

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**October 4, 2005
3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Sullivan, P. Bishop, A. Serban, K. McLellan, T. Garey,
K. Molloy, B. Lindemann, K. Molloy, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, M. Guillen

ABSENT: S. Ehrlich, P. Haslund, E. Frankel

GUEST: P. Naylor, J. Shultz (for E. Frankel)

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

Keith McLellan announced to the Council that Jack Friedlander has received the honor of being selected the Administrator of the Year by the California Association for Post-Secondary Education and Disability (CAPED). Dr. Friedlander was nominated by the DSPS faculty and staff for his exemplary leadership to the college, especially DSPS, and his outstanding leadership for the highly successful merger of classroom instruction and student support services. The Council applauded Dr. Friedlander for this well-deserved award. The award will be presented at CAPED's annual conference on October 12th.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Enrollment update: *Serban*

Andreea Serban said she will have enrollment updates for fall when they are finalized. Dr. Friedlander said if the goal is to continue to achieve our funded enrollment cap and non-state funded enrollment objectives, then we need to address the classroom, facilities and parking issues which impact students who come to the physical campus. Dr. Serban said that from fall 2000 to spring 2005 there has been a 60% increase in the number of students taking classes off campus or online.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Major facilities maintenance and 5-year construction plan

Jack Friedlander started the discussion by informing the Council that he doubts that there would be money remaining in Prop 55 that would pay for the actual construction of the SoMA building. He said when the Legislature reconvenes in January it will consider putting on the fall 2006 ballot a K-14 education facilities bond measure. The Legislature and the Governor need to approve placing this bond measure on the November 2006 ballot and the voters would need to support funding this bond. Dr. Friedlander said that If the bond measure is on the fall ballot and is passed it will allow us to start the SoMA construction in summer 2007. If it doesn't pass, he said the construction of SoMA would be delayed possibly until we could pass our own local bond measure.

Joe Sullivan went over the list of facility improvement projects, which was distributed at the last meeting. He indicated that each project proposal must include a description of the scope of the request, a sound rationale justifying its need and its strategic importance to the college, and an estimate of the costs for it to be completed. CPC will be asked to rank the projects and to send its recommendations to John Romo for his review and approval by the Board. This plan would then be submitted to the state. He said that from this plan we would create an advertising brochure to promote the needs and requirements of the college and lay the groundwork for a possible bond measure in 2008. Vice President Sullivan reminded that Council that there is a description of each of the projects listed in the binder that was provided to the members at the last meeting. He said John Romo has asked that we go back and refine the scope and provide the argument on why it is strategic that we remodel or build a building as we go forward.

Joe Sullivan also put together a comprehensive long- range development plan calendar that contains all of the projects that are on our 5-year construction plan and capital outlay plan going into the future. It identifies the chronology for each of the projects based on their present prioritization.

In regard to the PS building safety remodel, Mr. Sullivan said the working drawings are being prepared which need to go to DSA for review. We have to refit the life fitness buildings and remodel ECC 4-15 to accommodate the classes presently in the PS Building. At present the earliest we could start construction is January 2007. This would give us plenty of time to complete the remodels of the temporary facilities. In the pursuing discussion, a point was made about the timing of the start of the remodel which does not take into account the possibility that the spring 2007 semester may begin a week earlier than in the past to accommodate having two summer sessions in summer 2007. Jan Shultz stressed that adequate time be allowed to move the labs. Dr. Friedlander appreciated the input from the Council on this time line and will take the concerns expressed into account in the planning process.

Jack Friedlander said that the goal now is to have the drafts of what are the facilities needs that are program driven to EC prior to the winter break. He said when we meet as a body in late January or February we will rank and get closure on our facilities needs. This will go to the president and the Board for approval. That will drive our decision about whether to consider a bond measure or not. He said that construction costs are going up 30% so we have to make sure we build these costs into the estimates for each of these projects.

Joe Sullivan distributed the major maintenance projects planning construction calendar which lists all of the major projects that are either 50% funded by the state or 100% funded by the District which we are going to attempt to start or complete over the next 12 months.

Keith McLellan commented that it is his understanding that the source of funds for District projects is from end-of-year balances. He questioned: (1) the role of CPC in determining the priorities for the District projects; and (2) who makes the decision on how end-of-year balances are spent. He said as he understands it, EC designated how last year's end-of-year balances were going to be spent and also determined which of the major maintenance projects were going to be funded. Dean McLellan asked what role, if any, does CPC have in that particular process. Joe Sullivan responded that on a going-forward basis, there is a whole list of unfunded projects that we have. He said last spring CPC prioritized each of these proposed facilities projects as priority 1, 2, or 3. In response, Council members indicated they did *not* have a recollection of CPC prioritizing these projects. Dr. Friedlander said that he will check the minutes. He went on to state that while these projects were discussed at several Deans Council meetings, he did not recall CPC being asked to rank the projects.

Keith McLellan asked that if CPC did not prioritize the items that they come back to CPC now for ranking and that we discuss the role of CPC in this process. He said the funding and ranking of facilities projects and the allocation of ending balances are the only ones that are left at the sole discretion of EC and the college president. All other planning and budgeting proposals go through a review, consultation and decision-making process. The District's facilities and construction projects need to be considered along with other resource requests.
|

Joe Sullivan reported how the ending balance funds were designated. He said that the amounts allocated were \$2.7 million to fund the completion of the SCT/Banner implementation; \$2 million to the parking structure fund; \$365k to the District major maintenance projects; and the estimated balance to meet the Board policy of maintaining a 5% reserve fund. With respect to the decision to allocate the \$2m towards the parking structure, Jack Friedlander said that we finally have a hearing date to meet with the Coastal Commission and demonstrate our intention to mitigate the demand for campus parking. In order to build the SoMA building, we are going to need more parking. We are asking the Coastal Commission to not require us to build more parking at this time since this

building will be used to relocate existing educational programs and offices from existing campus facilities that were not designed to accommodate these high-tech programs. Moreover, we do not have adequate funding to build a new parking structure at this time. Joe Sullivan said we do know that the Coastal Commission is requiring that we build a parking structure at some point in time. By depositing the \$2m towards the parking structure, it is reinforcing our commitment to build parking at some point in the future.

Jack Friedlander said we had anticipated new faculty offices being in place next to the Humanities Building by the end of October this year. Joe Sullivan just informed him that we are not even close to meeting this time line. Due to a number of factors, the two modular buildings will not be ready for faculty and staff to move into until late February or early in March. The International Students and Study Abroad programs will move into one of the modules and the other would be used for faculty/staff offices. The areas in the IE building being vacated will be converted into faculty and staff offices. This conversion will not take place until after the Spring 206 Semester.

At the next meeting Joe Sullivan will bring back the major maintenance timeline and the planning and construction calendar.

4.2 CPP: Suggested changes to the draft of the CPP identified by EC

- A. Tier 1 recommendations that are being implemented
- B. Process for analyzing Tier 2 recommendations

This item was not discussed.

4.3 College Plan 2005-08

- A. Review of new state accountability measures for community colleges and its relationship to the College Plan
- B. Incorporation into the College Plan of goals and objectives to develop the institution's human resources, facilities, technology and finance plans
- C. Proposed timeline for completion of the Plan

Andreea Serban said we need to reach agreement on the wording of the goals and objectives to be included in the College Plan. Our goal should be to have a clean draft produced by the next meeting. We will take it to the Board study session on November 2nd and then to the December meeting of the Board for approval. Kathy Molloy commented that in the discussion of the College Plan that took place at a Deans Council meeting the recommendation was made to remove many of the specific goals and objectives that were in the draft of this document and to include only those that articulated a major strategic direction for the institution. Tactical plans would be developed for achieving each of the goals and objectives that need to be accomplished in order to achieve the strategic

directions articulated in the College Plan. Jack Friedlander said that the current and proposed College Plans include a mixture of “strategic” and “tactical” planning and they should be kept separate. Paul Bishop defined “strategic” as goals that are fairly global in terms of where the institution is headed. “Tactical” would be on an annualized basis to define how we are going to achieve those goals. He said ultimately “tactical” is always tied to budget. Dr. Friedlander indicated that he has attached to the agenda the State accountability measures on which we are judged against. He said we have our own internal measures but the outcome measures defined by the state and by our accrediting association are the ones that will be used to assess the college’s effectiveness. Kathy Molloy said to get faculty buy-in on the Plan we need to take a look at some things that might not be included in the state accountability measures that faculty agree are good goals for us to achieve. Jan Shultz reminded that Council that John Romo had asked the Council to have the Plan be more of a vision instead of a list of detailed tasks. She said the Plan started out that way but now the vision is not as clear.

Kathy Molloy said that at the outset of the planning for the College Plan it was to set forth the goals with the objectives with statistics being presented in a follow-up document. She felt the detail level should be separate. Jack Friedlander said that we are not ready for the “tactical” aspect of the College Plan. Jack Friedlander asked that in discussions on the student learning outcomes how do you take that language of what it is we want to accomplish with these outcomes and put this language in the strategic and even tactical language that people can grasp and be excited about achieving. Andreea Serban said the Council would be provided an updated College Plan at the next meeting.

5.0 Adjournment

Upon motion [Garey/McLellan] the meeting was adjourned.