

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, October 7, 2008
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
A218C
Minutes

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, D. Cooper, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, B. Partee, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: J. McPheter, A. Scharper, L. Stark

Call to Order

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of the minutes of the September 23, 2008 Meeting.

M/S/C [M Guillen/Molloy] to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2008 CPC meeting with the following correction:

- **Darla Cooper was present at the September 23, 2008 meeting.**

Information Items

2. Information from state budget workshop October 6. -
 - VP Sullivan reported on information from the state budget workshop he and Leslie Griffin attended on October 6th.
 - He reported that the country is not technically in a recession but close, which in turn affects California's service oriented economy, resulting in low state revenues which affects our state budget and our college's budget.
 - There was further discussion regarding the current economic crisis.

Discussion Items

3. College Plan 2008-11 Oct 7 Draft
 - CPC members reviewed the latest version of the College Plan for 08-11 objective by objective. President Serban pointed out the addition of Objective 1.14, the Master Educational Plan. This will be the plan that links plans for instructional programs and student services with the development of our facilities. It will include our rationale in terms of instructional programs and student services vis-à-vis the development of renovations and/or new buildings. We need to recognize the demands in the community and the economy and address how we will align our

programs with the demands. The Accreditation Team will want to know if we have a Master Education Plan.

a. ADA review was undertaken by the college in 2007.

- President Serban noted that the Academic Senate recommended that an ADA transition plan should be included as an objective in the College Plan. VP Ehrlich presented the documents that were sent to the Chancellor's Office in May 2007 regarding our Voluntary Compliance Plan showing that we are ADA compliant. VP Sullivan reported that currently we have a consultant, Peter Robertson from Access Unlimited, who is completing an Accessibility Survey of the entire campus, including the Wake and Schott Centers plus Cosmetology. He is setting up a data base for us, with the complete study of all the campuses including areas where we need to improve accessibility. Susan Broderick noted some current access problem areas. Tom Garey commented that the Humanities Building being in compliance in 1975 does not mean that it meets current standards. These areas, even though deemed compliant when the building was built, do not necessarily provide modern day accessibility requirements. VP Sullivan noted that we are currently ADA compliant and at the same time we are always looking at problem areas which we are going to continue to improve either through repair or modernization of a building. The Humanities Building is included in the Measure V modernization plans and other problems are covered under the "deferred maintenance" plans in the Bond. The wording to be included in the College Plan that everyone agreed upon: *Review the results of the accessibility study and develop and implement a plan to improve accessibility.*

b. Executive VP Friedlander went through some of the changes in the College Plan that needed to be made. President Serban said that the college plan, including these changes, will be reviewed at the Board Study Session on October 16th and submitted for approval at the Board meeting on October 30th.

M/S/C [Molloy/Alarcon] to approve the College Plan 2008-11 with the new changes made at the meeting and submit to the Board for approval.

4. Employee survey (latest version attached)

- President Serban reported that the Standard IV accreditation workgroup worked on the latest version of the Employee Survey. Their recommendations were discussed as well as a few additional changes suggested by CPC members. Our goal is to administer the employee survey in October because we want to give employees enough time to fill it in, then to have time to review the results and make the necessary improvements where we needed. We also want to be able to document in our self study that the needed improvements of a larger magnitude that have been identified by the survey have or are being addressed. There was discussion clarifying details on the survey to ensure anonymity. For those who do not have computers there will be a box where they can submit their surveys. VP Ehrlich stated that another goal is to be as inclusive as we can be. Ignacio Alarcon offered to translate the survey in Spanish.

5. Draft institutional code of ethics (attached)

- President Serban stated that Standard III.A.1.d requires that we have an institutional code of professional ethics: “The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.” This Standard is part of the Accreditation Standards in place since June 2002. Since SBCC was one of the last institutions to be accredited under the old standards in October 2002, we did not create an institutional code of ethics. VP Ehrlich researched and combined several examples of codes of ethics from other community colleges resulting in the attached. Tom Garey would like to research further and submit a draft. President Serban said that since we want to adopt The Code of Ethics by spring, we are open to further suggestions. We need to leave time for the draft to go to the Academic Senate, the Classified Consultation Group and to the Student Senate for input, before it is agreed upon, adopted and endorsed in CPC. The code of ethics is not a policy, so does not go before the Board. President Serban will be meeting with the Student Trustee and ASB President in three weeks; she can speak to them then.

6. Linking program review to planning to budgeting

- President Serban stated that the above agenda item will be an ongoing conversation for this year, because it is an accreditation requirement that we must fulfill. We must link the results of our program review to planning and budgeting by building a fund that will be used to support at least some of the resource requests identified in the Program Reviews. In spite of this being a difficult budget item at this time and even though it will take us a number of years to get to build a solid program improvement fund in support of program reviews, at the very minimum we need to have something developed this year that will fund some of the items in the 09 – 10 budget year. President Serban made the suggestion that we use all or part of the SB1133, the physical plant and instructional equipment block grant, to start building this program improvement fund. The amount of money received from the state in this block grant varies from year to year; we received from zero in some years up to \$5 million at one point. There are criteria for using this money. The instructional equipment money can be used for software, technology equipment or non-technology equipment in support of instruction (see handout with state guidelines). She mentioned that at our college there has been no connection between program reviews and budget development; these were parallel processes. She stated that one suggestion is to begin to start building this fund the same way we build our construction fund and our overall technology equipment fund. We can analyze how this money was used in the past; the small, routine expenditures versus more significant expenditures. This money does not have to be spent each year, so it will be possible to save over time. She stressed that she does not want to take an actual across the board cut from departments in order to create such a fund, and does not want to impact significantly

one department or one division. In answer to CSEA President Auchincloss' question regarding the one time usage for positions, President Serban stated that we cannot use this particular block grant for positions. We also need to identify a source of ongoing funding as part of the program improvement fund to fund positions identified through the program reviews. President Serban suggested that we should develop a formula for example taking some percentage of the growth funding that would feed into this kind of a fund. Classified positions that are needed should be identified through the program review since that is the way we will fund them in the future. Tom Garey asked for some examples of what the fund for the physical plant and instructional equipment categories had been applied to in the past. Executive VP Friedlander reported that the instructional equipment money was allocated proportionally to the Deans who worked with their dept. chairs and their units to allocate this money. Vice President Sullivan reported that on the construction side, the physical plant allocation always went into the construction fund and was used primarily for safety issues. President Serban mentioned that there are matching funds: There is a 3 to 1 match from the State to district for the instructional equipment and 1 -1 for construction. Executive VP Friedlander asked how we tracked the expenses for these funds. VP Sullivan said that they reported that the funds were allocated to Ed Programs for instructional equipment but now it is required that we actually track each individual expense. The allocations to construction were included automatically in the reports to the state on HAZMAT and safety. The matching funds come from the General Fund. And this year we can take the \$129,000 from the SB1133 and use that for our matching funds. More details about matching funds were discussed. The consensus was that members wanted to think about this and talk about it at the next meeting.

7. Suggestions for an evaluation framework of governance structure and decision making processes.

- President Serban said that this is another requirement for the Accreditation Standards IV which relates to the Objectives 5.1 and 5.2 in our College Plan. We need to develop a framework for evaluating our governance structures and decision making processes. The Standard IV workgroup has several suggestions. CSEA President, Liz Auchincloss presented one of those suggestions which is that in order for the committees to honestly evaluate themselves, a non-committee member should administer a short survey during one of the committees' meetings and collect them. Using the survey monkey versus handing out the surveys was discussed as well as further discussion on communication to committee constituents and the value of their feedback. Diane Rodriguez-Kiino is finalizing a document listing all our current committees and workgroups, their charters, and their membership. Tom Garey asked what the process for developing the survey instrument for committee evaluation would be. President Serban said we have yet to come up with that. CSEA President Auchincloss added that no schools have yet been able to do this yet. President Serban said that anything we could do would be better than nothing.

Adjournment

M/S/C [Serban/Garey] to approve the meeting is adjourned

Next meeting

Tuesday October 21, 2008 3-4:30pm A 218C