

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**July 17, 2001  
1:00 to 4:00 PM  
A218C**

<b>MINUTES</b>
----------------

**PRESENT:** J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, A. Serban, K. L. Rose, K. O'Connor, K. Hanna, J. Chase.

**ABSENT:** B. Fahnstock, B. Hamre, T. Garey

**1.0 Call to Order**

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

**1.2 Announcements**

Dr. Friedlander announced that Marilyn Spaventa has been appointed to the Dean of Educational Programs position vacated by Ramiro Sanchez effective August 13<sup>th</sup>. Diane Hollems has been appointed assistant dean for Professional Development Studies/Dual Enrollment effective July 27<sup>th</sup>. The interviews for the Online Student Support Specialist position vacated by Joelle Mathiot have taken place and reference checks are being conducted.

Karolyn Hanna informed the council that she had just returned from Philadelphia where she served as a mentor for the National Commission on Graduates of Foreign Schools of Nursing. This organization compiles and administers a screening examination for RNs from 40 countries around the world to determine if they are likely to pass the U.S. licensing exam prior to their immigration to the U.S. She was a mentor to item writers who were preparing test questions. Karolyn has been asked to serve on the Commission again next year.

**2.0 Information Items**

**2.1 Status of state budget and its implications for SBCC (*Dr. MacDougall*)**

Dr. MacDougall reported that the California State Assembly did approve the budget with the following adjustments:

- COLA was adjusted downwards to 3.78%.
- Growth is at 3%
- Part-time faculty compensation was reduced by \$5m from \$62m to \$57m.

- Energy costs and conservation are in the budget for two years of support at \$49m.
- COLA for PFE is included in the budget.

The Senate will need to approve the budget and the Governor will need to sign the budget. The Governor is considering cuts between \$200m to \$600m. The items in the budget that are most vulnerable for community Colleges are:

- \$158m in the capital outlay projects; and
- the COLA funding for PFE.

## 2.2 COLA for PFE funds

Addressed in Item 2.1.

## 2.3 Technology Issues:

Dr. MacDougall addressed the challenge of identifying resources for information technology-related requests needed to proceed with college initiatives.

ITC ranked the new technology initiatives which included ongoing and one-time initiatives. The one-time funding of technology initiatives was included in the \$84,000 PFE funding for technology. The funding of the one-time technology funded projects was put on hold pending the outcome of the state budget.

Dr. MacDougall was asked to comment on the approach that is being taken to fund the five top-ranked ongoing technology requests that were ranked by DTC. These included the new network security position, the WebCT/Campus Pipeline administrator, \$84,000 in one-time funds to support new technology initiatives and \$27,000 of ongoing funds to replace new technology equipment. Dr. MacDougall stated that the source of funding to pay for the new and replacement technology equipment items and the costs of replacing this equipment was the unallocated PFE funds. Since these funds were put on hold until after contract negotiations, the council asked Dr. MacDougall to address when the college would be able to move forward in funding these items. Dr. MacDougall said he would try to identify the source of funds to pay for both the \$84,000 to purchase new technology equipment as well as the \$27,000 needed to replace those items.

Dr. MacDougall went on to say that the ongoing funding to support the other two top-ranked priorities, the network security position and the WebCT/Campus Pipeline administrator presents a serious challenge at this time. Dr. MacDougall said he recognized that both of those positions are critical for the institution to move ahead in achieving its objectives. Initially the source of funding to pay for those positions was to be Tech II funding. However, due to the energy crisis and the slowdown in the economy, the funding to support Tech II at the state level will

not be in this years budget nor is it likely to be in the following year's budget which presents a serious problem for Santa Barbara City College as well as the entire system. Dr. MacDougall noted that he reluctantly may have to consider one-time funding of those positions until there is more clarity at the state level of what is going to happen with Tech II funding. The college is in a position where both the network security position and the WebCT/Campus Pipeline administrator position are vital to the college's capability to move ahead.

#### **2.4 Definition of what constitutes a department/unit reorganization:**

The discussion on reorganization is encompassed in Item 2.5 below.

#### **2.5 Criteria for reclassifying positions**

Dr. MacDougall was asked to provide the council with the criteria for reclassifying positions. Dr. MacDougall stated that members of the Cabinet met to discuss this issue and develop the following criteria:

1. The proposed reclassification of the position must be part of an approved [by the college president] department/unit reorganization. In order for a proposal to be considered a reorganization, it must involve significant changes in the job responsibilities and reporting relationships within the department/unit; and
2. Significant changes in the job responsibilities of the position are required in order to implement the department/unit reorganization.

These criteria should be used in evaluating requests for reclassifications, regardless of whether the position proposed for reclassification is vacant or occupied. Dr. MacDougall noted that the term "significant" in both the criteria for judging whether a department/unit is going through a change in department/unit organization constitutes a reorganization and if the changes in the job responsibilities of the position are "significant" are subject to interpretation and introduces the element of judgment in doing so. Dr. MacDougall stated that the criteria developed by Cabinet represents a reasonable means to approach what has been a challenging area.

Kathy O'Connor asked Dr. MacDougall if both of these criteria must apply in order for a department to reclassify an employee, even if the job responsibilities in a department have been changed significantly. In other words, according to these criteria, it is impossible for a position to be reclassified unless it is part of a department/unit reorganization. Dr. MacDougall stated that Kathy O'Connor's interpretation of the application of the criteria for reclassifying positions was correct.

Karolyn Hanna asked for clarification as to what CPC's role is in reviewing requests to reclassify positions. She asked whether the information is being

presented to CPC as an information item or if CPC had any meaningful role to play in providing input into determining whether or not the proposed reclassification is warranted. Carolyn asked whether proposals for reclassification of positions are approved by Cabinet and presented to CPC as an information item. If that is correct, then the role of CPC is limited to providing feedback as to whether or not the proposal has merit.

Dr. MacDougall responded that the process is that any request for reclassification of positions should be brought to CPC as an information item. The purpose of bringing this information to CPC is to: (1) inform members of the council of proposed changes; and (2) to allow members of the council to provide their point of view as to what is being proposed. However, the responsibility for determining the administrative organizational structure of the college rests with the President.

The question was asked what role CPC has in approving a reorganization or reclassification of positions in which the resources to pay for it do not reside in the department/unit budget. Dr. MacDougall responded that if a reorganization in an area is essential for a department/unit to carry out its responsibilities and funds are not available in the unit to pay for it, then it is his responsibility to work with the vice presidents to identify how resources can be shifted to pay for the reorganization. This may often be the case in divisions of the college, such as Human Resources/Legal Affairs, which has a very small budget and would not necessarily have the capacity to absorb additional costs. However, this may not be the case for Educational Programs which constitutes 60% of the budget and, as such, has much more flexibility to absorb changes in responsibilities related to reorganization and reclassification.

Kathy O'Connor expressed concern that these criteria could force departments to reorganize just to get one employee reclassified. Dr. MacDougall responded that positions will remain the same unless a reclassification is called for by restructuring the unit. Kathy related a problem in Educational Programs where a position in the FRC for reclassification had been approved through all the consultation processes twice and still that person cannot be reclassified. In this case, the person occasionally does work out of her classification and has upgraded her skills and abilities consistently but is one of the poorest paid people on campus. A case for reclassifying that position based on number two of the criteria cannot be made as we now have to meet the first criterion as well.

Kathy O'Connor added that in the past there was an unwritten policy that a reorganization could occur within units as long as the funds to do so were available within their own budgets. Under these circumstances, the proposed reorganization was brought to CPC as an information item. However, if additional resources are required to implement the proposed reorganizations, it affects the budget of the college and, as such, the proposed request should be subject to an approved budgetary review process. Dr. MacDougall responded that the college will have to determine how it can fund a reclassification; either out of the existing

budgets, or another source of funding. He added that that president's responsibility is to make a judgment at a certain point as to what is essential for an administrative unit to be able to carry out its function. Kathy added her frustration of having a twice CPC approved request for an additional \$4,000 to reclassify a position in the FRC vetoed by Dr. MacDougall while being asked to endorse a reclassification request in HR/LA that requires an additional \$37,235.

Kathy O'Connor added that the faculty representatives to CPC are placed in a most difficult situation in defending a decision/recommendation from CPC that has not been through the consultation process and does not reflect the Senate's point of view.

Karolyn Hanna requested that the process for reorganizing department/units and reclassifying positions be written and be placed in the district's policy manual. Dr. MacDougall stated that these procedures for establishing district organizational structure as it pertains to the college administration should be brought forward to CPC. The responsibility for establishing the district organization structure and the duties and responsibilities should be that of the president's. Karolyn offered to work with Sue Ehrlich to make a recommendation as to the language for the reorganization/reclassification and where it should lie in the district policy/procedure.

## 2.6 Proposed reorganization of Human Resources and Legal Affairs

Sue Ehrlich distributed as an information item the rationale, structure and funding source for the proposed reorganization of Human Resources and Legal Affairs (HR/LA). This reorganization proposes significant changes in the structure of HR/LA and has the approval of Cabinet and Dr. MacDougall. It is being brought to CPC because it does have implications for college resources. She outlined significant changes in the structure of HR/LA and commented that the reorganization from HR to HR/LA has added to her responsibilities of being directly involved in a number of higher level legal issues around the campus, broader than the employment issues that HR has handled in the past.

The proposed changes to current HR/LA positions are:

1. Eliminate the position of Human Resources Specialist and create a new position of Human Resources Manager  
Additional cost: \$37,235
2. Senior Secretary to Administrative Secretary  
Additional cost: \$3,784
3. Classified HR Clerk to Classified HR Technician  
Additional cost: \$6,432.71

4. Certified H.R. Technician to Sr. Certificated H.R. Technician  
Additional cost: \$7,652

TOTAL Cost of Reorganization: \$55,106

Funding Sources:

1. Current allocations for existing positions
2. Additional \$5,000 from present HR/LA budget
3. Funds to be identified: \$50,000

A discussion ensued on the significant cost required to reorganize HR/LA. Sue Ehrlich expounded on her rationale for the reorganization, which was discussed in the handout.

Karolyn Hanna asked if there is a way to show cost savings of legal expenses now that Sue Ehrlich handles legal affairs as part of her responsibilities in HR/LA. Dr. MacDougall responded that in the long term there may be cost savings. Dr. MacDougall informed the council that fortunately, the legal expenses of the college have been minimal.

It was suggested that Sue Ehrlich attend an Academic Senate meeting in the fall to discuss the impact of the growth of SBCC on Human Resources in past years and the rationale for and implications to the college of adding the "legal affairs" to the Human Resources department.

- 2.7 Review and critique the draft of the College Plan for 2002-2005.

The council reviewed the 6<sup>th</sup> draft of the College Plan for 2002-2005.

- 2.8 Plan and timeline for completing the College Plan for 2002-2005.

CPC will meet on Tuesday, September 18<sup>th</sup> to review the next draft of the College Plan.

### **3.0 Other Items**

There were no other items.

### **4.0 Adjournment**

Dr. Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 3:00 PM.