

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, May 15, 2012
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT

J. Friedlander, (Chair), Acting
Superintendent/President;

I. Alarcón, Past-Pres., Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, Pres., CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA;
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment,
Research & Planning;
K. Monda, Academic Senate
Representative, Chair Planning and
Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President
K. O'Connor, Academic Senate
Representative;
M. Spaventa, Executive VP Ed Programs;
J. Sullivan, VP Business Services;

ABSENT:

J. Englert, ASB President;
C. Salazar, Classified Staff
Representative;

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Assoc. (IA);
P. Butler, P&R, Academic Senate;
J. McPheter, Classified Consultation
Group;
J. Negroni, Student Senate Member and
newly elected Student Trustee;
B. Partee, Dean, Educational Programs;
B. Pazich, Dean, Ed Programs;
J. Pike, Director, Learning Resources
Center; Co-director, Gateway Program;
A. Scharper, Dean, Ed Programs;
L. Stark, Pres. Instructors' Association;
E. Stein, Classified Consultation Group;
L. Vasquez, ITC, Committee;
J. Walker, co-Steward of the Supervisory
Bargaining Unit (SBU)

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 VP, Business Services Sullivan called the meeting to order in the absence of the Acting Superintendent/President Friedlander and asked for the approval of the minutes for the May 1, and May 8 CPC meeting.

M/S/C (Bishop/Monda] to approve the amended minutes of the May 1 and May 8 CPC meetings. One abstention, the rest in favor.

2.0 Announcements

- 2.1 Article that was published in this past Sunday's Voices section of the Santa Barbara News-Press describing the Get-Focused...Stay-Focused Progression in Education Model (Att. 3)
- 2.2 Email exchange Peter MacDougall and Eric Skinner, Executive Vice Chancellor for Programs, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office regarding the "Get-Focused...Stay-Focused Progression" in Education Model. (Att. 4)

3.0 Information Items

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Analysis of the governor's revised budget (May Revise)

VP Sullivan handed out a printed version of the critical slides that came from the California State Budget Overview of the Governor's May Revise Webinar and went through them slide by slide. He stated that the clarity we got from the May Revise was the fact that they did not touch education. Sullivan said that one of the comments made during the webinar was that this information is not hard and fast, but it does show the significant difference of the affect of the Governor's Budget with taxes and without taxes. We will be impacted seriously without the tax measure passing. And there was further discussion about the fact that the college will be prepared if the tax measure does not pass.

VP Sullivan brought up the Community College League of California web page that allows each district to look at the "District Budget Impact". Each District's budget scenarios are provided to assist districts generally with budget planning. Several factors will change the final impact on each district. VP Sullivan pointed out the salient points, the Net apportionment cut, the Work Load Reduction percentage and total FTES reduced with the passing of the tax measure and failure of the tax measure to pass and compared it to the projections from the SBCC spreadsheet.

4.2 Review of updated 5/8/12 spreadsheet showing the options for achieving a balanced budget by 2013 – 14.

VP Sullivan projected the updated spreadsheet and explained how it had changed, then showed the options for achieving a balanced budget. He stated that at the moment we can achieve this without eliminating summer school and without impacting salaries. There was discussion regarding consultation groups meeting this summer to look at the numbers in detail. All of this information will be part of the tentative budget and can be changed at a later date. There was further discussion regarding the impact of eliminating all categorical back-fill in 2013-14 and that there needs to be further clarification. There needs to be more clarification on the expenses for the Student Success Initiatives.

4.3 Process for identifying and prioritizing budget reduction items to achieve a balanced budget by 2013-14 (Att. 5)

4.4 Date(s) for summer CPC meeting(s) - There will be a meeting Monday, June 18, 2012 from 2pm – 4pm in A218.

5.0 Action items

5.1 Approval to reduce short-term hourly worker budgets for each VP and the college president cost center by 50% for 2013– 14.

This action voted on by the members of CPC means that CPC approves putting the above recommendation into the tentative budget for 2012-13. There was discussion and clarification prior to the approval of the recommendation.

It was agreed upon that departments need more accountability when hiring hourlies and there need to be consequences if they go over budget. There was agreement that there needs to be further discussion about a plan to reduce services if the college needs to.

M/S/C (Monda/Alarcón] to approve to reduce short-term hourly worker budgets for each VP and the college president cost center by 50% for 2012-13 (this was modified from 2013-14). There were seven Yays and four Nays.

- 5.2 Approval of proposal to lift hiring freeze if the 50% reduction in short-term hourly worker budgets is implemented.

M/S/C (Neufeld/Negroni] to approve the proposal to lift hiring freeze on short-term hourly workers. There were eight Yays and four Nays.

This will not go into effect immediately. VP Sullivan recommended that the President send written directions as there were questions about whether these were across the board changes or not.

6.0 Adjournment

- 6.1 VP Sullivan asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

M/S/C (Bishop/Monda] to adjourn the meeting. All in favor.

- 6.2 The next CPC meeting will be a special meeting: Monday, June 18 in Room A218C, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

5/17/12 - Email from J. Friedlander to CPC and CPC-cc

The reason for needing this meeting is noted below. I need to have CPC's recommendation on how best to address this FTES decision for the coming year and the implications of whatever we decide to do on our budget reduction decisions.

Attached is the FTES projections for 2012-13 that we will be discussing at Tuesday morning's special CPC meeting. The spreadsheet does not take into account the loss in credit FTES that would take place if we were to cancel the classes we cut from the coming summer and fall schedules. I will have this information on Monday.

As shown in the attached spreadsheet that does not include the credit class section reductions we just made to the summer and fall schedules, we will be under our FTES cap if we convert all the non-enhanced non-credit classes to fee-based offerings this coming year and do not restore the credit classes we cut from this summer's and fall schedules. The plan to reduce our FTES for the coming year was based on the worst case budget scenario for 2012-13, which at the time included the anticipated \$5 million work load reduction to cover the state's shortfall in revenues for 2012-13. As we learned this past Monday, much to our pleasant surprise, the \$5 million cut to our budget (which includes a workload reduction) we were advised by the Chancellor's Office and CLCC to expect for next year is not included in the governor's revised budget. The second spreadsheet shows the number of FTES we would be over cap if the tax measure is not passed.

Decision

Option 1: We do not convert the non-credit non-enhanced FTES to fee based classes this fall (full-year if the tax measure passes) and we restore the credit sections we just cut from the summer and fall schedules. If the tax measure is not passed in November, we would convert non-credit non-enhanced classes to fee-based offerings in the winter and/or spring quarters and would reduce sections in the spring credit schedule.

Implications of this Option

If we pursue this option, the college would capture all of the FTES it is eligible to receive plus the additional funds that are tied to FTES (e.g., categorical programs, Perkins grant, and full funding for each of the CE centers). However, if we offered the sections needed to achieve our funded cap, the savings we identified in the Budget Reduction Options Spreadsheet from workload reduction would have to be off-set by from budget reductions in other areas.

Delaying the transition of non-enhanced non-credit classes to fee based offerings until the Center for Lifelong Learning is implemented in June, 2013 would be well received by members of our community that enroll in these classes.

If we decide to not meet our FTES cap in 2012-13, we would need to spend the money to do so the following year since colleges that do not achieve their funded FTES cap have one year to do so before being financially penalized.

Option 2

We continue our plan to convert all of the non-credit non-enhanced FTES plan on being under cap for 2012-13.

Implications of Pursuing Option 2

We would save the money from reducing our class sections that is identified in the Budget Reduction Options Spreadsheet for 2012-13 but not in the following years. This, this would be a one-time savings. If we decide to go with this option, we would be hurting students who will not be able to enrol in the courses they must take to achieve their educational and career objectives in a timely manner. It would also not be well received by the large number of students that enroll in our non-enhanced non-credit classes.

I discussed this situation with Lori Gaskin and will share her thoughts with you at Tuesday's CPC meeting.

Jack

Dr. Jack Friedlander

Acting Superintendent/President

Santa Barbara City College

Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394

Tel (805) 730-4011

www.sbcc.edu



2012-13 FTES Projection with 6.2% Workload Reduction if Tax Measure is Not Approved

	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Noncredit Total	Total CA Resident FTES
2011-2012 First Principal Apportionment Posted 3/1/12	13,776.39	811.85	1,131.30	1,943.15	15,719.54
Base Funding per FTES	\$ 4,565	\$ 3,232	\$ 2,745		
Projected Reduction Rate	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%
Workload Reduction	-6.20%	-6.20%	-6.20%	-6.20%	-6.20%
Projected Reduction FTES	-1,906.65	-112.36	-156.57	-268.93	-2,175.58
2011-12 Funded FTES Target as of 2/16/2012	11,869.73	699.49	,974.73	1,674.22	13,543.95
Estimated Funding	\$ 54,183,200	\$ 2,260,794	\$ 2,675,580	\$ 4,936,373	\$ 59,119,573

P2 Projection Reported April 20, 2012

FTES Reported	13,133.26	717.00	1,095.60	1,812.60	14,945.86
FTES Over (Under) Target	1,263.52	17.51	120.87	138.38	1,401.91
% Over (Under) Target	9.62%	2.44%	11.03%	7.63%	9.38%
\$ Over (Under) Target	\$ 5,767,760	\$ 56,593	\$ 331,787	\$ 388,381	\$ 6,156,140

Assume All Noncredit Nonenhanced become Fee-Based except 110 PCW FTES

FTES Reported	13,133.26	717.00	110.00	827.00	13,960.26
FTES Over (Under) Target	1,263.52	17.51	(864.73)	(847.22)	416.31
% Over (Under) Target	9.62%	2.44%	0.00%	-102.44%	2.98%
\$ Over (Under) Target	\$ 5,767,760	\$ 56,593	\$ (2,373,635)	\$ (2,317,042)	\$ 3,450,718

2012-13 FTES Projection

	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Noncredit Total	Total CA Resident FTES
2011-2012 First Principal Apportionment Posted 3/1/12	13,776.39	811.85	1,131.30	1,943.15	15,719.54
Base Funding per FTES	\$ 4,565	\$ 3,232	\$ 2,745		
Projected Reduction Rate	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%
Projected Reduction FTES	-1,052.21	-62.01	-86.41	-148.41	-1,200.63
Projected 2011-12 Funded FTES Target as of 3/1/12	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	1,794.74	14,518.91
Estimated Funding	\$ 58,083,559	\$ 2,423,538	\$ 2,868,182	\$ 5,291,719	\$ 63,375,279

P2 Reported April 20, 2012

FTES Reported	13,133.26	717.00	1,095.60	1,812.60	14,945.86
FTES Over (Under) Target	409.09	(32.84)	50.71	17.86	426.95
% Over (Under) Target	3.11%	-4.58%	4.63%	0.99%	2.86%
\$ Over (Under) Target	\$ 1,867,400	\$ (106,151)	\$ 139,185	\$ 33,035	\$ 1,900,435

Assume All Noncredit Nonenhanced become Fee-Based Except 110 Parent Child Workshop FTES

FTES Reported	13,133.26	717.00	110.00	827.00	13,960.26
FTES Over (Under) Target	409.09	(32.84)	(934.89)	(967.74)	(558.65)
% Over (Under) Target	3.11%	-4.58%	0.00%	-117.02%	-4.00%
\$ Over (Under) Target	\$ 1,867,400	\$ (106,151)	\$ (2,566,237)	\$ (2,672,388)	\$ (804,988)
Credit FTES needed to balance loss of NCNE FTES					176.35

2012-13 FTES Projection 5/21/2012

Funding Per FTES	
Credit	\$ 4,565
Noncredit Enhanced	\$ 3,232
Noncredit Nonenhanced	\$ 2,745

2011-12 Apportionment Cap <small>See http://bit.ly/2011-12-apport-p1</small>	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Totals
2011-2012 Base Funded FTES	13,776.39	811.85	1,131.30	\$ 68,616,118
2011-12 Workload Reduction %	-7.64%	-7.64%	-7.64%	
2011-12 Workload Reduction \$	\$ (4,803,168)	\$ (200,411)	\$ (237,181)	\$ (5,240,760)
2011-12 Workload Reduction FTES	-1,052.21	-62.01	-86.41	-1,200.63
2011-12 Revised Funded FTES (Cap) as of 3/1/12	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	14,518.91
2011-12 Revised Funded Cap \$	\$ 58,083,625	\$ 2,423,543	\$ 2,868,190	\$ 63,375,358

2011-12 P2 Reported April 20, 2012	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Totals
FTES Reported	13,133.26	717.00	1,095.60	14,945.86
FTES Over (Under) Target	409.09	(32.84)	50.71	426.95
\$ Over (Under) Target	\$ 1,867,402	\$ (106,151)	\$ 139,186	\$ 1,900,437
% Over (Under) Target	3.22%	-4.38%	4.85%	2.94%

2012-13 Projection Assumptions:

- Convert all Noncredit Nonenhanced courses to fee-based except 110 FTES from Parent Child Workshop
- Reduce Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 by 101 total sections at 3 FTES each =~ 300 FTES reduction.

	Credit CA Resident	Noncredit Enhanced	Noncredit Nonenhanced	Totals
2011-12 FTES Reported	13,133.26	717	1,095.60	14,945.86
2012-13 FTES reductions from above assumptions	-300.00	0.00	-985.6	-1,285.60
Projected 2012-13 FTES	12,833.26	717.00	110.00	13,660.26
Assume 2012-13 Cap FTES same as 2011-12	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	14,518.91
2012-13 FTES Over (Under) Cap	109.09	-32.84	-934.89	-858.65
2012-13 \$\$ Over (Under) Cap	\$ 497,955	\$ (106,151)	\$ (2,566,245)	\$ (2,174,441)
Equivalent Credit FTES needed to balance loss of Noncredit Nonenhanced (Total dollars / funding per Credit FTES)				476.35

Effect of possible additional 6.4% Workload Reduction in 2012-13

Assume 2012-13 Cap FTES same as 2011-12	12,724.17	749.84	1,044.89	
6.4% FTES Workload Reduction	-814.35	-47.99	-66.87	-929.21
Corresponding 6.4% reduction in funding	\$ (3,717,352)	\$ (155,107)	\$ (183,564)	\$ (4,056,023)
2012-13 FTES cap after 6.4% workload reduction	11,909.83	701.85	978.02	13,589.70
2011-12 FTES Reported	13,133.26	717	1,095.60	14,945.86
2012-13 FTES reductions from above assumptions	-300.00	0.00	-985.6	-1,285.60
Projected 2012-13 FTES	12,833.26	717.00	110.00	13,660.26
2012-13 FTES Over (Under) workload-reduced cap	923.43	15.15	-868.02	70.56
2012-13 \$\$ Over (Under) workload-reduced cap	\$ 4,215,306.67	\$ 48,955.97	\$ (2,382,680.42)	\$ 1,881,582.22
Equivalent Credit FTES needed to meet cap (Total dollars / funding per Credit FTES)				\$ (412.19)

Section Counts as of 5/21/2012	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
Summer	426	431	465	537
Fall	2,021	2,120	2,017	2,073
Spring	1,950	1,950	2,030	2,061
Total	4,397	4,501	4,512	4,671
Difference from previous term	-104	-11	-159	-130

Reductions Category	Identified \$2.4 million	Categorical Backfill	50% reduction in short term or substitute (hourly) employees	Reduction in Permanent classified and management positions	Reduce Non-instructional support services	Revenue or Expense Offset	Workload reduction for \$4.0 million, ? FTES or ? sections	Reduction in cost or revenue generation for high cost programs	Reduce over cap FTES, 710 NCNE FTES, 414 QTR sections	Current Budget Deficit Reductions	Summer School instructional	Summer School Conversion to 11 or 10 month employee	Salary Reduction for 12, 11 and 10 month employees (1% for discussion)	Reduction for all Faculty (1% for discussion)	Freeze step, class and longevity. Parking fees
Certificated Salaries	604,561	325,000			150,000	160,000	1,337,449		717,917	1,957,478	1,949,824		21,000	338,449	240,000
Classified Salaries	1,130,229	250,000	965,000		150,000					2,495,229		521,799	192,000		240,000
Benefits	390,921	173,550	110,975	-	93,600	37,440	153,807		82,560	889,046	239,765	203,502	79,794	79,197	149,760
Supplies and Materials	152,647									152,647					
Other Operating Expenses	45,342									45,342					
Unallocated Cost Estimate	31,882			1,408,000		795,000				2,234,882					250,000
Total	2,355,582	748,550	1,075,975	1,408,000	393,600	992,440	1,491,256	-	800,477	7,774,624	2,189,589	725,301	292,794	417,646	879,760
Objective	9,713,997	7,358,415	6,609,865	5,533,890	4,125,890	3,732,290	2,739,850	1,248,594	1,248,594						
Remaining	7,358,415	6,609,865	5,533,890	4,125,890	3,732,290	2,739,850	1,248,594	1,248,594	448,117						
Triggers	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit	November Legislation	Current Budget Deficit	Current Budget Deficit		June 15 Budget	June 15 Budget	June 15 Budget and/or November Tax Increase Measure	June 15 Budget and/or November Tax Increase Measure	June 15 Budget and/or November Legislation
What is the impact on students?	Reduced services	Reduced services, categorical backfill is budgeted at \$825,000. Backfill in 2011 was \$743,000.	Reduced services, hourly budget does not include grant funded, security, food service, FWS or the bookstore	Non-credit only	Reduction in seervices	N/A	Fewer sections due to workload reduction.	Reduced services to Students			Students would not progress. This would enable the college to maintain full fall and spring semesters maximizing service to students.		Furloughs could be rotated through the year to reduce impact.	No direct impact.	N/A
Timing issues or year of reduction.	This would reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	This would reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	This would reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	This would not reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year. Contracts would not expire until June 30, 2013.		About 50% would offset expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	Would be implemented in January for spring? Only about half of the savings would be realized in fiscal year.	This would need to be negotiated			This would not reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	This would not reduce expense in the 2012-13 fiscal year	This would need to be negotiated	This would need to be negotiated as it would reduce all salaries in schedule 10.	This would need to be negotiated.
What is the impact on jobs?	This would reduce jobs in some areas, primarily through attrition.	This would reduce the services to students and the number of positions in the Categorical programs, EOPS, DSPS, credit and non-credit matriculation.		Reorg of CE would eliminate permanent management and staff positions. Reorg of Computer instructional labs would eliminate some lab tech positions (not included above).	Re-assignment of faculty to classroom and reduce classified support staff. Reducing Stipends would reduce salaries above contract to instructors. Reduce 10 extended days for non-instructional faculty, \$80,000.	Would preserve jobs. The \$160,000 + benefits is from not replacing full time faculty positions.	Would impact adjuncts, overload and summer pay.		The overcap cost for NCNE is calculated at 30 students per class times 30 hours per class, times 710 FTES divided by 525(hrs per FTES)		Reduces adjunct and summer pay for instructors, would preserve classified jobs.	Would preserve Jobs, but would impact the income of some classified by 8.5%.	Would preserve Jobs, but would reduce income of employees.	Would preserve Jobs, but would reduce base salary of full time instructors by 5%.	Would preserve jobs.
Which bargaining units would be affected?	CSEA and Management	IA, CSEA and Management	N/A	CSEA, Confidential and Management	IA and CSEA	IA, CSEA, confidential and Management	IA	IA, CSEA, confidential and Management			IA and CSEA	CSEA	CSEA, Confidential and Management	IA	IA, CSEA, confidential and Management
FTES							Only 773 FTES to be reduced				Summer 2011 Credit Resident 1,178; Credit non-resident 123; non-credit enhanced 125; non-credit non-enhanced 16				