

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, August 30, 2011  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
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;  
J. Englert, ASB President;

M. Guillen, Classified Staff Rep;  
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, Acting Executive VP Ed  
Programs;  
J. Sullivan, VP Business Service

**ABSENT:**

C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative

**GUESTS:**

J. Morris, Information Systems Specialist,  
Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning;

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association;  
L. Vasquez, ITC, Committee Chair

**Announcements**

Acting Superintendent/President Friedlander opened the meeting stating that the agenda and attachments will be projected on the screen during the meeting in an effort to save paper. It was decided that future agendas and attachments will be put on Xythos and the link to the Xythos file will be emailed to all members.

Dr. Friedlander gave a quick update on enrollment, as of the morning of August 30. Total head count by 2.63%, 18,000 students and cumulative units is up about 2%. For California resident students, the total units were up less than 1%. He anticipates that our final enrollent (FTES from resident students) will be down by 1 – 2 % from last Fall. Our resident FTES is likely to be 3 to 4% lower this spring compared to last spring due to reductions in sections.

Dr. Friedlander introduced Jeffrey Englert, the new Associated Student Government President. Mr. Englert will be representing students at CPC Meetings. Mr. Englert apologized for being

late; his Tuesday afternoon class ends at 3:20pm, and he will continue to arrive late if it will not be disruptive. Mr. Englert stated that this year the series of events the Student Senate has lined up are going to be fantastic. There are eight pending applications from more students interested in being involved with the Student Senate.

Dr. Friedlander said the main thing that Mr. Englert can do by attending the meetings is to bring information and issues from the CPC Meetings to the Student Senate so that the Student Senate is aware of and can provide input on items as President of the ASG, Mr. Englert can provide CPC the student perspective on issues that CPC is discussing. Dr. Friedlander said that Mr. Englert's role in representing the students is important in that it enriches CPC discussions.

## **Information Items**

1. Intent to replace the Dean of Educational Programs: Student Development position that Keith McLellan is retiring from at the end of December, 2011. Goal is to fill this position in January, 2012.
  - A. Dr. Friedlander pulled this informational item from the agenda because he did not want to take any action with the position Dean McLellan will be vacating until all different options have been explored. He will be receiving information from Acting EVP Spaventa after her meeting with all the chairs and managers of the departments Dean McLellan supervises.
2. Status of the process to determine new districts for the election of SBCC Board members.
  - A. Dr. Friedlander described the redistricting process. The census data comes out every 10 years and all elected officials are required to do a redistricting study.
  - B. Step one of the process is to determine new districts for the SBCC Board members took place at the August 25<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting. The consulting company specializing in redistricting studies, who works through the Community College League of California (CCLC), made the attached presentation to the Board.
  - C. The key factor for SBCC is on the page that addresses Traditional Redistricting principles. It delineates the boundaries for the Santa Barbara City College School District (SBCCSD) and states the population goal for each area. Our districts of Carpinteria and Montecito have a population under the number required. Regardless of the redistricting option selected, these districts will have to be combined. There was further discussion and questions regarding redistricting as well as the process.
  - D. The next step: the consulting firm will present several options to the Board at the September 22, 2011 Regular Board Meeting. They will go through the

pros and cons of the options, listen to public feedback and then provide the college with three options they think that meet the legal requirements.

- E. The Board has to take action on the redistricting option for future Board Seat elections at the November Board Meeting.
  - F. The last step: the Consulting Company takes the option approved by the Board and does all the filing with the county regarding the district changes. We then have our new districts.
  - G. There was further discussion about some of the questions asked regarding the different Board Members' term expiration dates in areas that are combining their districts and the pros and cons of voting for Board members just in their district or voting for Board members at-large as they have in the past.
3. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)
- A. Jack Pond's letter of August 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 (Attachment # 2) giving the college 30 days to respond to the complaint it received about the Board of Trustees violating Title V, California Educational Code requirements and several ACCJC accreditation standards; July 1, 2011 letter of complaint sent to ACCJC (Attached to #1 Jack Pond's August 25<sup>th</sup> 2011 letter); ACCJC's Complaint Policy, (Attachment #3).
    - a. Dr. Friedlander gave a synopsis of the situation regarding the letter that was received in the President's Office in July regarding a visit in September from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Dr. Friedlander spoke with the President of ACCJC, Dr. Barbara Beno, to discuss the situation and pointed out that according to ACCJC's Complaint Policy, we were not being given our due process. Dr. Beno checked with her staff and attorney and agreed. A revised letter came from Mr. Jack Pond, VP, ACCJC, who handles complaint issues, stating that the college has 30 days to respond to the letter of complaint and he included a redacted copy of the letter of the complaints as we had never officially received it. The redacted confidential letter just shows what was material to the investigation and protects names of those mentioned in the letter that ACCJC did not have evidence that they had permission to include their names since the letter was sent to them as a "Confidential" document.
  - B. Process and Timeline for responding to the complaint by Friday, September 23.
    - A. In my role as Acting Superintendent/President, I will coordinate the college's response to the complaints. Individual responses are to be submitted to me by Tuesday, September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011.
    - B. I will prepare the draft of the college's responses to the allegations in the letter.



does the search, reviews the applications, then makes the selections and presents the Board with the names of those to go through the final interview process, which would include all the representatives from the College community.

- vi. Dr. Friedlander stated that the goal is to have a job announcement out in December or earlier, the applications due in early January and have the new Superintendent/President start as close to July 1<sup>st</sup> as possible.
- vii. Dr. Friedlander remarked on the current transition in his new role and how differently his time is spent. He said he is appreciative to those who have volunteered and stepped up to assist him in this transition making it more manageable in trying to do what is in the best interest of the institution moving forward.
- viii. Dr. Nevins has offered to provide assistance with various projects where he has time to do so. Dr. Friedlander stated that from time to time he will ask Dean to assist him with various projects

## **Program Review**

Dr. Friedlander stated that before going over details of items on the program review, he wants Jordan Morris, Information Systems Specialist from Institutional Research Department, to present the new template for rewriting program reviews first.

1. Status of last year's ranking of program review and non-routine resource requests to be funded from this year's budget (Attachments #4 - #10 )
2. Identification of the process to identify the highest priority general equipment, software and hardware requests that can be funded with the \$1.5 allocated to pay for new resource requests.
3. Proposed time line for completing this year's program review process. This is the year when all programs reviews need to be re-written (Attachment #11 )
  - a. A Program Review Workgroup was formed: Dr. Monda, Dr. Nevins, Ms. Vasquez, Dr. Scharper, and Mr. Else to look at a more reasonable timeline and to go over the design of the Program Review and the guidelines for Program Review that would allow for SLO information, curriculum etc.
  - b. Dr. Friedlander suggested scheduling a meeting with Dr. Monda and Mr. Neufeld to go over the latest spreadsheets and rectify any differences. Mr. Sullivan's office will take all items that are approved, assign budget numbers and get that out to everybody before the next CPC Meeting which is September 20<sup>th</sup>.
4. Presentation by Jordan Morris, showing the changes that have been made in the templates for submitting program reviews and resource requests.
  - a. Before Mr. Morris presented the new program review template, a discussion took place about what date should be on the title label and a decision was made that the title label will reflect the year they are working on the program review and it is understood that it is for the next budget year, eg. 2011-12 date is for the 2012-13 year.

- b. Mr. Morris presented the draft of the new template that will reflect the beginning of a new 3 year cycle, so the question came up about whether to roll all previous information into the new templates or leave them blank. After discussing the pros and cons, the idea of a hybrid was agreed upon. The information in the first three tabs would be rolled over and the rest would be left empty allowing for the chair or department head filling it in to give more thought to what will really be needed.
  - c. It was pointed out that there are many new chairs and department heads who have never filled out a program review, because of this it was suggested that they be given very clear instructions.
  - d. Dr. Friedlander pointed out several times that when looking at the needs of a department, the question to keep in mind is “What do we need in order to offer a quality program and to stay current?”
  - e. VP Sullivan pointed out that the program review will be different this year because we are looking at reducing and not growing.
  - f. The question came up about putting in requests year after year so that the request is not forgotten when the more abundant years come, then we can actually order it. The answer for the time being is that each department needs to look at what they currently need to operate a quality program in an environment where the college is reducing expenditures. Ask for what is critical and essential for your program.
  - g. There was a long discussion regarding how to set up the program review templates to reflect Scenario 5, the 5% reductions and the current budgetary environment. It was decided that a Program Review Workgroup would meet to discuss the questions that came up at this meeting and that their guidelines be very clear.
  - h. There was further discussion on buying a new item, would it then become routine or non-routine.
5. Next steps for completing the program review and non-routine resource requests processes.

## **Budget**

- 1. Review of Fixed and Variable Costs Analysis (Attachment#12).  
VP Sullivan went through his attachment, “Background for Budget Development” which outlines exactly what the college is currently facing.
  - a. Some of the highlights from his talking points on the document are that 90% of our expenditures are for salaries and 10% are for operating costs. There is over a \$1M increase to the benefits, primarily from health and welfare and the state unemployment contribution rates, which contribute to increasing the percentage of employee benefits for all full time employees. The analysis of the average increase in the benefit rates has climbed from 21% to 23% over the last 3 years while salaries have gone down.

- b. Using Business Services Dept. as an example, he pointed out that there is nowhere near the department's share of the \$2.5 million reduction left to cut in supplies and operating expenses. This leaves only salaries and benefits for virtually all of the cuts to expenditures.
  - c. Where will the \$2.5 M reductions come from and VP Sullivan's analysis leads to the following conclusions:
    - a. The College will have to reduce positions, hourly and full-time, in order to meet the necessary budget reductions. The reductions need to begin now in order ensure that any full-time positions not filled will come from attrition. (re-organization will become a by-word here on campus)
    - b. Dr. Friedlander interjected that this is where we need to look at our priorities as an institution, on the areas where we need to maintain a high degree of excellence. We need to look at everything more creatively.
    - c. As positions are eliminated, the services provided will need to be reduced, modified or eliminated. This will result in reallocations as services are prioritized.
    - d. In order to reduce the "BIG HAMMER" in year 3 the attrition will need to start as soon as possible.
    - e. VP Sullivan pointed out that program review could be different this year because we are looking at reducing and not growing. After further discussion, there was consensus in the group that this was not the appropriate intention for program review.
    - f. Further discussion took place on consequences of the increase of tuition from \$36 to \$46 and the fact that the delay in implementing this fee increase from spring to summer session will result in a further reduction in state support of approximately \$1M.
    - g. In answer to someone's question regarding the severance pay for the Superintendent/President Serban; it is included in the adopted budget.
2. Review of proposed Adopted Budget for 2011-12 (Attachment #13)
- a. CPC members need time to go through the adopted budget prior to the Fiscal Committee meeting and the upcoming Study Session. An unofficial CPC meeting was scheduled for Friday, September 2 at 11 a.m. in A218C to discuss the adopted budget.
3. Review of balances for the Construction and Equipment Funds (Attachment #14): Joe Sullivan.

### **Agenda items for next CPC meeting**

- 1. Review of goals and objectives for CPC for 2011-12.

- a. Dr. Friedlander stated that we may have to schedule special meetings to get caught up.
- 2. Identification of projects/tasks CPC needs to complete this year and time line for doing so.
  - a. Dr. Friedlander will bring this list to the next meeting.

### **Additional Items**

- 3. Additional items
  - a. Dates for the CPC Meetings need to be finalized due to conflicts for P&R. This is in process. We will meet the 13<sup>th</sup> of September, and check the other dates to make sure CPC will meet the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of each month. (P&R is always on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month).
  - b. Dr. Friedlander said we need an extra meeting because we have so much to do.

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned.

**Next 3 CPC meetings: September 20; October 4; October 18**