

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**March 4, 2008  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
A218C**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** J. Friedlander, J. Romo, P. Bishop, J. Sullivan, B. Partee, D. Cooper, I. Alarcon, S. Broderick, T. Garey, K. Molloy, G. Thielst, M. Guillen, L. Vrazilek

**ABSENT:** S. Ehrlich, P. Buckelew, C. Salazar (*for Auchincloss*), C. Ramirez

**GUESTS:** M. Ferrer, A. Green, L. Griffin, L. Skogberg

**1.0 Call to Order**

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the February 5<sup>th</sup> CPC meeting.

**M/S/C [Molloy/Garey] to approve the minutes of the February 5<sup>th</sup> CPC meeting.**

**2.0 Announcements**

Jack Friedlander announced that several members of the Council are participating in the president search committee meeting today and will be absent from CPC.

**3.0 Information Items**

3.1 Update on state budget: *John Romo*

President John Romo expressed hope that the college would not have to make budget reductions for 2007-08. He said the Governor's budget reduction for community colleges is \$32 million; however, our system office has identified dollars to offset that amount so that colleges will be minimally affected for this fiscal year. He said we can anticipate major cuts in the 2008-09 budget when the May revise is announced. President Romo said there is a likelihood of an increase in the student enrollment fee. The system's position was to not support an enrollment fee increase but, given the realities of the state budget, the position now is that if there is to be a fee increase that it be moderate. John Romo said it was announced a few days ago that there had been a miscalculation in the projection of the state property tax revenues by \$75 million dollars for this year. Although we have not heard officially, the state will apply the deficit to the apportionment for the college. This means than we will receive approximately 1.3 percent less which translates to an estimated \$968,000 cut in funding for SBCC.

John Romo and Joe Sullivan shared their information on the projected impact of a 1.3-percent reduction in our allocation. President Romo said that since we are a very well fiscally managed District we will not have to contemplate drastic action for 2007-08 and will still be able to maintain our 5-percent contingency and our allocations to the Equipment and Construction Funds as well as utilizing ending balances which the District may need for some of the projects for which we have committed especially if the bond measure doesn't pass. However, he said the college may face some real challenges in 2008-09.

John Romo said the bond activity continues both from the educational side and the campaign run by our consultant Mary Rose. It is still in the formulating stages although there is a considerable amount of work in preparation for the kick-off of the campaign in early April. He said we have continued to receive strong endorsements for the bond and there has been no opposition presented to date. The college met the deadline to get the argument in favor of the bond to the County for the ballot pamphlet and no one has submitted an argument opposing the bond for publication. President Romo said he and Des O'Neill are meeting with groups to enlist their endorsements.

### 3.2 Examples of short-comings identified by WASC in its accreditation of community colleges that need to be taken into account in our planning processes

Jack Friedlander said he was concerned by a list he received of all the schools either put on warning or probation by our regional accrediting association and the reasons for its doing so. Lake Tahoe Community College, as a service to others, compiled a list of key points and feedback from their self-study. This document was provided to the Council. Dr. Friedlander made some points from this document and also from one compiled by the College of Marin as it pertains to our overall planning process which includes SLOs. He cautioned that if a college loses its accreditation status, it means that its credits have no value. It is also no longer eligible for any federal money (which includes financial aid and Federal grants). He said in order for higher education to maintain its long-held tradition of policing itself, evaluating itself and making improvements through its accreditation process, there has to be evidence that colleges are meeting the standards and assessing the degree to which their claims of what students will learn from completing their courses and degrees are being achieved. Jack Friedlander said we have to show how our student learning outcomes are tied to our college planning, budgeting and program review processes and to demonstrate those processes are being implemented. The expectations and pressure the accreditation associations are under is reflected in their increased diligence in evaluating the degree to which colleges are meeting the specified standards. We have to show in our College Plan and our budget review and program review planning documents how this links back to course, program and institutional SLOs. We presently have program reviews in Educational Programs but we need to have ones for the other units of the college as well.

### 3.3 Review of SBCC's performance on the 2007 State Accountability Measures (ARCC)

The Council was provided a copy of the accountability report that we have to submit to the Chancellor's Office every year. The one-page statement on the "College Level Indicators Self-Assessment" summarizes the data. Jack Friedlander said that compared to our peer group we are above average on each of the seven measures. He said that the data is based on students who entered the college prior to implementing the Partnership for Student Success initiatives.

#### **4.0 Discussion items**

##### **4.1 Review draft of the revised college mission statement**

Jack Friedlander, Ignacio Alarcon and Kathy Molloy worked collaboratively to formulate a draft of the mission statement for the college. The Council made minor changes to this statement as presented. Dr. Friedlander will ask Diane Rodriguez-Kiino for her assistance in re-writing the section of the paragraph that addresses the diversity of the campus. A new draft will be forwarded to the Council after EC reviews it tomorrow. It will be disseminated to the constituency groups in the consultation process and then brought back to CPC.

##### **4.2 Review of proposed timeline, job description for chairs, and committee structure for completing the college's self study for accreditation**

Jack Friedlander said that he and Darla Cooper developed a structure for completing the college's self study. Dr. Cooper said this semester we need to set the structure in place, pick a faculty co-chair and determine what the committee structure is going to consist of and its membership. The steering committee needs to meet and do some prep work so that everything is finalized before the semester concludes. She said during the summer the co-chairs will be very busy working to prepare the materials for members of the accreditation standards committee which they need to write the self-study report. The goal is to have a draft of the self study by the end of October to be distributed to the Board of Trustees and the campus community. This will leave about a month for the draft to go through the consultative process before the end of the semester.

Dr. Cooper discussed the accreditation standards committee structure and membership required for the accreditation self-study. There will be an accreditation steering committee to oversee the process. EC will appoint the administrators to serve as co-chairs for each of the standards committees and Ignacio Alarcon will work with the Academic Senate to appoint faculty co-chairs. CSEA will appoint classified members and the Student Senate will appoint students to serve on each of the committees. For the position of self-study faculty co-chair, it will be necessary to give them reassigned course time and stipends for the work they do in the summer in order for the person to perform the responsibilities of this position. It is important to identify who this person will be as soon as possible.

As an aside, it was mentioned that the college has to bear the costs of the accreditation team to visit the college, i.e., transportation, hotel, food and meeting rooms. There are typically 12 people on a team.

#### 4.3 American College and University President's Climate Commitment: *Adam Green & Leif Skogberg*

Leif Skogberg began the discussion by enlightening the Council on the specifics of the President's Climate Commitment agreement which is a national campaign to have college and university presidents commit to taking specified actions to reduce their institution's environmental footprint. President Romo has agreed to sign this commitment if it is endorsed by CPC and approved by the Board of Trustees. The signing of this agreement is an acknowledgement that climate change is an issue that colleges and universities need to address. There are accountability measures to this agreement which will require staff time and funding. An estimate is needed to assess the amount of additional resources required to fulfill the college's commitment to this agreement. The college has made significant strides in this area. Adam Green informed the Council that there are six accountability measures of which the college would need to meet two of the six to satisfy this agreement. The college has met two of these requirements and on its way to meeting three. The SoMA building will be built to meet LEED Silver certification. With the initial investment towards sustainability, it has been shown that it will pay off in years to come. Dr. Green said Santa Barbara City College is a pilot program for the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in higher education for a sustainability tracking program that will track the progress of college campuses in achieving sustainability outcomes. Tom Garey asked that a net cost report be provided to the Council. Jack Friedlander said he would move this item forward with John Romo and EC.

#### 5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

#### 6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion by Mike Guillen, the meeting was adjourned.



COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA  
ON THE WEB: WWW.CCLEAGUE.ORG/LEGINFO/BUDGET/

# STATE BUDGET UPDATE

UPDATE #3 ♦ MARCH 28, 2008


A status report on the actions, discussions, and rumors in Sacramento related to the community colleges' state budget for fiscal year 2008-09. This update is distributed to all chief executive officers for distribution to trustees, administrators, faculty, classified, public/governmental relations officers and student leaders.

## LAO RECOMMENDATIONS, PROPERTY TAX SHORTFALL, ADVOCACY EFFORTS

### Legislative Analyst Office Releases 2008-09 State Budget Analyses

The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) released an analysis of the Governor's 2008-09 proposed budget on February 20<sup>th</sup> and projected a larger deficit - \$16 billion vs. the Governor's \$14.5 billion - at the conclusion of the 2008-09 fiscal year absent corrective action. Those figures were substantially reduced when the Legislature and Governor took immediate action to reduce current year expenditures, and the state deficit is now pegged at \$8 billion. While the budget deficit was halved, the continued economic slowdown – driven primarily by the downturn in the housing sector and rising energy prices – have driven down consumer spending and state tax collections signaling the possibility the \$8 billion deficit figure may increase. The next estimate will occur with the May Revise, and until then the LAO has outlined a complex set of recommendations and included a comprehensive “alternative budget” to the one proposed by the Governor.

The LAO “alternative budget” includes a detailed current year and budget year Proposition 98 recommendation, which still results in “suspension” for 2008-09; however under the LAO plan the “suspension” would be \$800 million vs. the Governor's proposed \$4.0 billion suspension. The LAO Proposition 98 plan is premised on reducing the current year



Proposition 98 guarantee to the minimum level in the current year; however this recommendation was flatly **rejected** by the Legislature during the special session. Despite the Legislature's refusal to bring down the current year guarantee, the Legislative Analyst - Elizabeth Hill - indicated the Legislature still has until June 30, 2008 to act, and should consider the flexibility the recommendations provide in the event revenues continue to deteriorate.

Notwithstanding the uncertainty created when the Legislature rejected the LAO's current year Proposition 98 recommendations - the overall K-14 Proposition 98 spending plan and specifically the community college recommendations should be understood.

In the current year, the LAO recommends reducing the Proposition 98 guarantee by an additional \$1 billion in order to appropriate the minimum amount;

however in a unique reclassification of appropriations, the recommendation **would not** actually reduce K-14 spending in the current year. The reclassification of appropriations simply designates some appropriations as part of the Proposition 98 guarantee and some appropriations as “settle-up” without counting towards the Proposition 98 guarantee. The ultimate goal of the exercise – the reduction of the Proposition 98 base going forward. This reduction of the Proposition 98 base moving into 2008-09, coupled with the LAO “revenue raising proposals”, results in a \$2.0 billion increase to Proposition 98 in 2008-09. However, the \$2.0 billion does not result in significantly more resources than K-14 already received in 2007-08 (see chart). Further, the LAO alternative does **NOT** fund a K-14 COLA (estimated cost \$3.0 billion), and still results in a suspension to the 2008-09 Proposition 98 guarantee - albeit by a smaller amount - \$800 million.

In addition, under the LAO proposed budget for 2008-09, only \$80 million of the proposed \$2.0 billion increase is designated for community colleges - and this \$80 million year-to-year increase for community colleges is the result of a 30 percent fee increase, (\$20 to \$26 per credit unit) the proceeds of which are redirected back to the system. Such a fee increase is not “moderate” or “predictable”, will result in student attrition, and raises concerns that community college students will be expected to carry the burden of state revenue shortfalls. It is important to remember the \$80 million is a cumulative increase over the revised budget for 2007-08 and the attached League budget chart breaks down the proposed LAO adjustments: 1) 1.7% for enrollment growth; 2) Mandates \$25 million; 3) All categoricals budgeted at the same level as 2007-08, with the exception of an \$11 million reduction Economic Development.

The LAO also proposes “creating fiscal and program flexibility for districts to meet local needs”, and as such recommends the creation of two block grants. The Student Success block grant – which would include Financial aid/outreach, EOPS/CARE, DSPS, Fund for Student Success, Matriculation, and the Basic Skills initiative and the Faculty Support block grant – which would include Faculty staff outreach, Part-Time faculty compensation, part-time office hours, and part-time health insurance. In addition, the LAO recommends the suspension of the Quality Education Investment Act, which equates to the \$38 million available for career technical education and Scheduled Maintenance & Instructional Equipment for 2008-09. It is very early in the process and the LAO recommendations should be viewed in that context.

## Property Tax Shortfall

Last week, the System Office revised the First Principal Apportionment and estimated community colleges will be hit with an \$84.4 million deficit attributed to a property tax shortfall. It is important to note however that, this is a *preliminary* estimate given the economic downturn affecting the housing sector it could in fact worsen. At this time, the revenue limit calculation for each district has been reduced by roughly 1.5 percent – a significant amount considering the “cut” was unanticipated and districts are now three-quarters of the way through the fiscal year. It should be noted that unlike the current year reductions approved in the special session, the property tax shortfall will directly impact instruction and student services. Colleges may reduce summer school course offerings and cut student support services - which will make it more difficult for students to complete their educational goal.

The League, along with other system advocates, will advocate for property tax backfill legislation in the current year, and call upon the Administration to re-calculate the budget year property tax estimate to ensure the figure used to assemble the budget is not built off an over-inflated property tax base.

## Advocacy

Now more than ever community college’s must articulate the impact of the property tax shortfall and proposed budget will have on student access and student success. The League will be hosting three more Capitol Day events (April 15<sup>th</sup>, May 20<sup>th</sup>, and June 17<sup>th</sup>) in Sacramento this Spring, and CEO’s are encouraged to send advocacy teams to Sacramento. It’s important legislators and their staff hear firsthand how colleges will respond to the current year cut and proposed budget year reductions. Web Link: <http://www.ccleague.org/i4a/pages/Index.cfm?pageID=3356>

In addition, the League will be hosting roughly 20 community forums throughout the state at local colleges and local businesses who partner with colleges, in order to remind the public of the economic benefits generated by their local district. Specifically the goal of these community forums will be to highlight the tremendous return on investment the colleges provide the local economy and highlight the need to maintain and increase the investment in community colleges in order to maintain California’s competitive edge. All community college constituent groups are encouraged to attend these forums, and colleges will be soon be contacted to host these events.



**COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE  
OF CALIFORNIA**

Item	2007-08 PROPOSED REVISED BUDGET	2008-09 System Budget Request	2008-09 Governor's Proposed Budget (after workload increases and across the board reduction)	Change from 07- 08 REVISED Budget to 08-09 Gov Proposed Budget	Percentage change from 07-08 Enacted Budget	2008-09 LAO Proposed Budget	Change from 07- 08 REVISED Budget to 08-09 LAO Proposed Budget
<b>General Apportionment</b>							
Base Apportionment (incl. GF, P-Tax, Fee)	5,423,341,000	5,732,549,000	5,692,549,000			5,692,549,000	
Baseline Adjustments (not shown in budget)			7,584,000			7,584,000	
2007-08 Reduction due to unused growth	-80,000,000						
Student fee reduction (to \$20 full-year)	33,245,000						
Student Fee increase (to \$26 full-year; reduce state GF)						-79,000,000	
<b>PROPOSED SPECIAL SESSION MID-YEAR REDUCTION</b>	<b>(40,000,000)</b>		<b>40,000,000</b>			<b>40,000,000</b>	
	5,336,586,000	5,732,549,000	5,740,133,000			5,661,133,000	
Cost-of-living adjustment (categorical COLA incl. below)	248,431,000	177,996,000	0			0	
Growth for Apportionments	107,532,000	200,639,000	60,118,000			97,700,000	
Career Development & College Preparation	-	30,000,000	-			-	
<b>Total General Apportionment</b>	<b>5,692,549,000</b>	<b>6,141,184,000</b>	<b>5,800,251,000</b>	<b>107,702,000</b>	<b>1.89%</b>	<b>5,758,833,000</b>	<b>66,284,000</b>
<b>Categorical Programs</b>							
Academic Senate for the Community Colleges	467,000	503,000	416,000	(51,000)	-10.92%	467,000	0
Accreditation Assistance Team	-	2,000,000	-			-	
Apprenticeship	15,229,000	15,229,000	14,240,000	(989,000)	-6.49%	15,229,000	0
Basic Skills	33,100,000	85,286,000	29,494,000	(3,606,000)	-10.89%	33,100,000	0
Cal PASS	-	2,000,000	-			-	
Career Technical Education	20,000,000	68,000,000	17,821,000	(2,179,000)	-10.90%	20,000,000	0
Child Care Tax Bailout	6,836,000	7,288,000	6,392,000	(444,000)	-6.50%	6,836,000	0
Disabled Students Programs and Services	115,011,000	122,889,364	110,769,000	(4,242,000)	-3.69%	115,011,000	0
Economic Development	46,790,000	46,790,000	41,692,000	(5,098,000)	-10.90%	35,790,000	-11,000,000
EOPS	108,786,000	114,039,000	102,849,000	(3,937,000)	-3.69%	106,786,000	0
CARE	15,505,000	16,569,000	14,934,000	(571,000)	-3.68%	15,505,000	0
Equal Employment Opportunity	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,557,000	(190,000)	-10.88%	1,747,000	0
Foster Care Education Program	5,254,000	5,601,000	4,682,000	(572,000)	-10.89%	5,254,000	0
Fund for Student Success	6,158,000	6,158,000	5,487,000	(671,000)	-10.90%	6,158,000	0
Full-time Faculty: Increase Positions	-	45,000,000	-			-	
Matriculation	101,803,000	145,827,000	98,049,000	(3,754,000)	-3.69%	101,803,000	0
Nursing	22,100,000	22,100,000	19,692,000	(2,408,000)	-10.90%	22,100,000	0
Part-Time Faculty Compensation	50,828,000	100,828,000	45,290,000	(5,538,000)	-10.90%	50,828,000	0
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	1,000,000	16,000,000	891,000	(109,000)	-10.90%	1,000,000	0
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	7,172,000	14,172,000	6,391,000	(781,000)	-10.89%	7,172,000	0
Physical Plant and Instructional Support	27,345,000	27,345,000	24,366,000	(2,979,000)	-10.89%	27,345,000	0
Professional Development	-	10,000,000	-			-	
School to College Bridge Program	-	9,750,000	-			-	
Special Services for CalWORKs Recipients	43,580,000	46,958,000	38,832,000	(4,748,000)	-10.89%	43,580,000	0
Student Financial Aid Administration	51,640,000	58,321,000	45,044,000	(6,596,000)	-12.77%	51,640,000	0
Student Senate	-	300,000	-			-	
Telecommunications / Technology Svcs / C.V. U	26,197,000	33,547,000	23,343,000	(2,854,000)	-10.89%	26,197,000	0
Transfer Education and Articulation	1,424,000	12,424,000	1,269,000	(155,000)	-10.88%	1,424,000	0
Mandates (6870-295-0001)	4,004,000	24,004,000	4,004,000			29,004,000	
<b>Total Categorical Funds</b>	<b>709,976,000</b>	<b>1,060,675,364</b>	<b>657,504,000</b>	<b>-52,472,000</b>	<b>-7.39%</b>	<b>723,976,000</b>	<b>-11,000,000</b>
<b>Ongoing Funds Subtotal</b>	<b>6,402,525,000</b>	<b>7,201,859,364</b>	<b>6,457,755,000</b>	<b>55,230,000</b>	<b>0.86%</b>	<b>6,482,809,000</b>	<b>80,284,000</b>
<b>One-Time Funds (Prop. 98 Reversion &amp; Settle-up)</b>							
Physical Plant & Instructional Support	8,084,000	200,000,000	-			-	
Career Technical Education SB 1133	32,000,000		38,000,000				
Nursing Equipment / Allied Health Equipment	8,084,000						
Nursing Program Simulators	4,000,000						
Mandate reimb (SB 1108, Chapter 216 Statutes 2004)	0	40,000,000	25,000,000				
Career Technical Education	0	30,000,000					
Technology Items	0	1,300,000					
Open Educational Resources		3,000,000					
Cal PASS	1,000,000						
Basic Skills (06-07 funds; available one-time)	included in 06-07						
ONE-TIME VETO SET-ASIDE	5,500,000						
<b>One-time Prop 98 Funds Subtotal</b>	<b>58,668,000</b>	<b>274,300,000</b>	<b>63,000,000</b>				
<b>Miscellaneous (Non-program) Items</b>							
Mandate reimbursements (see above)							
Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT)	570,000	570,000	508,000				
STRS Payments for CCC Employees	87,812,000	88,128,000	88,128,000				
Lease-Purchase Bond Payments	58,328,000	68,122,000	68,122,000				
Lottery	167,535,000	167,535,000	167,535,000				
<b>Total State-Determined Funding</b>	<b>6,775,438,000</b>	<b>7,800,514,364</b>	<b>6,845,048,000</b>				
<b>Funded FTES</b>	<b>1,171,258</b>	<b>1,212,252</b>	<b>1,182,971</b>				
<b>Prop 98 (Local) Ongoing Funding per FTES</b>	<b>5,466</b>	<b>5,941</b>	<b>5,459</b>				
<b>Prop 98 (Local) One-Time Funding per FTES</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>53</b>				
<b>Funding per FTES</b>	<b>\$ 5,785</b>	<b>\$ 6,435</b>	<b>\$ 5,786</b>				

College Planning Council  
April 8, 2008

Attachments 2 and 3 of the College Planning Council April 8, 2008 meeting are missing.