

**Santa Barbara City College**  
**College Planning Council**  
**Tuesday, December 7, 2010**  
**3:00 pm – 4:30 pm**  
**A218C**  
**Minutes**

**PRESENT:**

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;	M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;
I. Alarcon, President, Academic Senate;	K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative, Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
O. Arellano, Vice President, Continuing Education;	K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Representative;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;	D. Nevins, President Elect Academic Senate;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;	C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative;
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;	J. Sullivan, VP Business Services
T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative;	
A. Garfinkel, President Student Senate;	

**ABSENT:**

S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA;	R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning
------------------------	--

**GUESTS:**

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association Chief Negotiator;	A. Scharper, Dean Ed Programs;
M. Croninger, Member Board of Trustees;	J. Schultz, Member Academic Senate;
K. O'Connor, Vice Chair Curriculum Committee, Member Academic Senate;	L. Stark, President Instructors' Association;
J. Meyer, Member Planning and Resources Committee;	L. Vasquez, Chair Instructional Technology Committee

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

**Information Items/Announcements**

1. Academic Senate did not support the request made at last week's CPC to fund the additional sections requested for Spring 2011 (attached what was requested with corrected TLU costs).

Academic Senate President Alarcon stated that the request for adding sections for Spring 2011 was not supported by the Academic Senate because of the fact that the College would be going down the path of serving more students without State funding. Executive VP Friedlander stated that he presented both sides and acknowledged that we would be spending money for which we would not get reimbursed. Dr. Friedlander said that we will have the same problems next fall and spring. There continues to be requests coming in to add sections, but there was really no support among the Senators, so Dr. Friedlander

withdrew the motion. Dr. Friedlander reported that at the Deans' Council, there was a long discussion about building the Fall 2011 schedule that would serve the most students.

The Associated Student Body President Garfinkel reported that this was discussed at the Student Senate Executive Meeting. Their one suggestion for future reference is that when more classes are added that they be confined to General Education classes and IGETSE classes rather than some of the other extra classes.

2. Additional sections which may be needed for Spring 2011 (attachment).

Executive VP Friedlander reminded the council that when the College increased the number of international students, the council agreed to offer them support by way of setting aside some sections until they arrive in January such that they can enroll full-time, which is required for international students, and achieve their goals while here. This semester there will be 50 more international students attending than last spring, for a total of 300 new international students.

Executive VP Friedlander explained further that since the international students do not assess until January, we do not know what classes they will need in terms of basic skills classes. We do know which classes they will need in order to complete the specific programs they signed up for, the whole reason for them to attend SBCC. Those sections are put on standby with different starting dates. If we need to open up these sections, there are extra seats for resident students. The money for these standby sections is not coming from state apportionment, from the general fund, and it is not FTES that we are not getting reimbursed for. Everyone at the college benefits not only from their presence, but these fees pay for the added sections which the resident students will benefit from.

There were further questions, discussion and clarification. All students benefit from the attendance of international students. There is a misperception in the public's eye that the attendance of International students takes away opportunities from the California students which is not true. It creates more opportunities for more resident students.

Superintendent/President Serban reported that Governor Schwarzenegger held a press conference recently announcing that there is a fiscal emergency and he called in a special session of the legislature. Dr. Serban spoke of the two main cuts that have an impact on our college: the cutting of the CALWORKS program and the cutting of childcare support which would impact our Kinko's Early Childhood Center. The good part is that in this proposal there are no additional cuts to higher education.

Superintendent/President Serban spoke about the support the college has given to full-time classified staff working in categorical programs when categorical funding has been reduced, everybody stayed employed in some form or another at the level they were at. Dr. Serban said that an issue for us is that we have a full-time classified person hired in CALWORKS who is a SPA and if CALWORKS gets cut more, we need to see what we will be able to do.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the severe cuts will have an impact on Kinko's. The cuts are in

who can qualify and the amount of money they would be able to receive. Dr. Friedlander has been working with the Director Rizo of the Early Learning Center to see what it would mean for the Center if their subsidy were reduced. Academic Senate Vice-President Neufeld asked if this would be a mid-year adjustment. Dr. Friedlander stated yes, both that and CALWORKS is two phases. There is what will happen right away and what happens July 1. These are pretty severe cuts. Associated Student Senate President Garfinkel reminded everyone that this is the students that don't get that stipend anymore or that without a subsidy for childcare will drop out of school. Those will be people who will have to go back on welfare who will not be able to complete their education until their kids are school aged and then it is harder and harder to go back. Dr. Friedlander agreed with her and said the implications are pretty dire. It is the worst.

### **Discussion Items**

#### **3. Funding of sabbaticals for 2011-12 – Andreea Serban, Ignacio Alarcon**

Superintendent/President Serban reminded the CPC members that the agenda item of funding sabbaticals and details involved were first brought up at the September 19, 2010. Dr. Serban reported that the College's highest spending on sabbaticals was in 2007 – 08, about \$340,000 was spent. Sabbaticals were taken in 2008-09 because they had been scheduled, but Sabbaticals for 2009 – 10 and 2010 – 11 were suspended. The discussions were around considering the reinstatement of about half of that amount totaling about \$170,000.00 for 2011-12, with the understanding that if some dramatic cut in the State budget occurs the sabbaticals will not be able to take place. However, assuming that the budget information is the same as what we know now, and because if faculty members are going to start working on their schedules in January for the Fall, then we need to know as soon as possible because of planning for the faculty and their departments. In the next two meetings, the topic was discussed further. At the October 5, 2010 meeting, then at the October 19, 2010 meeting, Academic Senate President Alarcon stated that the Academic Senate wanted to do further research and would report back at the December meeting.

Dr. Serban stated that the Academic Senate had their discussion yesterday and asked that Academic President Alarcon please give a summary of the discussion. Mr. Alarcon reported that the gist of the meeting was that the Senate is in support of the reinstatement of the sabbaticals and they would like to guarantee that three full-year sabbaticals are funded. Mr. Alarcon said that since they do not know exactly what the cost of a Sabbatical is, it may turn out that the amount of money needed for the three sabbaticals is less than the \$170,000. Mr. Alarcon reported that basically the Senate wanted to bring up the fact that the \$170,000 is half what it cost in 2007-08 which paid for six faculty members to take sabbaticals, so the \$170,00 should pay for ½ the number of faculty taking leave. The Academic Senate did not come to a vote per se but that was the consensus. Academic Senate Vice President Neufeld reported that the Senate had an extended discussion around this topic, exploring other issues or other possible areas that might be affected, they looked at other restoration matters as part of the discussion, spending quite a bit of time on it. The Senate does support, at this time, the funding of three faculty members. Approving the 2011 – 12

sabbaticals at this time gives plenty of time for the planning for not only the faculty but for the department. Mr. Alarcon said that the three faculty members: Rob Dependahl, Jan Schulz and Collette Barr have been approached and they are still willing to go for a full year as their projects are still viable.

There was further discussion in support of the reinstatement of the budget for the sabbaticals. CSEA President Auchincloss reported on what was discussed at their Consultation Group. Ms. Auchincloss said that even though the group does not participate in sabbaticals, their main interest is that they want to make sure that the College is financially sound enough to be able to afford this and that the reinstatement of sabbaticals will not have any negative consequences on the College budget. Dr. Serban stated that she appreciates the feedback and assuming things will stay as they are right now, she thinks we can consider this commitment and if in January or February we hear of a massive cut then she thinks we will have to review this again. Academic Senate Representative Garey pointed out what a small percentage this amount of money is. Ms. Auchincloss said that this could pay for a lot of things, one example being tutoring hours. Dr. Serban agreed that everything adds up. Everyone at the College came through and were most judicious about saving money everywhere we could and at the same time there comes a point in time when some commitments need to be made for planning purposes. There was further discussion in support of reinstating the sabbatical leaves because it is a good investment in the college and has a positive effect on the faculty and students. And the discussion against reinstating the sabbaticals was that it could pay for the full increase and cost of health and welfare benefits that have been absorbed by families in the 80% plan for the last two years. It was brought up that we could make the same argument for equipment, for salaries, raises etc. Sabbaticals were suspended for two years and when faculty do come to an institution, they always ask if sabbaticals are offered. If we do not offer sabbaticals it is harder to get good faculty members.

**M/S (Garey/Nevins) moved take the approval of Sabbaticals in the 2011 – 12 budget to an action item. All in favor.**

**Action Item: M/S/C (Garey/Nevins) to approve three Sabbaticals in the 2011 – 12 budget. Nine Yays (Alarcon, Arellano, Bishop, Friedlander, Garey, Garfinkel, Monda, Neufeld, Nevins) and four Nays (Auchincloss, Guillen, Salazar, Sullivan).**

The Associated Student Senate President Garfinkel suggested an amendment to that motion which would be to not go higher than \$170,000. There was discussion including that the formula on which sabbaticals are funded are written into several policies and those would have to be amended in the process. Joe Sullivan, VP Business Services, stated that it is highly unlikely to exceed more than \$170,000. There was no support for the amendment, therefore there was no amendment.

Instructors' Association Member Alsheimer asked for a sample of how the administration calculates the cost of a sabbatical. It is on the spreadsheet showing the calculations about how.

Ms. Auchincloss asked about priorities for example wouldn't we want to spend the money on adding of sections versus reinstating sabbaticals. Academic Senate Vice-President Neufeld stated that Ms. Auchincloss is right, there are priorities but this is very different. The section addition was a very different proposal that was brought to us than restoration of services and funds that we had in the past. This very topic was discussed at length at the Academic Senate meeting and the difference is that it has to do with funding from the state. The more we absorb teaching for free, the more likely the state is going to see us teaching for less money. If we can add all these sections and still do it with the money we are being paid then in future they will say well you can it with less money. They have already done that.

There was further discussion regarding the priorities of hiring readers and tutors. Dr. Serban said that there was money restored to pay tutors and she provided information about this. Dr. Serban said that the hourly budget for 2010-11 is strong and what was being said about not enough money is an inaccurate statement. She referred to agenda item number eight below.

4. Timeline for budget development for 2011-12 (handout) – Joe Sullivan
5. VP Sullivan went over the Draft Budget Development Timeline in detail. Dates will be verified, adjusted and the attachment will be resent.
  - a. Timeline for review and ranking of program review requests (attachment)  
Dr. Serban said she sent the attached timeline for a reminder. Discussion of dates.
  - b. Budget principles (attachment)  
Dr. Serban said that this is the time to remind us all that these are Board adopted Budget Principles for over 20 years. The Board will look back and reaffirm or not and the Budget Principles have been a very good direction for what is important.
6. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual unrestricted general fund expenditures and 2010-11 adopted budget by cost center (Attachment) – continued discussion from Nov 2, 2010 CPC meeting – Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin

Joe Sullivan, VP Business Services, said they did not write comments on it, but if you look at this data, it does give everyone a chance to look at their departments, and it includes all the restricted funds. If there was restricted money in any department it shows in this report. Discussion and clarification took place.

7. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual restricted general fund expenditures and 2010-11 adopted budget by cost center (Attachment) – Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin
8. 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual revenues and 2010-11 adopted budget revenues (Attachment) - – continued discussion from Nov 2, 2010 CPC meeting - Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin
9. Hourly expenditures 2005-06 to 2009-10 actual and 2010-11 adopted budget (Attachment) -

Andreea Serban, Joe Sullivan, Leslie Griffin

Dr. Serban stated that the data (shown in the attachment) shows that in terms of the allocation for the Tutorial Center and the Gateway to Success Program for hourly short term staff and student workers the budgeted amount in the 2010 – 11 fiscal year is larger than we have ever allocated. Dr. Serban reviewed the numbers in the attachment and said that in terms of tutorial support, we are at the highest level ever in the last five years. Dr. Serban went through the attached hourly short-term expenditures details and the total amount budgeted for this year which is \$1.5 million. This tutorial support is the highest support that the college has ever put in the budget. It is important to not propagate false information.

There was discussion about why there is the impression that there is no money for tutors among the faculty and how is it distributed. Dr. Serban stated that this is why the detail by cost center has been provided. What needs to happen is that the Deans and Department Chairs need to review this and make sure the money is distributed. There was further discussion. Mr. Garey said that the argument earlier was regarding adding sections and the impact of larger sections with no support of readers and tutors. That is not reflected here. Dr. Serban said that all hourlies are in the hourly budget regardless of what they do. The bottom line is that we did restore the readers. This money has been restored in a time when the College did not get any new money. We are at a much higher level and it is the decision of the Deans and the Department chairs to allocate that and we do not interfere with that process. Dr. Serban reiterated that there is \$1.5 million in the budget for hourly support and Ed Programs can decide among themselves how to allocate that money. It is a discussion within each division and each division needs then to talk to their units. And this discussion went to the next agenda item.

10. Educational Programs Unrestricted General Fund Hourly Expenditures, Supplies and Materials and Travel & Conferences 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 Actual and 2010-11 Budgeted (Attachment) – Joe Sullivan, Jack Friedlander

Superintendent/President Serban asked the CPC members to look at the single page attachment because this is where the bulk of the budget is reported. For Ed Programs alone, Dr. Serban pointed to the hourly staff section and what was actually spent versus the budget, starting with 2007-08 which was the highest actual spend of all the hourlies. If you apply that 15% average pay reduction to 2007 -08 that would have reduced the \$2.6 million dollars to \$2.13 million. The budget for 2010 – 11 in all these hourlies categories for Ed Programs is \$1.8 million. The difference between those amounts is \$147,000. Basically between all the hourlies in Ed Programs there are short of the same dollar amounts comparable \$147,000. So that is quite a remarkable achievement in a time of fiscal crisis. An effort was made by this institution from various funding sources of the College to bring money back into Ed Programs which is the direct support to students. This really needs to be recognized. Then if you look at other categories, actually the budgeted 2010- 11 is much higher than even in the best of the times. The best of the times was 2007 – 08, that was our best budget year of about 10 years or so. Mr. Garey stated that the purpose of the

argument was the perception of the reductions in instructional support of the readers and tutors and if you look at the same chart, hourly readers in 2007-08 were funded \$71.7 thousand and the current year it is \$55.4 thousand that is a significant reduction. Superintendent/President Serban stated that if you apply the 15% of the hourly rate reduction comparably speaking you would get almost the same amount. There were no readers in 2009-10; there was only \$712.50 spent that year. Look where we are coming from in a time where we actually don't get any additional money. We have no additional revenue and were cut more this year. Here is a restoration of expenditures in a time when our revenue from the state is declining and let's not undermine the importance of international students and other areas because that is where we get extra money that helps us to be able to do some of these things.

Additional discussion about individual departments budgets and restoration of hourly rates, readers and tutors took place. Each Department needs to speak to their Dean and Department Chair.

11. Addendum Item: Listening Session

Dr. Serban added this item to the agenda, the topic of the Listening Sessions that had been discussed in previous CPC meetings. The need to talk about it now is because there is a timing issue. There is a process in terms of inviting businesses, civic organizations, educational organizations and other types of organizations and individuals that institution deems important to listen to. CPC has already discussed the pros and cons of hiring a company for the amount of \$25,000. This college has never done this before, but on the other hand if we want to listen to the community in a way that is organized that could most likely help us, this is one way to do it. Dr. Serban is bringing this back as an item to discuss and to see if there is support or not because if there is no support it will not go any further and if there is then she will take the next step in contacting the company that has done this for a number of colleges around the state and for the State Chancellor's Office. This spring we will be working on the college plan. We can develop the College Plan without this. She is not saying that this is an absolute must.

The members discussed concerns, the pros and the cons and how they are organized and what this type of organization does. The Listening Sessions are more of a strategic discussion rather than complaints and things that need to be fixed.

**M/S (Monda/Salazar) to make the investment to hire an outside group to help us prepare our Listening Session.**

**M/S (Alarcon/Nevins) to move the motion to action.**

**M/S/C (Monda/Friedlander) to hire the outside consultant group to conduct Listening Sessions to help along the process to prepare our College Plan. All in Favor.**

Dr. Serban acknowledged the group and how she appreciates the work they have done this semester; it has been very productive and I wish you all a Happy Holidays.

Dr. Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meetings:**

**Tuesday, February 8, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C;**  
**Tuesday, February 22, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C;**  
**Tuesday, March 1, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C;**  
**Tuesday, March 22, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C**

**Working sessions on draft of College Plan 2011-2014 scheduled for March 11, 2011 9am-12pm A217 and March 18, 2011 9am-12pm A217**