Call to Order
I Order of the Agenda
As set

II Approval of Minutes
A November 29, 2012
Professor Nance moved to approve
Professor Deaver provided the second
The minutes are approved without dissent

III Public Comments
1 Professor Mettler announced that Leonor Aguilera will be replacing Nena Baldizon-Rios as the Senate representative for Counseling and Special Services.
2 Professor Scott discussed an issue that the Math Department is having with an agreement made with the Title V Grant and Math 81 classes. The Grant requires 16 additional hours of time in the Math Study Hall (MASH), which means one hour per week. Traditionally, time at MASH was for study and homework, but the Grant requires the students to perform an additional exercise at MASH during this hour per week. The Math Department has now been asked to drop students that do not attend the first two weeks of one hour study at MASH, regardless if they have been attending the actual course. He stated that this seems to be an Administrative breach of the Faculty’s right to determine course attendance policies.
3 Professor Nance clarified that the requirement is a State mandate regarding the one hour per week to be arranged. Classes with “positive attendance” require stringent accounting in order for money to be collected from the State.
4 Professor Evett said that the Faculty needs to consider Linda Miscovic’s interpretation of the 10% drop policy; that it should be employed after the census and that a student who misses classes (even if less than 10%) before census, can be dropped. Dean Miscovic believes that a
student that attends the first day should be dropped if: (1) they are absent the next class or
two and (2) they have had no contact with the professor. Dean Miscovic points out that this
prevents students from fraudulently receiving financial aid, the College from unfairly
receiving money from the State, and allows other students into the class.

Professor Rutan thanked the Senate and the Faculty for the support they gave him last
semester.

IV ASG Report – Rachel Bulosan
1 The ASG Winter Retreat was a big success.
2 The ASG is implementing the Student Success Task Force recommendations.
3 Club Rush will take place the week of February 6.
4 Battle of the Bands will be held March 9 from 6:00 p.m. to 9 p.m. to raise funds for “To
Right Love on Her Arms.”

V Action Item
None

VI Discussion Items
A Update on Grant Request Form (Appendix 1 – Grant Request)
1 Professor Evett discussed that the Grant Request Form is undergoing some slight changes,
but the Budget Committee and College Council are in favor of adopting it.
2 One change is to ensure that the signatures are received in a progressive manner to ensure
that the Grant request flows through the appropriate channels in the appropriate timeframe.

B Revised Equivalency Forms (Appendix 2 - Equivalency)
1 President Barembaum discussed the changes being made to the equivalency forms to make
them easier to follow and complete.
2 He further stated that each Department will need to work with their colleagues at Santa Ana
to clearly establish in writing what they consider to be equivalent educational or work
experience in their respective field.
3 The form will be coming forth to the Senate as an action item and the process to establish the
written equivalency will soon follow.

C New Budget Allocation Model (Appendix 3 – New Budget Model)
1 President Barembaum said that the current budget model has not been reviewed in years, nor
followed exactly, and that there appears to be flaws in the model; because of this, a new
budget model is being proposed and likely to be adopted in February and implemented for
the 2012-13 year.
2 The new model will allow money raised by the Colleges to stay at the Colleges after 16.31%
is given to the District; this percentage will be looked at later and a move towards a “charge
back system” is to take place.
3 The new model will allow the Colleges more flexibility in spending money; it will not garner
more money for the Colleges.
4 The Colleges will be able to hire Faculty and Staff according to the needs of the College not
the District.
BAPR will serve as the body to address emergencies, unforeseen challenges, surpluses, Faculty Obligation Number, etc.

**D EMP Update** (Appendix 4 – EMP Update)

1. Aracely Mora announced that SCC has completed the external environmental scan and has convened the focus groups to begin the internal evaluation.
2. This process discovered six themes: students, curriculum, campus, faculty and staff, community partners, and resources.
3. The EMPC has drafted a plan to have three open forums during February.
4. Following the forums, there will be college-wide subcommittees formed around each of the themes to identify and formulate goals.
5. The goals created are to be evaluated as to whether they align with the Faculty Vision and Values.

**E Faculty Forum Debrief**

1. Professor Evett announced that only 70% of the Faculty had turned in their grades on the agreed upon submission date. It is very necessary that the Faculty submit grades by noon on the first Thursday after finals week.
2. Professor Evett reported that the Faculty wants to see cuts at the District before more cuts to the classroom.
3. Professor Sproat reported that the Library does not have the resources to accommodate a student’s need to find a source with a publication date less than two years old. She asks that the Faculty make accommodations for these students and more importantly that the Senate help the Library receive more funding.
4. She also added that the Library has an Amazon wish list that any are welcome to support at: [www.sccollege.edu/library](http://www.sccollege.edu/library)
5. Professor Elchlepp asked if there was any action the Senate could take to prevent further cuts to the classroom.
6. President Barembaum responded that a resolution could pass through Senate to the Board to that effect.
7. Professor Evett reported that there will be various letters drafted to FARSCCD discussing the Faculty’s position on various issues.

**VIII Reports Discussion**

**A Curriculum – President Barembaum**

1. No report given

**B SLOARC – Professor Powell**

1. No report given

**C Senate Report**

1. No report given

**D Technology – Professor Scott**

1. No report given

**E Facilities – Craig Nance**

1. No report given

**E College Council – President Barembaum**

1. No report given
President’s Report – President Barembaum

No report given

Professor Isbell moved to adjourn
Professor Deeley seconded the adjournment.
The meeting is adjourned without dissent.
Appendix 1 - Grant Request

Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant
College Council
Santiago Canyon College

1. GENERAL INFORMATION:

Project Title: ____________________________________________________

Project Initiator: __________________________________________________

Project Administrator: _____________________________________________

Project Coordinator: ______________________________________________

Grantor Agency: __________________________________________________

Grantor Agency Deadline for Proposal: ________________________________

Funding Period: __________________________________________________

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION/PLAN:

Estimated grant amount: ___________________________________________

Match required: Yes ☐ No ☐

Estimated match amount: __________________________________________

In-kind/Cash match requirement: Yes ☐ No ☐

Where will funds for match originate? ________________________________

Comments about match: __________________________________________

3. WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS, IF ANY, AND HOW WILL THEY BE MET?

4. ANTICIPATED PROJECT PERSONNEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Needed</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Existing/New</th>
<th>Funded Match</th>
<th>Stipend or Release Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the Project Coordinator involved in any other grants (i.e. manager/coordinator or participant). If so, what amount of release time does she/he receive for the other grant participation?

5. CURRICULUM (PROGRAM/COURSE)IMPACT:
6. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COLLEGE/DISTRICT:
   ▪ How does this project relate to the goals and objectives of the college?
   ▪ How does this project relate to the goals and objectives of the program to which the grant relates?
   ▪ Where is the need for this project identified in the related program’s EMP/DPP/Program Review?
   ▪ Will this project impact other departments/units? Yes □ No □
   ▪ If yes, identify which department/unit and explain how you plan to include them in the planning process.
   ▪ Please list each department, the chair(s) to whom you spoke and whether or not the faculty in the department are willing to participate in the proposed project.
     - Department __________ Chair(s) ___________ Willing to Participate Yes □ No □
     - Department __________ Chair(s) ___________ Willing to Participate Yes □ No □
     - Department __________ Chair(s) ___________ Willing to Participate Yes □ No □
   ▪ How will project facilities requirements, if any, be met?

7. LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COLLEGE/DISTRICT:
   ▪ When funding ends, will this project be institutionalized? Yes □ No □
   ▪ If so, what is the estimated cost to fund this project?
   ▪ If not, what will happen to this project and the personnel involved with it?

8. HAVE THE FOLLOWING BEEN ADVISED OF THIS PROPOSAL?
   □ Academic Senate President □ Curriculum Committee Chair □ Department Chair(s) of Department Impacted by Project
   □ EMPC Chair □ RSCCD Research & Grants office

9. Operational Approvals: (Obtain signatures in the order below)
   
   Project Initiator: ___________________________ Date ___________________________

   Project Administrator: ___________________________ Date ___________________________

   Vice President: ___________________________ Date ___________________________

10. Final Approvals: (Obtain signatures in the order below)

    College Council Chair: ___________________________ Date ___________________________

    Academic Senate President: ___________________________ Date ___________________________

    College President: ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Appendix 2 – Equivalency

RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Request for Equivalencies to Minimum Qualifications

The Local Governing Board is authorized to employ those who meet the minimum qualifications through equivalency.

The Local Governing Board will rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate(s) to determine equivalencies to minimum qualifications through a process of mutual agreement between the local Academic Senate(s) and the District.

A candidate for a faculty position cannot be hired if his/her qualifications are not equivalent to the minimum qualifications, as stated in the discipline’s list, set by the State Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges in consultation with the Statewide Academic Senate. If a candidate believes that s/he meets the qualifications through equivalency, it is incumbent upon the responsibility of the candidate to indicate the basis for the equivalency and to provide the conclusive evidence for the equivalency through official transcripts from an accredited institution consistent with Title 5 Regulations, publications, other work products, documentation of relevant work experience, or demonstration of mastery of a required skills as appropriate.

Prior to considering an individual candidate for an equivalency, the Department must first consider the specific equivalency criteria for the discipline (Form I). The discipline equivalency criteria must be reviewed and approved prior to the consideration of an individual requesting an equivalency. The qualifications of an individual candidate will be reviewed and documented (Form II) to determine if the candidate has met the minimum qualifications through equivalency already established by the Department in Form I.

Please note:
The equivalency in academic disciplines that have a minimum qualification of a Master’s Degree or other required degrees and/or coursework should include equivalent academic preparation. Work experience, publications, or mastery of skill can not substitute for required academic coursework in these academic disciplines unless conclusive evidence is provided that delineates the components of the Master’s Degree or any other required degree and that demonstrates how the work experience, publications, or mastery of skill satisfy each requirement of that degree.

In addition, a department cannot create an equivalency for a specific course within a discipline. The equivalency must be based upon the entire discipline and cannot be course specific.

Also, discipline equivalencies apply across the District and are not college specific. It is expected that a department will consult with the corresponding department at the other sister college and include the department chair at the other sister college in this process.

If a department wants to alter its approved equivalencies (Form I), the department must reconsider and file a new “Request for Equivalencies to Minimum Qualifications” Form (Form I). This will invalidate the prior Form I that was previously submitted by the Department and the new Form I will become the approved guideline for future considerations.
Instructions for Form I:

To assist the Academic Senate(s) and the local Governing Board in making valid decisions regarding employment of those who meet minimum qualifications through equivalency:

A. The Department makes a request to the Academic Senate to convene a Department Equivalency Committee.
   1. The Equivalency Committee will be selected by the Department, in conjunction with the academic senate, and will include the following:
      • Academic Senate Representative appointed by the senate president
      • Department Chair or designee from both colleges or academic areas
      • Three faculty members from the department, faculty service area, discipline, or division respectively. It is recommended that discipline faculty from both colleges be included.
   2. The Equivalency Committee may request an administrator to serve as a nonvoting resource person for the committee.

B. The Equivalency Committee will:
   1. List the current minimum qualifications for the discipline (Form I, Item 1)
   2. List the equivalencies for the discipline that the department accepts as valid (Form I, Item 2).
   3. Below is a list of criteria that some departments have considered in determining valid equivalencies to meet minimum qualifications. This list is being provided to assist the department in deciding appropriate equivalencies and is not intended to be an inclusive list.
      1. University units in a discipline from an accredited institution
      2. Teaching Credentials
      3. Licensure
      4. Alternate degrees
      5. Years of Related Experience (if applicable)
      6. Mastery of Skill
      7. Continuing Education Units (e.g. nursing)
      8. Portfolio

Please note:
Equivalencies for disciplines that have a required Master’s Degree or another required degree and/or coursework as a minimum qualification should include equivalent academic coursework. Work experience, publications, mastery of skill, etc. cannot substitute for equivalent academic preparation unless
conclusive evidence is provided that delineates the components of the Master’s Degree or any other required degree and that demonstrates how the work experience, publications or mastery of skill satisfy each requirement.

Equivalencies are discipline specific and NOT course specific. An instructor granted an equivalency within a discipline meets the requirements to teach any course within that discipline district-wide.

4. Include a rationale to assist the President of the Academic Senate and the local Governing Board representative (the appropriate College President or designee) in their review and approval process (Form I, Item 3).

C. Process for Submission:
   1. Write in the department submitting the request.
   2. Obtain the signature of the Department Chair or designee from each college. If there is no corresponding program at the other college, then one chair signature is sufficient. A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.
   3. Obtain the signatures of the faculty from the Department, FSA Discipline or Division. A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.
   4. Obtain the signature of the appropriate Dean/Supervisor. This signature indicates that the dean has been informed of the department’s support of the equivalency request and the dean’s receipt of the request.

D. If supported and signed by the Academic Senate representative on the committee, the Chair of the Equivalency Committee will forward the request to the Academic Senate President for approval.

E. If denied by the Academic Senate President, the request will be returned to the Department listing reasons for denial.

F. If approved by the Academic Senate President, the equivalency request will be forwarded to the College President or designee for review and then forwarded to Human Resources. The document will be posted on the Intranet by Human Resources.

“If you cannot understand and apply these instructions, your master’s degree will be declared invalid.” - Anonymous
RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Request for Specific Equivalencies to Minimum Qualifications for a Discipline/Program

FORM I

Each time a department wants to alter its agreed upon equivalencies for all discipline hirings, it must file a new “Request for Equivalencies to Minimum Qualifications” form.

Name of the Discipline: ____________________________________________

1) List the current Minimum Qualifications for the discipline:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

2) List the equivalencies that the Department accepts as valid:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

3) Rationale: _______________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Submitted by:
Department: ________________________________
Required Signatures

SAC Department Chair or designee: ____________________________ Date: ______
A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.

SCC Department Chair or designee: ____________________________ Date: ______
A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.

Three faculty from the Department, FSA, Discipline or Division:
A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.

1) __________________________________________ Date: ______
   Last (print)  First (print)  Signature

2) __________________________________________ Date: ______
   Last (print)  First (print)  Signature

3) __________________________________________ Date: ______
   Last (print)  First (print)  Signature

Academic Senate Representative: ____________________________ Date: ______
A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the proposed qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline.

Appropriate Dean/Supervisor: ____________________________ Date: ______
Signature indicates receipt of equivalency request.

SAC Academic Senate President: ____________________________ APPROVED / DENIED Date: ______

SCC Academic Senate President: ____________________________ APPROVED / DENIED Date: ______

Reason for Denial: ______________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

College President or Designee: ____________________________ Date: ______

If not approved at any level, the form will be returned to the appropriate Department Equivalency Committee.
**Instructions for Form II:**

To assist the Academic Senate(s) and the local Governing Board in making valid decisions regarding the employment of an individual who meets the minimum qualifications through equivalency:

A. The Department convenes an Equivalency Committee.
   1. The Equivalency Committee will be selected by the Department, in conjunction with the academic senate, and will include the following:
      - Academic Senate Representative appointed by the senate president
      - Department Chair or designee
      - Three faculty from the department, faculty service area, discipline, or division, respectively. If there is a corresponding program at the sister college, discipline faculty from both colleges must be invited to participate.

   Please note:
      - Equivalencies are district-wide and not college-specific. An instructor granted an equivalency within a discipline meets the requirements to teach any course within that discipline at either college.
      - That instructor is eligible for a full-time tenure track position within that discipline at either college.
      - A tenured faculty member who is granted an equivalency gains seniority in that discipline dating back to their original hiring date.

   2. The Equivalency Committee may request an administrator to serve as a nonvoting resource person to the committee.

B. The Equivalency Committee will consider each applicant by completing Form II as follows:

   1. Indicate name of applicant who is being considered for an equivalency.

   2. Indicate the discipline under consideration for equivalency.

   3. The Equivalency Committee will review current Form I on file with HR and document evidence of equivalency in Items A through F on Form II, as appropriate. Include a copy of current Form I with equivalency request.

   4. Obtain the signature of the Department Chair or designee. A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the individual meets the requirements listed on Form I for the discipline.

   5. Obtain the signatures of the faculty from the Department, FSA Discipline or Division. A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the individual meets the requirements listed on Form I for the discipline.

   6. Obtain the signature of the appropriate Dean/Supervisor. This signature indicates that the dean has been informed of the department’s support of the equivalency request and the dean’s receipt of the request.
7. Attach both Form I and transcripts or other appropriate supporting documents to Form II. This entire equivalency packet will then be forwarded to the Academic Senate President for review and approval.

8. If denied by the Academic Senate President, the request will be returned to the Department listing reasons for denial.

9. If approved by the Academic Senate President, the equivalency request will be forwarded to the College President or designee for review and then forwarded to Human Resources. If the equivalency is done for a full-time screening committee, the equivalency packet is returned to the screening committee once approved by the senate president.

**Please note:**
Equivalencies for disciplines that have a required Master’s Degree or another required degree and/or coursework as a minimum qualification should include equivalent academic coursework. Work experience, publications, mastery of skill, etc. cannot substitute for equivalent academic preparation unless conclusive evidence is provided that delineates the components of the Master’s Degree or any other required degree and that demonstrates how the work experience, publications, or mastery of skill satisfy each requirement of that degree.

“If you cannot understand and apply these instructions, your master’s degree will be declared invalid.” - Anonymous
RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Request for evaluation of Applicants who meet Minimum Qualifications through Equivalencies for Hiring/FSA Determination

FORM II

When a Department Equivalency Committee is reviewing applications, the following criteria will be used to determine if an individual meets the minimum qualifications through equivalencies

Name of applicant: _______________________________________________________________

Discipline: ______________________________________________________________

Candidates meeting the requirements through the equivalency process must provide conclusive evidence of equivalency using one or more of the following as appropriate below:

A. ___ Transcripts showing that the appropriate courses were successfully completed at an accredited college consistent with Title V Regulations or comparable foreign institution. *(Indicate college source and attach transcripts)

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

*Required for disciplines that have a Master’s Degree or another required degree and/or coursework as a minimum qualification.

B. ___ Publications that show a command of the major in question, the general education of the candidate, or his/her writing skills.

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

C. ___ Other work products that show a command of the discipline in question, the general education of the candidate or his/her writing skills.

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

D. ___ Demonstration of Mastery of the required skill.

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

E. ___ Work Experience

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

F. ___ Other:

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Please note: The equivalency in disciplines that have a minimum qualification of a Master’s degree or another required degree and/or coursework must include equivalent academic preparation. Work experience, publications or mastery of skill can not substitute for academic coursework in these academic disciplines.
Required Signatures

Department Chair or designee: ________________________________ Date: ________

A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the individual meets the requirements listed on Form I for the discipline.

Three faculty from the Department, FSA, Discipline or Division:

A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the individual meets the requirements listed on Form I for the discipline.

1) ___________________________________________________________ Date: ________
   Last (print) ____________________ First (print) ____________________ Signature

2) ___________________________________________________________ Date: ________
   Last (print) ____________________ First (print) ____________________ Signature

3) ___________________________________________________________ Date: ________
   Last (print) ____________________ First (print) ____________________ Signature

Academic Senate Representative: __________________________________________________________________ Date: ________

A signature indicates support for the equivalency and agreement that the individual meets the requirements listed on Form I for the discipline.

Appropriate Dean/Supervisor: ________________________________ Date: ________

Signature indicates receipt of equivalency request.

SAC/SCC Academic Senate President: ________________________________ APPROVED / DENIED Date: ________

Reason for Denial: ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

College President or Designee: ________________________________ Date: ________

If not approved at any level, the form will be returned to the appropriate Department Equivalency Committee.
**Rancho Santiago Community College District Budget Allocation Model**

**Based on SB 361**

**Introduction**

The budget allocation model described in this document provides the guidelines, formulas, and basic steps for the development of an annual district wide budget including the allocation of budget responsibilities for Santa Ana College, Santiago Canyon College and District Operations referred to as the three district budget centers. The budget is the financial plan for the district, and application of this model should be utilized to implement the district’s vision, mission statement, district strategic plan and the technology strategic plan as well as the colleges’ mission statements, educational master plans, facilities master plans and other planning resources. The annual implementation of the budget allocation model is to be aligned with all of these plans. To ensure that budget allocation is tied to planning, it is the responsibility of the Budget Allocation and Planning Review Committee (BAPR) to review budget and planning at the end of the fiscal year and, if necessary, recommend adjustments to the budget allocation model to keep the two aligned for the coming year. The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees are ultimately responsible for the annual budget and the expenditures associated with the budget. BAPR is responsible for recommending the annual budget to Chancellor and Board of Trustees and in fulfilling that obligation the budget allocation model provides the guidelines for the distribution of revenue. BAPR can choose to modify, ignore or enhance some or all of the guidelines, however, any change should be documented and approved by the Chancellor.

The goal of the budget allocation model is to create a documented allocation process that provides financial stability and encourages fiscal accountability at all levels in times of either increasing or decreasing revenue streams. It is also intended to be simple, transparent, easy to understand, fair, predictable and consistent, using quantitative, verifiable factors with performance incentives. BAPR should conduct a review(s) during each fiscal year to assess if the implementation of the budget allocation model is meeting the goal.

Under state law, the District is the legal entity and is ultimately responsible for actions, decisions and legal obligations of the entire organization. The Board of Trustees of the Rancho Santiago Community College District has clear statutory authority and responsibility and, ultimately, makes all final decisions. Likewise, the Chancellor, under the direction of the Board of Trustees, is responsible for the successful operation, reputation, and fiscal integrity of the entire District. The funding model does not supplant the Chancellor’s role, nor does it reduce the responsibility of the District Operations staff to fulfill their fiduciary role of providing appropriate oversight of District operations. It is important that guidelines, procedures and responsibility be clear with regard to District compliance with law and regulation related to the 50% Law, Full-Time/Part-Time faculty requirements, Faculty Obligation Number (FON), attendance accounting, audit requirements, fiscal and accounting standards, procurement and contract law, employment relations and collective bargaining, payroll processing and related reporting requirements, etc. The responsibilities for these requirements are to be maintained by District Operations, which has a responsibility to provide direction and data to the colleges to assure they have appropriate information for decision making with regard to resource allocation at the local level, thus, assuring District compliance with legal and regulatory requirements.

All revenue is district revenue because the district is the legal entity authorized by the State of California to receive and expend income and to incur expenses. However, the majority of revenue is provided by the
taxpayers of California for the sole purpose of providing educational services to the communities served by the district. Services such as classes, programs, and student services are, with few exceptions, the responsibility of the colleges. It is the intent to allocate the majority of funds to the colleges in order to provide those educational services. The model intends to provide an opportunity to maximize resource allocation decisions at the local college level. Each college president is responsible for the successful operation and performance of his or her college. The purpose and function of the District Operations in this structure is to maintain the integrity of the District and its individual colleges and to facilitate college operations so that their needs are met and fiscal stability is assured. District Operations has responsibility for providing certain centralized functions, both to provide efficient operations as well as to assist in coordination between District Operations and the colleges. Examples of these services include human resources, fiscal and budgetary oversight, procurement, construction and capital outlay, and information technology. On the broadest level, the goal of this partnership is to encourage and support collaboration between the colleges and District Operations.

**Implementation**

*A detailed transition plan for the implementation of the new budget allocation model should include:*

- Standards and milestones for the initial year
- An evaluation process to determine if the standards and milestones have been achieved or if there is adequate progress
- A process to ensure planning is driving the budget

**Revenue Allocation**

The SB 361 funding model allocates resources to the colleges in the same manner as received by the District. The method allocates all of the resources to the colleges as earned.

**College and District Operations Budgets and Expenditure Responsibilities**

Expenditure responsibilities for the colleges, district operations and district wide services are summarized in Table -1.

The total annual revenue to each college will be the sum of base funding for each college and center as defined by SB 361 and applying the current FTES rates for credit base, non-credit base, career development and college preparation non-credit base revenues and any local unrestricted or restricted revenues earned by the college.

The allocation will be reviewed by the BAPR. In reviewing the allocation of general funds, BAPR should take into consideration all revenues, including restricted revenues, available to each of the budget centers. If necessary, BAPR will recommend an adjustment(s) for the coming year and submit it to the Chancellor.

The resources allocated to District Operations and for district wide services will be based on a proposed budget prepared by District Fiscal Services, reviewed by BAPR and approved by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. Funding will come from any revenues generated by District Operations, the previous year’s ending balance and from general apportionment.

**DISTRICT OPERATIONS** - Costs incurred for operation of centralized services provided by District office staff, such as human resources, purchasing, payroll, accounting, etc.

**DISTRICT WIDE SERVICES** - Costs to support those District functions which are most effectively managed on a centralized basis, such as auxiliary services, safety and security services, information technology
services, and facility planning services. This would also include costs associated with mandated, statutory, or contractual costs that must be paid and cannot be reduced or changed, e.g. retiree health benefits, property and liability insurance, audit, etc.

Annual expenditure budgets for the District Operations and district wide services will be developed based on the projected levels of expenditure for the current fiscal year, taking into account unusual or one-time anomalies.

An annual review of District Operations and district wide services will be conducted by BAPR each fall. The review will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the services provided to assure the District is appropriately funded. If BAPR believes a change to the allocation is necessary, it will submit a recommendation to the Chancellor.

**District Reserves and Deficits**

Per current Board policy, the District is required to maintain a minimum of 3% of the ongoing operating expenditure budget as a contingency reserve. The Board may also set a higher reserve level through the Board Budget Assumptions.

The Chancellor reserves the right to adjust allocations as necessary as a result of any unforeseen circumstance that significantly impacts the budget that is beyond the control of the District and colleges.

**College Budget and Expenditure Responsibilities**

Colleges will be responsible for funding the current programs and services that they operate as part of their budget plans. There are some basic guidelines the colleges must follow:

- Requirements of the collective bargaining contracts apply to college level decisions.

- The state required Full-Time/Part Time faculty requirements and FON must be maintained. Full-time faculty hiring decisions by the colleges are monitored on a district wide basis.

- In making expenditure decisions, the impact upon the 50% law calculation must be considered and budgeted appropriately.

- Allocating resources to achieve the funded level of FTES is a primary objective for all colleges.

**Budget Center Reserves and Deficits**

It is recommended that the colleges and District Operations set aside a contingency reserve to handle unplanned expenses. If unspent by year end, this reserve falls into the year-end balance and is included in the budget centers’ beginning balance for the following year.

If a budget center incurs a deficit for any given year, the following sequential steps will be implemented:

The budget center reserve shall be used to cover any deficit. If reserves are not sufficient to cover budget expenses and/or reserves are not able to be replenished the following year, then the budget center is to prepare
an expenditure reduction plan and/or submit a request for the use of District Reserves to help offset the deficit. The expenditure reduction plan and/or a request to use District Reserves is to be submitted to BAPR. If BAPR agrees with the expenditure reduction plan and/or the request to use District Reserves, it will forward the recommendation to the Chancellor who will make the final determination.

District Operations: Economic Development expenditures are to be included in the District Operations budget but clearly delineated from other District Operations’ expenditures. Any State-funded COLA will be incorporated into the coming year’s budget only if recommended by BAPR and approved by the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

Attached is a checklist (Table 1) to be used to identify specific expenditures and the assignment of budget responsibility. Prior to development of the coming year’s budget, BAPR should review the checklist and recommend changes if necessary.

**Revenue Modifications**

**Apportionment Revenue Adjustments**

It is possible that the District’s revenue from apportionment could be adjusted after the close of the fiscal year in the fall, but most likely at the P1 recalculation, which occurs eight months after the close of the fiscal year. Any increase or decrease to prior year revenues is treated as an addition or reduction to the colleges’ current budget year.

**Allocation of New Revenue**

Growth Funding: When growth is funded in the final state budget signed by the Governor, growth will be funded prospectively by the District. Subject to District growth cap and other funding limitations, growth dollars will be advanced to the colleges based on the Chancellor approved annual FTES targets. Plans to go after growth funding requires BAPR approval, and the plans should include how growth funds will be distributed if one of the colleges does not reach its growth target.

Revenues which are not college specific will be allocated based on total funded FTES.

Due to the instability of revenues, such as interest income and mandated cost reimbursements, revenues from these sources will not be part of the allocation formula. Income derived from these sources will be added to the district wide reserves.

**Other Possible Strategic Modifications**

**Summer FTES**

There may be times when it is in the best financial interest of the District to shift summer FTES between fiscal years. When this occurs, the first goal will be to shift FTES from both colleges in the same proportion as the total funded FTES for each of the colleges. If this is not possible, then care needs to be exercised to ensure that any such shift does not create a disadvantage to either college. If a disadvantage is apparent, then steps to mitigate this occurrence will be addressed by BAPR.

Borrowing of summer FTES is not a college-level decision, but rather it is a District-level determination. It is not a mechanism available to individual colleges to sustain their internal FTES levels. Attempting to do so would raise the level of complexity on an already complex matter to a level that could be impossible to manage and prove detrimental to the District as a whole.
Long-Term Plans
Colleges: Each college has a long-term plan for facilities and programs. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Presidents, will evaluate additional funding that may accrue to the colleges beyond what the model provides. The source of this funding will also have to be identified.

District Operations: District Operations and district wide services may also require additional funding to implement new initiatives in support of the colleges. BAPR will evaluate requests for such funds on a case-by-case basis and submit a recommendation to the Chancellor.

Full-Time Faculty Obligation Number (FON)
To ensure that the District complies with the State required full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON), the Chancellor and his cabinet will establish a FON for each college. Each college shall be required to fund at least that number of full-time faculty positions. If the District falls below the FON and is penalized, the amount of the penalty will be deducted from the revenues of the college(s) causing the penalty. BAPR should regularly review the FON targets and actuals and determine if any budget adjustment is necessary. If an adjustment is needed, BAPR should develop a proposal and forward it to the Chancellor for approval.

Possible Appendices to be added if determined to be necessary

a) Definition of Terms
b) Frequently Asked Question & Answers
c) Transition Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure and Budget Responsibilities</th>
<th>SAC &amp; CEC</th>
<th>SCC &amp; OEC</th>
<th>District Operations</th>
<th>District wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Salaries- (1XXX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State required full-time credit Faculty Obligation Number (FON)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bank Leave</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Impact upon the 50% law calculation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Faculty Release Time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty Vacancy, Temporary or Permanent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faculty Load Banking Liability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Adjunct Faculty Cost/Production</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Department Chair Reassigned Time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Management of Sabbaticals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sick Leave Replacement Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AB1725</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Administrator Vacation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classified Salaries- (2XXX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Classified Vacancy, Temporary or Permanent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Working Out of Class</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vacation Accrual Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Overtime</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sick Leave Replacement Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Compensation Time taken</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Benefits-(3XXX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 STRS Employer Contribution Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PERS Employer Contribution Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OASDI Employer Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Medicare Employer Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Welfare Benefits, Increases/(Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SUI Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure and Budget Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAC &amp; CEC</th>
<th>SCC &amp; OEC</th>
<th>District Operations</th>
<th>District wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employee Benefits-(3XXX) - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers' Comp. Rates, Increase/(Decrease)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Retiree Health Benefit Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPEB Liability vs. &quot;Pay-as-you-go&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cash Benefit Fluctuation, Increase/(Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Operating Exp & Services-(5XXX)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property and Liability Insurance Cost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waiver of Cash Benefits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Gas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Water</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Electricity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Waste Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Water District, Sewer Fees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Board of Trustee Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scheduled Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Copyrights/Royalties Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Legal Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Outlay-(6XXX)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equipment Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Instructional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Non-Instructional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improvement to Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improvement to Sites</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 2

## Revenue and Budget Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAC &amp; CEC</th>
<th>SCC &amp; OEC</th>
<th>District Operations</th>
<th>District wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Revenue- (81XX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grants Agreements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Fund Matching Requirement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In-Kind Contribution (no additional cost to general fund)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indirect Cost (overhead)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Revenue- (86XX)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base Funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apportionment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COLA or Negative COLA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Growth, Work Load Measure Reduction, Negative Growth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Categorical Augmentation/Reduction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>General Fund Matching Requirement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In-Kind Contribution</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unrestricted (abate cost of utilities)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restricted-Proposition 20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instructional Equipment Matches (3:1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scheduled Maintenance Matches (1:1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Part time Faculty Compensation Funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>State Mandated Cost</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Revenue- (88XX)</td>
<td>SAC &amp; CEC</td>
<td>SCC &amp; OEC</td>
<td>District Operations</td>
<td>District wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Contributions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fundraising</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Proceed of Sales</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Health Services Fees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rents and Leases</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Enrollment Fees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Non-Resident Tuition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Student ID and ASB Fees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the Spring 2011 semester, the EMPC constructed a tentative timeline leading to the completion of the 2012-2016 EMP document. The tentative plan is as follows (please also see the flow diagram at the end of this cover page).

Assistant Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, Caroline Durdella will be working on an environmental scan which will incorporate data from various domains of inquiry including community population demographics and trends, trends in enrollment, workforce trends, social trends, and technological trends. The expected completion date for this environmental scan is late 2011.

While the environmental scan is being completed during the remainder of 2011, the EMPC will, in parallel, facilitate a college-wide internal evaluation to identify and assess areas of strength and areas for improvement at SCC. This internal evaluation will be shaped through focus group meetings of the EMPC with various college constituencies including faculty, classified staff, administration, and students. It will also be informed by program reviews from academic departments, student services, and administrative services and the 2011 SCC accreditation report and other typical measures related to student success and achievement.

Beginning in the Spring 2012 semester, a process of conversation, discussion and triangulation involving the external scan and the internal evaluation together with the RSCCD strategic plan and facilitated by the EMPC will result in an SCC action plan and goals. This will form the basis of the 2012-2016 EMP document. This document will be edited and shaped during Summer 2012 and completed and approved in the Fall 2012 semester.

A draft proposal of the Institutional Scan for the 2012-2016 EMP document is attached. The draft explains the purposes of the (external) Environmental Scan and the Internal Scan and proposes timelines for completion and proposed domains of inquiry, data types, and sources of data for each scan.

The plan for the 2012-2016 EMP document is for it to consist of 3 parts: (1) an assessment of the previous EMP document (not so much whether each and every goal was accomplished, but rather how effective was the previous EMP overall in guiding planning and decision making), (2) data and interpretation of results from external and internal scans, and (3) a resulting college strategic plan and goals.

The EMPC would like to reaffirm the idea that, in SCC’s culture, the “Educational Master Plan” is actually a trilogy of dynamic documents: (1) the DPPs, which describe a multi-year horizon of department- and program-level goals and activities reviewed, revised, and updated on an annual basis, (2) the Program Reviews, which provide deeper discussions, introspections, quantitative analyses, and evaluations for departments every three years (two years during the transition toward 2016) and serve as the central link between the RSCCD and College goals, accreditation feedback, and the department
plans, and (3) the multi-year EMP document which is published as a snapshot every 6 years (4 during the transition to 2016) and which describes the college-wide strategic plan. It is important for SCC constituents and accreditation personnel to understand that the “EMP” at SCC actually refers to (and has always referred to) this whole trilogy.

While the proposed format of the 2012-2016 EMP document departs from that of the previous two EMP documents in the sense that it will less resemble a collection of department plans and more resemble a cohesive college-wide plan, it is important to appreciate that, taking all three parts of the “EMP” together (DPPs, Program Reviews, 6 year EMP document), none of that information will be lost. Rather, the different parts of the trilogy will each become more focused and, ultimately, more useful for effective college planning.

The 2010-2011 SCC EMPC