

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

COLLEGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

November 1, 1983

M I N U T E S

Present: P. MacDougall/P. Huglin, Chairpersons; M. Bobgan, A. Bailon, N. Cretser, L. Fairly, P. Freeman, C. Hanson, E. Jardine, J. Kay, M. Mallen, D. Oroz; Resource: Burt Miller, R. Sanchez

Absent: G. Gaston

WORKSHOPS ON COLLEGE PLANNING

The Chair gave the background on this item stating that in December of 1982 the Board of Governors endorsed a program of developing and testing new comprehensive planning procedures. The objectives of the program are to provide information that would enable the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office to more effectively represent all California Community Colleges, reduce duplication of efforts in preparation of annual reports to the Chancellor's Office and accreditation, encourage improvements in local evaluations, and improve state level policy-making.

The Chancellor's Office was instrumental in setting up a series of workshops around the state in cooperation with FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education). Each workshop will present a different model of planning. The first workshop will be held in Long Beach, Wednesday, November 9, with Larry Friesen (representing faculty), Burt Miller and Richard Sanchez attending.

Dr. MacDougall added that the emphasis of the program was on cutting down duplication of work that takes place with the accreditation team and the annual reporting to the Chancellor's Office and to try to see that the planning mechanism that an institution sets up will be compatible with the needs of both agencies so that institutional planning and reporting to the Chancellor's Office are not conducted from two entirely different perspectives.

REPORT ON MEETINGS OF ASSEMBLY SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE AND OPERATIONS

Dr. MacDougall informed College Planning Committee of the Select Committee Hearings on Community College Finance that will take place in the next few months. The purpose of the hearings is to take testimony regarding "level of financing, including state and local sources of funds; student charges; staffing and expenditure ratios and controls; definition of purpose and need for variable funding for separate missions of the community college; possible efficiencies associated with consolidation and realignment of community college districts;

Report on Select Committee Meetings (continued)

appropriate redefinition of roles and responsibilities of state and local agencies associated with community colleges." The committee will report on its findings and make recommendations by January 30, 1984. He added that the first of the hearings was held in Los Angeles on October 26 at which time students and staff presented their concerns regarding staff layoffs and proposed fees that would place an undue hardship on the Los Angeles Community College District's large low-income student population.

PRESS CONFERENCE AT SBCC

Dr. MacDougall reported on the press conference that was held last week on the SBCC campus which included the Chancellor of Ventura Community College District, Superintendent/President of Allan Hancock Community College District, Eli Luria, President of the Board of Trustees of Santa Barbara Community College District and himself. The view of the three districts in regard to the fiscal situation of the community colleges was presented, and the urgent need for a resolution of the situation was stressed. Dr. MacDougall suggested that it's not a fiscal issue, because there seems to be money available to deal with the community college funding; it appears that the solution to the problem lies with the leadership in Sacramento (Governor Deukmejian and Assembly Speaker Willie Brown). He thought that the press conference was helpful in letting the public know that the three districts have a unified position and are supporting the compromise legislation which would include fees with a number of safeguards built in to protect the system.

Dr. MacDougall added that as Chair of the California Assn of Community Colleges Commission on Legislation and Finance he has written to every legislator and the Governor urging that the issue be dealt with immediately and not be left till January. He also communicates on a regular basis with Bill Cunningham, Education Advisor to the Governor, to discuss possible solutions. He has written a letter to Assemblyman O'Connell urging him to exert some leadership on behalf of community colleges and proposed two areas of consideration which may provide the basis for breaking the deadlock between the Assembly and the Governor and achieve some bipartisan support: 1) "Sunset" provision which would end the imposition of tuition at the end of the Governor's term of office; 2) Tying in, by statute, a relationship (percentage) of the fee to the total cost of education for the community college student, thereby preventing runaway escalation of the tuition fee. The Superintendent/President is also attempting to contact Assembly Minority Leader Bob Naylor and have him reiterate a statement he made earlier (to Dr. MacDougall) regarding his willingness to support the "sunset" provision, thereby throwing the issue back into the hands of the Assembly Democrats. The whole thrust of the Superintendent/President's efforts at this time is to seek resolution during the month of November, so that positive planning efforts can be made for the remainder of this college year and for 1984-85.

1984-85 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Dr. Hanson distributed "Overview of Income and Expense" to members which is a synopsis of economies that have been implemented over the last three years and a list of possible savings ("rough estimates") for 1983-84 that covers staffing and salaries, energy conservation/utilities savings, maintenance/equipment, cost reductions and fee increases.

Dr. Hanson also distributed "Funding Projections for 1984-85" which lists eight sets of assumptions and the projected budget figures to be used in each of the eight scenarios. He emphasized that the "ending balance" of \$821,459 in the 1983-84 budget is a "soft" figure because of three factors: 1) the Board of Trustees might prefer not to defer the payment on the Goleta Valley Continuing Education Center; 2) there may be a "shortfall" in revenue; and 3) there may be a "shortfall" in ADA. Also to be considered is the Board's preference for a contingency balance between 5 and 8 percent.

Projection I	State funding level for 1982-83 with 5% ADA decline
Projection II	State funding level for 1982-83 with mandatory fees of \$50/semester (6 units or more) and \$5/unit with less than 6 units, and 5% ADA decline
Projection III	Same as Projection II but with 10% ADA decline
Projection IV	State funding level for 1983-84 with 5% ADA decline
Projection V	State funding level for 1983-84, ADA capped at 1982-83 level
Projection VI	State funding level for 1982-83 plus 6% COLA, no ADA change
Projection VII	State funding level for 1982-83 plus 6% COLA, 5% ADA decline
Projection VIII	State funding level for 1982-83 with no ADA decline

Dr. Hanson indicated that the most realistic assumption would be I, II, III, VI, VII, and VIII; the least likely would be IV and V. He suggested placing the most emphasis on II and VII or VI and VIII if the "hold harmless" provision is passed. He informed members that they should choose the projections they want to work with in budget development and that the Board of Trustees would do the same when they hold their retreat.

1984-85 Budget Development Update (continued)

M/S/C Bobgan/Freeman

To recommend that College Planning Committee delete Numbers IV and V from the list of projections for consideration in budget planning.

Ayes: 8 Noes: 0 Abstentions: 2

M/S Jardine/Kay (Motion failed)

To table the motion until after the Board of Trustees has held its retreat.

Ayes: 2 Noes: 7 Abstentions: 1

Dr. Hanson suggested using a 10% drop in ADA in Projection VII instead of 5% to more accurately project funds available for budgeting.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY/CLASSIFIED COMPARISONS

Mr. Oroz reviewed the "Employee Comparison Data" for members and explained that it was a comparison of SBCC to other community colleges in the state in terms of relative distribution of types of employees, i.e., administrators, faculty, technical paraprofessional, etc. He stated that the data was taken from the Chancellor's Office Annual Report on Staffing and Salaries, 1982-83, and lists the data by Table A: Number of Employees; Table B: Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Employees; and Table C: Number of Employees by Type of Assignment.

Mr. Oroz computed the percentage of the 837 total number of employees for SBCC in each of the categories listed. All three tables indicate that the number of non-faculty categories is lower at SBCC as compared to statewide averages.

ba
cc: Asst Deans
 Division/Department Chairs
 Rep. Council