

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**March 6, 2001  
3:00 – 4:45 PM  
A218C**

**MINUTES**

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, B. Fahnestock, L. Fairly, S. Ehrlich, K. McLellan, A. Serban, L. Rose, T. Garey, J. Lynn, K. O'Connor, K. Hanna

**1.0 Call to Order**

- 1.1. Approval of minutes of the February 20, 2000 CPC/DTC meeting.

Due to lack of time, this item will be put on the March 22<sup>nd</sup> agenda for approval.

- 1.2 Announcements

There were no announcements.

**2.0 Information Items**

- 2.1 Staffing in the cashier's office:

Brian Fahnestock discussed his proposal to reclassify the intermediate account clerk position in the Cashier's Office to an account tech position. He reviewed the rationale for the reclassification saying that since there are two people performing the same responsibilities, they need to be at the same level of compensation. Lynda Fairly stated that it was important that if the two individuals were performing the same responsibilities they needed to be at the same classification levels otherwise the district could be subject to a discrimination complaint.

Several members of the council said that while they support the need to reclassify this position, they have concerns about the ad hoc approach that is being taken for approving requests for reclassifications. Jim Lynn requested that we have guidelines for assessing whether or not to reclassify positions and that a comprehensive approach for the reclassification of positions is needed.

Bill Hamre stated that since Brian Fahnestock's request has been approved by Dr. MacDougall, and the funds for this reclassification reside in the Business Services budget, Brian should be able to make the changes he wants to have his division operate as effectively as possible. CPC's involvement is at those times at which new resources are being requested.

Jim Lynn asked how the position vacated by Mona Wilke in the Cashier's Office is currently being filled. Brian said student workers were currently filling the position so as to allow him time to evaluate the needs of the Cashier's Office in that he will be operating in fundamentally different ways once the Oracle systems are in place. More specifically, he said it would be premature to fill that position with a permanent person until he had more clarity as to how the Cashier's Office will operate in the future.

Dr. Friedlander said that this was an information item coming to the council and that they can express their concerns but that Brian Fahnestock and the president have the authority to move forward with this reclassification. Further, Dr. Friedlander questioned what the role of CPC is in reviewing the proposals for reclassification when the funds to pay for the reclassifications reside in existing budgets. Dr. Friedlander said he would discuss this matter with Dr. MacDougall and inform the council at its next meeting what the appropriate role is of the council with respect to reviewing and approving requests for positions and reclassification of positions.

2.2 Two-year position for a business process analyst to assist with the implementation of Oracle Finance, Oracle HR and the new accounting software systems

Brian Fahnestock presented his proposal to create a two-year position in his office to assist with the implementation of Oracle Finance, Oracle Human Resources and the new accounting software system that the college is acquiring. Mr. Fahnestock stated that these are major complex software packages that need the attention of a full-time staff member over a two-year period to fully implement those systems. The position is needed in that there is no one on his staff that has the time or expertise to oversee the implementation and integration of these complex software programs.

Tom Garey asked what the sources of funds were to pay for this two-year position. Brian responded by saying that they would come from dollars set aside in the Oracle conversion project and in savings that exist each year in the Business Services budget that accrue while vacant positions are being filled. When asked what the cost of the position would be, Mr. Fahnestock responded that it would be in the \$80k range. Lana Rose asked Brian if there was any documentation that the council could review regarding this position. Mr. Fahnestock said that he hadn't brought a proposal to the council. Lana Rose said that it was hard for her to evaluate this type of request in the absence of a written proposal specifying what this person would do, the cost and the sources of revenue to pay for the position.

Brian stated that this position was needed and the software packages would help streamline business processes for the college. Without the position, it would be very difficult to implement and take advantage of the capabilities of these new software programs.

**3.0 Discussion items**

3.1 Critique of draft of vision statement

Dr. MacDougall provided the council with an overview of the vision statement and requested that the College Planning Council complete its review of the vision statement within the next few weeks. The vision statement is a reference point for developing the college's three-year plan as well as the institutional self-study for accreditation.

Kathy O'Connor raised the concern that although she understood the value of technology, the vision statement tended to over-emphasize technology which would present a problem with large segments of the college community. She felt that it would be more appropriate to focus on the desired objectives the college is attempting to achieve and to mention that technology is one of the methods to realize those objectives as opposed to giving the appearance of technology being the primary means of achieving those outcomes.

Tom Garey thought that the vision statement should take into account major challenges the college is facing and major changes that are taking place in society in addition to technology such as changes in population, environment and ethics. Dr. MacDougall said that those kinds of issues could be addressed in trends that would influence the objectives the college establishes for itself which would be in the College Plan but not in the vision statement.

Members of the council offered specific suggestions to Dr. MacDougall on changes in wording in the vision statement and in the order in which the statements were made. Dr. MacDougall noted those changes and said that he and Andreea Serban would meet to revise the vision statement taking into account the expressed concerns of the council.

Dr. MacDougall recommended that the College Planning Council distribute the vision statement to the college community for review. He recommended that the initial discussions of the document he distributed to the council be limited to the vision statement. Members of the council agreed that they would focus their initial efforts on the vision statement and would send that out to the consultation groups for review.

Karolyn Hanna noted that the mission statement in the existing three-year plan differs from what is stated in the catalog and from what is proposed in the revised vision statement that the council is being asked to consider. She strongly recommended that once we agreed what the vision and mission statement is for the revised College Plan, it should be consistent in all the college's publications.

Dr. MacDougall stated that he would schedule presentations from community-based agencies on trends taking place in their respective areas that might influence the college. He will organize two sessions with two or three presenters that would take place during the times when the Academic Senate is normally scheduled to meet. He would invite Cox Communication to discuss its plans for delivering voice, video and data into homes throughout our community. A representative from K-12 school systems will be invited to discuss changes in enrollment patterns and demographics that may affect the college. An invitation will also be extended to a representatives from Santa Barbara County and perhaps the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments to discuss changes taking place in the county that may affect the college in such areas as housing, economic development and transportation. A representative from UCSB would be invited to discuss the university's plans with respect to growth in enrollments in the lower division,

upper division and graduate level as well as impacted majors that may affect UCSB. Also, UCSB's plans for housing students and other policy changes that may affect SBCC will be discussed.

Dr. MacDougall said that he and Andreea Serban will contact the speakers and schedule the presentations to take place at the April 25<sup>th</sup> and May 9<sup>th</sup> Academic Senate meetings.

### 3.2 Draft of steps and timeline for completing College Plan

Since the meeting ran late, Dr. Friedlander asked to delay Item 3.2 to the following meeting in order to allow time for the presentations by the PFE workgroup chairs.

### 3.3 Presentation by workgroup chairs of top-ranked PFE proposals

**Technology Workgroup:** Laurie Vasquez distributed a handout of the rankings by the technology workgroups of the one-time and ongoing proposals and gave an overview of the top-ranked items. Dr. Friedlander said it was not totally clear as to how much was being requested on one-time and ongoing funds and there were discrepancies in the totals in the top-ranked items. Furthermore, it was not particularly clear as to which items were included in the one-time requests and the ongoing requests. Laurie Vasquez said that she would make the changes in the spreadsheet to make the appropriate corrections as to what is being recommended by the workgroup. Dr. Friedlander expressed his gratitude to Laurie Vasquez for chairing the Instructional Technology PFE workgroup and he asked her to express the appreciation of the council to the members of the workgroup for their efforts in performing the task.

**General Resource Workgroup:** Jane Craven presented an overview of the top-ranked items by the General Resource Workgroup. Tom Garey noted that there were a number of requests that were being recommended for new positions in the Information Resources Division. Tom asked Bill Hamre if he had produced a longitudinal study showing the trends in the college's spending for technology hardware, software and staff. Bill Hamre said he had not produced such a report but would do so. Tom said that such a report is needed to provide the council and members of the college community a perspective of where we have been and where we are going. Such a context is needed in order to adequately assess the need for new positions and funding to support our technology initiatives.

Questions were raised concerning the recommendation to fund a 3/4-time locksmith position. Tom Garey asked how much the college was currently spending to pay for an off-campus locksmith. Brian Fahnestock responded that we are currently spending approximately \$20,000 a year. Tom Garey asked what was the rationale for doubling our costs for performing this function that is currently being done for \$20k. Brian Fahnestock responded by saying that our current approach to maintaining locks for the 2,000-plus doors on campus is inadequate and we lack proper inventory control and oversight of the entire process. We need to have someone on campus who is responsible for the 2,000-plus locks and it could not be effectively done by out-sourcing. Jim Lynn said we need the locksmith otherwise the security of the college will be put in jeopardy. Tom Garey said when he listened to Brian Fahnestock's rationale as to why the position is needed, it did match what was stated in the proposal. Tom Garey said the proposal was

inadequate in that it did not reflect what was now being requested of the council. Tom Garey asked that Brian re-write the proposal to reflect what, in fact, was being requested and that he look at out-sourcing the function as opposed to bring on a 3/4 staff person to oversee this effort.

Dr. Friedlander expressed his gratitude to Jane Craven for chairing the General Resource Request Workgroup and he asked her to express the appreciation of the council to the members of the workgroup for their time and effort in completing its assignment.

**Faculty Development Workgroup:** Jack Ullom gave an overview of the top-third items that were ranked by the Faculty Development Workgroup. Dr. Ullom distributed to the council spreadsheets showing the rankings for one-time and ongoing requests. The council was impressed with the appearance of and use of colors in the handouts. Dr. Ullom described how the committee combined the faculty resource development specialist request and the expanded faculty development program. Dr. Ullom noted that no one-time resource requests were submitted to this workgroup.

**Student Success Workgroup:** Jack Ullom began to review the top-ranked items of the Student Success Workgroup. However, since several members of the council left the meeting early, Dr. Friedlander felt that it would not be appropriate to continue the presentations in their absence. Members of the council agreed that all members needed to be present for each of the presentations. If members of the council chose to not be present for all of the presentations, they should not be able to vote. Dr. Friedlander asked the council if they wanted to end the meeting and to invite Dr. Ullom and Keith McLellan back to the council to have them begin their presentations again at its next meeting. The council endorsed that recommendation and reiterated the importance of having all the members present for the entire meeting.

Dr. Friedlander reminded the council that its next meeting on March 20<sup>th</sup> would begin at 2:00 p.m. He asked Beverly Schwamm to schedule the presentations of the Student Success, Enrollment Management and Vocational workgroups from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. Dr. MacDougall will join the council at 3:00 p.m. to review his priorities for both one-time and ongoing PFE funding.

#### **4.0 Other Items**

There were no other items.

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.