

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

February 7, 2006

3:30 - 4:30 PM

A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, A. Serban,
K. McLellan, T. Garey, P. Haslund, E. Frankel, B. Lindemann, K. Molloy,
L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, M. Guillen, K. Russell

GUEST: P. English

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Andreea Serban announced that the Accreditation Commission has approved the college's mid-term report. She said that a member of the Commission staff advised the college not to request doing an experimental self study for its next accreditation. Dr. Serban said the next scheduled visit is in fall 2009 rather than fall, 2008. She will confirm with the Commission that the fall 2009 date is correct. If so, the self study will need to be submitted in May 2009.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on spring enrollments

Andreea Serban indicated that yesterday was the census date for semester-long sections. The short sections, dual enrollment and professional development class enrollments are not entered into the system until later. Compared to the same time last year the California residence enrollments are at least equal. She said there is a tremendous increase in non-California residents, which do not count toward meeting the college's state-funded FTES target. Dr. Serban said that although these numbers are good, there are not sufficient to capture the 2.58 allowable growth for this year. The degree to which we will be able to achieve our growth and Basic Skills FTES targets for this year will depend on how much is generated from short-term sections, Dual Enrollment and Professional Development courses.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Review of approach for funding the Admissions Technician position approved at the January 24th CPC meeting

The Council was provided the minutes from the discussion during the last CPC meeting on the request for the Admissions Technician position. Jack Friedlander said the position has been advertised. He said the approval for the position was a major boost to the morale of Allison Curtis, Director of Admissions, and her staff. He reiterated the Council's motion at the last meeting to approve the position and to have EC inform the Council how this position would be funded. Dr. Friedlander indicated there are two ways to approach this: (1) submit the proposal as part of our allocation process for next year's budget and have it considered with all of the proposals and ranked accordingly; or (2) fund this position from growth funds that we have to allocate next year. Thus, when CPC is ranking new proposals the money for this proposal is already accounted for. Dr. Friedlander said that we could look at the proposed budget process prior to making this decision. He suggested the Council postpone the discussion until it discusses the process that will be proposed in EC. He said the President is asking that CPC recommend to him the way it wants to proceed.

Jack Friedlander reiterated that there is no alternative but to take either of these two steps. He said that if there were funds in Educational Programs to fund this position he would have proposed it to the Council. Keith McLellan said he would like to come back to CPC with the process. As the Council looks at the growth funds, there are certain items that are pre-committed, such as the negotiated increases in faculty and staff salaries and benefits for the 2006-2007 and increases in fixed costs, that will not be included in the resource allocations to be ranked for funding by CPC. Keith McLellan is asking the Council to be informed of what monies are available from growth and how much of those dollars are available for CPC to recommend funding proposals. Liz Auchincloss reminded that Council that when some classified positions were cut, it was thought that they were temporary cuts when, in fact, they were permanent cuts.

4.2 Implications of the Governor's budget for SBCC

4.3 Budget development process

Jack Friedlander went through the "Principles" and "Process" of the *College Consultation Process for Prioritizing Needs and Allocating Funds* and invited questions and/or offered clarifications in the document.

In regard to item 3 of the "Process", "sabbatical leave excess cost adjustment", Joe Sullivan said the prior method of calculating the cost of the sabbatical didn't include the actual full cost of the sabbaticals. This deficit has accumulated over the years up to \$100,000. It was an error that carried forward and will need to be subtracted from available funds. Sue Ehrlich raised a question in regard to banked TLUs accumulated for sabbaticals. Dr. Friedlander responded that these are paid when faculty are on sabbatical at the current rate and not the rate in place at the time the TLUs were banked. However, when a faculty member retires, their banked TLUs are paid out at the rate that was in place when it was earned. Joe Sullivan said that these "banked TLUs" represent an unfunded liability. He said the college is going to begin to accrue a reserve against the funds this year. Jack Friedlander said the auditors felt that every year there were ample funds in end-of-year balances to cover it thus it was not an audit exception. As we draw down our end-of-year balances we need to recognize it

as an unfunded liability. Dr. Friedlander said that a number of faculty members are using some of their banked TLUs to draw down their teaching loads as they approach retirement.

Joe Sullivan said that he needs to quantify the revenue and expenses we have for this year. He said we should have this information by the next CPC meeting. Mr. Sullivan said what we are allocating is the residual money remaining from the 2005-06 budget from growth and equalization. He said what we are actually calculating is based on 2005-06 net knowing what we have and then allocate on a go-forward basis starting July 1 of 2006.

Dr. Friedlander said the next time we meet we will review the request for proposals that is going out to units and then send it out after the next CPC meeting.

Keith McLellan said that although he recognizes there are critical position requests that will be submitted, the request for the Admissions and Records position has some unique attributes that may set it aside from pressing needs. He said he was on the Project Redesign team that made the decision to drop this full-time position in Admissions & Records in 1996. He said the decision was made on a false promise of a product (Oracle's ERP in general and its SIS in particular) that didn't exist. All of this was taking place at a time the district perceived itself as being in dire straits financially and under the false impression that the implementation of OSS would enable the college to conduct its business with fewer staff. There were people with a strong voice that prevailed at that time. Mr. McLellan said that EC and CPC have to make a decision that a mistake was made and to rectify it. Liz Auchincloss concurred with Mr. McLellan but offered that there may be other departments that need additional positions to conduct their day-to-day business that that they should have the same opportunity to bring those position requests forward. Dr. Friedlander said that each Vice President will present compelling cases for requests for positions in their respective areas where they have staffing limitations.

The Council did not disagree with the egregiousness of Dean McLellan's account of the position request in Admissions & Records. Sue Ehrlich said that there are other items lurking in the background that meet that same test of egregiousness. Joe Sullivan said that if you look at the way that decision was made to cut 6-8 positions in 2002-03 and the resulting ending balances that occurred after that decision, you could make the same argument that we made this decision based on essentially false information. He can support either way of presenting this A&R position because he felt it would rise to the top. Mr. Sullivan asked that we focus on a go-forward basis and present the arguments together for all the other issues.

Lynda Fairly said that in the past we have put all our priorities forth, we debate them and come up with creative ideas for solving problems and then we vote. She felt that it is out of our college process to take one position, which we all feel that is very important, and say it is so unique that it is more important than anything else when we don't know what else is going to be brought forth.

4.4 Priority Institutional Initiatives for Spring/Summer 2006

The attached list of initiatives was not current. An updated list of these priorities will be sent to the Council.

5.0 Adjournment

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.