

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**March 16, 2004
3:00 – 4:30 PM
Room A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, K. McLellan, P. Haslund, T. Garey, G. Garroll, E. Frankel, L. Rose, A. Serban, L. Auchincloss, R. Nadanyi

ABSENT: J. Jackson

GUESTS: L. Griffin, P. Naylor, S. Coffield, K. Hughes

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

Jack Friedlander announced that Ben Partee went with five of our students for a march on Sacramento to protest the fee increase and reduced funding for community colleges. He said the event was phenomenal and was largest turnout ever in terms of a march on Sacramento.

Jack also pointed out a nice article in the "Career" supplement of the *Santa Barbara News-Press* about Peter Naylor; how he got into teaching and what it means to him.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 There were no information items.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Classified positions on hold and the implications of not filling those positions:

Sue Ehrlich distributed a list of the unfilled classified positions and a description by the supervisors of the areas of how the work for those positions is being accomplished. She identified the names of the people who were in these positions prior to their being vacated. Joe Sullivan will provide an accounting of the savings from not filling those positions.

4.2 2004-05 Budget Development

A. Budget projections for 2004-05 (*Sullivan*)

Joe distributed a current budget projection for the unrestricted General Fund Revenue for 2004-05. It compares the projected budget for 2003-04 and the projected budget for 2004-05 and what has actually been budgeted 2004-05. Joe defined “deficit factor” for the Council as after all the revenues are actually collected by the state, if there is a shortfall, i.e., property tax, student fees, then the state applies a “deficit factor” to the revenue we are suppose to receive; a percentage less of what we were projected to receive. He said it has nothing to do with contributions on a local basis but a deficit system-wide. He anticipates an approximate two-percent deficit factor this year, however, we have not included this potential reduction in funding in our budget at this juncture.

Joe also distributed and discussed the updated model for the two-year comparison of the unrestricted General Fund which listed the audited 2002-03 actuals, the adjusted budget for 2003-04 based on the enacted budget and the increase/decrease to the Governor’s January budget proposal’s reflected in the rough-cut budget for 2004-05.

4.3 Review criteria for submitting requests for budget augmentations

Jack indicated that there are two broad criteria to be considered for building next year’s budget:

- A. The item is essential to meet identified health and safety concerns; and
- B. It is essential to the operation of a core program or college function that, if not addressed, will result in serious problems in carrying out critical basic tasks (including consideration of items that were cut from the 2003-04 college budget).

Jack said he is working with the deans who are working closely with their respective departments to identify needs that fit into one of these two categories. The first attempt by each VP would be to look within their distinct expenditure patterns of the 4000 and 5000 accounts and as they look in areas where funds haven’t been expended on a consistent basis in those areas, determine whether those funds could be reallocated within divisions to meet other needs. If the resource need cannot be met within a VP’s budget, it could be brought to CPC and ranked to identify which of those items meet criteria A *and/or* B. The areas that were identified at the last meeting that were priorities were: (1) sabbaticals; (2) \$1.2m for construction; (3) \$1.8M for equipment; and (4) what we need to meet our growth cap, which would most likely fall into criteria “B”. Jack said that he would sort the requests as ongoing and one-time requests.

4.4 Budget development timeline

Joe Sullivan provided an updated budget development timeline. It was noted that CPC’s future meetings will be held on April 6th, April 27th, May 4th and May 25th (10:00 to noon, A218C).

5.0 Action Items

5.1 Smoke-Free Workplace Policy 2510 (*taken out of order as first item*)

Rose Nadanyi, Associated Student Senate representative, reported that the Student Senate does not support the proposed designated smoking areas policy because they

feel it would be a waste of money and could not be patrolled effectively. They do support getting the word out that this is not just policy but state law. To enforce the 20-ft. rule, she suggested that ashtrays be moved away from the buildings. Overall, she said students are not very interested in following policies and it is unlikely that students would observe either the designated smoking areas or the 20-ft. rule.

Liz Auchincloss said the CSEA agrees with the Associated Students, that people will not go to the designated smoking areas, especially in inclement weather. However, she said that they agreed that some effort should be made to enforce it at least by a verbal communication by Security if they are in the presence of someone who is smoking in undesignated areas.

Peter Haslund reported that the Academic Senate voted by a small margin to support the designated smoking area policy. He said the Senate prefers using the word “facilities” as opposed to “buildings” as it is more inclusive of the structures on campus. They also acknowledged the problem of enforcement. There was also a concern of enforcement not only for employees but also for guests who come on campus. Tom Garey added a concern about creating a liability for the district if the 20-ft. law is not enforced and an injury should incur as a consequence. Peter said there is also the issue of funding the signage for the designated areas. Joe said that when we are in compliance with the law, there would be funds available for signage. He also said what would be most effective is voluntary compliance, but Security will have a card stating the policy to hand to people who are not in compliance.

Dawn Dunn, who manages the Santa Barbara County’s Public Health Tobacco Prevention Settlement Program, spoke to the Council. She indicated that any policy we pass would want to reference *AB846*, which is the state law requiring a minimum 20-ft. no smoking area away from building doors and windows. To achieve compliance, we would have to have a sign at every entrance. She said the state is making metal signs that would be available to us.

Keith McLellan asked that CPC be provided an approximation of the cost (e.g., signs, cards) of implementing this policy.

M/S/C (Haslund/Garey) to postpone until April 6th the action of the smoking policy to allow the Academic Senate to make suggestions for a language changes.

6.0 Adjournment

M/S/C [Rose/Frankel] to adjourn the meeting.