

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL

September 5, 1995
3:00 p.m. - A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, Chair, D. Barthelmess, L. Fairly, B. Hamre, C. Hanson, T. Garey, J. Peterson, K. O'Connor, D. Oroz, J. Romo, L. Auchincloss (for B. Hull)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made to approve the Minutes for the September 5, 1995 meeting by Dan Oroz, seconded by Lynda Fairly. The motion was approved with the corrections noting the presence of Liz Auchincloss (for Bill Hull) and the absence of Tom Garey at the meeting.

III. ACTION ITEMS: Hearing Stage

1. ***SBCC Information Resources Statement of Vision and Directions, 1995-2000***
Bill Hamre distributed copies of the *Statement of Vision and Directions, 1995-2000* developed by the College Computer Coordinating Committee. The document is an update from the Statement developed in 1991 and is the basis for SBCC's information technology planning through the year 2000. Mr. Hamre noted that 90% of the goals established in the Statement have been met. The Chair asked members and their constituents to review the document and to send any comments or concerns to Mr. Hamre before the next CPC meeting on September 19.
2. ***SBCC Policies for Student Use of Computers and Networks***
Bill Hamre distributed copies of the proposed policy developed by the Instructional Computer Planning Committee (ICPC). The policy has been approved by the College Computer Coordinating Committee and the Academic Senate. Concern was expressed that some sections of the policy, e.g., ***Enforcement***, are too general and that the policy should be reviewed to ensure

that it parallels the Student Services' Standards of Conduct guidelines. The proposed policy will be reviewed by Bill Hamre, Bill Cordero and George Gregg, revised as necessary and submitted to CPC on September 19 for further discussion/action.

III. REVIEW OF PRIMARY CPC OBJECTIVE

Dr. Friedlander identified the primary CPC objectives for 95-96:

- (1) Institutional Planning (Development of Statement of Institutional Directions and Timeline and Process for Developing Department/Unit/College Division Plans);
- (2) Review and Refine Measures of Institutional Effectiveness;
- (3) Complete Self-Study for Accreditation;
- (4) Review College Budget;
- (5) Project Redesign; and
- (6) Resource Allocations

IV. OVERVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Dr. Friedlander presented an overview of the various components of the College's planning process. A lively discussion took place on the need to streamline and more fully integrate the various components of the planning process. The components of the institutional planning process include:

- Vice Presidents' annual goals and objectives that are submitted to the college president
- SIDs
- Program reviews
- Department/unit three-year plans
- Committee goals and objectives
- Task force and ad hoc committee goals and objectives
- Goals and objectives resulting from the college's Self-Study for Accreditation
- Goals and objectives resulting from the college's Matriculation self-study and site visit
- Outcomes emerging from Project Redesign initiatives
- Institutional research
- Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness

Some members found the myriad of planning processes to be confusing and nearly all present expressed concern about the lack of time available to do a good job in completing each of the planning processes and attend to the growing demands on their time. A recommendation was made to consider establishing the College's planning process as the institution's 20th redesign project. The proposal included the following elements:

- Schedule an all-day meeting for CPC in October to critique existing processes, map the planning process and begin brainstorming new approaches to planning.
- Form an institutional planning redesign team this fall.
- Suspend planning activities until the results of the institutional planning redesign team are received, validated and approved for implementation.
- Spend the balance of the year implementing the processes identified in the institutional planning redesign project.

Dr. Friedlander agreed to discuss with the Cabinet the concerns identified with the College's planning process and the proposal to establish the institutional planning process as the 20th redesign project. The outcomes of the discussion with members of the Cabinet will be presented to members of CPC at the September 19 meeting.

V. INDICATORS OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Dr. Friedlander reported that review and critique of existing measures of institutional effectiveness identified in the Second Annual Comprehensive Accountability System and based on goals identified in the College's SID is in progress. Departments and units will be looking at how the stated measures of assessment (student access, success, participation and satisfaction, human resources, fiscal and physical resources) are to be used in program improvement. Mr. Hamre stated that he would send copies of the *Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness, Statement of Institutional Directions* and planning documents from 94-95 to assist units/departments in the planning process.

VI. ACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY

Bill Hamre and Janice Peterson have been assigned over-all responsibility for the development of the Accreditation Self-Study. The self-study must be completed by May 6, 1996. During the accreditation cycle the accreditation commission will be focusing on the Project Redesign activities the college has been engaged in and how the redesign project meets the eight accreditation standards. Members of CPC asked Mr. Hamre and Ms. Peterson for greater clarification on how the focus on Project Redesign would be used to meet the accreditation standards. Concern was expressed that we would be writing two reports, one to address each of the accreditation standards and a second report describing Project Redesign. Suggestions were made on how to keep the focus of the self-study on Project Redesign while meeting the requirement to address each of the accreditation standards. Janice Peterson asked members of CPC to give her feedback on the process she outlined for conducting the self-study for accreditation. Ms. Peterson and Mr. Hamre agreed to take the suggestions they received into account in refining the proposed process for completing the accreditation self-study. An updated draft of the

self-study process will be presented at the September 19 meeting of CPC.
Liz Auchincloss requested that the record reflect that the Classified State Employees Association (CSEA) is the agency representing classified employees under *Accreditation Standard 4 Faculty and Staff*.

VII. COLLEGE BUDGET

Dr. Hanson distributed copies of the 95-96 ADOPTION BUDGET and gave an overview of the college's overall budget. Revenues under the 95-96 Budget are projected at \$40 million. According to the Dr. Hanson, the fiscal outlook for the College is not quite as bleak as expected. The Adoption Budget Sheets reflect an additional 1994-95 revenue anticipated but not budgeted (from general apportionment, Basic Skills, etc.) totaling \$1,084,239. However, we are not assured that the property tax will come in as budgeted at the state level. The College expects to receive additional 1995-96 revenue (from COLA and Basic Skills) of \$1,336,412.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

cc: Cabinet, Deans/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate, Instructor's Association, CSEA, Classified Council, College Information, *The Channels*