

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, September 3, 2013  
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.  
A218C**

**Minutes**

**PRESENT:**

L. Gaskin, President and Chair  
L. Auchincloss, President, CSEA  
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology  
P. Butler, Chair Planning & Resources Committee  
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research & Planning  
P. English, VP Human Resources  
J. Friedlander, Executive VP Ed Programs  
E. Katzenson, ASB President  
J. McPheter, Classified Staff Representative  
M. Medel, Supervisor Bargaining Unit  
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative  
K. Neufeld, President-elect, Academic Senate  
K. O'Connor, Academic Senate Representative  
C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative  
J. Sullivan, VP, Business Services  
L. Vasquez, Academic Senate Representative  
D. Watkins, Managers Group Representative

**GUESTS:**

C. Alscheimer, AS Liaison  
N. Mahaffey, Tutorial Center  
J. Pike, Director Learning Resource Center  
A. Scharper, Dean Ed Programs  
L. Stark, President Instructors Association  
J. Zavas, Assistant Controller

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

**2.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

College Planning Council (CPC) members introduced themselves to those assembled. CPC has a new member, Elie Katzenson, Associated Student Body President. Lyndsay Maas introduced the new Assistant Controller, James Zavas.

Cindy Salazar announced that Michael Medel was newly married. Congratulations were given.

**3.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

**3.1 Replacement of Budgeted Positions – P. English**

There were no positions to report on.

**3.2 Review of Proposed Adopted Budget – J. Sullivan (Att. 3.2)**

Mr. Sullivan distributed an updated version of Attachment 3.2, Assumptions Used to Develop the 2013-14 Adopted Budget. Changes were highlighted in red (previous) and blue (new). The presentation began with a review of Revenue. Mr. Sullivan noted that a deficit factor was not included in the budget; that may change with the finalized Adopted

Budget. The college has not received guidance from the state with regard to funding projected as a consequence of the dissolution of the state's redevelopment agencies. Dr. Gaskin commented on item 2b under Revenues. She clarified that while growth/restoration of FTES is available to us, the college won't recognize it until after it's been accrued. In addition, the college will need to make up the 680 FTES borrowed from summer 2013. She observed that, to date, we've experienced a 4% increase in FTES projections.

Mr. Sullivan briefly reviewed Expenses noting two changes. The first was item #4 in which employer contributions toward health benefits were increased from \$777,000 to \$858,000 as stated on the updated Budget Assumptions handout. The second change was to item #11. Mr. Sullivan stated that the estimated cost for the Ewing study was included in the Adopted Budget. Further clarification was given with regard to the Ewing study's management reclassification and salary table recalibration. It was explained that the management reclassification cost of \$157,800 referred to the increase to bring management and confidential salaries up to current market status. The salary table recalibration cost of \$958,900 referred to the total increase amount needed to adjust the classified salary tables based on current market surveys.

Transfers were briefly reviewed. Mr. Sullivan mentioned that in item #1, "matriculation" will be corrected on the final Adopted Budget to read "Student Success and Support Programs."

Discussion ensued. Per a request, it was agreed to provide a breakout of the recalibration of the salary tables.

Dr. Gaskin commented that the litany of expenses (Expense items #1-15) that are factored into the Adopted Budget are significant and make a statement that the institution values and believes in all its employees. She added that the management classifications had not been assessed since 2005.

The 2013-14 Adopted Budget will be taken to the Board of Trustees for action on September 12, 2013.

### 3.3 CPC Retreat Notes 08/05/2013 – L. Gaskin (Att. 3.3)

Dr. Gaskin explained that the CPC Retreat notes were a compilation of the discussion regarding our capacity as an institution. It was agreed to replace "Modeling enrollments across programs" under Opportunities with "Managing/projecting enrollments across programs."

## 4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 4.1 Revisions to Core Principles: First Reading – L. Gaskin (Att. 4.1)

This was the first reading for Revisions to Core Principles. The second reading will take place at the September 17, 2013 CPC meeting. Dr. Gaskin explained that the Academic Senate took the opportunity last year to examine the college's core principles. Attachment 4.1, Revision to Core Principles is a replication of the college's current core principles incorporating the Academic Senate's recommended changes.

#### 4.2 Program Review Timeline: First Reading – R. Else (Att. 4.2)

Mr. Else remarked that this is the last year of the three year Program Review cycle. Important dates on the timeline include Monday, Oct. 7, 2013, the beginning of the cycle which is scheduled one week after the October 1, 2013 CPC meeting's second reading of the Strategic Directions and Goals. Mr. Else explained that the Strategic Directions and Goals which were generated during the Integrated Planning process will be incorporated as an optional website link on Program Review this year. The link will consist of a new column adjacent to the College Plan link, and that next year the College Plan link will transition to Strategic Directions and Goals. Dr. Gaskin remarked that Accreditation will find the transition meaningful as the institution seamlessly transitions from the College Plan to Strategic Directions and Goals.

November 1, 2013 is the deadline for Program Review submissions. The end of the cycle, April 15, 2014, is fixed to have Program Review finished in time for the budgeting process. He clarified that the committees involved in reviewing resource requests, District Technology Committee (DTC), Instructional Technology Committee (ITC), Planning & Resources (P&R), are responsible for scheduling their own meetings in order to meet the deadline of March 24, 2014, the date scheduled for the EC Review of resource requests. Committee feedback is expected by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 21, 2014.

In response to a question, Kenley Neufeld explained that the Program Review and Evaluation Committee (PEC) will hold its first meeting on Thursday, Sept. 5, 2013. At that time, the committee will review its charge and determine what its role may be with regard to the Program Review process.

It was agreed to change the date for the DTC Review deadline to March 21, 2014 to better align with DTC's meeting schedule.

#### 4.3 Review of the Modular Master Plan – J. Sullivan (Att. 4.3)

Mr. Sullivan gave a brief history of the portable buildings on campus. He explained that the California Coastal Commission had issued a notice of four violations, the most significant of which was with regard to 44 unapproved portable units. The Modular Master Plan is a seven year plan consisting of five phases for the removal of the portable buildings. Phase 1 includes converting swing space into usable space, and moving programs that were in portables that have fallen into disrepair into better portable buildings. Phase 2 (page 3, Attachment 4.3) shows the buildings that will be removed (in blue). It was noted that some of the buildings will be sold to buyers who will remove them from campus; more rundown buildings will be dismantled and discarded. Phase 3 consists of moving programs from ECC1, ECC2 and ECC3 into the West Campus Classroom Building and preparing the portables' sites for the East Campus Classroom Building. It was noted that both Phase 4 and 5 are dependent upon the bond measure passing.

#### 4.4 Overview of Potential Initiatives to Meet the College's Enrollment Targets – J. Friedlander (Att. 4.4)

Item 4.4 was discussed after item 4.6. Dr. Friedlander presented an overview of proposed strategies for increasing the number of FTES needed to receive full state enrollment funding. He reviewed some of the more noteworthy strategies, beginning with Strategies to Increase Student Course Completion, Persistence and Goal Achievement Rates. Specific strategies in this category included ESP, Transfer Success Programs, GE Learning Communities and CE-to-credit initiatives, as well as requiring students on academic

disqualification to take a one-year one-unit course on career and educational planning before they can re-enroll; offering two six-week summer sessions starting in 2015; and, offering a three to four day optional orientation to new students prior to the term start. Dr. Friedlander noted that this last strategy is a major student success strategy used at other colleges.

Curriculum Initiatives Designed to Serve Under-served Populations or New Populations of Students was next reviewed. Dr. Friedlander discussed the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Institute which offers job skills training for those students wanting to re-enter or advance in the work force. He also examined the Career and Educational Planning Course which the college will be offering over the upcoming winter break. Dr. Friedlander clarified that the purpose of the state's funding of Continuing Education is to prepare students for employment and/or transfer into a credit program.

A brief discussion ensued after the introduction of the Academic Amnesty program which will be called the Fresh Start Program at SBCC. It is for students on academic probation who left the college three or more years ago and who now want to re-enter.

Dr. Friedlander reiterated that the challenge of the college is to grow FTES and to grow with a purpose. He stressed that the biggest challenges to the college with regard to these goals are limited classroom space and parking.

Dr. Gaskin added that the integration of Continuing Education into Educational Programs has had many positive effects.

Kathy O'Connor added that more faculty need to be aware and trained on the On Track Program.

#### 4.5 Prioritizing Campus Facility Needs – L. Gaskin (Att. 4.5)

Item 4.5 was taken out of order. The topic of developing a set of criteria to prioritize the campus facility projects was discussed at the August 5, 2013 CPC Retreat. Attachment 4.5 provided a timeline for the process. It was agreed to make the following changes:

September 18 through November 11 (CPC members determine their priority) changed to September 18 through November 18.

Week of November 11 (CPC members register their priority) changed to the Week of November 18.

November 19 (CPC reviews compiled prioritization as a first reading) changed to December 3.

December 10 (CPC takes action to recommend prioritization) will be the second reading.

The prioritization will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the January Board meeting.

CPC members Kenley Neufeld, Joyce McPheter, Priscilla Butler, Jack Friedlander and Michael Medel volunteered to serve on a subcommittee established to develop the criteria to guide prioritization. The subcommittee is expected to bring its results to the September 17, 2013 CPC meeting.

#### 4.6 Utilizing the Aspen Award – L. Gaskin

Item 4.6 was taken out of order. Dr. Gaskin informed CPC that she is required to submit a report to the Aspen Institute by September 15, 2013, sharing with them how we intend to use our prize money. She reported that the concept of an endowment with the SBCC Foundation was the most prevalent choice among CPC members at the August Retreat. She noted that the benefit of an endowment is that it can continue to grow and give. It was therefore agreed to keep the funds with the SBCC Foundation accrued interest from the funds in an endowment. Dr. Gaskin will request of CPC, in spring 2013-14, that it begin to identify how the funds are to be allocated for first use in 2014-15.

#### 4.7 Budget Development for 2014/15 – L. Gaskin

This item was carried over to the September 17, 2013 CPC meeting.

### **5.0 ACTION ITEMS**

### **6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

6.1 The next regularly scheduled CPC meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 17, 2013 in Room 218C, 3:00-4:30 p.m.