

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

October 2, 2007
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Romo, B. Partee, I. Alarcon, S. Broderick, T. Garey, G. Thielst,
L. Auchincloss,

EXCUSED ABSENCE: P. Bishop, P. Buckelew, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, D. Cooper,
K. Molloy, M. Guillen

GUESTS: K. O'Connor [for Molloy], P. English [for Ehrlich]

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the September 4th CPC meeting.

The approval was deferred until the October 16th meeting.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Tom Garey announced that the California Chamber of Commerce has decided to oppose the Community College Initiative.

2.2 Ben Partee announced that the college has received a \$106,000 grant to implement green building strategies and certification into the Construction Academy. Dr. Partee also announced that Cox Communication has agreed to provide high-speed internet access at a rate of \$19.95 (approximate a 50% reduction from its standard rate) to low income eligible students who are enrolled in 9 or more units with a 2.0 or above GPA. The Financial Aid office will extract from the database the individuals who would qualify under the criteria established by Cox Communication and Santa Barbara City College. A letter will go out from the Financial Aid office informing those students which qualify. Those students would then go to Ben Partee's office to get the paperwork to submit to Cox Communication.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0 Discussion items

4.1 Consideration of placing a bond measure on a future ballot

President John Romo said he has been quite public about the need for the Board to consider the possibility of a bond. There is a forum on October 4th at the college which is part an “in-service” series of activities for the Board and the members of the college community to learn more about bonds. A consultant gave a presentation to the Board on a variety of financing options that districts have available to them for capital construction projects. At the forum on October 4th there will be two consultants, Ruth Bernstein and Mary Rose, who will describe the typical steps a district follows in each phase of the process from assessing support for passing a bond to planning and implementing a bond campaign. The forum will not be to discuss whether or not SBCC should go for a bond. John Romo said he is planning to make a recommendation to the Board at its October 22nd Study Session to pursue a bond and to hire a consultant to conduct a study on the degree of community support for approving a bond measure in general and the projects that we would like to include in the bond in particular.

President Romo said one of the deciding criteria in making a decision to go out for a bond is that the state has basically changed the way it funds capital construction projects. The threshold for passing a bond went from 66.7 to 55 percent and that out of 71 districts, 67 districts have passed at least one bond and have had two or three bonds approved by their voters. The state now requires that a significant percentage of state supported capital construction projects are to be paid out of local funds and if we don't get a bond approved the college's match would come out of our General Fund. With the exception of the SoMA building, our list of highest priority projects are core infrastructure projects for existing buildings: the PS renovation; Humanities renovation which is in the category of highest priority for the state; Phase I & II of the Drama/Music Building [some Phase I dollars already available]; and necessary renovations in the Administration building. He said we have the opportunity to get state money but the matching dollars will be challenging to obtain.

John Romo said the earliest time that the Board could go out for a bond would be November 2008. The next opportunity would be June 2009 if there was a county-wide election at that time. Beyond that is a November 2009 date. President Romo also reminded the Council that three Board members will be up for re-election in November 2008. President Romo acknowledged through discussion with the management group that there was not “buy-in” among many members of the college community for the last bond campaign. That is why we went to some effort of ranking the capital construction projects to be considered for inclusion in the bond measures and to make this an open and inclusive process. He said our projects address core infrastructure needs as we have been told by the Coastal Commission that our campus cannot grow.

Liz Auchincloss indicated that the classified consultation group was ambivalent on the bond proposal. It would like a list of projects as its members weren't that involved in the process of providing input. John Romo offered to come to the consultation group as that group did not exist during the consultation process. Kathy O'Connor said it is critical that when discussing the bond and buildings to not leave out the issue of staffing. She said funding of the priority resource rankings that CPC developed last

year has been delayed and most of the positions on that list are classified positions which need to be funded. John Romo said he would like to be able to begin funding the positions on the list of priority items. He said the reasons he has not done so is: (1) the Governor is still sitting on \$33 million dollars for Basic Skills/ESL and the differential funding for enhanced non-credit courses; and (2) he does not have his year-end balances from last year because of the staff time devoted to the implementation of Banner. He said in October he will be taking an un-audited statement of the 2006-07 budget to the Board indicating ending balances. Hopefully we will know about the \$33m for Basic Skills at that time. President Romo said he has to be cautious about what he recommends to the Board for funding. It is believed in Sacramento that the Governor over-estimated revenue to get a balanced budget and as result there will be a mid-year adjustment. What that means for the college is that the state would discount its FTES reimbursement. The college's funded growth cap this year is just 1.25%. John Romo said he may decide to fund a couple of the highest priority core infrastructure positions that need to be addressed. However, the risk of doing so is the potential of having a reduction in state funds upon which we based our budget. He said if the Community College Initiative passes in February, the college, on the calculations of CCLC, will benefit by \$5.2 million in ongoing general fund dollars. President Romo concluded by saying that there is a critical need to address a couple of the positions on the priority resources list.

President Romo discussed the college's 2009 Centennial and the decision to be made of whether to make it a 2008-09 celebration or wait until 2009-10. The decision will be made when we decide when we go out for a bond so that we can link the promotions.

4.2 Accreditation standards and expectations that:

- A. Need to be addressed in the college's planning processes
- B. Need to be taken into account in developing the College Plan: 2008-2011

Jack Friedlander discussed the accreditation standards distributed to the Council informing them that these standards have taken on a new significance and level of scrutiny. He would like have each of the Council members review these standards to identify those that are not being adequately addressed. Dr. Friedlander would like each of the Council members to read and be very familiar with the standards so that we can align each of them to our policies, procedures and processes.

As an aside, Dr. Friedlander indicated to the Council that he is a member of two statewide legislative taskforces. He is writing three proposed changes that he would like to be considered by the Chancellor's Office Consultation Council.

1. Any externally imposed mandate from the state and federal agencies that require colleges to implement and have significant costs with doing so need to be analyzed by the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors as part of the process for determining the system budget priorities for the following year. He gave the

example of SLOs which require a significant investment of staff and faculty time to learn and implement.

2. When colleges are asked to add new faculty or staff as a result of new positions per *AB1725* or categorical positions the Chancellor's Office needs to allocate one-time and ongoing costs to support those positions (e.g., offices, equipment, travel and conference, maintaining buildings as well as impact on administrative services). Over a period of time it adds up to a lot of people for which the district has to absorb the cost to support beyond the funds allocated for salaries and benefits.

3. Dr. Friedlander indicated that other colleges are having a problem with slim pools to fill dean positions. As a result of the passage of *AB1725*, tenured faculty members have to give up their tenured status to take a dean position. He is developing a proposal that would strengthen the retreat rights for certificated and administrators to be transferred to a faculty position for which they receive tenure prior to becoming an administrator. Ignacio Alarcon commented that the way Cal State handles retreat rights is when a person comes for a dean position he or she interviews with members of the department where they would have retreat rights. Dr. Friedlander said he would amend his proposal to add this procedure.

Dr. Friedlander briefly went over the rubrics presented by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College for the characteristics of Institutional effectiveness: Program Review, Planning and Student Learning Outcomes. The Commission expects a level of proficiency in each of these areas or else it will get a warning at the time of their visit. He said that the college will be held accountable for statements that are in our college plan.

Because of the small number of members attending the Council meeting today, further discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

4.3 College Plan: 2008-2011: *John Romo and Jack Friedlander*

A. EC's draft of *College Plan: 2008-2011 Challenges and Priorities Developed by the Executive Committee*

John Romo said this is the year we that we need to complete the evaluation of our College Plan: 2005-08 and begin the development of the 2008-2011 college plan. EC has done an update on the plan through last year which will be brought to CPC and to the Board at a future date. He said that in the spring there will be a more comprehensive evaluation to close out the 2005-08 plan. The introductory section of the plan that includes the principles needs to be updated. We need to identify the major overarching challenges and priorities of the college for the three years of the plan. The traditional step in the development of a plan is to identify and address the District's major the challenges and opportunities. For each section we should state the major challenges and opportunities. The *SBCB College Plan 2008-2011 Challenges*

and Opportunities Developed by the Executive Committee was provided as a framework for CPC as well as the Board to begin the process for developing the new college plan. One important issue is whether these challenges and priorities link to the new accreditation standards.

B. Timeline for completing the College Plan

Jack Friedlander reviewed the timeline for completing the College Plan: 2008-09

4.4 Status of funding the resource requests that were ranked by CPC last year:
John Romo

Addressed by John Romo under item 4.1.

4.5 SBCC's Centennial Celebration: *John Romo*

This was discussed in item 4.1.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.