic Senate Member Kathy Molloy asked for clarification of the last sentence in the handout. Academic Senate Member Kathy O'Connor noted that this proposed new process is much better than what we had before.

**Meeting was adjourned.**

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, April 21, 2009; 3:00-4:30pm; A218C