

**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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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, we've 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.