## SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL April 6, 1999

# MINUTES

- PRESENT: Jack Friedlander, Chair, Karolyn Hanna, Kathy Molloy (for Robin Goodnough), John Romo, Bill Hamre, Dan Oroz, Kathy O'Connor, Jim Lynn, Lynda Fairly and Lana Rose
- EXCUSED: Charles Hanson and Joey Ferguson, Student Body Representative

#### 1.0 CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Dr. Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

### 2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 March 16, 1999

*M/S/C:* To approve the minutes as submitted (Rose/Romo)

#### 3.0 IDENTIFICATION OF STATE BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2000-2001

- 3.1 The Chancellors Office has invited each college to provide input and recommendations concerning the state budget. Dr. MacDougall has asked the College Planning Council to provide its suggestions in regards to state budget priorities by April 10, 1999.
- 3.2 The Planning & Resources Committee developed a list of state budget priorities. This list was distributed to and discussed with members of the CPC. The Council added a budget request for an augmentation to ongoing funds provided to colleges for equipment replacement.

#### 4.0 IDENTIFICATION OF STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2000-2001

{Item 4.0 was taken out of order, before 3.0}

4.1 <u>Distance Education</u>: For the purposes of state reimbursement, there should be no differences in the attendance type and state reimbursement rate for sections of courses offered in a distance education or in a classroom-based mode of delivery. At present, for the purpose of state FTES reimbursement, all distance education courses are considered as independent studies. Independent study courses are funded on the basis of units assigned to the course rather than on number of contact hours. Thus, a college offering a four-unit biology course with a laboratory component will receive state reimbursement for six hours a week when it is offered in a classroom-based mode (three lecture hours and three laboratory hours). However, a college offering the same course in a distance learning format will be reimbursed as if the class had four contact hours. Since the workload and compensation paid to faculty teaching the classroom-based and the distance learning sections of the course are the same, there is a financial disincentive for colleges to offer distance education courses that have a laboratory component. Title V needs to be changed so that colleges are not penalized financially when offering courses with a laboratory component in a distance education format.

- 4.2 <u>Clarification of the 60% Rule</u>: Clarity is needed on the activities that count towards the 60% workload of hourly adjunct instructors. For example, if hourly adjunct instructors participate on a voluntary basis in district paid professional development activities, should the time spent in such activities be included as part of their workload?
- 4.3 <u>Maintain Local Governing Boards</u>: We are opposed to any legislation that would eliminate local district governing boards or transfer the authority of local governing boards to a statewide governing board.
- 4.4 <u>Funding for Non-Credit Matriculation</u>: A primary goal of the Non-credit Matriculation program is to transition students from non-credit to credit instructional programs. At present, colleges do not receive Non-credit Matriculation funds for non-credit students who enroll concurrently in credit classes. This provides a financial disincentive to colleges that are successful in transitioning students from non-credit to credit programs. Matriculated students taking credit and non-credit courses concurrently receive services from both the credit and non-credit matriculation programs. Thus, non-credit Matriculation programs should continue to be reimbursed for matriculated students who are concurrently enrolled in non-credit and credit classes.
- 4.5 <u>Permissive Fees for Online Classes</u>: Colleges and universities are finding that it is more expensive to offer online courses than classroom-based courses. More specifically, colleges are incurring significant new costs to provide students with the option and convenience of taking online courses. Additional costs required to support online courses include: compensating faculty for their participation in training and course development activities; hosting courses on the campus/district network; providing technical support for the students (help desk) and faculty involved with online classes; and providing support services for those enrolled in online classes such as online registration, financial aid, assessment, counseling, advising and tutoring.

Colleges should be allowed to charge a permissive fee to help offset the additional costs associated with offering students the option of enrolling in an

online course. The fee should be restricted to an online course in which students have the option of enrolling in another section of that course not offered in an online format. Thus, students who want the convenience of taking a course in an online format may be charged a permissive fee to help offset the costs of providing them this option.

- 4.6 Eliminate the Waiver of the Health Fee for BOGG Recipients or Reimburse Colleges for the Loss in Income Resulting from this Fee Waiver. At present, community colleges are responsible for back filling the lost revenues resulting from the waiver of the health fee for BOGG recipients. Since the costs of providing the services for which the health fee is assessed is based on all students, the waiver of the health fee for BOGG students translates in having colleges allocate resources to cover the gap between the actual costs of providing these services and the revenue received from the health fee. Legislation is needed to end this non-funded mandate by either eliminating the waiver of the health fee for BOGG recipients or by having the state reimburse colleges for the loss of income resulting from this fee waiver.
- 4.7 <u>Change the Education Code to Allow Non-Credit Programs to Receive State</u> <u>Reimbursement for Worksite Experience Courses</u>. Non-credit programs are being asked to play a significant role in preparing CalWORKS clients and other students for employment. A critical component of the programs being designed to help students achieve their goal of entering/advancing in the workplace is to provide work site experiences for these individuals. At present, non-credit programs can not receive state reimbursement for work site classes. Changes in the education code are needed to enable non-credit programs to incorporate work site experiences into the programs they design for students preparing to enter the workforce.
- 4.8 <u>The State FTES Reimbursement Rate for Non-Credit Courses Offered by</u> <u>Community Colleges Should Be the Same as it is for Non-Credit Courses</u> <u>Offered by High Schools</u>. Legislation is being requested to equalize the state reimbursement rate for non-credit instruction offered by community colleges and high school districts.

#### 5.0 APPROACH TO DEVELOPING THE ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE 1999-2002 COLLEGE PLAN

- 5.1 Objective 38 in the proposed College Plan calls for the development and implementation of a resource allocation budgeting process that builds from the College Plan. Discussion concerning the development of activities to achieve the goals and objectives of the 1999-2001 College Plan led to the following conclusions:
  - Recommendations on activities to be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives in the College Plan should be solicited from various constituent groups

- ° CPC will send a letter to constituent groups asking them to submit initiatives
- The person assigned responsibility for each goal will form work groups to develop and implement plans to achieve the desired outcomes
- <sup>o</sup> The deadline for submitting plans to CPC to achieve the goals and objectives in the College Plan is October 1, 1999

#### 6.0 DISCUSSION OF THE PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING INITIATIVES TO BE SUPPORTED WITH NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR EXCELLENCE FUNDS SHOULD THEY BECOME AVAILABLE IN 1999-2000

6.1 This item was tabled until the next meeting of the College Planning Council that is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, April 20, 1999.

#### 7.0 OTHER

7.1 On April 5, 1999, Cabinet members met with bond campaign consultants. A major demarcation arising from that meeting is that once the Board of Trustees approves pursuit of the bond measure, the bond enters into the political realm. No district funds or resources may be allocated to support this initiative. The bond campaign is to be supported with external funds and efforts to promote the campaign must be conducted on the employees' personal time, not work time. The bond campaign is to be supported with external funds and efforts to promote the campaign.

The results of the survey to assess the public's support of the bond measure are encouraging despite other bond proposals. In order to achieve successful passage of the bond, 66% (about 33,000 people) of the people anticipated to vote in the November election will need to vote in favor of the measure (average local voter turnout is 49,000). If successful, the bond will result in an assessment of \$10 per \$100,000 in assessed property value. Thus, an owner of a property that is assessed at \$400,000 will have an additional \$40 per year added to their tax bill to pay for the bond. The consultants urged that the college's message and advertising campaign to the public be clear and focused. The college's channels of communication must also be clear to avoid the pitfalls of internal differences.

#### 8.0 ADJOURNMENT

8.1 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

cc: Cabinet, Deans/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate, Instructor's Association, CSEA, Classified Council, College Information, *The Channels*