

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, September 22, 2009
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
PE214 Physical Education Conference Room
Minutes

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Molloy, K. Monda, D. Nevins, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan, N. Ridgell

GUESTS: J. Clark, L. Griffin, J. Meyer, K. O'Connor, A. Scharper, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez

Call to Order

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of minutes from the July 27, August 25 and September 1, 2009 CPC meetings (attached)

M/S/C [IAlarcon/DNevins] to approve the minutes (7/27, 8/25, 9/1) with the corrections of the August 25th CPC meeting minutes noted by Academic Senate Member Monda. C. Ramirez abstained as he was not present.

Information Items

2. Preparation for the flu season

Superintendent/President Serban reminded the council that Susan Broderick, Director, Student Health Services sent out campus-wide emails with information from the SB County Public Health Department outlining ways for employees and students to protect themselves from the flu and to prevent the spread of the flu. She also sent a flyer announcing the SBCC seasonal flu vaccine clinic at the end of September, plus two prevention posters. Superintendent/President Serban reported that there is a Crisis Team on campus who is monitoring cases on campus and we will be alerted if we are anywhere near a pandemic. There is no pandemic right now and students should be attending classes.

Discussion Items

3. Update of program reviews due October 15
 - a. Clarification on what needs to be updated and included

Superintendent/President Serban reported that there have been several questions about the updating of the program reviews: "Exactly what do we need to update in the program reviews?" Superintendent/President Serban reminded everyone that Samantha Thomas, Information Systems Specialist III, is offering training on how to use the new Program Review Website. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that areas that need to be

updated are: The Resource Requests templates and the Progress on Goals and Objectives for each department/unit. The Resource Requests from last year were rolled over, so the text from last year is there to update if needed. The other areas do not need to be updated right now.

- b. Use of resource request to inform the budget planning for 2010-11

Superintendent/President Serban stressed that it is absolutely necessary for the Resource Requests to be done by October 15th because they will be used in the budget development process for 2010-11.

- c. Role of P&R and ITC in ranking of Resource Requests

4. Clarification of use of equipment fund 2009-10 and 2010-11 (handout) – Andreea Serban

Superintendent/President Serban opened the discussion from one of the three handouts provided, “Description of the Utilization of the Equipment fund (known as “Fund 41)”. This document outlines what has been discussed in CPC and Academic Senate last year. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the main goal is to understand the ongoing needs of the College. Superintendent/President Serban asked for discussion, and suggestions for clarity on this document since a number of departments had questions about it.

- a. Interim Director of PE, Kathy O’Connor questioned exactly what is meant by equipment versus supplies in the sentence in the 2nd paragraph: “Routine Equipment items are those that a department needs to replace/buy on an annual basis in order to perform its core functions.” Superintendent/President Serban stated that some departments have used Fund 41 for items that are more supplies than equipment. Superintendent/President Serban said that we need to understand the difference between ongoing supplies versus ongoing equipment. CSEA Consultation Group Member Guillen identified equipment as being a hard durable good versus supplies that are consumable.
- b. VP Sullivan stated that this year, 2009 -10, each department needs to put together a list of what has been purchased from Fund 41 that is of an ongoing nature. The goal is to get those expenditures into the general fund and out of the equipment fund so that the department’s supply budget is replenished on an ongoing basis. Some departments are using Fund 41 for routine ongoing supplies that they buy every year. VP Sullivan said there is a report in Banner that has information about what each Department had used from Fund 41. He suggested that perhaps this can be used to analyze what each department has used; it would help in making sure there are no surprises in the future.
- c. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we want to identify this year, 2009 – 10, each department’s best estimate of what is spent for supplies and ongoing/routine equipment needs out of Fund 41 through a list of routine ongoing expenses and cyclical purchases. Superintendent/President Serban referred to the Sample Equipment Inventory handout that is just that, equipment of \$5,000 or more that contains information of when the equipment was bought and how long it will be useful. This information will be used in budgeting for the future and will provide a three-year window of our needs. Further clarifying discussion took place.
- d. Academic Senate Member Monda asked for further clarification on the budgeting. Superintendent/President Serban stated that in the annual budget a certain amount will be budgeted for ongoing/routine equipment expenses. If the department sees that the budget

is not adequate, they will then request a budget augmentation from new money that would come through the program review.

- e. Academic Senate Member Monda asked: If I was using Fund 41 for supplies, what do I do? Superintendent/President Serban stated that she would report that she had used the funds for routine supplies and include that amount in the estimate to be provided for the ongoing/routine amount to be included in the general fund budget.
- f. VP Sullivan gave a short history of what was done in the past and now the budget will reflect what the actual needs of the college are.
- g. The periodic, non-annual equipment that needs to be replaced on a regular, non-annual basis will be funded from the College's equipment fund. Superintendent/President Serban stated again that Program Reviews should include ONLY the NEW equipment that a department needs. The non-annual is still considered a routine expense because it is ordered routinely every so often. These should NOT be included in Program Reviews. Program Reviews should only include NEW equipment needs that we need to rank. Clarified that The Resource Requests in the Program Review is about NEW equipment requests.
- h. Once the amounts that Departments are spending on a routine/annual basis are in the budget, there will be one scrutiny level and that is if the amount requested seems unreasonable, then they are able to look at the historical amount that has been spent from Fund 41.
- i. In response to the question about if a Department does not spend their supplies budget, will they lose it the next year, and Serban explained that unspent amounts from departmental budgets roll to ending balances. But the next year, the departmental supplies budget is restored, generally to what it was the prior year. In some years when we received COLA, the supplies accounts were augmented by a percentage of the COLA.
- j. VP Sullivan explained in response to a question about "hoarding" money, that Departments do not need to "hoard" because the supplies and routine equipment budgets should be what the Department needs to operate.
- k. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out that there is only so much money we have as an institution and sometimes the Department may have to wait for their new equipment item, especially in bad budget years such as now.
- l. Superintendent/President Serban explained what the following means, from the "Fund 41" draft handout: *"...resources for which a department needs an allocation of funds or other support beyond what it currently has need to be included in program reviews."*: 1) If a department needs a new piece of equipment, it needs to be included in the program review or 2nd it may be a routine expense, but the department does not have the money for it. Request it in Program review because it may cost more than in years past, meaning you want to acquire something that will become part of your routine budget but your current budget is not sufficient to cover the additional expense. She continued to say that it may take us a couple of years to refine this process.
- m. After further discussion about details, Superintendent/President Serban said that whatever amount that was used from Fund 41 for routine/annual expenses, will now be allocated in each department's supply budget.

5. Timeline for Budget Development for 2010-11 (handout) – Joe Sullivan, Andreea Serban

Superintendent/President Serban reported from the handout: "Draft Budget Development timeline – 9/22/09". This timeline has been updated in order to allow time for the various groups, such as Academic Senate, P&R and ITC to discuss and rank before the requests come to the President and CPC for further discussion and ranking. Superintendent/President Serban reported that after the

program reviews are received, it will take about 3 weeks to produce reports with the resource requests that will be distributed to all groups. The goal is to have the rankings by P&R, ITC and the Academic Senate completed by February 16th, and at the February 23rd CPC meeting the discussions will begin on the rankings and would be completed by the end of March. At the beginning of April, the first preliminary version of the budget for 10 – 11 could be completed. This schedule is similar to prior years, with the exception of the incorporation of the Program Review component. Superintendent/President Serban provided an example of how that would be done.

Superintendent/President Serban advised that the other information that would go into the Program Review is the request for a restoration of funding. A request for restoration of funding should only be because the lack of that funding critically impacts students directly and/or that the program is seriously impacted. Superintendent/President Serban said that in order to fully restore everything that has been cut will take several years because she reminded everyone, the funding has been cut so deeply and most likely will continue through 2012-13. Superintendent/President Serban said that the restoration of funds should be pointed out in the Program Review template. VP Sullivan described further how to do this: The rationale should include what the purpose is for restoring. Restoration would be in the description. The cost centers and object codes will be included in the spreadsheet that the Controller Griffin would send to Managers. Academic Senate Member Monda stated that last year not everyone knew that restoration goes into Program Reviews. VP Sullivan reminded the group that that information needs to be communicated to all Managers and to those who are working on the Program Reviews. Academic Member Garey clarified the fact that the information in request for restoration needs to match the information of what was cut, which people can get from the spreadsheets. Superintendent/President Serban stressed that the Controller will be sending the spreadsheets to those who need them.

- a. Categorical programs – communication from the Chancellor’s Office regarding administrative relief for categorical programs (attachment) and implications for budget planning for 2010-11

Superintendent/President Serban stated that this will be discussed at the next CPC Meeting.

6. College priorities for 2009-10 (attachment) – All

- a. Objectives from the college plan 2008-11 and district technology plan 2008-11 on which to focus in 2009-10 (attachments; also attached FYI the enrollment management plan 2009-11)
- b. Planning agendas identified in the self study (attachment)

Superintendent/President Serban stated that the above topics require some time for discussion. At the next CPC meeting on October 6th, we will look at the objectives, and planning agendas that we want to focus on this academic year. Superintendent/President Serban stated that in 2009-10, as indicated in the College Plan 2008-11 and two of the planning agendas in the self study, we need to develop a frame work for regular evaluation and improvement of the institutional governance structure and decision making processes. The draft of the Education Master Plan will be completed in October 2009 and finalized by Dec 2009.

7. Planning and revised schedule of deferred maintenance projects (handout); update from kick-off meeting for the Humanities building remodel – Joe Sullivan, Steve Massetti

Superintendent/President Serban stated that she wants the Council to review and discuss the information in the two handouts. Since the decision to postpone the building of SoMA, the two handouts include a revised estimated spending of Measure V funding as it relates to the first and second bond issues and the update on the Humanities Building remodel. Superintendent/President Serban reminded everyone that 85% of the 47 million needs to be spent by November 2011 and she reported that after looking forward at what the assumptions are for state funding in the next 10 – 15 years, there are only two other College projects that have a good chance of receiving money from the State: the MacDougall Administration Center and the Schott Center.

VP Sullivan reported from the handout: “Estimated Bond Spending Revised September 22, 2009”. He went through it line by line explaining how the District Measure V funds will be spent. VP Sullivan continued with how the projects were divided between the two bond issuances showing how they planned to spend the 85% of the \$47 million by November 2011. Questions, answers, discussions then ensued. VP Sullivan explained what the ideal situation with the State issuing the next bonds would be if the funding is there. The first year of bond funding, the money will be spent on preliminary drawings. The next year State issued bond would include funding for the working drawings for the two projects and then the following year, the funding from the bond would include the construction and equipment. He explained this is all conjecture because of the uncertainty of the State Fiscal situation. The size of the bonds may also be reduced over time. With these uncertainties the construction phase may be postponed up to five years.

Program Manager Massetti reported from the second handout which is the Humanities Building Improvements Kick-Off Meeting Agenda that shows the Project Scope and the Budget Breakdown. He stated that the scope on this remodel is pretty limited and an entire modernization is not being done due to the limited funding available. He went through the list of construction items under the Project Scope, some examples are: ADA compliance needed and required elevator replacement, fire alarm, etc. He stated that the swing space modifications will come out of the budget for this project and the goal is to minimize the modifications to the swing space. He reviewed the list of the planned next steps, stating that it is a reasonably aggressive schedule. He outlined the ideal situation. After the completion of the Drama/Music renovations, the intention is to get the Drama/Music Departments moved back into the renovated building by January 2011. Then move everyone out of Humanities and the Campus Center into their swing space in January 2011. That is 18 months of construction and move-in so that we would be able to be back in by fall 2012 and fully occupying and using the building, project completely finished.

Superintendent/President Serban stated that this is a preliminary schedule and to expect ongoing revisions. She reiterated that 85% of the \$47 million must be spent by November 2011, and the more of the deferred maintenance projects we can do, the better. The swing space problem limits what we can accomplish. Superintendent/President Serban stated that if anyone sees some major oversight of something that should have been noticed and there is a reason for a particular timing that is compelling, let Steve Massetti know about it. There was further discussion about looking at the possibility of starting the remodel of the IDC building earlier than is scheduled. VP Sullivan said that in this initial phase of planning, they are looking at how they utilize the campus over the summer. There was further discussion about the costs of modernization in the future, State Funding, Design and DSA Fees and the timing of projects listed on the deferred maintenance project schedule.

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 6, 3:00-4:30pm A218C