AGENDA
Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara Community College District
May 27, 1997
4:00 p.m. - Study Session
Catering Room HRC - 102/Gourmet Dining Room
Santa Barbara City College
8:30 p.m. - Closed Session
Catering Room

1. Financial Overview 1997-98
   a. Process for Requesting One-Time and Ongoing Financial Resources
      Resources
   b. Proposed 1997-98 State Budget Augmentations - Implications for SBCC

2. Data Base Conversion Project, Project Redesign
   a. Bill Hamre will be present to answer questions regarding our next steps
   b. Project Redesign - an Update; CPC Presentation
   c. Enclosed Article, "Are We Ready?" Discussion of Key Issues regarding Governance Issues

3. Miscellaneous
   a. CCCT Conference - Trustee Report
   b. Center for Philosophical Education - A Proposal
   c. Proposal to Name the Football Field
   d. Welfare Reform - SBCC's Plan
   e. Continuing Education - Coordination with UCSB on Issues regarding Religion and Society
   f. College Alcoholic Beverage Policy (Ed Code Section and SBCC Policy)
   g. Student Workers
   h. Staff Survey

Attachment
Priority Registration

Camarata Pacifica

1997-98 Proposed Board Meeting Schedule

Attachment

Other

Superintendent/President's Evaluation
College Planning Council
Tuesday, May 20, 1997
Peter R. MacDougall

Agenda Item 2.2: Process for Requesting One-Time and Ongoing Resources

A. Budget: General Fund, Unrestricted

1. General Fund Budget (Unrestricted) $35 million.

   Roll Over Budget. Exception: Mgrs. have the right to reallocate within 4000 (Supplies) - 5000 (Other Operating Expenses and Services).

   ◆ 1000 Certified Salaries  Total Expenditures $30.3 million
   ◆ 2000 Classified Salaries  86.57% of the Budget
   ◆ 3000 Benefits
   ◆ 4000 = $1 million
   ◆ 5000 = $3.7 million

   Reallocation of funds can be considered when a position becomes vacant. Department/college can evaluate and determine whether to replace or reallocate. Restrictions regarding full-time faculty, there is a legal requirement to maintain full-time faculty at a specified level.

2. C.O.L.A. - What do we do with?

   a. 86.57 percent committed by the present contract to upgrade salaries and benefits.

   b. 13.43 percent of C.O.L.A. is available to:

      ◆ Meet salary step increases or other budgetary increases not anticipated. The C.O.L.A. may also be used to meet special needs.

      ◆ Spread among 4000 - 5000 Accounts (this was done in 1996-97).

      ◆ 1996-97 C.O.L.A. = Approx. $1 million. 13.43% - $134,300

3. Growth

   At present the collective bargaining contracts commit us to use growth to increase salaries minus obligations to fund additional FTEs. Funding to meet additional FTEs needs include: additional full-time faculty (required by law); TLUs to fund growth; additional marketing costs; student support and services (counseling, tutoring, etc.) to maintain service level; and, periodically costs for increases in administrative costs.

   Other than funds to support growth, all growth funds are applied to salaries and benefits.
There is a year plus "buffer" in applying these funds, thus, growth in the first year is used to meet immediate expenses to cover additional FTEs and one-time funding needs.

State funding other than C.O.L.A. and growth is almost always "categorical"; e.g., one-time or multi-year block grants that can only be expended for specific purposes. Examples included funds to enhance technology, library materials, equipment, additional deferred maintenance, special repairs, economic development, etc.

**Conclusion:** If current contracts stay in effect, there is little, if any, money available to meet ongoing expenses other than as noted above. Some college funding is available on a one-time basis.

For the College Planning council (CPC) this conclusion is very important to understand. Our needs in applying technology to more effectively support student learning and improve student services and college administration processes are substantial. The requests for greater support for technology support staff, staff to carry out institutional research, duplicating, general supplies, tutors, readers, new athletic teams, new programs, etc., are many.

We cannot remain as we are. We must change to continue to attract, serve and educate students in accord with present demands and expectations.

As can be concluded—Project Redesign with its potential for cost-savings by changing processes to capitalize on technology—continues to be our hope. Such cost-savings, when realized, can be used to support the areas of need noted above.

**B. Commitments of One-Time Funds**

1. At present, there are two areas identified as priorities for one-time funds.

   a. **Board Policy for Campus Maintenance and Equipment Replacement**

      ♦ $670,00 - Building and Maintenance: This figure is a minimum to meet basic requirements. It is increased annually by the C.O.L.A.

      ♦ $800,000 - Non-Technological Equipment: This fund is used to replace non-technical equipment (inventory = ________). The lottery fund is the primary source. When the lottery is insufficient must come from one-time. (Lottery income projected as $1.2 million = 550,000 Salary commitment, and 650,000 for equipment.)

      ♦ 850,000 Technology Equipment Replacement

   Total one-time money needed annually (not including any lottery shortfall) = $1,670,000.

   b. **Project Redesign**

      ♦ Conversion - Estimated Cost: Approx. $2.9 million

      ♦ Project Redesign Team Implementation Cost - Estimated Cost: Approx. $2.0 million

      ♦ Annual Cost: ____________________
2. Other college needs for which one-time costs can be considered.
   a. College Plan - One-Time Resources
   b. Projects; e.g., classroom space in P.Ed., MDT, Welding, etc.

C. Unanticipated Expenses or Income Shortfalls: These represent situations for which funds must be available to make up for shortfalls or meet needs.
   1. Basic Skills Loss of Funding ($558,000)
   2. Property Tax Shortfalls (In recent years this has been as much as $1 million plus.)
   3. Cost for Temporary Buildings for the LSG Remodel
   4. Necessary Construction not Supported by the State; e.g., Space for Information Technology Division
Assembly, Senate Subs Agree on 10.3%; Forward Budget to Full Houses

In an enormous victory for the community college system, both budget subcommittees agreed to apportion 10.3% of Proposition 98 funds, even with a large number of high-cost K-12 education initiatives. This provides legislative support for the agreement between for the community colleges and K-12 organizations. The Governor's May Revise funded community colleges at 10.18%, or around $40 million less than the two subcommittees. These actions done in the final week of subcommittee hearings; both houses are expected to hear the full budget next week before sending their respective versions to conference committee. Also in the final week of actions, the committees acted on a number of community college capital outlay projects. For a list of the status of various projects, check out the League's web page at http://www.cerritos.edu/cclc.

Because of the significant amount of new funds, both subcommittees funded nearly all systemwide priorities, as identified by the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors. Funds provided by the subcommittees augment the level of funding provided to the community colleges in the Budget Act of 1996 by around $390 million, or a 13% increase. The Governor’s May Revise would provide an additional $332 million, or an 11.3% increase. The following chart demonstrates the level of funding provided in the Governor's May Revise and the subcommittees. For information about one-time funds and more details, check out the League web site at http://www.mother.com/cclc. (All figures below are increases above 1996 ongoing funding levels.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONGOING FUNDS</th>
<th>Governor (May)</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLA: Base and Categorical</td>
<td>90,961,000</td>
<td>90,961,000</td>
<td>90,961,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of Growth Formula</td>
<td>89,203,000</td>
<td>89,203,000</td>
<td>89,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,600,000</td>
<td>8,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment</td>
<td>43,838,000</td>
<td>43,838,000</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Needs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom. Infrastructure</td>
<td>9,700,000</td>
<td>9,700,000</td>
<td>4,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Inc. Health Svs. Assist.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Student Senate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Student Success</td>
<td>9,073,000</td>
<td>9,073,000</td>
<td>4,073,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Reform</td>
<td>63,200,000</td>
<td>63,200,000</td>
<td>66,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Office Hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Apportionment Increase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,039,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AUGMENTATIONS:</td>
<td>320,975,000</td>
<td>383,314,000</td>
<td>371,237,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) The Instructional Materials fund requires a 3:1 state: local match. (2) The Governor's and Senate's budgets include $5 million for technology-related faculty and staff development in the Telecommunications Infrastructure line-item. (3) This item was formerly known as the "health fee backfill." (4) Fund breakdown for welfare reform is detailed in the story below. (5) Specific language is not available on these items.

Assembly Supports Flexibility in Welfare Reform Funds

In response to encouragement by community college advocates, the Assembly adopted language allowing greater flexibility in the expenditure of funds under the "Welfare Reform" budget item. The Assembly supports allocating $51.5 million as block grants to districts based on the number of TANF recipients enrolled. The funds could then be used for a variety of activities, including short-term education and training programs, job readiness skills, job placement, staff coordination, curriculum development and other student services. The funds would be required to supplement, not supplant current services. The Assembly also would provide $15 million for increased community college child care services for TANF recipients.

The Senate adopted language supported by the Department of Finance, which would break funds into two grants, allowing minimal flexibility within each grant. Specifically, the Senate's budget would allocate $47.7 million to meet child care and work study needs for TANF recipients, which could be spent among the two categories according to district needs. The second grant would provide $15.5 million for job placement, job development, coordination of services and curriculum development.
College Planning Council
Tuesday, May 20, 1997
Peter MacDougall

Agenda Item 2.1: Update on Project Redesign

Background Beginning: April 1994

A. Why:
   1. Budget Uncertainties
      • $400,000/year
      • No salary increase for 3 years
      • Long-term improvement in fiscal situation unlikely
   2. Increased Competition - Technology
   3. Institutional Renewal

B. What:
   1. Best approach determined by CPC to enable SBCC to respond to present and future challenges
      • Project Redesign (Reengineering)

C. How:
   1. ID Core College Processes
   2. Apply reengineering methodology through teams. Results improve instructional/ student programs by applying technology. This will yield greater efficiencies and money can be saved and distributed to meet College needs.

D. Process:
   1. CPC - April 1994-December 1994
      • Developed approach
         ⇒ ID vision
         ⇒ Define Project goals and expectations
         ⇒ Understand reengineering principles
         ⇒ Select key processes - ID 100; selected 20
   2. January 1995
      • Pilot Project
      • Position Paper: "Faculty Redesign at Santa Barbara City College - Increasing Student Learning and Faculty Satisfaction" given to all faculty. Paper jointly prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President of the Academic Senate and other faculty.
   - Developed a complete training team approach
   - Support structure for teams was developed
   - Tech Team was formed to provide project management
   - A few teams were underway

   - Approximately 18 teams completed Redesign Projects

5. Fall 1996 - February 1997
   - Development of Phase I Implementation Plan
   - TMI Summer/Fall

6. January 1997 - Present
   - TMI Team
   - Conversion of College data systems. The conversion of the College’s data systems is viewed as central in enabling Project Redesign’s in-depth implementation to take place.

E. Present - Summer 1997
1. Conversion - Begin the process. Implementation of Phase I. Implementation of the Phase I Project Redesign projects will proceed concomitant with the conversion
2. TMI - Refinement—cost analysis—identification of next steps
3. Identification of Phase II Projects
   - Proposed team to redesign the College’s organizational structure (from functional-based to a process-based organization).
   - TMI related teams
   - Other teams
4. Enhance fiscal analysis methodologies

F. Future
1. Follow through on the conversion Project Redesign and implementation with support of strategic partners
2. Proceed with Phase II projects
3. Provide fiscal analysis to measure financial benefits
4. Conduct a thorough project evaluation
Are We Ready?

Institutions Must Internalize the Instructional Changes Necessary to Implement Distance Education

BY JOHN SWALEC

The implementation of distance education at our nation's community colleges will require many more operational changes and adaptations by boards, administrators and faculties than may be realized. A major question which will need to be addressed is: Have we fully internalized or prepared for the changes that will need to be made?

It can be expected that many of the students who attend community colleges in the future will still wish to attend time- and place-bound classes. However, we can expect that a significant number of these students will take advantage of asynchronous instructional methodologies and thus obtain an education at their convenience.

As more instructors utilize distance education to connect with these student learners, time- and place-bound offerings, which have often been controlled for the convenience of the administration or faculty, will become less attractive to students. As a result, colleges will be moved to reach out to potential audiences by being sensitive to times when the students choose to be available whether it is at their home, at their work, or anywhere they find it convenient.

Furthermore, more and more students will be seeking additional knowledge to meet work or personal needs and, therefore, will not be as driven to obtain certificates or associate's degrees. Also, students will not always be as interested as they have been in the past to enroll in the traditional three-credit course which meets three times a week within a 16-week paradigm. Rather, learners will proceed when they wish, as fast as they wish and where they wish to obtain desired knowledge or information.

Given this scenario, consider the implications which will be created by this environment. While administrators may initially become focused on the need for the faculty to change their teaching styles, consider how unprepared these administrators will become when the credit hour or even the contact hour is no longer a viable measurement for faculty loading or for obtaining state funding.

In addition, administrators will need to face the challenge of recruiting or training teachers who are prepared and "tuned in" to facilitating learning or coaching students rather than asking students to regurgitate knowledge.

Significant changes will be needed in our staff development programs since veteran faculty will find such changes difficult to handle without sufficient support and encouragement.

See Distance Education on page 5
Distance Education from page 3

Other administrative challenges will include a re-shaping of the schedule of offerings. There may not be a traditional start of the semester. In many cases there may no longer be the need for traditional semesters or quarters.

Administrators will also find that when implementing distance education instruction, faculty may not ever need to enter a classroom since the instruction can be handled directly from the home. Guidelines for paying faculty will require adjustments. Traditional union agreements may need to be re-negotiated to allow the typical 15-hour load to be replaced by what may become a contact hour or even a 40-hour work-week arrangement. Thus, a "typical load" will need to be redefined. Overloads and summer assignments will also be impacted.

How will administrators adapt or accept that teachers may not need to be in their offices or on campus? Since the instructor can communicate from any location, many can and will stay at home while communicating with their students. Accountability will not be an issue since teachers will be able to be logged on and monitored as to the amount of time they spend communicating with their students. But, will teachers still be required to attend office hours on campus when they can better communicate with students from other sites?

What will be as interesting to observe is how administrations and boards will adapt to other implications of implementing distance learning. For example, given that more students will not need to be physically present on campus, fewer new buildings will be needed. When programs and classes can be delivered by numerous institutions into our once-protected boundaries, will we openly accept these "credits" as part of our certificate and associate's degree programs? When those boundary lines no longer keep competition out of our districts, how will we respond? When certificates and associate's degrees are no longer sought or required by an employer will traditional programs be impacted?

Are we prepared for these changing conditions and/or circumstances? Will boards or administrators find it difficult to make resources available for instructors when they are not physically available on campus? Will administrators adjust to supporting instruction when they cannot control the scheduling of students and teachers? How will they feel if the location of instruction and learning is left largely up to faculty and students?

In summary, it is clear that the implementation of distance education will require significant adjustments in community college operations, more than we may have expected or realized. These changes will not come easily, but when they do come, they will result in a reshaping of our approach to instruction and also how we operate our campuses. While we can expect that our colleges will still have traditional programs and classrooms, we can also be sure that dramatic changes will need to be made for institutions to survive the competition which will occur as distance learning becomes a more frequent option selected by students.

How we prepare for and meet these changes, in large measure, will determine which institutions will best serve their constituents.

Those boards or administrators who refuse or even delay their response to addressing the needs of these students will miss, in large measure, an opportunity to serve their constituents and will more than likely drive them to others who will respond.

John Swalc is the president of Waubonsee Community College in Sugar Grove, IL.
Mission Statement

The Department of Philosophy’s Center for Philosophical Education will serve to create a uniquely rich, primarily extra-curricular, educational environment for the study of Philosophy at Santa Barbara City College. This environment will not be isolated solely to the Philosophy Department but will serve to enrich the intellectual and learning environment of the campus community as a whole, faculty, student and staff, along with the greater community of Santa Barbara. The Center shall attain this goal by fulfilling the following seven functions:

A. Organize annual Philosophical Conferences on themes of contemporary philosophical importance. These conferences will host researchers of international reputation and will be open to the community at large.

B. Publish the Proceedings of the conferences to further research in the particular areas of study as well as to disperse philosophical knowledge to a larger, nonprofessional audience.

C. Publish an undergraduate international journal of philosophy - tentatively titled, STOA. The Center will provide students with an opportunity to publish their work and to be actively involved in the publication and distribution of a professional journal.

D. Provide scholarships and other means of financial support for SBCC students studying philosophy. To also support SBCC students in attending other philosophy conferences, particularly annual conferences offered by other philosophy departments specifically organized for the undergraduate student.

E. Raise funds sufficient to be self-supporting in a manner consistent with and coordinated through the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College.

F. Support SBCC Philosophy Faculty in professional development projects that will serve to strengthen and further develop the Department of Philosophy and the Center itself.

G. Support extra-curricular undergraduate programs of study in philosophy at SBCC such as the Philosophy Club, alumni visits, guest speakers and/or colloquia.
Santa Barbara City College is the ideal location for this Center as it is a community college within a community known world-wide for elegance, art and knowledge. In fulfilling its primary functions of conference organizer and journal publisher, the Center for Philosophical Education will provide many city college students with their first opportunity to be in contact with world-class researchers, to attend and witness academic discussions amongst brilliant scholars and to learn about, by participating in, the activity of academic publication. It will also provide members of our community with the unique opportunity to attend philosophy conferences which are of the highest levels of excellence. Along with the publication of its proceedings and its journal, the Center's conferences and publications will serve to further inform and remind our local, state, national and international communities of the exceptionally high standards of learning and excellence in education that Santa Barbara City College has become so widely known for.

**Center Organization**

The **Center** shall be "housed" within the Department of Philosophy at SBCC.

The **Steering Committee** for the Center shall include all full time members of the Department of Philosophy. When there are an even number of full time faculty within the department, the Department of Philosophy faculty members may select an external, non-philosophy, full time, faculty member to serve as an equal voting member on the Steering Committee. This External Steering Committee Member shall serve for one year as a voting member with annual appointment subject to Philosophy Department faculty voting approval. The External Steering Committee Member position itself shall be renewable upon a vote of the Philosophy Department faculty each year. The Steering Committee shall have responsibility, consistent with the broader set of rules and regulations which define the operation of Santa Barbara City College as a whole, for the Center's operation. When a Steering Committee vote is needed, each member of the Steering Committee shall have one vote. A majority of votes cast shall be determinant. All Center policy shall be consistent with Santa Barbara City College policy and is always subject to approval by the Board of Trustees in a manner consistent with overall SBCC district policy.

The Steering Committee shall hire, consistent with Santa Barbara City College District procedures, an **Executive Director** for the Center. The Executive Director shall be responsible for the primary on-going activities and functioning of the Center, including, among other duties, keeping the required financial records essential to the effective functioning of such a Center, organization of the various Center conferences, the publication of the proceedings from these conferences, the publication/distribution of the Center's undergraduate journal of philosophy and the fundraising needed to support the Center. (This is not intended as a complete list of the duties of the Executive Director.) The Executive Director shall hold a Consultant position through SBCC Foundation and shall be paid by the Center for his or her services in a manner consistent with district policies and procedures. All major events, publication proposals, grant solicitations, scholarship awards and the like initiated by the Executive Director shall be approved by the Steering
Committee in a manner consistent with district policies and procedures and coordinated with the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College prior to being formally executed by the Center's Executive Director.

The Center shall have an **Advisory Board** consisting primarily of academics but also of non-academic leaders. The Steering Committee and the Executive Director shall be responsible for selecting and inviting individuals to serve on the Board of Advisors. The Board of Advisors shall be consulted, primarily, for purposes of review in the development of future conferences and in the publication of conference proceedings and the Center's undergraduate journal. The number of Advisory Board members is open and shall be determined by the Steering Committee in consultation with the Executive Director.

Additional **Administrative Support Staff** shall be hired according to Center need and with the approval of the Steering Committee and consistent with SBCC district hiring procedures.

The position of **Executive Board Member** shall be reserved for those individuals or organizations who primarily, though not necessarily, have played a financial role in supporting the Center. Solicitation of Executive Board support shall rest primarily with the Executive Director but in consultation with the Steering Committee. All fundraising efforts shall be coordinated with those of the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College.

In anticipation of possible future funding, it may be necessary for the Steering Committee to create other official Center positions, such as Research Fellow or President for the purposes of securing such funding. Such positions with their requisite descriptions of rights, duties and obligations shall be the responsibility of the Steering Committee and shall be consistent with SBCC district hiring procedures and policies.

The Center for Philosophical Education shall operate within the Mission Statement of Santa Barbara City College. All Center policies and activities shall be consistent with those of Santa Barbara City College and shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees in a manner consistent with appropriate precedents for such academic units within the district.
Budget - Center For Philosophical Education
1997-1999

Journal - STOA
   VOL. 1
   Publish - $7,533.88 (5,000 copies)
   mailing - $1,482.00 (3,000 copies/initial mailing list)
   admin. - $2,500.00 (125 hrs/6.33 weeks)
   TOTAL - $11,515.88

   VOL. 2
   Publish - $5,373.49 (2,500 copies)
   mailing - $622.00 (1,500 copies)
   admin. - $2,000.00 (100 hrs/5 weeks)
   TOTAL - $7,995.49

Conference - 97-98
   (based on /spring 97 conference)
   Travel - $2,100.00 (6/350.00)
   Hotel - $3,200.00
   Food - $1,120.00
   Publicity - $225.00 (including proceedings)
   Admin - $3,000.00 (150 hrs/7.5 weeks)
   TOTAL - $9,645.00

ONE YEAR BUDGET TOTAL - $29,156.37

Projected Annual STOA subscription income at 1000 subscriptions - $30,000.00

END OF YEAR BALANCE - plus $843.63

The Center for Philosophical Education - CPE - intends to secure, conservatively, at least 1000 to 1500 subscriptions to STOA. These subscriptions represent less than 5% of the potential market of subscribers. Also, at this time, STOA has no competitors in this market and our initial inquiries have yielded an unanticipated flood of positive support. Our hope would be to have 1500 plus subscribers. With our active philosophy club at SBCC we will tap a ready reservoir of student volunteers to assist with sporadic clerical tasks involved with shipping etc., thus a kind of barnraising in the traditional American-style. Our students provided wonderful support during our entire sp 97 conference. The additional money raised through STOA will be used to either supplement administrative costs incurred with additional subscriptions or be used for a variety of student enrichment programs as outlined in the Center's Mission Statement.

As a result of the tremendous success of our Spring 1997 Conference on *Time, Tense & Reference*, which was completely underwritten with a donation from Mr. Steven Humphrey, Mr. Humphrey has agreed to underwrite additional conferences and to help us in securing other benefactors to develop and maintain CPE. While we are presently waiting for Mr. Humphrey to return from his summer home, we have been in contact with him, and have every expectation that he will prove yet again a strong source of financial support. This does not include the other half-dozen possible donors which we will be contacting without the need of Mr. Humphrey's assistance. In view of the tremendous wealth of some of these other possible donors, anyone of them could readily underwrite CPE for years of operation. Hence we are very optimistic at this time regarding CPE's financial stability.
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*Published by The Center for Philosophical Education  
Department of Philosophy • Santa Barbara City College*
The Center for Philosophical Education · C.P.E.
was established in 1997 by the Department of Philosophy at Santa Barbara City College to foster a broader understanding of and deeper appreciation for the academic discipline of Philosophy within both the undergraduate and general populations. To these ends, the Center publishes STOA as a forum for celebrating and nurturing the philosophical growth of undergraduate students in addition to providing the general reader with access to a range of quality academic writings from novice philosophers. The journal has a particular interest in publishing undergraduate papers from a wide range of countries around the world, thereby fostering communication between scholars and students from a variety of backgrounds.

Through the publication of undergraduate philosophy papers submitted by professors, STOA recognizes and supports the vital pedagogical position of mentor. For many undergraduates, the finding of a mentor is often the pivotal intellectual experience in their undergraduate education. Both the student and the supervising faculty member will be credited in STOA. Finally, each issue of STOA will contain a section titled, QUIDDITAS, in which a solicited paper by a professional, academic philosopher will provide an overview of a contemporary philosophical problem.

Submissions should be sent to the Center for Philosophical Education in care of the Executive Director. While there is no fixed length for submissions, only undergraduate submissions will be accepted and each submission must be made through a college or university faculty member who is formally recommending the student's paper. Papers should be submitted double-spaced standard format and on disc. Accompanying each disc should be information regarding software used, including release, e.g. WordPerfect 4.0; which computer was used (either IBM compatible PC or Apple Macintosh).

All inquiries regarding STOA can be made through the following:

Executive Director
The Center for Philosophical Education
Department of Philosophy · SBCC
721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara, California 93109-2394
phone: 805-965-0581 #2476
fax: 805-963-7222
e-mail: ajokic@sbcc.sbcceo.k12.ca.us
PROPOSED BOARD MEETING DATES FOR 1997-98

July 24, 1997
August 28, 1997
September 25, 1997
October 9, 1997 (Board Study Session)
October 23, 1997
November 13, 1997
December 11, 1997
January 22, 1998
January 29, 1998 (Board Study Session)
February 26, 1998
March 26, 1998
April 23, 1998
April 30, 1998 (Board Study Session)
May 14, 1998
May 28, 1998
June 11, 1998 (Board Study Session)
June 25, 1998