

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
September 20, 2005
3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Sullivan, S. Ehrlich, P. Bishop, A. Serban, K. Molloy, T. Garey,
E. Frankel, J. Schultz, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, M. Guillen

ABSENT: L. Fairly, B. Lindemann, P. Haslund

GUEST: P. Naylor, J. Hock, J. Hendricks, A. Pittman

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.2 **M/S/C [Naylor/Frankel] unanimously to approve the minutes of the September 6th CPC meeting with minor corrections.**

2.0 Announcements

There were no announcements.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Enrollment update: *Serban*

Andreea Serban gave the enrollment update and distributed the latest headcount census figures as of this date. Jack Friedlander stated that what is not reflected in the census data is the significant growth projected to take place this fall in Dual Enrollment and Professional Development Center (PDC) enrollments. In addition, we need to take into account the growth in FTES we had this past summer in our enrollment projections for the academic year. Dr. Serban was asked how much of our growth since 2000 has taken place in strictly off-campus enrollments, i.e., dual enrollment, PDC, and online classes. She responded in the last four years for fall the percentage increase in that category has been 60%, a phenomenal number that allows us to accommodate this growth without an impact on the main campus. Dr. Friedlander noted that the number of off-campus enrollments that Andreea reported does not include students that enrolled in both on-campus and online classes.

3.2 Draft of College Plan: 2005-2008

Andreea Serban indicated that the College Plan was e-mailed to the Council and asked the members to review it and be prepared to discuss it at the October 4th meeting. She said we need all consultation on the Plan completed so that it can be submitted to the Board for approval on December 15th.

3.3 Educational Programs: Reorganization of Professional Development Center

Jack Friedlander said that the Professional Development Center (PDC) has been asked to take on some new responsibilities. The major change in scope is that the PDC will be responsible for developing personal development programs for the college's management and classified staff in consultation with those groups. Attachment 2 to this agenda outlines this change as well as the rationale for the change in status of Diane Hollems from an associate dean to a Dean of Educational Programs to oversee this area. Dr. Friedlander said this is presented as an information item to the Council because there are no additional funds required to fund the Dean of Educational Programs position and it will in fact save the district approximately \$4,000. Dr. Hollems will report to Jack Friedlander instead of Pablo Buckelew. Kathy Molloy questioned how the change in assignment/position gets made without taking the process through the Academic Senate. Dr. Friedlander responded that this is not a change that requires consultation. The President and EC has agreed to it and since there is no cost to the District it comes to CPC as an information item. When there are cost implications it would then come for approval to CPC.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 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 will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.2 Major facilities maintenance and 5-year construction plan

Joe Sullivan distributed an outline and a notebook to the Council that outlines SBCC's long range development projects which include the remodel of the Sports Pavilion, the new SoMA building, the Physical Sciences building remodel project, replacement of the International Education building, the remodel of the Drama-Music building, the construction of a new Multi-disciplinary classroom on the West Campus, and remodels of the Schott and Wake Centers, La Playa Stadium, the Children's Center, as well as access, parking and traffic mitigation. The handout summarized the estimated projected costs, the state's and district's contributions for these projects and the projected start and end dates in the college's 5-year construction plan. The notebook encompasses the working

budgets and layouts for the anticipated projects. Mr. Sullivan said there is a question of whether we would be able to build the SoMA building prior to building a parking structure. The parking garage would have to be built entirely with District funds. He said we will have to build the parking structure but it is a matter of when as well as where and what size. Jack Friedlander said it would take until December, working with the architects, to get our best estimate of the cost of each of the alternatives under consideration for the location and size of the parking structure. It is John Romo's intent to take the proposal for the SoMA building to the Foundation Board at its next meeting to discuss the feasibility of a capital campaign to raise money needed to augment the amount of money allocated from the state to construct this building.

Vice President Sullivan presented a virtual tour of the SoMA building and described its facilities which will include classrooms, specialized media and computer labs, faculty offices, a small film theatre and a snack bar. He also provided a color map of the East Campus which shows which buildings (ECOC 1 & 2, Security, FRC and IE/ESL) will need to be moved to allow for a staging area for the building process.

Dr. Friedlander said that this 5-year plan will come back before CPC in December. The Board will look at it in study session in January or February and then consider approving it at its March meeting. Joe said the goal is to present a 5-year plan to the State on June 1st that accurately reflects the college's facilities needs. This plan will incorporate the college's vision for the future. We will have the opportunity in subsequent years to update and revise this plan if there are sound reasons to do so. The plan is that by spring we can develop a brochure to kick off a capital campaign for SoMA and to start building support for a potential bond measure that would be targeted for fall 2008.

Dr. Friedlander mentioned that as a result of the 16-week calendar, block scheduling, and offering a full compliment of classes on Friday, there will be a substantial increase in the college's classroom utilization rate. This rate is used by the System Office in prioritizing the facilities projects to be funded.

Peter Naylor said the presentation reminds us of what planning is all about. He said as we talk about the College Plan it is not yet a plan but a statement of goals we are refining. A College Plan would look at where are we going which in turn would determine what facilities and human resources are required to support the attainment of the goals and objectives in the College Plan. He said all we are doing at this stage is setting goals.

Jack Friedlander responded that this is in essence what we are doing. The projects to be included in the proposed bond measure are to be based on the existing and projected program needs of the college. He said the Board has stressed that we need to spend more time on the justification and rationale for each project to be included in a bond measure and the process for doing so

should be tied into our planning processes. Dr. Friedlander said that is why we are engaging in this process so that when we do go out for a bond measure we can do just that. He said at the same time we want to finalize our College Plan for 2005-08. President Romo has indicated that the goal is to finish the College Plan before the end of the year. Dr. Friedlander acknowledged Mr. Naylor's point that the two processes need to be synchronized and to reflect that in the College Plan as well as the equivalent human resources aspect. As we plan for the SCT/Banner implementation we need to take into account both the existing and projected human resource needs needed to support the new systems.

4.3 Demo of Campus Bulletin Board and its proposed use in facilitating intracampus communication: *Serban (addressed first on agenda)*

Jack Friedlander announced that a demonstration of the colleges Campus Message Board on our SBCC website (<http://sbcc.edu/messageboard/>) will be presented to the Council with the objective to have more information posted on the message board as well as a wider recognition by the campus community to avail itself to it on a more frequent basis. The Campus Message Board has been in place and it is the hope that we would be able to use this avenue to have a dialogue/blog in our process of developing the College Plan 2005-08. Jennifer Hock walked the Council through the site of the Campus Message Board with a live website presentation. The Council offered recommendations to make the site more accessible and user friendly. A number of the Council members questioned whether the proposed message board is the most effective way to achieve the objectives for using this method of communication. It was agreed that an alternative method than what was being proposed is needed to effectively communicate intra-campus information and to promote greater opportunities for members of the college community to participate in the development of policies, procedures and planning documents

5.0 Action Item

5.1 Mid-term Accreditation Report: Serban

M/S/ [Ehrlich/Sullivan] to approve the Mid-term Accreditation Report for submission to the Board of Trustees at its September 22nd meeting

Discussion:

Jack Friedlander said the accreditation commissions (the one responsible for our region of the country as well as the accreditation agencies for colleges and universities in other parts of the nation) are becoming more aggressive in overseeing the extent to which colleges meets their standards. For the first time they are turning down quite a few college mid-term reports because of some abuses in the proprietary sector. Since the commissions can't discriminate against proprietary schools, they are now enforcing the requirement that colleges submit major program modification and proposals for new programs to the

agency for approval. Both the System Office and the accreditation commission must now approve requests for major program modifications as well as proposals to implement new programs.

Kathy Molly expressed concern about the process the Board of Trustees uses to evaluate its effectiveness. Dr. Friedlander said that the Board came up with a mechanism for evaluating itself. He said this question has been asked a few months ago about the value of an evaluation that is based entirely on the Board's self-evaluation of itself but not on feedback from the members of the college community and the constituencies it serves. Sue Ehrlich said there is a huge range of formal and informal processes for Board and Superintendent evaluations. She went on to say that she thought formal input is important, however one should not assume that the Board does not get input from a lot of people. Jack Friedlander said the community evaluates the members of the Board at the time that they run for re-election. He said that he would communicate these concerns again to President Romo.

Liz Auchincloss said we should be aware, although we have made some progress, that if you compare the support the college gives for faculty governance and staff governance, there is a gap. She hopes that more progress would be made on this in the next three years if we want to pass this standard.

The motion was carried unanimously.

6.0 Adjournment

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