SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
May 6, 2003
3:00 – 4:30 PM
Room A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Romo, B. Fahnestock, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, L. Rose, P. Haslund, E. Frankel, G. Carroll, A. Serban, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, and E. Salazar

ABSENT: T. Garey

GUEST: Leslie Griffin, Ron Baker

1.0   Call to Order

1.1   Approval of the minutes of the April 15th CPC meeting

M/S/C [Rose/Carroll] unanimously to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2003 meeting.

2.0   Announcements

The next CPC meeting will be May 20th.

3.0   Information Items

3.1   FTES update: P2 submission

Andreea Serban reviewed the second apportionment report that is due to the state on April 30th and indicated that it is still an estimate but does not include the final positive attendance report for S03.

Jack Friedlander said that our major area for growth next year is through the Center for Management and Staff Development. There are a number of potentially large FTES opportunities to pursue but we need to evaluate the cost of generating additional FTES in relationship to the college's funded FTES base for 2003-2004. He also said that the decision as to whether the anticipated increase in student fees will be implanted in the fall or spring semester would not be made until the state budget is passed. If the increase in fees is implemented for the fall semester, the obvious problem is how to collect the increase in fees from students who have already registered.

Note: John Romo addressed Items 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 5.1 inclusively.

3.2   Update on state budget

John Romo said that there is not much new to report the on community college state budget deliberations. It is anticipated that we will have a budget by early July. Yesterday the state passed legislation that would allow them to borrow money to pay into the required amounts towards the state's pension system. In regard to a reinterpretation of Prop 98 funding, John said that there is

some indication that the budget situation is such that certain triggers which would lower the amount net that is available to K-12 and community colleges would go into effect because of the budget crisis. John Also indicated that our community college funding level out of Prop 98 should be 10.4% as statutorily required.

3.3   Permanent classified positions that have been approved:
        Change in testing technician assignments in assessment

        John Romo informed the Council that there was an appeal submitted to fill a vacancy [Lydia Aguilera] in the assessment office. Keith clarified that there were two, ¾- time positions in assessment. He said one ¾-time person left. We took the ¼ of the ¾ position, added it to the other ¾ position making one full-time position and one ½-time position. Lana asked that the Council be provided a list of the positions that are currently frozen.

4.0   Discussion Items

4.1   Categorical program reductions for 2003-04 and criteria used to identify mandated
        and/or core services

        Brian Fahnestock addressed the 2003-04 budget reductions for the core programs and the question of how much we would backfill the categorical programs if they took the same proportional hit as the other programs. We would need approximately $1.2m to transfer from the unrestricted general fund to the restricted general fund. We would then determine how much a program could cut without cutting into the core so we could determine what the actual backfill would be. He further discussed the model on the 2003-04 budget reductions of core programs distributed to the Council. John said that the backfill is not reflected on the unrestricted budget reduction model but is reflected in the spreadsheet that showed our potential shortfall of $1.2m distributed at the last CPC meeting. Keith McLellan (credit matriculation), Ron Baker (EOPS, DSPS) and Bill Hamre (technology core services) distributed information that reflected how the categorical programs in their respective areas define core services and their estimated savings. They will come back with a more defined representation of what the backfill would actually have to be.

4.2   Request for reinstatement of cuts for 2003-04: [addressed under 5.1]

        A.   Academic Skills Center
        B.   Center for Management & Staff Development

4.3   Review of Oracle Student Information System [see 5.1]

4.4   Bulletin Board

        Bill Hamre informed the Council that in the effort to try to eliminate some of the college-generated SPAM in the GroupWise mail system, IRD is working with our web development group to provide a link on the SBCC website where people can post messages that are not college business as well as to provide a mechanism for providing discussion groups. Over the next few weeks a prototype will developed and brought to CPC.

5.0   Action Items

5.1   Overview of budget reductions for 2003-04, and action

        Brian Fahnestock indicated that the estimate of budget reductions that he distributed to the Council is the same as was distributed at the previous CPC meeting, but with the proposed

budget reductions [discussed at last CPC meeting] itemized on the cover page. This packet of reductions reduces the budget by $4,009,554 representing a 7.2% reduction.

Brian said if we get relief from the hiring requirement, it would represent an additional $650,000 in savings from salaries and benefits for those faculty positions that we would not be filling. This number also assumes some vacancies. The number not added in is the requirement for new faculty from growth. The other waiver we have asked for is the nine vacancies that we are not filling. These vacancies represent $4m-plus dollars.

Peter Haslund gave a brief report on the discussions regarding requests from districts to defer meeting their full-time faculty obligation that took place at the State Academic Senate meeting he attended. Peter said that he and Kathy O'Connor decided to withdraw our region's resolution in support of a waiver for one-year as it would have gone down in defeat. The Academic Senate has worked hard to get the ratio of 75/25. There is also a degree of realism that at some future point this would be the bargaining point. John said the earliest our request would be acted upon by the Board of Governors would be July.

Bill Hamre discussed the IRD budget reductions that had not been previously reviewed by the council awaiting such time as we had more information about Oracle. John said that since the last meeting there has been much consideration of the Oracle implementation. The recommendations from the workgroups that have been working for several weeks concur that we have enough of the product in hand to be able to draw a conclusion that the product will deliver what we anticipated it would. He said there are still some gaps, but there is confidence that those gaps can be filled.

Bill said that the one-time and ongoing costs to the college to implement OSS costs are making it very challenging to move ahead with this project. John indicated he needs two pieces of information before he goes to the Board on May 8th with a final recommendation on whether to continue moving forward with OSS. That information is not yet available. One is an honest estimate of what the cost to implement and what the ongoing costs are going to be. There has been continued upward adjustment to the budget. John expressed his appreciation for the work done by Brian and Bill, and others to define our actual costs. Bill is setting up a 3-year model going forward. John also wants to have a context of how this compares with the cost of other systems. John said that he is speaking with Oracle and indicating to them that he expects more from them in terms of working to approach this implementation as a continuing partnership meaning they have to do better for us in terms of cost in light of the change in the economic environment of the college from last year. Bill Hamre indicated that Oracle is very committed to this product.

John's recommendation is that we give consideration to the IRD reductions as presented here with Oracle costs yet to be determined and defined.

Liz Auchincloss inquired about the classified hourly reduction in IRD. Bill said the intent is to augment the regular user support staff with interns in the anticipation that this allows us to be operational 24/7. Keith reminded the Council of its deferral of the approval of this budget until we knew what the effects of implementing Oracle would be on IRD's capacity to support existing or planned new technology initiatives. He said based on the discussions today, he has not seen any change in how we would address non-Oracle projects specifically in the coming year. Coupled with the fact that Oracle is going to be the number one IRD priority, he stated that we do have many other technology initiatives that are in place and we have to make some tough decisions about which projects, if any, we can proceed on at the same time that we are preparing for the full implementation of OSS. He does not feel that CPC has yet an understanding of what we won't be able to do. Yet, we are being asked to make a decision that we are going to accept this budget at face value but with no discussion about what those consequences are. He went on to say that

3

CPC is charged with the responsibility of knowing the consequences of this decision to approve the budget reductions. Bill Hamre said that in structuring the cuts, he has tried to preserve all of the regular full-time people in IRD. These are people, to a larger extent, who can work on those ongoing projects as well as new initiatives. It is true that by cutting some of the consulting resources that we have fewer resources to bring to projects. He indicated that the budget cannot be cut and have the same level of expectation of support throughout. I think our web development group, our systems administration group and program analyst will continue to work on the highest priority projects identified by the college. That doesn't mean exclusively Oracle but the highest priority activity. Bill also said that once Oracle takes over the responsibility of hosting the application it would relieve some of the full-time staff to assume other responsibilities.

In regard to item 4.2 of the agenda, the budget proposal does not reflect the reinstatement of cuts. John Romo indicated there was a request from Jerry Pike (Academic Skills Center) and Diane Hollems and Pablo Buckelew (Center for Management & Staff Development) for reconsideration of cuts that they had identified for next year's budget. In the Academic Skills Center a classified FTE position was folded and the employee in that position retired. We took those dollars as savings. He said that Jerry Pike made a request to keep those dollars for use in other components of the skills development program, specifically the writing lab to add to the resources available. Jerry Pike has requested that the funds from the full-time classified staff position in the LRC that is being vacated be redeployed to convert a 19.5 hour LTA position to a permanent 50% position with 50% benefits and to create a second 50% permanent full-time LTA position in the LRC Writing Lab to respond to the increased demands made by students for support with their writing,

The second item was for reinstatement of the $17k cut from the Center for Management & Staff Development for classified hourly. It was felt that with the increase in interest and demand from the Center, it was a mistake to cut in this area. Without those resources they cannot meet all of the demand for this program which is a FTES generating activity. The Executive Council felt that each of these requests to be exempted from the hiring freeze be placed at the top of he list of budgets cuts to be reinstated in light of the priorities agreed to by the council to keep to a minimum budget reductions that have an immediate and adverse effect on instructional support and enrollment. Once we know our budget for 2003-2004, we would be in a much better position to determine the consequences of restoring the funds to each of these departments.

Lana Rose made the point that when we have decided on what these cuts are going to be, to go back and reinstate the funds upon special requests is not going to be acceptable. She stressed that if we are going to cut, then it should stay cut, until we go through another whole cycle of review.

Liz Auchincloss addressed the reinstatement of the positions to the Academic Skills Center. Her concern is the issue of the retirement of the fulltime permanent employee in the Center which could have been viewed as a layoff. We are now using the same dollars to hire two half-time people without giving that person the opportunity to retrain for either of those positions. John Romo responded that it is a programmatic judgment in terms of the scheduling needs of that program. Liz said she was told that the program would have to be cut to save money; now they ask for the money back and add new positions. Jack Friedlander said that the program was eliminated because it was a flawed model. Liz emphatically objected to this reinstatement and gave notice to the Council that from her perspective it is not an appropriate action. John Romo said that we are not moving on these items as a budget decision at this time.

Peter Haslund commented to Mr. Romo said he had said earlier that we are treating these two recommendations with favor. John said he feels that they both have strong justification from a programmatic perspective. Peter questioned that the action we are about to take is seen as temporary? John said strictly from a budget perspective and we would reevaluate it in July. His

inclination is that once we get more information about the college's budget for next year, we would establish a consultative process that would look at all of the appeals to reinstate budget cuts. Jack indicated that we may need a summer CPC meeting to review the implications for the college of the final state budget.

(M/S/C [Rose/Fairly] to approve the budget as amended by the revised figures presented today. Yeas:10, Nays: 2 [Liz Auchincloss and Jan Jackson], Abstentions: None

John said that we need to start a mechanism as soon as possible in anticipation of 04-05 problems for a program-by-program analysis in all instructional areas and operations areas from the perspective of how we can save money and/or what we will not be able to do.

6.0   Other Items

There were no other items.

7.0   Adjournment

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.