

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL

January 24, 2006

2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

P.E. Conference Room

MINUTES for A&R POSITION

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Proposal to add a new position: Senior Admissions and Records Technician

Jack Friedlander began the discussion acknowledging Allison Curtis, Director of Admissions and Records (A&R). Allison will give an overview of the proposal. He said we have an emergency situation that has gotten much worse in this area where they are so severely understaffed at this point. Dr. Friedlander said he didn't know how we would implement Banner with everything A&R are being asked to do. The proposal is requesting to funds for the new position and a methodology for doing so.

Allison Curtis spoke to the Council and stressed that there is an absolute critical, critical need for a new full-time Senior Admission and Records Technician to support current business processes. She said if the college has any hope of being successful in implementing SCT Banner we must have this position. The SIG consultants, who are assisting SBCC with the implementation of Banner, indicate that the supervisor of Admissions and Records will need to spend at least 40% of his/her time working on Banner implementation activities. The Director of Admissions and Records will have to spend at least 50% of her [Curtis] time working on Banner-related activities. The current staff members in A&R may spend up to 25% of their time sporadically and across the course of the project in Banner implementation activities.

Allison Curtis said the current staffing model does not provide any room that implementation at all. Ms. Curtis said that since 2002, A&R has had four supervisors. The cost of training, turnover, as well as morale within the A&R office, cannot be underestimated in this decision as well. Allison Curtis said that this is not the first time that A&R has come forward with this request and has done so since 1996.

In 1996, a position was not filled in A&R because of the expectation that when the Oracle system would be implemented we would not need that additional staff person. During that time enrollment has grown from 11,932 to now serving 17,000 students. The A&R team has openly accepted all new initiatives that the college has put forward to meet its growth and enrollment targets. Those include supporting the Professional Development Center with a very manual labor intensive application, enrollment and grading process and well as the Dual Enrollment program. All of the different short course initiatives that the college is now offering, our system does not handle, and again, it is another entirely manual process that is ripe for error. Ms. Curtis said this is

a position that we will need also after the Banner implementation. She said the workload will not diminish but the nature of the work will change.

Lynda Fairly echoed Ms. Curtis' comments that the Admission staff has always has been understaffed. It has been a tradition that people put in overtime and come in on Saturdays and it is now out of hand.

Joe Sullivan said that he does not dispute the need for another position in Admissions & Records. He said his concern is that we are filling a full-time permanent position using temporary money and **feels that if there is really a need, then we need to supply the need and not try to do it out of temporary funds where ultimately they are going to go away and we will need have to find out how to fund it regardless.**

A second issue is the allocation process for Banner implementation backfill funds. He said the backfill money for the policy, how we use the backfill money [Banner] should go to the Steering Committee. We originally said that when we set it up that we would go to the Steering Committee and it would make a recommendation based on the needs of the different areas. Allison Curtis concurred that Dan Watkins thought that was an important step to take. Mr. Sullivan said he wanted to emphasize that he supports the position but had issues with the method of payment.

Allison said what is not stated in the methodology Dr. Friedlander proposed for pay for this position, and what we will fully realize, is that in 2007-08, after fully implementing SCT Banner, that Admission and Records is going to be able to reduce our spending in our hourly dollar budget by \$40,000. We can't guarantee that at this point but based on what we know from other schools and how much we spend in our hourly budget now just to support current operations, we could expect to realize that savings at that point as well.

Dr. Friedlander said we desperately need the money to fill this position this now. This year there is money in the Banner backfill budget to pay for the balance of the year. We have to come up with the additional \$13,000 next year of General Fund dollars. Then the following year, 2007-08, this position would be entirely funded with General Fund dollars. He said the way he wants to approach this is we would submit the proposal for creating a new position as part of the process we follow for new resource allocations and would put this forward as my number one priority. Without approval of this position it is and will continue to adversely affect how we do business. He also said that that by 2008 we might be able to reduce A&R's hourly budget but we don't know that. Joe Sullivan has indicated the reality is this is how we are doing business and we can't do business anymore because we will be losing good people [in Admissions]. Jack said it is such a priority to this institution that if he had to, he would make painful cuts.

Keith McLellan said he supports Joe's proposal and asked if we had a mechanism mid-year to pre-commit district funds to this full-time position and if not, the proposal that sets here seems like a reasonable interim process so that we can get this position

into the basic and core cycle of budgeting. This would give us an interim solution to the A&R staffing problem which needs to be addressed right now especially since Jack Friedlander is saying when Ed Programs brings their budget requests to CPC next year, it will be on the top of the list.

Mr. McLellan said even though we don't have a mechanism right now, he is in agreement that we support the interim position with a commitment that we will make the ongoing a priority without having to make any commitments from CPC with that money but knowing that it is our reasonable intent particularly in our discussion about the allocation of COLA and growth funds in the coming year. We are not looking ahead at a diminished budget; but status quo or improved. From that perspective Mr. McLellan said he has confidence that there is some discretion in terms of anticipating what the college's budget is going to be.

Esther Frankel agreed that we should not fund a permanent position on temporary money. If we have an intent to commit permanent dollars, I suspect there are a lot of entities in the college that would like to have the same opportunity to present their case. She asked again what is the process. Jack Friedlander responded that knowing there are other priorities he has wrestled with this and has asked A&R to be patient. Now, he is saying we cannot afford as a college to wait. He recognized critical needs in other core functions but cautioned that we will not have any Admissions and Records staff if we do not address this critical need. Dr. Friedlander said he tried to come up with a proposal that respected the process we are developing but because we do not have mechanism in place right now to make this interim kind of decision, that he is willing to go out on a limb to indicate that if this proposal does not recommend this proposal, then he will have to come up with the funds.

Sue Ehrlich offered that Educational Programs has an adjunct budget at the end of the year that should be more than enough to deal with this. Dr. Friedlander responded that we cannot count on that ongoing because it is adjusted each year based on what was used the prior year. He said what Joe offered is the honest way of doing it because it is all coming from the same pot of General Fund money.

Sue Ehrlich said getting this in place now and getting through June 30th is worth doing because this is a need that existed even before the Banner implementation. She said Joe Sullivan is right with respect to announcing a commitment of any new resources and using this process to get a commitment of Banner backfill A& R is going to need Banner backfill and there are other entities that are assuming that Banner backfill funding will be available as well.

Jack Friedlander started the process by consulting with Dan Watkins about the amount of Banner backfill dollars that need and can be allocated for Admissions. Sue Ehrlich said the process has not begun yet to request backfill dollars. Keith indicated that backfill money is an ongoing request and funds are being requested as needed and not everything is known up front. Ms. Ehrlich said no one is anticipating that backfill money would be used in this manner to fund an ongoing position. Dr. Friedlander said

that he has heard everyone say that they will commit to fund this new position right away and that Educational Programs or the institution comes back through its regular process that we have developed for allocating resources. He is taking a calculated risk to pay for this position if CPC does not recommend its funding but doing so on behalf of the institution because we cannot function without having staff in A&R. We are in horrible straights and questioned how A&R staff would be able to do Banner. It is clearly a position we have to fund.

Peter Haslund indicated that as this is being discussed, he does not hear a single negative for the process. He said there are two questions: (1) do we support the proposal; and (2) how do we fund it?

Keith McLellan questioned that if the position were funded from a categorical source, is there any ongoing commitment to that categorical source if those monies for the categorical program are needed for something else. Sue Ehrlich indicated that if you hire a classified person from categorical money, that is a permanent position. That is in contrast to our ability to hire temporary faculty on temporary contracts that are purely categorical sources where the contract is year to year depending upon whether the categorical source continues. Dr. Friedlander commented that by the time we hire this person, possibly by April, they will not be a permanent employee by July 1st.

Liz Auchincloss said she sees that this is an error we have made in growth. This position should have been funded by growth. There are other equally or more critical positions that need to be funded so when those positions come, they need to be looked at. We are going to have to start using growth money. She said now we only have to hire instructors [from growth] so staff continues to get left behind. So, if this position has to be funded by growth next year, we are going to have to do it. Dr. Friedlander said what EC is working on and what will come forth next week is EC's proposal in terms of how we come up with a rational process of how we allocate funds to meet the needs of the institution that are affected when we grow, including looking at past staffing deficits that we know we have throughout the institution. In our College Plan we clearly have a statement about staffing and the principles we are proposing are that we need to pay attention to the major goals in the College Plan and this will clearly be one the principles that EC will put forward next week.

M/S [Haslund/Auchincloss] that this body approve the recommendation and leave the question of funding to those who can better deliberate and bring back a resolution to the funding issue at a subsequent meeting.

Tom Garey called a point of order that this is only on the agenda as a discussion item only. Jack Friedlander said what we would be receiving from EC at our next meeting is not on which positions to fund, it is a mechanism but the mechanism is silent on any particular position. Mr. Garey said this would allow us to frame this within the framework of the mechanism that is evolving rather than going out on a limb.

M/S/C [Fairly/Auchincloss] to move item 4.1 to action.

Discussion: Peter Haslund said the essence of the motion was to support the recommendation presented to us for the creation of this new position and to leave the matter, and to separate out, the question of funding for those better capable of deliberating and coming up with solutions for funding and bring back to CPC that solution at a subsequent meeting.

Note: The Council asked that this language be verbatim as to its intent.

The original motion was approved.

Lynda Fairly asked whether this position could be advertised. Dr. Friedlander said that based on the approval of this action, he will bring to the President's attention for his approval and decision to go forth.

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**February 7, 2006
3:30 - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, A. Serban,
K. McLellan, T. Garey, P. Haslund, E. Frankel, B. Lindemann, K. Molloy,
L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson, M. Guillen, K. Russell

GUEST: P. English

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

- 2.1 Andreea Serban announced that the Accreditation Commission has approved the college's mid-term report. She said that a member of the Commission staff advised the college not to request doing an experimental self study for its next accreditation. Dr. Serban said the next scheduled visit is in fall 2009 rather than fall, 2008. She will confirm with the Commission that the fall 2009 date is correct. If so, the self study will need to be submitted in May 2009.

3.0 Information Items

- 3.1 Update on spring enrollments

Andreea Serban indicated that yesterday was the census date for semester-long sections. The short sections, dual enrollment and professional development class enrollments are not entered into the system until later. Compared to the same time last year the California residence enrollments are at least equal. She said there is a tremendous increase in non-California residents, which do not count toward meeting the college's state-funded FTES target. Dr. Serban said that although these numbers are good, there are not sufficient to capture the 2.58 allowable growth for this year. The degree to which we will be able to achieve our growth and Basic Skills FTES targets for this year will depend on how much is generated from short-term sections, Dual Enrollment and Professional Development courses.

4.0 Discussion Items

- 4.1 Review of approach for funding the Admissions Technician position approved at the January 24th CPC meeting

The Council was provided the minutes from the discussion during the last CPC meeting on the request for the Admissions Technician position. Jack Friedlander said the position has been advertised. He said the approval for the position was a major boost to the morale of Allison Curtis, Director of Admissions, and her staff. He reiterated the Council's motion at the last meeting to approve the position and to have EC inform the Council how this position would be funded. Dr. Friedlander indicated there are two ways to approach this: (1) submit the proposal as part of our allocation process for next year's budget and have it considered with all of the proposals and ranked accordingly; or (2) fund this position from growth funds that we have to allocate next year. Thus, when CPC is ranking new proposals the money for this proposal is already accounted for. Dr. Friedlander said that we could look at the proposed budget process prior to making this decision. He suggested the Council postpone the discussion until it discusses the process that will be proposed in EC. He said the President is asking that CPC recommend to him the way it wants to proceed.

Jack Friedlander reiterated that there is no alternative but to take either of these two steps. He said that if there were funds in Educational Programs to fund this position he would have proposed it to the Council. Keith McLellan said he would like to come back to CPC with the process. As the Council looks at the growth funds, there are certain items that are pre-committed, such as the negotiated increases in faculty and staff salaries and benefits for the 2006-2007 and increases in fixed costs, that will not be included in the resource allocations to be ranked for funding by CPC. Keith McLellan is asking the Council to be informed of what monies are available from growth and how much of those dollars are available for CPC to recommend funding proposals. Liz Auchincloss reminded that Council that when some classified positions were cut, it was thought that they were temporary cuts when, in fact, they were permanent cuts.

4.2 Implications of the Governor's budget for SBCC

4.3 Budget development process

Jack Friedlander went through the "Principles" and "Process" of the *College Consultation Process for Prioritizing Needs and Allocating Funds* and invited questions and/or offered clarifications in the document.

In regard to item 3 of the "Process", "sabbatical leave excess cost adjustment", Joe Sullivan said the prior method of calculating the cost of the sabbatical didn't include the actual full cost of the sabbaticals. This deficit has accumulated over the years up to \$100,000. It was an error that carried forward and will need to be subtracted from available funds. Sue Ehrlich raised a question in regard to banked TLUs accumulated for sabbaticals. Dr. Friedlander responded that these are paid when faculty are on sabbatical at the current rate and not the rate in place at the time the TLUs were banked. However, when a faculty member retires, their banked TLUs are paid out at the rate that was in place when it was earned. Joe Sullivan said that these "banked TLUs" represent an unfunded liability. He said the college is going to begin to accrue a reserve against the funds this year. Jack Friedlander said the auditors felt that every year there were ample funds in end-of-year balances to cover it thus it was not an audit exception. As we draw down our end-of-year balances we need to recognize it

as an unfunded liability. Dr. Friedlander said that a number of faculty members are using some of their banked TLUs to draw down their teaching loads as they approach retirement.

Joe Sullivan said that he needs to quantify the revenue and expenses we have for this year. He said we should have this information by the next CPC meeting. Mr. Sullivan said what we are allocating is the residual money remaining from the 2005-06 budget from growth and equalization. He said what we are actually calculating is based on 2005-06 net knowing what we have and then allocate on a go-forward basis starting July 1 of 2006.

Dr. Friedlander said the next time we meet we will review the request for proposals that is going out to units and then send it out after the next CPC meeting.

Keith McLellan said that although he recognizes there are critical position requests that will be submitted, the request for the Admissions and Records position has some unique attributes that may set it aside from pressing needs. He said he was on the Project Redesign team that made the decision to drop this full-time position in Admissions & Records in 1996. He said the decision was made on a false promise of a product (Oracle's ERP in general and its SIS in particular) that didn't exist. All of this was taking place at a time the district perceived itself as being in dire straits financially and under the false impression that the implementation of OSS would enable the college to conduct its business with fewer staff. There were people with a strong voice that prevailed at that time. Mr. McLellan said that EC and CPC have to make a decision that a mistake was made and to rectify it. Liz Auchincloss concurred with Mr. McLellan but offered that there may be other departments that need additional positions to conduct their day-to-day business that that they should have the same opportunity to bring those position requests forward. Dr. Friedlander said that each Vice President will present compelling cases for requests for positions in their respective areas where they have staffing limitations.

The Council did not disagree with the egregiousness of Dean McLellan's account of the position request in Admissions & Records. Sue Ehrlich said that there are other items lurking in the background that meet that same test of egregiousness. Joe Sullivan said that if you look at the way that decision was made to cut 6-8 positions in 2002-03 and the resulting ending balances that occurred after that decision, you could make the same argument that we made this decision based on essentially false information. He can support either way of presenting this A&R position because he felt it would rise to the top. Mr. Sullivan asked that we focus on a go-forward basis and present the arguments together for all the other issues.

Lynda Fairly said that in the past we have put all our priorities forth, we debate them and come up with creative ideas for solving problems and then we vote. She felt that it is out of our college process to take one position, which we all feel that is very important, and say it is so unique that it is more important than anything else when we don't know what else is going to be brought forth.

4.4 Priority Institutional Initiatives for Spring/Summer 2006

The attached list of initiatives was not current. An updated list of these priorities will be sent to the Council.

5.0 Adjournment

Upon motion, the meeting was adjourned.

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

February 21, 2006

3:00 - 4:30 PM

A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, E. Frankel, T. Garey,
P. Haslund, B. Lindemann, K. Molloy, L. Auchincloss, M. Guillen, K. Russell

ABSENT: K. McLellan, A. Serban, J. Jackson

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Library Cyber Center & Cafe

Jack Friedlander announced that Verizon has donated \$60,000 for the placement of a Cyber Center and Café in the Library. The Library Cyber Center and Café, which will consist of 51 computers, tables and chairs, and a coffee cart, will be in place for fall semester.

- 2.2** Sue Ehrlich reported on the status of the faculty hiring process. She stated that within our applicant pools the candidates reflect a diverse population. She said the awareness of this issue and the great response on the part of departments that are hiring to assist in identifying the best approach to advertise their positions. Ms. Ehrlich said we had a large number of applications from the Job Fair this year.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Results of Student Survey on Summer Session Options

Jack Friedlander reported on the results of the summer session survey. He said he is determining what the cost would be to support a second summer session. The survey shows that the students want an early summer session in addition to the current six-week summer session. He said the proposal for two summer sessions and the results of the student survey will be discussed further at tomorrow's Academic Senate meeting. Dr. Friedlander said the second summer session would only make sense if

we need it to meet our FTES targets. In essence, it adds to the cost of doing business. But, without a 2nd summer session, the consequences are a lot more severe of not being able to meet our enrollment cap to generate funds which would result in having our FTES base lowered, or not raised, and the loss of state funds associated with the lowered base. Jack Friedlander said we will meet cap this year but may not capture all of the growth and Basic Skills FTES the college is eligible to receive. He said it is critical we grow to generate the additional money needed to keep up with inflation and higher costs of doing business, which includes negotiated salaries and benefits. Plus with higher education being a people intensive business, the cost of higher education has gone up twice the rate of inflation every year over the last decade because salaries and benefits costs needed to attract and retain well qualified faculty and staff have consistently been higher than the inflation rates used to calculate COLA. That is one of the reasons we need additional revenue.

3.2 Strategies for Meeting Student Needs and Enrollment Targets

Jack Friedlander discussed the strategies for meeting student needs and enrollment targets. He said John Romo is sending out a campus-wide e-mail explaining the background on this with a link to the report and where we are in terms of pursuing the various recommendations. He said the primary recommendations are: (1) to implement outreach strategies for out-of state students; (2) respond to demand of community; and (3) explore, investigate and evaluate the feasibility of the construction of up to a 600 bed student resident hall on campus. The plan now is to have the campus community engaged in a discussion of these recommendations. The proposed location for the student residence hall facility is in the area where the temporary Life Fitness Center is now located and from the far side of the bridge to the Marine Diving Technology building. He said the vendors for the construction of the student housing facilities plan, build, finance and operate these projects independent from the college. Thus there is no financial risk to the college. He said at the time the facility is paid off in approximately 30 years, the 501C that owns and operates it would transfer ownership to the college. Dr. Friedlander cautioned there a number of questions that need to be answered about the implications of this project on the college that need to be addressed. Peter Haslund commented that in order to have an intelligent discussion, we would have to have the data collection and have the answers to the questions that will be raised. Dr. Friedlander said he, Joe Sullivan and President Romo did the initial fact finding, but decided to wait until they engaged the Board in this discussion to see if they are amenable to even study on-campus housing.

Dr. Friedlander said it would be helpful for the Council to send him a list of initial questions they feel need to be addressed in order to fully evaluate the feasibility of moving forward with the proposed student residence facility.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Budget development timeline

Joe Sullivan discussed the process and timeline for budget development for 2006-07. He commented that we just received the P-1 report, the state apportionment allocation projection of 05-06 financial results. For 2004-05, we will receive \$290,000 more than what we had expected for that year. He clarified that it did not increase our base because this money was actually backfill for property taxes and the elimination the growth FTES deficit factor. Dr. Friedlander said that our base FTES and funding doesn't change; it means that we won't have money taken away like we have in the past couple years for the property tax shortfall and/or growth FTES funding deficit. It represents dollars that are not new revenue but rather dollars that will not be taken away; they will fall to ending balances. Mr. Sullivan said there have been major adjustments to the ending balances based on the 2004-05 year-end to account for the parking structure, the Banner implementation (\$6m) as well as the decision that was made last year to budget the equipment (\$1.8m) and construction (\$1.2m) funds as part of the ongoing General Fund instead of funding these accounts from ending balances. CPC agreed last year to line item the equipment, technology and construction funding into the budget. He said if we should get below our 5% reserves then the funding of these budgets as well as others would need to be adjusted.

4.2 Procedure for Submitting Proposals Requesting New Funds to Achieve One or More of the Institutional Goals and Objectives in the College's Three-Year Plan: 2005-2008

Supporting documents [attached to agenda]:

1. College consultation Process for Prioritizing
2. Form for Submitting Proposals for Resources for the 2006-07 Budget
3. Budget Form

Dr. Friedlander informed the council of the procedure and the forms to be used in requesting new funds that are available based on uncommitted dollars from this year's 2005-06 budget. He said that CPC is the appropriate consultation body to review and rank the requests for new resource allocations. The Student Success Initiatives (SSI), although brought forward in a different process, will be considered by CPC with all the other resource requests. The SSI will be presented as a package and CPC will recommend a designated amount of money to support the implementation of the SSI. CPC will not be ranking individual components of the SSI implementation plan. The Academic Senate process will determine how to allocate those funds within the SSI initiative once a dollar amount is determined. Joe Sullivan will have a close estimate of funds available from growth and equalization for 2005-06 at the time CPC ranks its priorities. If any positions are funded as part of this process, they will not be officially approved until there is final verification that the funds to pay for them are available.

4.3 Status of College Plan mission statement

Jack Friedlander said that this is a work in progress.

5.0 Action Items

5.1 Approval of *District Policy 3131, International Students*

M/S [Molly/Fairly] to approve changes to *District Policy 3131*

Discussion:

Liz Auchincloss said she could not support this motion without putting in the provisions for additional staffing. She said if the enrollment of international students goes up to the 5% the policy will allow in that area then there will be a very significant impact on the present staff. Jack Friedlander inquired as to the language used to address this concern when the Academic Senate recommended approval. Tom Garey said the caveat was that the Academic Senate would recommend approval with the provision that revenues generated by increased enrollment are used to provide sufficient services for international students and that the Academic Senate would be informed about what that would be.

Joe Sullivan said he couldn't support the motion if that language is added to the proposed policy. He said it is all General Fund dollars whether it comes from International Students, property tax revenues, and/or lottery money and it goes into the General Fund to be allocated as a resource for the college. Mr. Sullivan said it's not that the increase in international students would result in additional revenue, but rather the fact that if these funds are allocated to one program they are no longer available to fund the needs other departments/units of the college have to perform their essential core functions.

Sue Ehrlich said that she agreed with Liz Auchincloss that there is a staffing problem in International Students. Another concern is if that while we are indicating that International Students has to use their income to fund the need for its support staff it doesn't address the impact that this program has on other areas of the college.

Tom Garey responded that we charge international students an amount in excess of what we charge out-of-state students. He said the whole philosophy behind his part of the motion is that this excess money is what gets used to support the services, staffing and personnel necessary to support the unique needs that international students present us. If we are not doing that, we are not treating the international students fairly.

Barbara Lindemann said, in a follow-up to Mr. Sullivan's argument, it is also the case that we are assuming that the added income from the international students goes into the General Fund and can be used for everything. The income should be somewhat earmarked for offsetting the costs of serving international students. She said the problem is we always think in terms of what is going to generate income without paying enough attention to the costs of each decision we make on other areas of the college such as Admissions and Records or Payroll. We need to count in the costs as well as the benefits of each decision like this we make.

Peter Haslund noted that at a previous discussion of CPC, we concluded that we were not going to approve this policy change without a clear understanding that there would

be support. He said what is missing is some degree of specificity. Jack Friedlander said there is a proposal pending. He said what Tom Garey was proposing [the language added from the Academic Senate language] was to approve the policy up to 5% but with the understanding that it would be connected with a staffing proposal to support the international students which would come to the Council for review. He said because we approve the policy up to 5% doesn't mean we are going up to 5%. He said if there is not adequate staff support to serve additional international students we will not admit more of these students. Peter Haslund added that we originally came forward with the idea of generating increased income by recruiting international students. It was made clear by the committee then, and is contained in the International Students Education Committee minutes, that we were not going to do that unless portions of that income would be allocated to supporting the students.

Jack Friedlander said there was a plan in place that specified levels of funding support with the number of international students allowed to be accepted to the college that was part of the part of the original International Students proposal that was approved in the 1980s. For example, when we allocated TLU growth, part of it came from International Students to pay for the international students in those areas where they are enrolling. He said when it went to the Board committees for approval to increase the number to 600 during Dr. MacDougall's last year at the college; it never went to the Board for formal approval. In the meantime, the enrollment has exceeded what was in the policy and so now we can't talk about funding new positions unless we have the justification that we have more students. To add more students, we need a change to the policy. A plan linking additional support required to support more international students has been submitted to John Romo. He said president Romo has not taken this staffing plan to Council yet as he wanted the cap upped to 5%. The plan will come back to the CPC at its next meeting. No one has agreed to it because we haven't increased the cap.

Jack Friedlander said the staffing proposal for International Students, which is tied into the number of international students served by the college, will come to the Council at the next meeting. He asked the Council for its advice on the following question: if the numbers indicate a need for the increase of a staff person, which it does because we are at those levels now, do we use the revenue we generated from International Students to help serve and support them or does the proposal for staffing go through the budget process. Kathy Molloy said they approved the policy change based on the understanding that these resources would be part of the package.

A motion was made to amend the motion [Garey/Haslund] to endorse the proposal to increase the cap to 5% and that the enrollments be increased only to the extent that the college can support the increase in the number of international students.

Kathy Molloy agreed to the amendment to her motion.

Joe Sullivan clarified that what is going to the Board is the proposed change to *District Policy 3131* without the added language of the motion.

The motion as amended was passed unanimously.

- 5.2 Approval of Academic Calendar for Summer Session 2006 and the 2006-2007 academic year.

M/S/C [Molloy/Garey] unanimously to approve the academic calendar.

6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned.