
ABSENT: S. Ehrlich, P. Buckelew, C. Salazar (for Auchincloss), C. Ramirez

GUESTS: M. Ferrer, A. Green, L. Griffin, L. Skogberg

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the February 5th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Molloy/Garey] to approve the minutes of the February 5th CPC meeting.

2.0 Announcements

Jack Friedlander announced that several members of the Council are participating in the president search committee meeting today and will be absent from CPC.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Update on state budget: John Romo

President John Romo expressed hope that the college would not have to make budget reductions for 2007-08. He said the Governor’s budget reduction for community colleges is $32 million; however, our system office has identified dollars to offset that amount so that colleges will be minimally affected for this fiscal year. He said we can anticipate major cuts in the 2008-09 budget when the May revise is announced. President Romo said there is a likelihood of an increase in the student enrollment fee. The system’s position was to not support an enrollment fee increase but, given the realities of the state budget, the position now is that if there is to be a fee increase that it be moderate. John Romo said it was announced a few days ago that there had been a miscalculation in the projection of the state property tax revenues by $75 million dollars for this year. Although we have not heard officially, the state will apply the deficit to the apportionment for the college. This means than we will receive approximately 1.3 percent less which translates to an estimated $968,000 cut in funding for SBCC.
John Romo and Joe Sullivan shared their information on the projected impact of a 1.3-percent reduction in our allocation. President Romo said that since we are a very well fiscally managed District we will not have to contemplate drastic action for 2007-08 and will still be able to maintain our 5-percent contingency and our allocations to the Equipment and Construction Funds as well as utilizing ending balances which the District may need for some of the projects for which we have committed especially if the bond measure doesn't pass. However, he said the college may face some real challenges in 2008-09.

John Romo said the bond activity continues both from the educational side and the campaign run by our consultant Mary Rose. It is still in the formulating stages although there is a considerable amount of work in preparation for the kick-off of the campaign in early April. He said we have continued to receive strong endorsements for the bond and there has been no opposition presented to date. The college met the deadline to get the argument in favor of the bond to the County for the ballot pamphlet and no one has submitted an argument opposing the bond for publication. President Romo said he and Des O’Neill are meeting with groups to enlist their endorsements.

3.2 Examples of short-comings identified by WASC in its accreditation of community colleges that need to be taken into account in our planning processes

Jack Friedlander said he was concerned by a list he received of all the schools either put on warning or probation by our regional accrediting association and the reasons for its doing so. Lake Tahoe Community College, as a service to others, compiled a list of key points and feedback from their self-study. This document was provided to the Council. Dr. Friedlander made some points from this document and also from one compiled by the College of Marin as it pertains to our overall planning process which includes SLOs. He cautioned that if a college loses its accreditation status, it means that its credits have no value. It is also no longer eligible for any federal money (which includes financial aid and Federal grants). He said in order for higher education to maintain its long-held tradition of policing itself, evaluating itself and making improvements through its accreditation process, there has to be evidence that colleges are meeting the standards and assessing the degree to which their claims of what students will learn from completing their courses and degrees are being achieved. Jack Friedlander said we have to show how our student learning outcomes are tied to our college planning, budgeting and program review processes and to demonstrate those processes are being implemented. The expectations and pressure the accreditation associations are under is reflected in their increased diligence in evaluating the degree to which colleges are meeting the specified standards. We have to show in our College Plan and our budget review and program review planning documents how this links back to course, program and institutional SLOs. We presently have program reviews in Educational Programs but we need to have ones for the other units of the college as well.

3.3 Review of SBCC’s performance on the 2007 State Accountability Measures (ARCC)
The Council was provided a copy of the accountability report that we have to submit to the Chancellor’s Office every year. The one-page statement on the “College Level Indicators Self-Assessment” summarizes the data. Jack Friedlander said that compared to our peer group we are above average on each of the seven measures. He said that the data is based on students who entered the college prior to implementing the Partnership for Student Success initiatives.

4.0 Discussion items

4.1 Review draft of the revised college mission statement

Jack Friedlander, Ignacio Alarcon and Kathy Molloy worked collaboratively to formulate a draft of the mission statement for the college. The Council made minor changes to this statement as presented. Dr. Friedlander will ask Diane Rodriguez-Kiino for her assistance in re-writing the section of the paragraph that addresses the diversity of the campus. A new draft will be forwarded to the Council after EC reviews it tomorrow. It will be disseminated to the constituency groups in the consultation process and then brought back to CPC.

4.2 Review of proposed timeline, job description for chairs, and committee structure for completing the college’s self study for accreditation

Jack Friedlander said that he and Darla Cooper developed a structure for completing the college’s self study. Dr. Cooper said this semester we need to set the structure in place, pick a faculty co-chair and determine what the committee structure is going to consist of and its membership. The steering committee needs to meet and do some prep work so that everything is finalized before the semester concludes. She said during the summer the co-chairs will be very busy working to prepare the materials for members of the accreditation standards committee which they need to write the self-study report. The goal is to have a draft of the self study by the end of October to be distributed to the Board of Trustees and the campus community. This will leave about a month for the draft to go through the consultative process before the end of the semester.

Dr. Cooper discussed the accreditation standards committee structure and membership required for the accreditation self-study. There will be an accreditation steering committee to oversee the process. EC will appoint the administrators to serve as co-chairs for each of the standards committees and Ignacio Alarcon will work with the Academic Senate to appoint faculty co-chairs. CSEA will appoint classified members and the Student Senate will appoint students to serve on each of the committees. For the position of self-study faculty co-chair, it will be necessary to give them reassigned course time and stipends for the work they do in the summer in order for the person to perform the responsibilities of this position. It is important to identify who this person will be as soon as possible.

As an aside, it was mentioned that the college has to bear the costs of the accreditation team to visit the college, i.e., transportation, hotel, food and meeting rooms. There are typically 12 people on a team.
4.3 American College and University President's Climate Commitment: Adam Green & Leif Skogberg

Leif Skogberg began the discussion by enlightening the Council on the specifics of the President’s Climate Commitment agreement which is a national campaign to have college and university presidents commit to taking specified actions to reduce their institution’s environmental footprint. President Romo has agreed to sign this commitment if it is endorsed by CPC and approved by the Board of Trustees. The signing of this agreement is an acknowledgement that climate change is an issue that colleges and universities need to address. There are accountability measures to this agreement which will require staff time and funding. An estimate is needed to assess the amount of additional resources required to fulfill the college’s commitment to this agreement. The college has made significant strides in this area. Adam Green informed the Council that there are six accountability measures of which the college would need to meet two of the six to satisfy this agreement. The college has met two of these requirements and on its way to meeting three. The SoMA building will be built to meet LEED Silver certification. With the initial investment towards sustainability, it has been shown that it will pay off in years to come. Dr. Green said Santa Barbara City College is a pilot program for the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in higher education for a sustainability tracking program that will track the progress of college campuses in achieving sustainability outcomes. Tom Garey asked that a net cost report be provided to the Council. Jack Friedlander said he would move this item forward with John Romo and EC.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion by Mike Guillen, the meeting was adjourned.