Special Meeting of Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara Community College District
November 30, 1971

INDEX TO ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - What Has Gone Before
A brief historical perspective of Facilities and Related Developments in the Santa Barbara Community College District.

Attachment 2 - Statistical Data
A series of tables presenting current enrollments, projected faculty, and space needs, analyses of census data, the 1970 and 1971 priority lists of major capital improvements, and the initial equipment list for the nursing education facility.

Attachment 3 - Reports of Interest
Four reports which are typical of the "imponderables" which confront facilities planners.

Attachment 4 - Background For Construction in Cooperation with the State
Four items which describe requirements, procedures, and trends related to construction of facilities with State funding.

Attachment 5 - 1970-71 Report of Academic Senate Planning Committee
A summary of the 1970-71 activities and lists of general and specific recommendations of the Academic Senate Planning Committee.
President Sidney R. Frank called the special meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Community College District to order at 4:02 p.m.

Mr. Frank expressed the Board's appreciation to the staff who prepared the materials for the meeting.

Mr. Frank, on behalf of the Board, and the Superintendent welcomed Dr. Joe W. Dobbs as the new member of the District's Board of Trustees, unofficially.

Dr. Dobbs will officially take the oath of office at the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees on December 9th.

**FACILITIES WORKSHOP**

**OPENING PRESENTATION AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Superintendent introduced the following persons to the Board of Trustees:

- Mr. William Tipton, the representative from DMJM and the project architect for the District;
- and Dr. Seefeld,______________

at UCSB and members of his class who wished to observe the workshop meeting.

The Superintendent, in starting off the "Facilities Workshop", expressed the hope that the information conveyed at the meeting would serve as a base to help the College and the Board decide where they wish to go in the area of facilities. The Superintendent indicated that the theme of the workshop was: "The problem has not gone away."

The Superintendent read an excerpt from a report written by __________ McClain __________ in March, 1950:

"There can be no real solution without plant and equipment . . .

the concept of satellites is 22 years old."
(Mr. Wells arrived at 4:10 p.m.)

FIRST SESSION

(1) Topic: "What has gone before?"

Presenter: Mr. M. L. Huglin, Administrative Dean, Instruction

Objectives: . . To provide a brief historical perspective of facilities development in the District.
. . To familiarize participants with policies and decisions which have shaped facilities development.

Mr. Huglin gave a brief historical perspective of facilities and related developments in the Santa Barbara Community College District from 1911, when the junior college was established, to the present.

I. History of the College (consideration of the land across the street)

II. History of Governance (election of first Board of Trustees in 1965)

III. History of Student Enrollment (College is in a growth situation)

IV. History of Staff (with the increase in enrollment, there has been an increase in the College staff)

V. History of Administrative Leadership (Dr. Josephy Cosand served as the first president in 1958)

VI. History of Planning (began with Dr. Cosand's presidency in 1962)

Development of the Mesa campus

November, 1966 - first bond election was defeated

1969 - the $5,502,000 successful bond election provided for the development of the Mesa campus to accommodate 5,000 FTE students.

The College's Ten-Year Plan was developed to insure an orderly planning process for the College under the provisions of S.B. 691.

The unsuccessful bond elections of 1966, 1967, and 1969, as well as the limitations posed by the 1969 successful bond election, brought about re-thinking of "how to meet the educational needs of 8,000 students by 1980 under existing financial circumstances".

Discussion of various alternatives available to meet the needs of the future -- the enrollment increase.

VII. History of Facility Funding (history of the bond elections)

The last three elections dropped considerations for site acquisition in Goleta and Adult Division building rehabilitation.

The complete thrust was toward the development of the Mesa Campus.

VIII. History of Pride and Perseverance (of the SBCC staff and faculty)

After giving a brief historical review of the college, the continued growth pattern, the financial picture, and facilities development of the district; Mr. Huglin explained where we are today and posed the question: "How can we meet the needs of 8,000 students by 1980?"
(2) Topic: "What are the projected needs?"

Presenter: Dr. Thomas F. MacMillan, Director of Research & Development

Objectives:
. . To describe projected enrollments.
. . To provide analysis of projected source of students.
. . To identify & describe enrollment trends by curricula.
. . To identify & describe developing trends in curriculum and support services.

Dr. MacMillan reviewed a series of prepared tables presenting current enrollments, projected faculty, and space needs, analyses of census data, the 1970 and 1971 priority lists of major capital improvements, and the initial equipment list for nursing education facility.

NEEDS AND TRENDS:

Table I  Day Credit Enrollment Projections 1968 - 1978 Annual Estimates (State Department of Finance BD 240)
(shows weekly student contact hours--by number--factor) as projected by the State (not based on needs)

Table II  Actual vs Projected Enrollments 1957-60 versus 1967-70

Table III  Distribution of WSCH (weekly student contact hours) and Faculty Needs Projection by Division 1970, 1975, 1980

Table IV  Comparison of Current vs Projected Space Type Needs 1970 Actual vs. 1980 Projected
(shows how we look in comparison with the other community colleges in the state)

Table V  Comparison of Assigned Spaces for Various Functions: Statewide vs SBCC, 1969, 1970 (in percentages)
Topic: "What are the Imponderables?"

Presenters:
Mr. William E. Miller, President, Academic Senate
Dr. Thomas F. MacMillan, Director of Research and Development
Dr. Donald K. Sorsabal, Administrative Dean, Business Services

Objectives: To identify pending and possible developments in curriculum, instructional methods, materials, and procedures, organizational pattern, instructional support services, college facilities design, and facilities development.

Reports of Interest - Four reports which are typical of the "imponderables" which confront facilities planners.

Mr. Miller - (as last year's A.S. Planning Committee Chairman)

"How should we do our planning of what facilities to build and how to plan them?" "We must follow the standards of the State."

Miller believes:
1. must keep two sets of books
   needs to be projected
   weekly student contact hours

2. how should we go about attempting to meet
   the needs of our students here and also
   balance out with (get) long range solutions
   handle more than 5,000 students

3. Adapting to learning and teaching possibilities
   (the ability to adjust)

4. "More right answers" -- the problem of how to
   adjust to do (with) little money -- no money:
   "do you build fewer buildings or cheaper buildings?"

5. Issue: how do you exchange ideas
   (plus Dr. MacMillan; needs interaction with architects;
   plus date of 10-year plan has been changed to November)

To a question by Mrs. Alexander, Miller stated that
a list of what is needed should be prepared and have
architect interaction at that stage -- need more of
a presentation of alternatives.

Dr. Dobbs asked the Planning Committee's recommenda-
tion to solve the problem of the need for another
campus. Miller: A site should be (would be)
purchased and temporary site placed where the
students are in the Goleta Valley.

The "satellite concept" bothered Miller because of:
   the traffic
   the lack of unity (being a part of the college program
Alexander
Dr. Seefeld - did not like the satellite concept
Elkins - Marine Tech (Montecito/Nopal Street) good example of satellite

5. continued
   . duplication of effort
   (subject area specialty is good)

Need for definition of terms - "satellites", core curriculum
The right term, configuration, and the right definition is needed.

Garvin: noted that the whole district is the college

Meigs: 150 acres in Goleta was once offered to the college.

(3) continued

II. Dr. MacMillan  ENROLLMENT IMPOUNDERABLES:

Table VI  District High School Students Attending SBCC
1969 vs 1971

shows the number of students at SBCC drawn from the H.S.'s

Table VII  A-Distribution of SBCC Students by Zip Code - Fall, 1971 (N=5434)
            (an "index of effort" for geographical regions served by
            the district)
            shows how the students distribute themselves in this district.

B-Age Distribution by Population Area (18-24 yr olds, 18-64 yr olds)

C-Numbers of students Enrolled by Geographic Region, Shown as a
   Proportion of the Number of Population by Age kind of

Table VII-C - Dr. MacMillan indicated that this/data can
be used to see who the District is serving -- it may be
taken as a kind of "index of effort" for the SBCCD.

Interpretation of chart: the number of students currently
enrolled at SBCC from the central S. B. area is 48.2% of
the number of 18-24 yr olds and 9.1% of the number of
18-64 yr olds in the same geographic region. For the
sake of interest, Dr. MacMillan noted some of the geographic
regions specifically.

What is going to happen in curriculum methodology?
Dr. MacMillan referred to a statement by A. Alan Post,
Legislative Analyst, State of California to the 6th
Annual Conference of the Society for College and Univ.
Planning, in San Francisco, on August 9, 1971:
"Unless the planners and policy makers within the academic community are willing to accept the idea that further program expansion in Higher Education will have to be offset by contractions in existing programs of determined lower priority, or unless they develop new instructional approaches, workload allocations or organization changes which effectively reduce the existing unit costs of instruction, the initiative on making reductions will remain in the Statehouse."

Dr. MacMillan also referred to another "Report of Professional Interest" - Research Memo No. 71-5, taken from a keynote address by Brian M. Fagan, D/Anthropology at UCSB, entitled: "Audiotutorial 1971: The Challenge of the 1970's: (he read the following excerpt)

"The focus of our time and attention should be the learners, not our own fiefdoms, machinery, or systems of learning. Let us beware of worshipping our Learning Centers, minicourses, A/T systems, our hard and software with the fervor of Aztec priests and remember that our concern is student learning. The student is the proper focus of our objectives, tapes and slide sequences; his ultimate success an evaluation. Nor should we think of A/T as his only learning tool--even a pogo stick can teach one something, if only how to fall."

The changing enrollments patterns and how these will affect our needs in the future.

Table VIII  Consequences of the Ten-Year Plan for Classroom and Lab Capacity

"Patterns of enrollment are changing" according to Dr. MacM.

Table IX  Percentages of Students in Declared Majors: Fall 1965, 1968, 1970 - Day and Concurrent Enrollments

BREAK at 5:35 p.m. - RESUMED SPECIAL MEETING at 5:48 p.m.
SECOND SESSION

(4) Topic: "What is the current status of the Ten-Yr Plan and specific projects?"

Presenters: Dr. Donald K. Sorsabal, Administrative Dean, Business Services
Dr. Thomas F. MacMillan, Director of Research & Development

Objectives: . To describe procedures followed in working with the State.
. To identify and describe status of facilities completed, pending, and projected.
. To describe current status of resources for facilities.
. To identify pending decisions.

Attachment 4 - BACKGROUND FOR CONSTRUCTION IN COOPERATION WITH THE STATE

Drs. Sorsabal and MacMillan reviewed items which describe requirements, procedures, and trends related to construction of facilities with State funding.

Dr. Sorsabal stated purpose was to review our relationship with the State and to include the imponderables.

IMPOUNDERABLES - Financial ones (the State is going out of the business of financing construction)

"How do we finance our construction if the State does not come up with the money?"

The next imponderable: "what do we do?" -- bond sale, tax override

The State is withdrawing support -- they are giving us interest subsidy grants.

State Standards - 54% of State support, utilization factors
Imponderable: Is it going to be inforced, and if so what do we do to finance our program?

The JCCA of September 1

Project submittal date
the funding procedure, the construction, or working drawings
Total funds available now: $3,891,000
It is difficult to know what the State will support.