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I. **CALL TO ORDER**  
Ms. Higdon called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MARCH 13, 2008**  
A slight modification to the minutes was requested and Ms. Kaufman read out the requested modification. The modification requested was: IT requested that building names have a unique, abbreviated two (2) letter designations.

Mr. Fronke requested that additional wording be added to the minutes regarding the Business Education concerns. Ms. Kaufman will contact Mr. Fronke with regard to the revised wording for the minutes. Once this has been completed, Ms. Kaufman will send out the revised minutes.

Mr. Farmer moved that the minutes of March 13, 2008 be approved as amended. Dr. Mayfield seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The following abstained: Dr. Chambers, Toni Grijalva, Dr. Johnson, Lee Krichmar and Jenine Nolan.

III. **CIS LOCATION**  
Mr. Farmer announced that the CIS Department will move from the Liberal Arts Building & Business Education Building and consolidate into the Physical Sciences Building temporarily until the new CLO #2 building is built. This recommendation came as a result of a discussion held in the Liberal Arts Users Group meeting. Mr. Negrete approached Ms. Shepley after the Liberal Arts Users Group meeting and asked if it would be possible that the CIS Department only move twice, rather than three times. Ms. Shepley agreed to look further into his suggestion. After presenting the above solution, Mr. Farmer who presented it to Mr. Negrete and Dr. Rose, all agreed that this was a workable solution. Mr. Farmer added that this allows for the consolidation of all the CIS labs located in the Liberal Arts Building and the Business Education Building into one building. Ms. Shepley added that by moving to the Physical Sciences Building, this would give the College the opportunity to create four labs that are right-sized as well as bringing in the lab that is currently in the BE Building. This will provide a more appropriately sized space in a temporary location that CIS will occupy until their permanent home becomes available.

Mr. Nance asked if Ms. Shepley was aware of the structure of the lab that is in BE-12 at the present time. Ms. Shepley replied that yes she is aware and has walked the physical spaces with Mr. Negrete. Mr. Negrete showed her all the areas the CIS Department currently has. She noted that the Physical Science space has not been designed completely. Further discussion needs to take place regarding what type of work would be required to move into the Physical Sciences Building. Mr. Nance noted that a design had been created by Mr. Negrete to consolidate the entire CIS Department, offices and labs into SS138, SS139, SS140 and SS141.

A discussion ensued regarding the CIS location with the following comments:
Moving CIS to a new location allows the Liberal Arts faculty located in the Santa Barbara Building to move into the faculty office space in the Liberal Arts Building.

It is hoped that by moving BE-12 this will help with some of the scheduling issues that Professor Fronke discussed with the CTC at the last meeting.

It was noted that electrical and HVAC issues need to be worked out in the Physical Sciences Building. It was also noted that the cost analysis to do this work has not been completed as yet.

It was confirmed that the current proposal is to move the CIS to the Physical Sciences Building which will provide space for twelve faculty members who are currently located in the Santa Barbara Building. These faculty members would then have office space in the new Liberal Arts Building.

Concerns were voiced regarding the proposed permanent location for the CIS Department. It appears that there would be a disconnect between lab space and faculty offices. It was noted that the new building has not yet been designed, but the intention would be to put faculty offices near where their classrooms are.

As a result of concerns raised about the “homelessness” and the way in which the CIS Department is spread around campus, a consideration was requested. This consideration is to put CIS on one of the floors of the new Liberal Arts Building and put DSPS in the proposed location for CIS (CLO #2).

A question was asked if at what point does the College say “time-out” on the current master plan and re-think its plans especially in light of the current HPEA, Business Division and CIS concerns. It appears that it was developed without input from the appropriate areas. Ms. Higdon replied that you cannot take a “time-out”, but that the master plan is a living document. It is reviewed yearly. There are multiple construction projects both at DSA and the State that the campus would not want to stop. The College is under direction from the Board and the community to make certain the College continues to make progress on the GO Bond projects that the community voted for.

IV. LIBERAL ARTS NEW BUILDING

Mr. Ernest began his discussion by noting that the CIS location discussion was an excellent example of the disconnect in this top-down decision making process. The architect (tBP) and the decision makers in this process should have been exercising shared governance. The CIS Department should have been consulted regarding what their needs are and how those needs could be met. They were mandated to join the Liberal Arts Users Group at the “11th hour”, which he believes does them a disservice and is disrespectful to have them come in on Friday’s to make the user group meetings. When Mr. Ernest received the revision to the CTC agenda he was dismayed to see the CIS Location agenda item. His reaction was that, once again, a top-down decision was made where the Liberal Arts Division was marginalized from the process. He believes the CIS Department was also marginalized from the process. He felt that it was a decision that was tantamount to a vote of no confidence in the members of the CTC committee and the faculty in general. He added that although he believes it is a good
decision to move CIS, he wonders why the CTC committee shouldn’t be offended by the
decision making in this process that marginalizes meaningful participation. Mr. Ernest
made reference to a facilities project flowchart developed by the Facilities Planning
Committee in 2002 which was a model for proposed construction on campus. Mr. Farmer took issue with Mr. Ernest’s comments and indicated: 1) the change is where CIS stays temporarily. The CIS Department was not supposed to be permanently located in the Liberal Arts Building; and 2) the CIS Location change emerged out of a comment that Mr. Negrete made to Ms. Shepley. For it to be described as top-down decision making absent discussion with the appropriate parties is inaccurate. The plan was to bring the revised CIS location to the CTC committee. One of the reasons the previous Liberal Arts Users Group was cancelled was so it could be brought to this committee for discussion. Mr. Ernest replied that he was just sharing his perception. He is not privy to all the mechanics that have been going on regarding the discussion.

For clarification, the following are excerpts from past CTC meetings. These excerpts
will be indented and in *italics*. Mr. Ernest’s comments will be represented in bold.

Mr. Ernest referenced the following excerpt from the April 19, 2007 CTC committee.
This portion of the minutes references the committee structure for the Liberal Arts
Building Project.

> Ms. Higdon noted that the architectural selection for the Liberal Arts Building renovation was forthcoming and requested volunteer(s) from the Campus Transformation Committee. This began a discussion of the committee structure for such types of selection committees. The committee structure is as follows:

- Appropriate Vice President of the area being built/renovated
- Appropriate Dean(s) of the area being built/renovated
- Department Chair(s)
- Vice President of Business Services
- Director of Physical Plant
- The District’s CA/OR
- The College’s Master Plan Architect (as needed)
- 1 or 2 representatives from the Campus Transformation Committee (CTC)

Roger Ernest agreed to serve as the CTC committee member on
the architectural services for the Liberal Arts Building renovation.
The committee had no objections.

Mr. Ernest referenced the October 4, 2007 meeting of CTC:

> Ms. Shepley presented to the committee a power-point presentation which outlined the updated 2007 Master Plan. She indicated that the major change to the 2007
Master Plan was focused on the Liberal Arts Building. Ms. Higdon explained to the committee that a team of architects and engineers did a detailed analysis of the Liberal Arts Building to understand the required scope of work required by DSA in order to renovate the building. Mr. Ernest noted that the architectural selection committee was comprised exclusively of Liberal Arts Faculty. He was reminded that the CIS Department and DSPS were not included because those departments were not on the “horizon.” The original budget for the renovation of the Liberal Arts Building was $4.3 million dollars. Mr. Ernest noted that approximately five to six firms were interviewed. He was surprised that it was going to cost $17 million dollars to renovate the Liberal Arts Building. A question comes to mind, why was it that none of those other architects indicated that the project could not be completed for $4.3 million dollars. One could say that perhaps the architects did not realize the full scope of the project until after they assessed the building themselves. If he was going to submit a proposal for building, he certainly would look into the detail and see what he was committing his company to. In all fairness, they may have come back and done this, we don’t know. After the detailed analysis was completed, the new cost to renovate the building was budgeted at more than $17 million dollars. It was explained that this was the cost to bring the Liberal Arts Building up to the new building codes (new building codes will be in effect beginning January 1, 2008). It was asked how much it would cost to tear down the Liberal Arts Building and build a new building. The answer would be that it would cost approximately $15 million dollars to build a new building ($2 million less than a renovation). With the possibility of building a new Liberal Arts Building, the sequencing of other projects was reviewed. Mr. Ernest noted that at the last Liberal Arts Users group meeting he asked Ms. Shepley if the $15 million dollars included the addition of the DSPS 5000 square feet of the 20,000 square feet for the building. She replied yes. That meant that the decision to include DSPS in the Liberal Arts Building had been made at that point. This change provided the College an opportunity to review all College needs. The opportunity to relocate DSPS close to the one-stop shop was identified. Thus, the sequencing that was
given a closer look was moving DSPS closer to the Student Services area.

Dr. Vela reminded the committee that the master plan is a living document and every time something changes it gives the College an opportunity to look at the whole picture and not have tunnel vision. This was an opportunity for the College to refresh our minds again about all the other needs on campus and the projects that are still on the table. With the detailed analysis completed on the Liberal Arts Building, the College realized this was an opportunity to maximize our resources.

Mr. Ernest continued by indicating that the Liberal Arts Building project is a large construction project and the above language does not explicitly indicate those 5000 square feet of DSPS is moving into the Liberal Arts. It does not note any conversations with the appropriate parties regarding space requirements.

Dr. Vela added that in order to fund the new Liberal Arts Building, money was re-distributed from other projects and from contingency.

A question was asked about the square footage of the proposed new Liberal Arts Building. While an exact square footage is unknown at this time, it was noted that it is important to look at the utilization of labs to maximize the utilization of the high-tech center and not have valuable resources go under-utilized. Ms. Shepley added that all buildings are right-sized to ensure that the entire campus is developed to state standards.

Dr. Vela closed by saying that the proposed new Liberal Arts Building does not change the master plan, Mr. Ernest noted that moving DSPS and leaving CIS in the proposed new Liberal Arts Building was contrary to the master plan at that time, it is a recommendation to build a new building instead of remodeling. In order to do this, the College has to reduce some of the formerly dedicated funds from signage and landscaping, but not away from existing classroom space. She asked the committee for any objections to the proposed 2007 master plan. No objections were made by the committee. Dr. Vela stated that the updated 2007 master plan, as just reviewed by the Campus Transformation Committee, would be presented to the Board at their October 17, 2007 meeting.
Mr. Ernest noted that he had no realization that Ms. Shepley was going to present the Liberal Arts Building as a replacement of Liberal Arts with DSPS. An excerpt from the October 17, 2007 Board of Trustees meeting:

Consideration of Approval of the Updated Campus Transformation Implementation Plan

Dr. Vela introduced Deborah Shepley tBP/Architecture, who gave a presentation that outlined the changes to the Campus Transformation Implementation Plan. After discussion, it was moved by Mr. Moore and seconded by Dr. Edmiston to approve the Updated Campus Transformation Implementation Plan. The vote for approval was unanimous (6-0-1).

According to Mr. Ernest’s perspective, Ms. Shepley understood that she had approval from the CTC committee. He believes that the language was very ambiguous. A decision making process needs to be developed that clearly defines every step, every aspect of that building. He added that he is interested in product, and he believes students are interested in product. They want to have buildings that make sense, buildings that should function as they should function.

Mr. Ernest indicated that he spoke with Dr. Follett about possible location for DSPS and he really gained insight into what it is that they require. An excerpt from the September 13, 2006 CTC meeting:

September 13, 2006
- Dr. Follett inquired if the details regarding the student services consolidation in the Administration Building were available to the involved parties. She is concerned that the budgeted number shown on the ROM does not include feedback of what each user group would like to see in the configuration. Ms. Shepley indicated that no specific details have been done because user group meetings have not been held. What is known is that administrative functions in the administration building are being moved to make room for some reconfiguration of student service functions that are currently held there as well as provide space to incorporate DSPS functions. Mr. Ernest noted that this excerpt is in regard to DSPS moving from the Administration Building now, to at one point prior to this, the Physical Science Building until that was erased. It is a plea from DSPS to talk to user group.
Mr. Ernest continued his discussion by noting that after the first meeting of the Liberal Arts User Group, he e-mailed Ms. Higdon with some questions and concerns. He indicated that some of the concerns were answered subsequently, but there is one overriding question that needs to be answered. The question is, how can the Liberal Arts Division respond to the concern that having DSPS located in the Liberal Arts Building will not have negative impact on the Liberal Arts Division, specifically in the allocation and location of classrooms and offices. Why has there been no discussion of alternative solutions to meet the needs of Liberal Arts, CIS and DSPS? Ms. Higdon replied that in terms of the allocation of space that answer in details was provided at the 2nd Liberal Arts user group meeting. In terms of the location of space, that is an issue for the user group to work on. She noted that she does take issue with the assumption of the levels of the building. She indicated that what she heard at the user group meetings is don’t assume anything about the building; the users have to meet and discuss before an end product can be agreed upon.

Mr. Ernest suggested that the Liberal Arts Building User Groups be suspended until a determination is made regarding the location of DSPS. This could only happen with a discussion between the area managers and representatives from the Liberal Arts Division. Ms. Higdon recommended that the College not suspend the Liberal Arts Users group meetings. There was much discussion among the committee members and guests of the committee regarding the reasons why DSPS would be suited for an alternate location other than the Liberal Arts Building. In closing it was agreed that the Liberal Arts User Group will continue to meet. If there are such opposing issues that cannot be resolved, then those issues will be brought back to the CTC committee for further discussion.

V. MASTER PLAN
Due to time constraints, this agenda item was not discussed.

VI. NEXT MEETING: APRIL 17, 2008 @ 3:30 P.M.
The next CTC meeting is scheduled for April 17, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room.

VII. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR
Ms. Welliver noted that the HPEA issues have been put on hold a couple of times because of previous commitments of HPEA faculty and staff. She requested that the HPEA concerns be agendized for the next meeting.

Mr. Ernest requested that the IPP/FPP’s be revisited. He would like to review the content and language in the FPP’s. He noted that he was shocked to hear that once an FPP is approved that the building could not change locations. Ms. Higdon replied that you won’t find that specific language in the FPP. That’s a rule that is established by the Chancellor’s Office. Mr. Ernest continued by stating that he had spoken to Theater staff and they indicated to him that they had not been consulted with regard to the location of the new theater. They had only been asked about adjacency issues. Mr. Ernest noted that the location of the Theater is paramount. He added that one of the
rationales given for the proposed location of the Theater was that it was going to be close to WMT and would provide cross-curricular opportunities. This is not true. There is no cross-curricular activity between the Theater and WMT. He further stated that the Theater staff are very dismayed about the Theater location. Ms. Higdon replied to these statements by stating that if there is an issue with a particular area on campus, she would like to hear from the representative of that specific area. Mr. Fronke added that if Theater cannot be moved, then perhaps the committee should move forward. When Mr. Fronke spoke earlier in the meeting about taking a “time-out” he explained that he didn’t want to take a time-out on projects that are cast in stone, only those projects that are not. Mr. Ernest explained that the reason he spoke about the Theater location was that Dr. Vela, at a previous CTC meeting,* asked committee members for suggestions of where to move the CDC. Ms. Nolan spoke up and added that as the manager of the CDC she has not been asked about another proposed CDC location. She stated for the record that she does not have a problem with the current proposed location for the CDC. She does not know of a better location. It was noted that changing the proposed location for the CDC would not happen without serious input from the CDC.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Excerpt of minutes from the 02/21/08 CTC meeting.

* In closing this discussion, Dr. Vela noted that this continues to be a very complex issue and needs to be further reviewed. In recap the following is suggested:

- **HPEA Division would like to keep the old soccer field.**
  - If the old soccer field stays in its location, then another location for the same number of parking spaces would need to be found.

- **Move the CDC to another location.**
  - Suggested locations for the CDC are: where the current Physical Science Building resides; strawberry fields; near Campus Police/Avalon; and near Health Occupations.

- **Committee members were asked to bring back ideas on how to meet the HPEA requests without losing parking spaces and identify a location for the Child Development Center (CDC).**