

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*

**RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES IN DEVELOPING AND
USING STATEMENTS OF INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTIONS IN
THE COLLEGE' S PLANNING PROCESS**

1. The College Planning Council (CPC) is responsible for coordinating the development of the Statements of Institutional Directions (SIDs). The SIDs should represent the 15 to 20 major priorities the college desires to achieve in the next three years.

The SIDs should be developed with respect to the College's mission and changes taking place within and outside of the institution that may affect achievement of the mission. Some of the obvious factors that need to be taken in to account in determining the college's future direction include: the dramatic changes resulting from advances in technology; fiscal support for operating the college; changes in the educational, cultural and experiential backgrounds of our students and the expectations they have for attending college; alternative methods of delivering instruction that will result in increased competition for students; and growing college operational costs which, in addition to being labor-intensive, are becoming increasingly capital-intensive.


2. The SIDs need to be stated in a way that their attainment can be measured. Each SID should consist of a measurable desired outcome, a benchmark indicator against which it can be compared, and the procedures for collecting the data needed to assess the extent to which the outcome specified has been achieved.
3. The Cabinet will identify the staff members who will have primary responsibility for ensuring that the SIDs are being achieved. Although the achievement of most, if not all, of the SIDs will involve the efforts of faculty and staff in various divisions of the college, each SID will have one person with primary responsibility for coordinating, monitoring, and assessing the activities needed to achieve the desired outcomes of the SID.

The annual goals the vice presidents submit to the college president should correspond to the SIDs. The formative and annual summative evaluation reports the vice presidents submit to the college president should focus on the extent to which the desired outcomes specified in the SIDs for which they are responsible are being achieved.

4. The vice presidents will work with staff in their divisions on developing strategies for achieving the outcomes specified in the SIDs for which they are responsible. In as much as possible, the guidelines for developing unit/department three-year plans should focus on strategies for achieving the SIDs for which the division is responsible.

Santa Barbara City College

TO: Coordinators for the Development of Standards One - Eight for the Santa Barbara City College Self-Study to be Prepared for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Peter MacDougall 

DATE: September 19, 1995

SUBJECT: Operational Guidelines for the Preparation of Part I of the SBCC Self-Study

The memorandum to the College Planning Council (August 23, 1995), provides direction for developing a College self-study consisting of a section in which the College certifies that the eight accreditation standards are being met and followed by the core of the self-study, a case study of SBCC's Project Redesign and its effect upon the accreditation standards. Concerns have arisen regarding how we will certify that the standards are being met; specifically, that we might be doing the traditional self-study plus the special project. That is not the case.

The purpose of this memorandum is to outline the expectations for developing Part I; i.e., certification that the accreditation standards are being met.

We have asked for and received approval from the Accrediting Commission to do a focused self-study. Though the Commission has requested that we affirm the standards are being met, there is no intent to increase the workload involved in producing the self-study; thus Section I certification that the accreditation standards are being met should be brief. An outline specific to each standard is provided. It includes a suggestion regarding the maximum number of pages that should be needed to respond.

The work should be completed on Section I and turned in to Mrs. Janice Peterson not later than December 1, 1995. I do not believe that completing that task will be a problem.

Because of the concern expressed regarding duplication of work with the SBCC format, a brief description of what we will not do regarding the traditional report is included, then followed by the outline of what we will do.

What we will do. In a traditional self-study, the majority of colleges develop the self-study by dealing with each of the sub-elements of a standard by providing a thorough description of the College activity on the issues surrounding that standard. This is followed by an extensive analysis, then specific plans that the College will pursue to improve the status in meeting that standard. This detailed and thorough approach to each standard will not be followed.

What we will do to verify the standard is being met at Santa Barbara City College will be:

- a. Respond to the recommendation of the previous team (1990) by outlining how the College has reacted to the team recommendation.

Much of this information has already been completed through the College's mid-term report provided to the Commission. The mid-term report response for each standard will be attached. As is applicable, the response should be updated with specific actions that have been taken since the time the mid-term report was submitted. In most cases content pertinent for that update are suggested.

- b. Certification that the Standard is being met. This is done for each "sub-category." Assuming there is agreement that we are meeting the standard (as we reviewed each standard and sub-standard, there was confidence that we were), then:
- provide a paragraph or two that describes how the sub-standard is being met;
 - one to three examples to illustrate that conclusion should be provided; and, as applicable,
 - Identify support material that will be available in the visiting team room to confirm what has been outlined.

For example, in Standard One: The Institutional Mission. A paragraph explaining how we are directed by the mission would be illustrated by reference to our mission statement in the College Catalog and the *Statement of Institutional Directions* document. This affirms how the mission is clear and being implemented.

Institutional Planning/Institutional Effectiveness A paragraph would describe the College's extensive work in planning. The paper developed by Jack Friedlander, Bill Hamre and me; the SID; the *Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness* documents; institutional research agenda; and, outlines for conducting Student Services and Academic Affairs program reviews will be more than ample to illustrate our conclusion that we are meeting this sub-standard. Reference could also be provided to specialized plans; e.g., Technology, Transfer, EOPS, DSPS, Matriculation, etc.

The response to Standard One should not be longer than two type-written pages. Backup material available in the team room would be extensive.

The above represents the content for certifying that the College is meeting Standard One.

The process to be followed for Standard One would include a review with the College Planning Council.

The standard leader(s) will meet with resource groups for their standards. These groups were defined in the first memo (8/23/95). Discussions with the resource groups will center on the proposed response prepared by the Standard leader(s). The outcomes from these meetings with resource groups will be:

- receive feedback from the group as to their concurrence that this response represents the reality of SBCC, or modify as appropriate.
- team leaders then either delegate the responsibility or produce the two or three typed pages.
- review the brief report with the appropriate governance groups to CPC, (in the case of Standard I this will be possibly the Academic Senate and Classified Council) for final suggestions and approval; and,
- submit the brief report to the Self-study Coordinator, Janice Peterson..

Summary comments on producing Part one of the Self-Study - Certification that the Accreditation Standards are being met.

- The expectations regarding the report content and the process to be followed in developing that content are straight forward. The task should be both interesting and gratifying (gratifying because in almost all cases you will be impressed with how well we have addressed the standard.) The time required to achieve this task will be minimal. If you need further clarification, please confer with me, Bill Hamre, or Janice Peterson.

Part II, SBCC's Project Redesign and Its Affect Upon the ACCJC's Standards for Accreditation

Not later than November 1, each team leader will have a clear definition of the report format that will be followed in defining how we will deal with the issue of reengineering and its effect upon Santa Barbara City College's compliance with the standards for accreditation defined by the ACCJC.

Again, after spending considerable time reviewing the College's previous Self-Study report and preparing for this one, I am confident we will obtain more benefits from the new approach. The workload should certainly not exceed what would have occurred under the traditional method. We will learn more and it will benefit the accreditation process.

The material to be provided for the leaders for Standards 2 through 8 follows:

Standard Two - Educational Programs: The material needed to respond to this standard should not exceed four to a maximum of six pages.

The mid-term report was excellent in indicating the response to the recommendation on ESL, vocational education, and community education (copy attached). That mid-term response needs to be updated with specific actions that have taken place this past year in coordinating credit/non credit, ESL, and more effectively interfacing vocational education with the community, and for community education, e.g., the activities of the Business Committee.

For sub-standards 2.a through 2.h, an opening paragraph or two for each should affirm we are meeting these sub-standards. Specific examples to illustrate how that is being done and a listing of support material will follow. Support materials will be in the team room and a review of them by visiting team will enable them to verify that the College is meeting the sub-standards and thus the full-standard.

Examples to illustrate how the sub-standards are being met and suggested support materials could include:

- 2.a SBCC's Exemplary Program and Hayward Awards; the faculty lecturer program; instructional improvement booklets; and, the organizational structure.
- 2.b Describing decisions to drop our Dental Assisting and Machine Shop programs and activities underway to establish curricula for new programs in certificated nursing assistant home helpers, multimedia, etc.

General education would use the catalog, the placement of new courses under general education and the Curriculum Committee minutes.

These materials and others of which you are aware will verify how conscientiously SBCC is functioning to meet this Standard.

- 2.e Include outlines/fliers for our international programs, cosmetology contracts, and work experience/cooperative education and internship materials that outline both what we have attempted and is now taking place. Backup would include the Catalog statements on grading and Associate degrees.
- 2.f Examples and support material would include our work with high schools Tech Prep and applied math science; the Eisenhower Grant; transfer guarantees; and Jack's extensive work on earning for vocational school graduates. Again, we could provide an extensive array of information, but two or three examples to verify how we are meeting this substandard will be adequate.

- 2.g A schedule of non-credit curriculum and how that is developed, and credit/non-credit program coordination of ESL and business. Again, all that is needed is a statement (a paragraph or two) that verifies the sub-standard is being met and examples to illustrate how that is occurring.

I feel confident you have a good understanding of what must be done. Again, if there are questions, please feel free to see Janice or me.

Standard Three - Student Services: This standard should not require more than three pages maximum in order to deal with the aspects of it.

Response to recommendation(s) of the previous Team. The mid-year report forms the basis of the response with an update provided to demonstrate what has happened since.

- 3.a A paragraph affirming that the standard is being met. Backup material should include the reports on student characteristics, matriculation plan, the revised grievance procedure, the end-of-year banquets with the awards program, new Student Services building, and an organized chart.
- 3.b Paragraph indicating that we are meeting the requirement and information regarding the change in demographics since the last accreditation visit and other information of which you are aware will illustrate how this component is being achieved.
- 3.c Comprehensiveness of the Program. Certainly the organizational chart will help to do that. Counseling - emphasis on the new Career Center.

Standard Four - Faculty and Staff: Not more than three pages should be necessary.

Response to the last accreditation meeting update if appropriate.

Five substandards (a-e) selection qualifications, evaluation and staff development -- all that is needed is a paragraph or two verifying each of the substandards is being met and examples of how that is occurring.

Illustrate by providing evidence of what SBCC is doing to meet the standard. (Editorial comment: we are doing so much in this area, particularly in terms of staff development, that there should be little challenge involved in verifying our achievement of this standard.)

Standard Five - Library/LRC: The entire standard should not take more than a maximum of three to four pages to complete.

Response to the recommendation of the previous team, the mid-year report should be a good base to establish the response (attached). That should be followed by the Library Task Force report and subsequent activity and the LRC Task Force. In addition, anticipation that the LRC

will be a redesign project could be mentioned to illustrate the conscientious manner in which follow-up is being provided to the previous team recommendations.

Items 5.a through 5.d: A paragraph or two for each that establishes the position of how these substandards are being met followed by specific examples to illustrate the validity of that conclusion.

Resource materials should be identified and developed for the team visit.

5.e - Information Technology: There should be absolutely no problem in concluding the College's commitment to the standard and the effectiveness in meeting it. The support material showing the growth in technology on the campus, the establishment of the FRC, the vision plan, etc., all provide concrete evidence.

Standard Six - Physical Resources: No more than three pages will be required to fully identify how the College is meeting this standard.

The substandards 6.a through 6.c represent a "slam dunk"; i.e., the College should have no problem verifying how each of the substandards has been fulfilled with a paragraph or two for each of the substandards followed by examples. The illustrations for this standard can easily be identified in terms of construction, attention to deferred maintenance, and equipment acquisition.

Standard Seven - Fiscal Resources: Two to three pages should be sufficient.

Recommendation of the previous team should be identified with the response from the mid-term report and any update being made as might be necessary. It should be very easy to identify how we are meeting this standard. Substandards 7.a through 7.c merely will require a paragraph or two each stating the conclusion and illustrating that by concrete examples and identifying support materials.

Standard Eight - Governance: No more than four pages.

The recommendation made by the previous team should be responded to by the enclosed material from the mid-term report and updated as appropriate in terms of material explaining what has occurred since the mid-year time period.

Standards 8.a through 8.f will, again, require a paragraph or two which will confirm the College's view that the standards are being met and with concrete examples being given for each of them to illustrate how that is occurring. Support materials should be identified for inclusion in the team room and that material can be reviewed by the team when they arrive on campus.