

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**April 19, 2005
3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

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

ABSENT: B. Hamre, A. Serban

GUESTS: P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the March 15th CPC meeting.

M/S/C/ [Sullivan/McLellan] to approved the minutes of the March 15th CPC meeting. Tom Garey and Kathy Molloy abstained since they were not present at this meeting.

2.0 Announcements

- 2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that the final interviews for all of the new faculty positions have been completed and all of the first choice candidates have accepted other than for the English position which has yet to be offered.
- 2.2 Kathy Molloy gave a brief overview of the state Academic Senate meeting. She said that an issue she will take to the Senate is the discussion at the meeting concerning the student bill of rights which last year was called "Academic Freedom" [SB5].
- 2.3 Peter Haslund announced that a delegation of SBCC students spent a semester preparing to represent different countries at a "model" United Nations. They prepared as representatives of those countries and focused on three specific and contemporary issues that are actually be debated by the United Nations. Dr. Haslund proudly reported it was a very successful conference and that SBCC students took home for the first time the large award that says, "We are the best". Jack Friedlander added that this has been a terrific year for SBCC achievements
- 2.4 Peter Naylor commented that a resolution has been found to resolve the issue of the back pay for some English adjunct instructors. He said that it has been solved in a way that will be satisfactory for the faculty affected and he credited the administration for going beyond what they had to do to resolve this issue as well as the mutual cooperation of the English faculty and the IA.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Dates for College Plan summer planning sessions

CPC will meet on Monday, June 13th, Tuesday, June 14th and Friday, June 24th from 9:00 a.m. until noon in A218C to work on the College Plan 2005-08.

3.2 Input into items to include in the faculty/student survey to assess their support for proposed bond measure.

Jack Friedlander said that at the last meeting of CPC, the Council discussed the proposed bond measure, the college planning process (CPP), and the College Plan: 2005-2008. The Council recommended that each of these planning initiatives be integrated with one another and that each should be based on the common areas of focus/themes that John Romo presented to the Council: (1) student access; (2) student success; (3) the college's contributions to the economic, cultural, social vitality of the community; and (4) infrastructure (i.e., buildings, facilities, and faculty/staff support). Members of the Council recommended that another term be used to capture what is meant by "infrastructure." More specifically, the Council's recommendation is to use the major areas of focus to organize, identify, evaluate and prioritize proposed projects and resource requests in each of the institution's major planning initiatives (College Plan, CPC and proposed bond measure). Dr. Friedlander shared the Council's discussion with John Romo who appreciated the feedback from the Council. The second item that came from the discussion with respect to assessing support for the bond measure was to conduct an internal, anonymous survey of faculty and staff support for going forward with this initiative. Dr. Friedlander said what he and President Romo agreed was to develop a survey in the next week and asked the Council today to discuss any major items that should be asked in the survey. He discussed some of the "brainstorming" that was done at the Deans Council. Some suggestions for information to include in the survey to determine the degree of support as well as the survey offering some explanation of what it is they would be supporting.

Input from Deans Council was:

- Allow the faculty and staff to rank the importance of and their level of support for including each of the proposed projects on the bond measure.
- Provide faculty and staff the opportunity to suggest additional projects that they believe should be considered in the proposed bond measure.
- Explain why do we need a bond (in cover letter for the survey).
- Explain the expectations of faculty and staff to support a bond and ask them to indicate the extent to which they would contribute to each of the expectations identified.
- Talking points are needed to address the rationale for a bond measure and responses to the obvious questions members of the public may ask about the need for and affect of passing a bond measure (in cover letter for the survey).
- Ask faculty and staff that live in the college's service area if they would vote yes to pay for a property tax increase that will take place if the bond were approved. Ask respondents to rate the various amounts of property taxes they would be willing to support.

- Ask the faculty and staff to indicate if their friends/acquaintances that live in the college's service area would support this bond and, if so, how much in increased property taxes would they most likely be willing to approve? If not, why not?
-

Input from the Council on a survey was:

- In the cover letter provide a brief explanation of how bonds work and how they are funded. Identify the property tax implications associated with the amount of bond funds requested.
- For each of the projects included in the preliminary list of items to include in the bond, ask respondents to rate each item use a scale to assess their degree of support (strongly support to do not support).
- Provide respondents to the survey with the opportunity to identify additional projects to be included in the bond measure as well as an open-ended item encouraging them to offer their opinions and suggestions regarding the proposed bond measure.

Jack Friedlander briefly discussed the parking situation at the college indicating that the state will not provide any funds for a parking garage and that the estimated cost of building a 450 stall structure is about \$37,000 per parking space. The college is studying this problem and hopefully will have some short-term solutions by fall.

Dr. Friedlander asked that any further input be e-mailed to him.

4.0 Discussion Items

- 4.1 Continue ranking of items in the CPP potential Expense Reductions and Revenue Generation Summary reports.

The Council continued its discussion from last week on the items presented in the summary report and its initial ranking of tiers by the Executive Council.

5.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.