

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Friday, April 8, 2011
9:00 am – 11:00 am
A218
Minutes

Special session – preparation for the development of the College Plan 2011-14

PRESENT:

A. Serban (Chair), Superintendent/President;
I. Alarcón, President, Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research
and Planning

J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs;
R. Limon, President Student Senate;
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative,
Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President-elect

ABSENT:

T. Garey, Academic Senate Representative;
M. Guillen, Classified Staff Representative;
C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative;

J. Sullivan, VP Business Service

GUESTS:

M. Croninger, Board of Trustee Member;

Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Overview of today's session: approach, desired outcomes (9am – 9:10am)
This agenda has been carried over from March 25th.
2. Review and discussion of Year Two Evaluation of College Plan 2008-11
handout (9:10am – 10:20am)
Dr. Serban pointed out the three documents about Continuing Education that were
requested at the last CPC Meeting.

VP Continuing Education Arellano explained the spread sheet *FTES No Longer Eligible for State Funding by Category*. There was a request to understand as to why there may be some reductions in FTES reported for 2010-11. Dr. Arellano explained how she set up the spread sheet, and went through them one by one, enhanced and non-enhanced classes, explaining in more specific detail the comments from the spreadsheet. Dr. Arellano stated that FTES has been added in other areas, so this is not a straight loss of FTES.

Dr. Arellano explained the second spreadsheet handout that came from a request for a comparison of Summer of 2009 and Summer 2010. For Summer 2011, she and her staff are producing a similar schedule to 2010 where they will not be scheduling non-enhanced courses. Also there will be fee-based courses offered. There was a question in terms of

understanding the total number of sections that were not scheduled. There was further discussion about the use of nomenclature to differentiate between non-credit and credit because they do not mean the same thing: sections vs. hours.

Dr. Arellano said that they are doing a major compliance review in Continuing Ed that these hours may change because we are re-submitting over 600 course modifications.

Dr. Arellano explained the third handout entitled *The Importance of Maintaining Enhanced Funded Certificate/Diploma Programs During Challenging Fiscal Times*. Dr. Arellano pointed out the background which came from Senate Bill 361 Noncredit Enhanced Funding. She pointed out why these are so critical; they must lead to improved employability or job placement opportunities or certificate of competency in a recognized career field, articulation with college-level coursework, completion of an associate of arts degree or transfer to a four-year program. There is an aim to transitioning the non-credit students to becoming credit students. She pointed out that she listed all the approved certificates.

Dr. Arellano reported on the results of the Continuing Ed Goal that was in the College Plan for 2008 -11 which was to establish specific goals and objectives to increase the number of high school diplomas, GED and the vocational certificate. Some of the courses have advisory committees composed of several Santa Barbara Employers, whose input is valuable in terms of hiring.

Last week they received approval for the modified older adult courses, we continue to receive reminders of the State priorities from the Chancellors Office. There was further discussion and clarification of the costs of community service classes and the extra hidden costs, such as advertising and marketing, schedule of classes and operational costs. The Ed Code says that these classes have to be self-supporting and at the moment only the direct costs are covered.

Dr. Arellano and Mr. Else are working on ways that they can track how many students transfer from noncredit to credit.

VP, IT Bishop gave a run through of the District Technology Plan. The handout is done by goals and objectives within the plan, it is modeled after the College Plan. The goals are really the College Plan Goals 1 through 6 and the objectives and a brief update as to where we are. Some of those accomplished goals are: wireless set up has been completed across all areas with multiple access points even in the Luria Press Box, e-books in Bookstore and Library, increase use of campus debit card, increased online forms, provide online support services equivalent to those on campus – this is a big goal but it is being looked and, an in-house training plan has been implemented. Dr. Bishop said that the Banner implementation is almost at an end and they are under budget.

Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning Else gave a quick update from his area, reporting that they have explored the use of Argos for some advanced reporting capabilities that are more like what we used to have in the decision support system that Dr. Serban had in place before Banner. He explained how this works and how important it is. As part of the Title V initiative, especially in the early years of that, picking the right tools, doing the right kind of analysis and talking with users is an early part of the grant.

There was discussion regarding the success of the college's program review resource request and the need to continue to keep funding it where some colleges are afraid to use it, online assessment testing viability and the problems with assessment testing, inserting objectives regarding assessment into our objectives, register from ipad and smartphones within a year, and ideas for creating more money for renting wireless space in the library conference rooms in conjunction with local hotels.

3. Highlights from the Credit Student Profiles – handout (10:20 am – 10:40 am) Robert Else
Mr. Else reported the Fall headcount; we had the first slight drop in Fall 2010 after 11 consecutive years of going up, this is the first time we dipped down a little bit. Dr. Serban said the drop was done on purpose. Mr. Else pointed out an interesting trend: many more online students but the ones that are fully on line just dropped a little bit from last Fall. Executive VP Friedlander stated that it was because of dropping the HIT program. He said that the number of full-time students is increasing a little bit, we are up to almost 40%. Dr. Friedlander said that his prediction, going forward in the next couple of years we will see that number go up to the degree that we can accommodate them because of what is happening with the CSUs and UCs turning away more students and the cost. He stated that another thing that is happening is our transfer center is overwhelmed already because students are getting rejection notices from CSU and UCs. Because of this the students want to stay at SBCC and attempt to enroll in another school or try again at the UCs and CSUs. Dr. Friedlander said that in our transfer effectiveness plan and Title V grant that we are writing, it is expanding those opportunities but also one of the recommendations that will come out is setting up a scholarship center, so students can start looking up ways to help fund to go to state or out of state colleges. This adds a whole new degree of complexity to transfer advising now.

Mr. Else said we are almost 30% over on Hispanic students. There was a discussion on ethnicity data collecting.

Mr. Else said that we are now seeing an increase in students setting their goal of getting a degree and the same with a goal of transferring.

4. Highlights from the Economic Impact Study done for us by the UCSB Economic Forecast Project – handout (10:40 am – 11 am) Robert Else

There was a discussion regarding the presentations to inform the development of the College Plan 2011-14 that took place April 7th with Dr. Peter Rupert, Director UCSB Economic Forecast Project; Dr. Glenn Russell, Director Planning and Development, County of Santa Barbara; Steve Cushman, Executive Director, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce; Paul Casey, Assistant City Manager, City of Santa Barbara and Dr. Davis Hayden, Director Research, Evaluation and Technology, Santa Barbara School District.

Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research and Planning Else gave a quick update of the presentations given on April 7th. Mr. Else first pointed out one unexpected piece of information. The background to this is that the conventional wisdom has that our local high school (our feeder schools) enrollment is shrinking. Dr. Hayden predicted that enrollment might drop by 50 students or so a year for the next couple of years, but he expects enrollments to go back within three years. Mr. Else said that is not even 800 students from grade 7 to 12. Dr. Serban stated that in the Fall after graduating we usually get 25% of that

and within two years 65% enroll in SBCC. No one is really sure why after two years. There was a discussion around why this happens.

Mr. Else stated that the report SBCC commissioned from Dr. Peter Rupert, economist from UCSB, probably the biggest surprise that came out of this report was that their model, given the data that we gave them from all of our capital and operational expenditure and payroll and how much students pay and all the numbers we gave them. They put those numbers into their model, turned the crank and reported: the multiplier effect on the local economy for every dollar that we spend for all of the above is about \$1.5. What that means is that for every dollar we spend that generates an additional .55 cents in the local county economy, most of that in South County.

Dr. Serban said she was surprised about the data relating to Faculty and Staff who commute to work because it was lower than she thought. She stated that the reason this is an important finding is because in the last two plans we had goals and objectives about increasing help for commuters and it turns out that not that many commute. We should maintain what we have because we know it is being used. We have four vans: 1 for Lompoc, 2 for Ventura, 1 from Ojai. There was further discussion about commuting. On commuters, there are 86% are in SB County and 14% in Ventura County. We have this data, so we will do our own research.

5. Assumptions, Challenges and Priorities for 2011 – 14 – handout (11am – 11:50am) – All
Dr. Serban said that in planning for the next three years, we need to think about our assumptions will be of what the next three years will look like. That needs to drive the goals and objectives that we have. There was further discussion about framing the college plan, the budget, and who gets served and gets served under the worst case budget scenario. Dr. Serban stated that this is important and part of our assumptions for the College Plan, under the section on the first section, defining some prioritization. Dr. Serban said that she fully supports the new proposed priority registration that is being discussed now.

Dr. Friedlander spoke about tying in the electronic Ed Plan into some kind of mechanism that would link to the registration process. This could be in the challenges and objectives. Dr. Serban shared her thought that when they want to register to have a sort of message pop up prompting them which classes they should sign up for according to their customized Ed Plan. Then those who adhere to their Ed Plan would be given priority registration and then we would be able to schedule much more effectively and serve more students more effectively. There was further discussion on the pros and cons of this idea as well as how the budget cuts and scarcity in classes are changing the student culture. The changes that are taking place need to be communicated.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next CPC meetings:

Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Friday, April 22, 2011, 9:00am – 12pm A218C

Tuesday, May 3, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C

Tuesday, May 17, 2011, 3:00-4:30pm, A218C