

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
February 5, 2002
3:00 – 4:30 PM
Room A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, B. Fahnestock, S. Ehrlich, K. McLellan,
L. Rose, K. Hanna, T. Garey, R. Launier and J. Chase

EXCUSED: L. Fairly, A. Serban

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the February 5, 2002 CPC meeting.

M/S/C/ [Rose/Hanna] to approve the minutes of the February 5th CPC meeting with one abstention [Hamre].

1.2 Announcements

Betty Banville has announced her retirement effective March 1, 2002. Brian Fahnestock intends to find a replacement for her position as soon as possible.

2.0 Information Items

2.1 ACCJC accreditation visit to the college is scheduled for October 1-3.

2.2 The College Plan 2002-2005 was approved by the Board of Trustees at their January 2002 meeting. The final document will be distributed by the end of February.

2.3 This past weekend was community colleges lobbied in Sacramento for funds in the state budget. Dr. Friedlander reported that Dr. MacDougall was discouraged that the budget analyst who gave a presentation does not really comprehend community college budgets. From the analyst's perspective, the colleges are getting a 1.7% increase, not a decrease. He doesn't understand the implications of not having COLA, PFE and the adjunct dollars. Dr. MacDougall related that they met after the presentation for him to explain that the real measure in dollars is FTES reimbursement. The governor's budget represents a deduction of \$77 per FTES or a 1.5% decrease. Dr. MacDougall further felt that the Department of Finance does not have a good understanding of the community college budget.

Jack O'Connell was told by a member of the Department of Finance that the state deficit is now over \$13B as opposed to \$12.5B. Dr. MacDougall's projection is because it is an election year serious cuts will not be made in the programs. The budget will be passed that is inflated in terms of cost expectations and, after the election, cuts will be made in the budget.

Bill Hamre added that he had received clarification today from the Chancellor's Office about the t-tip [?] funding reductions. The governor's budget message wipes out the faculty and staff development funding which is approximately \$90k a year; \$60k for faculty development for online class stipends and training in the Faculty Resource Center and \$30k for the Staff Resource Center technology training area. They are also cutting the total cost of ownership allocation which is \$120k that we have been using to fund the Campus Pipeline, WebCT hosting by Sprint and \$30k to fund our additional internet capacity through Sprint and the 4CNet connection. Dr. MacDougall's response, not knowing the budget provisions, is that to support these areas funding will have to come out of reserves to continue those resources. We can not stop training faculty and staff nor can we not host Campus Pipeline.

- 2.4 Vice President of Human Resources/Legal Affairs Sue Ehrlich reminded the council that she had brought to CPC some months ago a proposal for the reorganization of Human Resources. At that juncture, a position of Human Resources Manager was created in the department and no other staffing requests were brought forth. The reason was that we were at the beginning of the implementation of the Oracle process. Sue said it is apparent now that there is a critical need in HR/LA for an additional lower level staff position to assist in the implementing, managing and maintaining the database system, to assist in maintaining the ability to produce reports and maintain data management and to be available as the system is implemented in other areas of the campus. The cabinet has given the authority to use growth money to create a human resources technician position. The department is also looking to use the technology to streamline the process of hiring adjunct faculty.

Lane Rose expressed her concern for the use of growth funds because we are not being funded for growth the way we should be and we should not have to hire new faculty out of the growth money. Dr. Friedlander responded that Dr. MacDougall brought the point to the Chancellor's Office that since we are being given less funds to operate, we should not be obligated to spend the entire growth dollars on hiring more full-time faculty members. We need this money to make up for the shortfall we have and use it to help serve more students. The Chancellor indicated that growth dollars are to be used to hire full-time faculty going forward into 2002-2003.

- 2.5 Presidential search – Sue Ehrlich announced that to date 21 applicants have applied for the position. She indicated that applications are coming from all over the country and she anticipates more applications being submitted prior to the

Feb. 7th closing date. There are also good pools for the faculty positions with the exception of nursing, radiography and cosmetology. Sue announced that approximately 25 applicants came from our participation at the Job Faire in Los Angeles.

3.0 Discussion Items

3.1 The final draft of Section V. SBCC's Approach to Defining and Achieving a Model Community College was distributed to the council prior to the meeting.

Dr. Friedlander reported that over the Christmas break, he, Dr. MacDougall and Andreea Serban met to settle on an approach and to writing the final draft of Section V. The model community college framework provides for an on-going review of the interplay between the evolution of the nine forces for change and their utilization/impact on the progress towards the college plan goals and objectives. We have provided for identifying possible other significant forces for change in the next year and to monitor the alignment between the forces of change, the vision statement and the college business processes and operations. Year one planning will be done this year. During the next three years, we will have an ongoing review of the progress made towards the goals and objectives of the plan through ongoing assessment issues affecting the program reviews and accreditations.

Dr. Friedlander commented that the short vision statement is missing from the document under "Vision Statement for a Model Community College". Sue Ehrlich offered the suggestion that the vision statement be disseminated to the campus community.

Lana Rose expressed her concern regarding the minimal usage of the nine forces of change in the integration of the college plan. She elaborated that if the forces of change are important enough, they should be adequately discussed in each of the areas. A discussion ensued on possible language changes to the draft that would better articulate the intent of the forces for change. Dr. Friedlander responded that the approach he, Dr. MacDougall and Andreea Serban took when writing the section was to address what support system[s] we need to achieve the goals and objectives of each section. Examples of the forces for change can be used to influence the obtainment of those objectives. Tom Garey commented that in our descriptions of the nine forces for change, where possible, make a linkage to student outcomes and/or behavior.

Lana further added that a mention of the forces for change in the technology narrative reinforces what we consider to be our forces of change. Dr. Friedlander summarized by adding this process is illustrative of how these forces of change interplay with our college plan in the way that the college does business.

The forces were change were prioritized as follows:

1. Learner Needs/Expectations
2. Societal/Community Changes
3. Collaboration
4. Regionalization/Globalization
5. Flexibility/Adaptability to Change
6. Knowledge Management
7. Technology
8. Employee Motivation and Development
9. Accountability/Regulations

Lana suggested that a sentence be added, because of the brevity of the section, that it is important to note that not every force for change is discussed in every section. There were numerous suggestions to language that were noted by Dr. Friedlander and will be incorporated by Andreea Serban. Sue Ehrlich noted the importance of incorporating into the document the words that define “action” and “energy” that reflect the commitment of the college to its goals and objectives. Lana Rose will submit the corrected version to the Senate for its approval at the March 20th meeting.

3.2 CPC Feedback on CPC on the verification section of the institutional self-study report.

Andreea Serban is working on this document. If you have any feedback, please provide it to her as soon as possible.

3.3 Allocation of funding to equip the new computer lab in the remodeled Life Science Geology (LSG) building

Dr. Friedlander commented that the remodel of the LSG building will be, for all intents and purposes, a new building. Funding for the new computer lab is a major concern. Bill Hamre reported that at the end of last year, the college was confronted with a set of decisions to be made for the LSG building in regard to structure and support for the technology within that building. He distributed a model outlining the requirements for the building which total over \$250k of which we have \$30k specified for this project. The issue is if this is what the program needs in terms of technology support for their new way of delivering instruction, how do we fund that set of initiatives and more importantly, how do we renew and refresh that technology over time. There is the need to fund new technology initiatives. It's been a constant struggle to find not only the one-time funds to support technology, which has been relatively easy, but, the funding for ongoing renewal has been more difficult. In the PFE discussions, we allocated \$50k last year to fund the replacement side of \$200,000 for the new initiatives. To replace this \$200k, we would need \$50k a year for new replacement funding to put aside to renew over a 4-year replacement cycle.

The amount of funding needed to replace all of the technology equipment in the LSG would totally deplete the \$50k a year or leaving \$5k so we could basically fund \$20k of new technology. This does not seem reasonable or fair in terms of the scope of technology demands. The proposal was made and discussed in cabinet to phase in the replacement cycle for the LSG renewal to lessen the impact on other new technology initiatives. What we have done is take that \$50k a year and instead of taking \$45k out the first year and every subsequent year, we have taken \$15k out the first year. Another \$15k out of a new \$50k the 2nd year and another \$15k out of the third year until we get to the \$45k level we need to support the LSG departments. The impact of that is for new technology initiatives for the next four years, we can fund \$140k of new technology initiatives, assuming we can find the one-time funding to support that set of new initiatives. Dr. Friedlander has committed to find funding for all of the video presentations and lab classrooms and to fund their replacement out of the existing equipment replacement initiatives. With this proposal [outlined on model] we are going to be able to fund more than \$500k for new technology over the next four-year period and be able to replace that technology. We are taking roughly \$162k one-time use from the technology equipment reserve to fund the LSG equipment in addition to the \$30k we had set aside plus the \$90k that has been identified within educational programs to fund that \$292k.

Dr. Friedlander added that the impact is rather than purchasing for the next four years \$200k... ..our cap is \$140k, so it is \$60k less per year over four years of new technology we can purchase. [***this is all I could make out from the tape so maybe you can reconstruct your thinking here***]

Karolyn Hanna asked whether there are other sources of monies that could be tapped such as gifts or grants. Dr. Friedlander responded that the big problem is not one-time funding but the ongoing replacement funds. We have tried to do fund-raising and have not been successful. Bill Hamre added that if we are successful with any donations or grants, that could reduce the \$160k one-time draw from the reserve account.

Brian Fahnestock interjected that he is hopeful that we might be able to tap the bookstore for some ongoing funds with the possibility of one-time funds for the LSG building. It has been the intention that when the loan is paid off for the construction of the bookstore, there would then be money to give back to the college. He estimates a contribution from the bookstore fund at \$15k.

3.4 Allocation of funds to purchase new technology.

Dr. Friedlander asked the question of where are the dollars coming from each year to pay for technology. One suggestion would be to allocate \$50k from growth funds each year.

3.5 Effects of governor's proposed state budget on SBCC.

A. Technology - *Discussed in 3.3*

Loss of funding of \$90k for Campus Pipeline and WebCT hosting and \$30k for added Internet connectivity.

B. Staff development – *Discussed in 3.3*

The allocation to the college will be reduced by \$90k.

C. Matriculation and CalWORKS

Dr. Friedlander reported that to his knowledge there has been no clarification or specificity as to where the matriculation budget will be cut, credit or noncredit or generally. Unfortunately for SBCC, a significant amount of our whole structure is built based on the staffing or processes of how we do business. There are few discretionary funds making it difficult to plan. In regard to CalWORKS, the governor is indicating that, with the exception of childcare, there will be no more CalWORKS funds going to community college. This has a significant implication for continuing education, especially in terms of staff. There is a question as to whether the governor even has the authority to make such a cut to a Federal program.

4.0 Action Items

There were no action items.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.