

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, March 23, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes**

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

ABSENT: P. Bishop, R. Else

GUESTS: A. Crosby, E. Morrison, K. Neufeld, K. O'Connor, A. Orozco, A. Scharper, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez,

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order. She welcomed two members of the community who came to listen to the meeting: Ann Crosby and Eleanor Morrison both take Continuing education courses.

1. Approval of Minutes from the March 16, 2010 CPC Meeting (attachment)
M/S/C [Guillen/Nevins] to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2010 CPC Meeting.

Action Items

2. Routine and non-routine equipment requests identified by each major area for 2010-11 be funded in full from the Equipment fund balance available as of June 30, 2010 (see attachment).
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban reviewed the routine equipment and non-routine equipment replacement requests identified by each area of the College for 2010-11. The proposal is that these equipments requests, which are needed to run the operation of the college, be funded in full from the Equipment fund balance available as of June 30, 2010.

M/S/C [Friedlander/Salazar] to approve allocating the amount shown on the attachment provided for routine and non routine equipment requests for 2010-11 and the routine would be ongoing and 2010-11 allocation for non-routine equipment is subject to adjustment after 2010-11. Student Senate Representative Garfinkel abstained because she was late.

- b. Discussion ensued regarding the clarification of the motion. Executive VP Friedlander stated that the intent of the motion regarding the allocation for non-routine equipment replacements was to be able to adjust the amount, because we are not voting on a list, we are saying given the variation from year to year we are

not locking ourselves into \$860,000 + for the following year because we don't know what the needs will be in 2011-12. The motion is giving us flexibility. Academic Senate Member Nevins brought up the point that what if departments were wildly wrong in their estimates and they need more money. Superintendent/President stated that if that is the case then the departments need to bring back their requests to their deans for discussion. Serban also clarified that inherent in the motion is the fact that this is the routine equipment budget we will be put into the general fund cost centers. If this amount is not enough, then for next year's budget we will discuss if adjustments need to be made, but for 2010 – 11 this is the amount in the budget. If there were a dire emergency, then a justification will need to be made. In response to an observation by Academic Senate Member Garey, Superintendent/President Serban clarified that the non-routine equipment replacement requests and associated budget allocation came from the inventories provided by each unit through the VPs, not from the program reviews; the program reviews reflect new equipment needs, not replacement needs. Serban also clarified, that as discussed at prior CPC meetings over the past two years, the budget for the routine and non-routine equipment is coming from the ending balances from Fund 41 and in 2010-11 there will be not be a Fund 41 in each cost center. Serban pointed out that the routine equipment expenses become a part of the general fund budget for each cost center which made a request starting in 2010-11. Academic Senate Representative Garey asked when will we look at reducing expenses. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we will look at reductions, as needed, once we have the preliminary budget for 2010-11. Interim PE Director O'Connor brought up contingency monies to be used for emergencies. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that the contingency budget is for equipment that is breaking and the department cannot wait for another year to fix it. Further discussion ensued. CSEA President Auchincloss asked if a department does not spend all their routine money, does it rollover. Serban clarified that this money does not get rolled over and each department will get the same amount in their budget in the next year. Serban reminded everyone that this had been discussed before and that the members all agreed that we are going to try this for a year before assuming that people spend money for the sake of spending money.

3. A minimum transfer of \$640,000 will be made to the Construction fund for 2010-11

M/S/C [Nevins/Ehrlich] to approve a minimum transfer of \$640,000 will be made to the Construction fund for 2010-11. All approved.

Discussion ensued. Academic Senate Representative Nevins wanted clarification that this is a transfer for ongoing maintenance. Superintendent/President Serban stated that indeed this is for ongoing general maintenance such as minor repairs that are done on a day to day basis and general campus maintenance. There was a discussion about naming this fund "routine maintenance" rather than construction because it more accurately describes what it is for. VP Sullivan pointed out that this transfer from the general fund ending balances goes into a fund called Construction Fund. This fund contains several sub-funds, one of which is for routine campus maintenance. Changing the name of the fund will only create problems in comparing expenses over time, so there will be no name change.

Superintendent/Serban stated that this amount is what it costs for the routine maintenance of the campus per year and we have never spent less than that. VP Sullivan reported that we are already reducing significantly the balance of that fund by the end of the year by not contributing more than \$640,000. In normal years, we transferred about \$2 million or more per year into the Construction Fund.

Discussion Items

4. Budget Development for 2010-11 – continued discussion
 - a. Ranking of program review requests for new equipment (hardware, software, non-technology) and facility improvements not scheduled to be funded from Measure V (handout)
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban handed out Program Reviews Resource Requests for 2010-11 for Facilities that are not funded from Measure V and need to be ranked. Serban stated that CPC needs to talk about the process of reviewing program review requests for next year in order to streamline it and make it simpler. There were suggestions, comments and clarification regarding this ranking process which CPC will continue to refine. This program review is a requirement for Accreditation. This is the first year we have tried this method and we agreed at the outset that we will make changes in the process and the timeline such that it becomes a more efficient and better process over time.
 - ii. Superintendent/President Serban stated that at this time it is a higher priority for the members of CPC to make decisions to inform the 2010 -11 budget. Serban stated that the preliminary budget needs to be done by the end of April. Serban stated that CPC can use the last meeting in April and the two meetings in May to agree on timelines and process for next year. This process will become better each year.
 - iii. Superintendent/President stated that as we already discussed is for next year we can develop a different timeline and a different review and ranking process. Serban said that she thinks it is important to give this new process the recognition that it deserves. In the past, nobody would have had this information available to see, the budgeting process has never been this transparent and inclusive in terms of decision making. This budget process is as transparent as anyone can make it and it is important to recognize that there is a lot of information to sift through in this process. If we want to have this level of transparency, we have a lot of information to look at. There is a choice between having a fully transparent and inclusive budgeting process which means spending a lot of time and discussion, but then all CPC members know everything or have a less transparent process which means that much less time would be spent in these reviews and discussions. And this process needs to take place in a fairly short amount of concentrated time where this information is analyzed and discussed by everyone.
 - iv. Academic Senate Representative Garey made a suggestion for the April 6th meeting that all of these spreadsheets list the complete ranking be re sorted into college wide divisional categories: Continuing Ed, Ed Programs, Business Services, Human Resources, President's Office, and Information

Technology. Within each of those breakdowns, he asked that they be listed in the rank order of the CPC rank order. Then we can look at each one of those groups and make a determination as to what those needs are and with estimated dollar information and start allocating money. Further discussion and clarification took place around this suggestion. VP Sullivan agreed with this idea of breaking it down in groups, each group ranks their own area and as a group, we come back together and quantify how much money does the College have to spend on all of these projects.

- v. Superintendent/President Serban handed out Program Reviews Resource Requests for 2010-11 for General Equipment. Questions, clarification, discussion about how the rankings were done and how to rank them further ensued. Serban pointed out that CPC needs to look at the needs from an institution-wide perspective. Serban reminded members that the feedback loop to other members of the college community is the responsibility of the CPC members who represent those groups. Serban stated that the budget amount for equipment was based on what the departments said is important for the different areas in 2010 -11. The requests are informed by real need. That is the link between program review, planning and budgeting, not simply stating a dollar amount that is available and then determining what that amount should be spent on.
 - vi. Technology Software and Hardware program review resource requests were handed out and discussed.
 - vii. Superintendent/Serban reported on the information included in the document *Additional Funding Needs for 2010 – 11 DRAFT of March 16th* .
- b. Continued discussion on minimum level of reserves to be maintained
 - c. Continued discussion on current program requests for general fund support (attachment)
 - i. Programmatic requests
 - ii. Proposal regarding readers
 - iii. Proposal from the Committee on non-teaching compensation
 - d. Funding decisions for:
 - i. New equipment and facility improvements identified in program reviews
 - ii. Program requests (i.e., categorical, readers, PSS, etc)
 - e. Next steps – Superintendent/President Serban suggested that CPC meet on April 6th to discuss the program review resource requests and categorical programs' requests for additional augmentation from general fund ending balances given the cuts in state allocations which may need to continue, so we should also meet on April 13th. Then at the meeting on April 20th we will have the final vote on what allocations to make for the various program requests for 2010-11.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next meetings: Tuesday, April 6, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C; Tuesday, April 13, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C, Tuesday, April 20, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C