

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

October 16, 2007
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Buckelew, J. Sullivan, B. Partee, I. Alarcon, S. Broderick,
T. Garey, G. Thielst, K. Molloy, L. Auchincloss, M. Guillen, C. Ramirez

ABSENT: P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, D. Cooper

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the September 4th and October 2nd CPC meetings.

M/S/C [Guillen/Auchincloss] to approve the minutes of the September 4th CPC meeting. Pablo Buckelew abstained.

M/S/C [Molloy/Auchincloss] to approve the minutes of the October 2nd CPC meeting with the following corrections:

- Mike Guillen was *not* present at the meeting as the minutes reflected.
- Pg. 2, Para. 3 should read: "John Romo said the earliest time that the Board could go out for a bond would be November ~~2007~~ 2008."

B. Buckelew, M. Guillen, K. Molloy and J. Sullivan abstained.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Jack Friedlander announced that at the Board Study Session members of the Board expressed their support for the proposal to hire a consultant to conduct a poll to determine the level of support in the community for a bond. Questions will be formulated from the capital construction projects which we have identified to see which ones do or do not resonate with potential voters. The results of this opinion poll will be provided to us in December. The earliest we can go for a bond would be in November 2008.

2.2 The governor signed legislation to release the Basic Skills/ESL funding. Jack Friedlander said he didn't see any major changes that would affect the approach we were planning to take in allocating these categorical funds.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0 Discussion items

4.1 Bond in-service follow-up and status report.

Jack Friedlander inquired for John Romo if anyone had feedback on the bond presentation by the consultants. Liz Auchincloss felt it was well presented. Pablo Buckelew thought it was very well done for two reasons: (1) we were informed as to the number of colleges that have passed bonds; and (2) the positive approach the consultants take in their process of recommending whether we go for a bond. He was very impressed by the consultants, thought they were knowledgeable, and that they gave a very good presentation.

4.2 Priorities and cost estimates for capital construction projects

Jack Friedlander said John Romo and the Board have formed a workgroup to meet with the consultants for the purpose of developing questions to be asked in the poll. The questions will be designed to gauge the degree of support for the projects for which we are considering including in the bond measure. We will look at public support for all the priority one and two capital construction projects for 2008-2011, but not include for bond measure consideration the projects for 2012-2014 which are primarily the priority threes. Dr. Friedlander reported that several of the deans asked why funding to pay for the District's portion of the Administration building modernization would not be included in the proposed bond measure given the intra-dependencies in the space allocations/proposed uses between the Humanities and the Administration modernization projects. They also asked where the money to pay for the college's match for the Administration building modernization would come from if not included in a bond. It was their understanding that if the next proposed state bond was approved it would fund both of those projects. Joe Sullivan responded that we don't have the "swing" space to do both buildings concurrently. He said the scheduling of the Administration Building is to follow Drama/Music, Physical Science, SoMA and Humanities so it would be at least five years out. He also said that we will not limit the polling to priority one and two items.

Kathy Molloy questioned the ranking of the capital construction projects as the ranking by the Academic Senate was not reflected in the handout. Joe Sullivan said what is listed is not just the priority 1 and 2 items but a combination of our priorities along with projects for which the funding from the state and/or legal ADA requirements are in the planning stages. He said we will see how these projects poll with the community. Ms. Molloy said the language used in the poll can affect the priorities. Joe Sullivan commented that Ms. Molloy is on the committee to work with the consultants on the language to be used in the polling. Mr. Sullivan said what is on our list is an estimate of our needs through 2012. The general classroom building and the multi-disciplinary center are no longer on our 5-year plan with the state because the Coastal Commission will not allow us to build any more buildings after SoMA. It will be discussed in committee on whether to pull these two buildings from our list. Jack

Friedlander said that ideally we would have a classroom/office building that would offset the need for as many temporary buildings as we could remove. Joe Sullivan responded that for a variety of reasons it may be very difficult to gain Coastal Commission approval for a new classroom/office building. He said there is \$8.3m in unfunded major maintenance projects that can be prioritized however we want. Each year we put \$1.2m from the General Fund into this account.

4.3 College Plan: 2008-2011: Draft of the challenges, opportunities and priorities identified by the Executive Council

Jack Friedlander said that in developing the new college plan we need to take into account the major challenges, opportunities that are likely to affect the college in the next few years. EC identified the major overarching challenges and priorities that need to permeate our thinking in developing the college plan. The major priorities identified by EC are:

- Preparing for the college's accreditation site visit in Fall 2009
- Major construction projects in progress or upcoming
- Maintaining strong enrollments in a climate of declining high school enrollments and no growth
- Continuously improving student success

The Council reviewed each section of EC's draft of major priorities, challenges and opportunities and in doing so made a number of suggested changes, additions and deleting. Jack Friedlander and Tom Garey will refine the language outside of the Council meeting and present it at the next CPC meeting.

4.4 Evaluation of the College Plan: 2005-08: *Jack Friedlander*

This item was not discussed.

4.5 Approach to completing the College Plan: 2008-2011

This item was not discussed.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.