
GUEST: L. Griffin, P. Naylor

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 The second of two college planning forums will be Monday, February 14th at 2:00 p.m. in PS101.

2.2 Student Representative Rose Ladanyi submitted her letter of resignation and of appreciation for being a member of the Council.

2.3 Jack Friedlander introduced Bill Rice who will be the new student representative of the Associated Students to CPC. This is his second year at SBCC.

2.4 It was announced that a SoMA student's short film was selected as the best of those produced by area college and university students.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Summary of main points made at the February 1st College Planning Forum on Educational Issues

Jack Friedlander and Lynda Fairly both expressed the value of the planning forum. Andreea Serban stated that a transcript of the panelists' presentations will be posted on the college's intranet.

3.2 Status of SIS procurement: Vendor demonstrations will be March 1–4 (SS250) and March 22–25 (Cyber Center instead of at the Garvin Theatre).

Jack Friedlander said that he has sent an email this morning on the method we are following for the selection of the new student information system (SIS). John Romo is chairing the overall selection process (leadership team). Jack is chairing the SIS Work
Groups. These work groups correspond to each of the major components of a SIS. The members of the SIS Procurement Work Groups are individuals that were intensely involved in developing the Oracle Student System. They are very familiar with the needs for each of the components to be included in a SIS.

A very detailed bid was sent out of the specifications that we wanted in a student information system. Of the companies that submitted proposals, only two qualified, Datatel and SunGuard SCT. Each of the two finalists has an established product that is being used by Community Colleges in California as well as ones across the nation. Dr. Friedlander added that Oracle did not submit a bid. He said that each of the workgroups developed very detailed business case scenarios. Each vendor will be spending four full days at the campus to demonstrate how their product is able to perform each of the business case scenarios that we specified. Dr. Friedlander said a consultant firm, SIG, was hired to assist us with the procurement process. Harold George is the SIG that is working directly with the college. So far, the procurement process is going very well. With respect to the vendor demonstrations, Dr. Friedlander said what would be appropriate for members of the governance groups (CPC, Academic Senate, Associated Students, CSEA and IA executive Board) to be present for the product overview sessions that will take place on Tuesday from 8:00 to 9:00 a.m. during the week that each vendor is on campus. In addition, faculty and staff would find the Thursday afternoon demonstrations of the student and faculty interfaces to be of much interest as well.

Attendees will be asked to evaluate these products. This information, along with the cost of the systems (to be requested after the product demonstrations) will be taken into account in the college’s decision on which of the two Student Information Systems will be selected. He said we hope to have the system in place for the spring 2007 semester. Dr. Friedlander cautioned that it is critical that we don’t express externally our preference for either of the vendors. Doing so would compromise our ability to negotiate the best price.

3.3 Process for selecting vendor

Addressed in 3.2.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Review of CPP reports: VPs present summary reports of the top priorities identified on the CPP reports for their respective areas

As agreed to by CPC, the Executive Council went through all the CPP reports and identified its preliminary list of recommendations for CPC to consider for potential expense reductions and revenue enhancements. CPC will be asked to review EC’s recommended rankings of ideas that have the highest potential of reducing costs and/or generating revenue. The purpose of this review is for CPC to identify those ideas that can be implemented immediately as well as those that have potential for expense reduction and/or revenue generation but need additional study. The desired outcome of the CPC review is to identify the proposals that should be evaluated this spring and summer and the process for conducting these analyses. The focus of
today’s meeting will be to complete the VP summaries of the CPP recommendations contained in the reports from the departments/units within their respective areas.

Lynda Fairly distributed her summary of expense reductions and revenue generation ideas for Continuing Education and discussed the items.

Joe Sullivan distributed his spreadsheet on expense reductions and revenue generation ideas for the areas of Administrative Services, Accounting, and Facilities, and Operations and discussed his items.


Jack Friedlander began his discussion on the expense reductions for the Educational Programs Support Office. He will conclude his presentation at the next CPC meeting.

(The handouts for these areas are made part of the minutes)

4.2 Discuss next steps in the process

Will be discussed when presentations of vice presidents are concluded.

5.0 Other Items

5.1 Next meeting of CPC is February 15th. John Romo will join the meeting to discuss the development of the College Plan 2005-2008 and the following steps to complete the CPP:

A. Completion of EC’s review of the CPP reports
B. Identification of major topics from the CPP reports that should be studied/evaluated this semester
C. Process for reviewing/evaluating the major topics identified to be pursued.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting.