

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**April 5, 2005
3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, B. Hamre, A. Serban, K. McLellan, E. Frankel, T. Garey, K. Molloy, J. Schultz, L. Auchincloss, B. Rice

ABSENT: J. Sullivan, J. Jackson

GUEST: P. Naylor, S. Coffield, J. Hendricks

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.2 Approval of the minutes of the February 8th and February 15th CPC meetings.

M/S/C [Auchincloss/Hamre] unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 8th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [McLellan/Ehrlich] unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 15th CPC meeting.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that there are two more faculty positions for which we have interviews scheduled, Philosophy and English. He is very pleased that we continue to get our first choices and is extremely excited about the talent we are bringing into the college.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on SIS selection process

Jack Friedlander informed the Council that Datatel and SunGuard/SCT gave their presentations of their SIS products to the college. The next step in the process is to invite each of those two vendors to submit their bids for pricing. The bids will be due early-May and to have President Romo submit to the Board at its June meeting his recommendation on the vendor to be selected. Our goal is by July to begin the process of preparing to implement the new SIS. If all goes well, the new SIS would be in place by the start of the Spring 2007 Semester. Dr. Friedlander said there will be a

two-hour meeting next week to go over all the evaluations we received from the attendees of the demonstrations for each of the vendors.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Potential for bond campaign

Jack Friedlander indicated that the Board's May 21 study session (Saturday morning) will be devoted to evaluating whether or not to go to the next step of *considering* going forth with the bond campaign. The next step would be to hire a consultant to do an analysis of: (1) community support we could anticipate for the bond measure; (2) the amount of money requested; (3) the amount of property tax increase they are willing to approve; (4) the degree of support they have for each of the proposed projects; and (5) reasons why they would support or oppose a bond measure. Dr. Friedlander said before the Board makes the decision to hire a consultant, they also want a sense of what support there is from the college community. If the Board says it is comfortable with the next step of hiring a consultant, part of the process would be to determine a reasonable amount of dollars to ask in the bond measure, i.e., the comfort level of the community. We would then prioritize our potential projects within that amount once we determine what the actual cost for each of these projects. The dates that are under consideration for the bond measure are June or November 2006.

Julie Hendricks, Assistant Facilities Director, joined the meeting to discuss a draft of a list of potential projects that have been identified to be included in the proposed bond measure. She provided brief descriptions of each of the following projects that are on the preliminary list of items to include in the bond measure: (1) School of Media Arts; (2) Global Studies/School of Modern Languages Building to replace the International Education building; (3) West campus multi-disciplinary classroom and office building; (4) Wake Center – renovation and expansion; (5) Schott Center – renovation and expansion; (6) classroom renovation—secondary effects of moving programs to one of the new or remodeled buildings; (7) La Playa Stadium improvements; (8) parking structure; (9) funds for technology, energy efficiency & utility improvements; and (10) Kinko's Early Learning Center – renovation and expansion. Some of these are projects that have been submitted yearly to the state for funding. Ms. Hendricks added that because of the increase in the cost of construction, some districts are using bond measures to supplement the district's contribution to these state-funded projects.

Jack Friedlander cautioned that in speaking about this bond campaign, if we choose to do it, the message has to be that our focus is on enhancing the facilities we provide to strengthen the programs and services the college offers its students and not to build more structures to serve more students. He added that the school district is downsizing because of a decline in enrollments and as such, the argument could be made that the college would not need new buildings. The message should be that we are providing the quality of education that students need and updating and modernizing buildings rather than to accommodate growth. Peter Haslund stressed the importance of crafting a statement that will address this issue and answer the question of why Santa Barbara should support the students who are going to be coming into this area from other parts of California or other parts of the world. Lynda Fairly

commented that we do have a lot of people in our area who are going to need to be re-educated and retrained. Peter Naylor added that if we put together a package that is driven by serving the community then the public relations problem becomes a great deal easier. Liz Auchincloss said she always felt that the community college is a good place to rescue students from high school who don't graduate and asked whether we have a count on the number of students whose lives have been turned around because of their participation in programs at SBCC. Sue Ehrlich added that we now promote the college through advertisements [for Financial Aid] that sound as though we have money to throw away. We need to promote the college in a way that supports our efforts to gain community support for the important contributions the college makes to the community. She suggested using testimonials from people who have found that the college has helped them address various issues, which are part of our ongoing recruitment effort. This will lay the groundwork well in advance of saying "bond campaign". It will assist us in laying the foundation for community support for the bond campaign. Peter Naylor said our marketing should be more long-range and programmatic so the public knows what we do, e.g., essential skills, EOPS, etc. Bill Hamre added that internal support is going to be dependent on the awareness that the Governor and Legislature has made it clear that they don't seem to want to fund construction projects by issuing more state-supported bonds, especially after seeing the number of communities that have approved to pay for capital improvement projects by agreeing to raise their local property taxes. In the past most of our construction has been paid from state bond issues. Dr. Friedlander concurred that this is the mindset of the state. He said we would be asking the departments and divisions as well as the consultation groups to have discussion on the items and support for a bond measure and to send their feedback to CPC.

4.2 Revised timeline for development of College Plan 2005-2008

The timeline for the consultative planning process and the development of the 2005-08 College Plan was distributed to the Council. Andreea Serban suggested that it would be advantageous to schedule three 2-hour sessions to work exclusively on the Plan. Andreea Serban suggested that the College Plan be used as a communication tool in our process to promote the college in support of the bond measure. Peter Naylor said he feels the most effective approach for developing the College Plan is going to be based on what we believe the college going to look like in eight years and how will all the pieces fit together in the integrated plan of what the college looks like in terms of the programs we have, how they operate, what our enrollment will be, and how these programs serve the community. Also, the College Plan should be used as a tool for selling the bond measure. Jack Friedlander said that the work completed on this plan during the summer would be presented to the college community in the fall. Input has already initially been solicited from the campus community through the College Planning Process (CPP). Bill Hamre asked whether we have a clear picture on what the College Plan should be. He felt that reviewing all the department initiatives would not necessarily give us the college plan structure that we need. He said that based on the evaluation of the first two years of the existing plan, we have far too many objectives to accurately measure and assess. Dr. Friedlander reminded the Council that when John Romo attended the last meeting, he indicated that the Plan should be more streamlined than the existing one we developed several years ago. Sue Ehrlich

said the point of the plan is maximum communication and to capture the essence and to articulately and effectively convey to someone what we are about. Keith McLellan said we should also focus on economic development, which goes beyond just course in business but enriching our citizenship and community. He said most of our plans have been inward focused. However, at this particular time, it may be appropriate to have a fourth component that is more explicit about what we are doing for to contribute to the community. Andreea Serban said it is also important that this plan be aligned with the accreditation standards because we will be evaluated on student learning outcomes. Dr. Friedlander said we should not think of the bond measure apart from the planning process; it should be one in the same. It would actually result in better planning and it would be easier for the college's internal and external constituencies to understand. This document would be very useful in the college's marketing campaign to gain support for the proposed bond measure. The College Plan, CPP and bond measure should be interrelated since they comprise the institution's short-term and long-term planning strategies.

4.3 Assigning priorities to recommendations identified in CPP report

Andreea Serban distributed the summary of the Combined CPP Summaries and Tiers, Instructional and Non-Instructional Expense Reductions and Revenue Generation document. The summary reflects the Executive Committees (EC) initial rankings to which of three tiers these items should assigned. John Romo is asking the Council to: (1) identify what the Council's recommendations are with respect to assigning items to be ranked as "tier 1" items and which of those items should be immediately implemented; (2) which items should be ranked as "tier 2; and (3) identify the process to conduct the evaluation of the tier 2 items starting this summer and/or in the fall semester. A discussion began on identifying the tier 1 and tier 2 items assigned to Continuing Education and IRD. The discussion will continue at the next meeting for other departments/divisions of the college.

5.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.