

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**March 15, 2005
3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, J. Romo, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly J. Sullivan, A. Serban, K. McLellan, E. Frankel, T. Garey, P. Haslund, J. Schultz, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, B. Rice

ABSENT: B. Hamre

GUEST: S. Coffield, P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Approval of Minutes of the November 2nd and November 23rd CPC meetings

M/S/C [Schultz/Gary] unanimously to approve the minutes of the November 2nd CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Garey/Schultz] unanimously to approve the minutes of the November 23rd CPC meeting.

2.0 Announcements

- 2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that the faculty hiring process is going very well and to date each of our first choice candidates for a faculty position has accepted. He said the talent we are hiring is exceptional especially considering all the competition statewide and nationally.
- 2.2 The demonstration for SunGuard/SCT will begin next Tuesday morning March 22nd and will take place in the Cyber Center.
- 2.3 The comprehensive student survey that we conduct every three years as part of the planning process was distributed yesterday to instructors assigned for the 108 class sections selected to be included in this survey.
- 2.4 Dr. Friedlander said that his request for departments/units to contact their counterparts at other community colleges that have implemented a six-week intersession along the lines that he has proposed and to assess the implications of this method of scheduling on their respective areas allowed ample time for discussion and evaluation as to whether this is a viable option for the college. He said, unfortunately, the perception in the college community is that he has a tight timeline and decisions need to be made in the next few months. This is not the case. He stated the importance of taking the time required to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the potential benefits and costs of adding a six-

week winter intersession. No decision has been made to put a six-week winter intersession in place but it is a concept that is worth study.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 John Romo will discuss the planning process for the College Plan 2005-08 (*addressed first on agenda*)

John Romo joined the Council to discuss the next reiteration of the College Plan and to also present the President's Office CPP items. He asked the Council to give him input on the recommendation of the approach we would use to develop the next version of the College Plan. President Romo indicated that our College Plan technically draws to a close at the end of the spring semester. When we distributed the CPP timeline, we included the steps and suggested timeframes for the development of the College Plan through the spring semester. He indicated that in regard to the timeline and the present commitments of the administration, faculty and staff, he does not want anyone to feel the pressure of having to complete this task by the end of the spring term. If we need to finalize the consultation part of this process early in the fall semester that would be acceptable in order to produce the best possible product.

John Romo said he sees CPC as the primary body that does most of the development of the plan and should be the producer of the first level of the general layout and outline of issues and priorities. It would then be sent out to the college community to the various consultation groups for review and input. It would then go to the President and the Board. He would bring the Board input back to CPC to define, debate and come up with the next draft that would then go to the President. If there were any concerns, he would come to CPC to address these issues prior to going to the Board for approval. Jack Friedlander reminded the Council that as a part of the CPP process, a question was asked about input into the College Plan. President Romo indicated it is good to stay within the context that we have had in that we would develop another 3-year reiteration of the plan. He said he would like to see a more succinct plan to address only the items emphasized that will be the highest priorities for the next three years. What he does like about the plan, especially in the Educational Programs areas, is that it is outcome focused and we should strive to maintain that.

Jack Friedlander commented that our philosophy in writing the current plan was to include new initiatives rather than on ongoing activities. In addition, at the time we were developing the plan, we needed to identify the efforts being taken to address the PFE outcome measures. Now we are going to have the new AB1417 statewide accountability model so our challenge will be to streamline the College Plan and still address the outcomes on which the college will be measured. John Romo responded that the new College Plan needs to address how the college will achieve the outcome measures identified in AB1417. Peter Naylor suggested that we might want to look out as far as 10 years but address the plan to the first three years of a long-range strategy.

John Romo reiterated Jack Friedlander's comment that we asked all departments in the CPP process to identify their major objectives for the next three years. This information needs to be considered in the development of the new College Plan. Andreea Serban has compiled that information and will be made available to CPC. He said CPC should look at where it can compile data from many sources in addition to the excellent information provided by Andreea Serban. President Romo said he now had transcripts from the planning forums and will identify the salient points of those presentations as another source of input into the development of the College Plan.

President Romo said there are three major areas on which we should focus the overall structure of the plan: A critical one is "access" in getting the students to the college; sustaining both the credit and non-credit enrollments by reaching out to all facets of the South Coast community. The second area is "student success"; to provide services so that our students can obtain their educational goals. The third area is "infrastructure" to provide the support for the core functions of the college. He defines "infrastructure" as everything that goes on at the college other than direct student contact (e.g., facilities, salaries, support for students, faculty and staff).

The Council will need to formulate a realistic timeframe for completing the plan. Andreea Serban mentioned that the College Plan 2002-05 is on the web.

- 4.2 Review of CPP reports: Jack Friedlander (instructional departments), Sue Ehrlich (HR/LA) and John Romo (President's Office) will present summary reports of the top priorities identified for their respective areas.

John Romo discussed the President's Office's expense reductions and revenue enhancements for the President's Office from the Combined CPP Summaries and Tiers document. His focus will be to: (1) conduct an organization structure analysis; (2) implementation of the student information system; (3) evaluation of the current CPP process results; (4) strengthen fundraising through the Foundation; (5) review institutional memberships; and (6) consider the feasibility of venturing into a new bond campaign for facilities and equipment. President Romo said if the Board feels supported of going out for a bond campaign, it would be in either June or November of 2006. He said if the Board supports this idea, we would come to CPC for consultation on the projects that could lend themselves to a successful bond campaign. John Romo said we are one of about eight districts that have not passed a bond measure since the threshold was lowered to 55 percent. President Romo feels we can make a case on programs for students as well as the needs for upgrading the infrastructure of the college. It was agreed that Santa Barbara is a "tough sell" for a bond measure.

Sue Ehrlich discussed her proposals for possible expense reductions and income generation [document not distributed] for the Human Resources/Legal Affairs area.

Jack Friedlander discussed the suggestions for potential credit instructional department expense reductions and revenue generation strategies within the Educational Programs Division.

(Handouts are made a part of these minutes)

4.3 EC's recommendations of Tiers 1, 2 and 3 CPP priorities

Tier 1: Items with potential cost savings/revenue generation that can be done quickly without additional analysis

Tier 2: Items with potential cost savings/revenue generation that need additional analysis/discussion

Tier 3: Items without money associated or with money but that cannot be accomplished within a short or medium range time frame or were already done and will not affect any new savings.

4.4 Discussion and identification of CPC's recommendations of CPP report items to be placed in Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

The Council has not yet addressed this item.

5.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.