

Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, November 4, 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, B. Partee, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: C. Alsheimer-Barthel, D. Rodriguez-Kiino, A. Scharper, L. Stark, L. Vasquez

ABSENT: C. Avendano, Associated Study Body President, S. Knotts, Student Trustee, K. Molloy

Call to Order

Superintendent/President Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 21, 2008 CPC meeting (attached)

M/S/C [M Guillen/I Alarcon] to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2008 CPC meeting with the following correction:

- a. **on the last page of the minutes, Action Item, the adopted motion had a clerical error: “though” should be changed to “through”.**

Information Items

Superintendent/President Serban reported the outcome of the October 28th presentations given to the two main rating agencies: Moody's and Standard and Poor's, by the Board of Trustees President, Des O'Neill, VP Sullivan and herself. The underwriters and the legal counsel for the bond, David Casnocha were also present. Superintendent/President Serban expressed appreciation to all those who have helped with this. She will email the presentation to all CPC members. Yesterday, Standard and Poor's gave SBCC an AA+ rating. This is an exceptionally good rating. No California Community College has received this rating in the last several years except for San Diego Community College. Moody's will give us their report in a few days and it looks good.

Today, at the County of Santa Barbara's Board Meeting, they approved our resolution to sell the bonds. There is a great interest in buying the bonds from people in the community.

2. First meeting of Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee scheduled for Nov 6, 4pm-6pm A218C
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that this is an organizational meeting.
3. Fall Accreditation Forums: Wednesday, Nov 5, 8:00 am – 9:30 am A211 and on Thursday, Nov 6, 2:15pm – 3:45 pm PS 101
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban announced the Forums again and stated how important these are.

- b. Superintendent/President Serban reported on her Accreditation Team follow-up / one day accreditation progress report visit to a college that was put on warning as a result of their last accreditation visit in Fall 2007. A warning is serious, followed by probation, which is followed by show-of-cause, which is followed by removal of Accreditation. Over 20 community colleges in California are on warning or probation. When put on warning, the US Dept of Education clearly states that a college has two years to completely fulfill what the Accreditation Team recommends. One of the things this college was given a warning for was because of the lack of an Education Master Plan.
 - c. The Education Master Plan has to be about two fundamental things: What are the instructional needs and student services needs and how these needs drive the planning for facilities
 - d. In the case of the visited college, there was neither documented need, nor any analysis in relation to the vision for the instructional programs, or the vision for student services. There was no information as to how these two combined are driving the facilities need. Superintendent/President Serban continued to say that this is not about safety issues, but it is about data and analysis to demonstrate need. A good example is that we need data to show why we decided to build SoMA.
 - e. Our Educational Master Plan – We will have a preliminary draft done by Fall of 2009 after the Program Reviews are done in May.
- 4. Budget Forums: Thursday Nov 13 2:30 pm – 3:30 pm PS101; Friday Nov 14 10:00 am – 11:30 am A211
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban announced the budget forums.
- 5. Academic Senate ranking of faculty positions (handout)
 - a. This is an alphabetical list; the Academic Senate will be ranking the positions tomorrow. All positions are subject to funding
- 6. VP Sullivan reported on the recalculation of base and growth; our growth number has been reduced another \$259,000. This is a reduction of what we were going to get for last year in growth. He spoke about what this means, and there was further discussion on the matter. Basically, there will be mid-year budget cuts and no one knows the extent of the cuts. The budget signed on September 23 states that mid-year budget cuts could be up to 7%.

Discussion Items

- 7. Development of an institutional code of ethics (draft attached, first time provided at the CPC on Oct 6, 2008)' process and timeline for review and feedback. This is required by one of the sub standards in Standard III. We need to start the review
 - a. After discussion about perhaps combining an adaptation of the code of ethics for faculty and the code of ethics example provided on Oct 6, everyone agreed on the edits they made on the example brought in last week. VP Ehrlich will edit this Institutional Code of Professional Ethics and send it to the CPC members. This will go to the Academic Senate and Classified Consultation group for approval before coming back to CPC for final approval.
- 8. Continued discussion on linking program review to planning to budgeting - All

- a. Approaches to creating a program improvement fund to support at least part of the resource requests identified in program reviews.
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban commented that CPC made a good start at the last meeting on this, but we need to continue to find more avenues for funding than the two block grants that we will use for the program review fund. We need a source of funding that can be used, not limited to a one time use like the block grants, particularly as we think of classified positions in particular. Superintendent/President Serban brought up the example that CSEA President Auchincloss and VP Sullivan spoke of, that we cannot have a new building like SoMA and assume that the existing staff can absorb that work. Several ideas were discussed about where the money will come from. The intention is that the money for this fund will not cut into an existing department's budget. New ideas that may emerge from the Program Reviews themselves of streamlining old ways of doing things, and cutting back on spending can be implemented while at the same time we are building this fund. Looking at our online courses as a way to increase revenues as well as a fund generated by our Centennial were discussed. In the current budget crisis, we may not be able to have enough money to sufficiently fund this program review fund, but we can have a formula in place for the time when we do have the money. We need to have a fund in place to show that the ideas from the Program Reviews are backed up and will be made a reality.
9. Continued discussion on evaluation of governance structure and decision making processes – All
- a. Review of list of current committees and workgroups (handout). Diane Rodriguez-Kiino compiled a list with governance committees and ad-hoc workgroups. A proposed categorization of these committees is also included. Everyone first looked at the Legend at the top of the list. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we need to agree on some kind of nomenclature in terms of what we call our committees...e.g. what is difference between college – wide and shared governance? Discussion ensued. It was agreed that there needs to be a procedure stating who creates a committee, its purpose, its charter, its membership, when it meets and what it is to accomplish. Superintendent/President Serban will email an electronic copy to all CPC members and asked that the members follow-up by sending corrections to Diane Rodriguez-Kiino, then she will make the corrections in one document. We will have a corrected version of what it is right now. Then we will continue with the process of evaluation of committee effectiveness and structure

Chairperson President Serban adjourned the meeting at 4:30pm.

Next meeting: Tuesday November 18, 2008 3-4:30pm A218C