

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

October 4, 1983

M I N U T E S

Present: P. MacDougall/P. Huglin, Chairpersons; M. Bobgan, L. Fairly,  
P. Freeman, G. Gaston, C. Hanson, E. Jardine, J. Kay, M. Mallen,  
D. Oroz; Resource: Burt Miller, J. Romo, R. Sanchez

Absent: A. Bailon

Pat Huglin, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

1. STATUS OF FUNDING FOR 1983-84

Dr. MacDougall briefly reviewed the funding status of community colleges. He stated that the reduction in basic funding, as announced in July would hopefully not become a reality because: 1) California Community Colleges had developed a very effective coalition that had worked together in developing principles of funding; 2) SB 851 was a good funding bill; 3) community colleges have been experiencing a rapidly diminishing base of funding for the past five years; and 4) the economy was headed in a positive direction.

SB 851 and accompanying bills would restore funding for community colleges, allow for cost-of living increase and/or institute fees of \$30-\$50, but so far none of the bills have been signed into law. It is unlikely that there will be any action till January, and Dr. MacDougall expressed extreme concern in maintaining the quality of education if adequate funding is not forthcoming.

2. BUDGET DEVELOPMENT CALENDAR FOR 1984-85

Dr. MacDougall distributed the Planning/Budget Calendar for 1983-84 to members and briefly reviewed tasks and completion dates.

M/S/C Gaston/Oroz - Unanimous

That the College Planning Committee approve the budget calendar as presented.

3. CONTINGENCY PLANNING IF APPROPRIATE

Dr. MacDougall suggested that contingency planning is the most difficult area in which to deal. If a plan is prepared with such specificity as to identify people and programs, considerable disharmony and apprehension can be created; and, in the end, the contingency may not be needed.

Dr. Mac Dougall indicated that a format has been developed by which programs of the college will be reviewed for possible contingency planning. The model, as developed by Dr. Sanchez, has a timetable of three years in which a third of instructional departments will be reviewed each year. In light of our present fiscal situation, however, the college must address the question of contingency planning by expediting the process of program review. He said that he would like to be able to look at all academic departments and non-academic departments in the college and based upon our financial situation in early December make some judgment as to the need for developing some contingency plans. He would like at that time to use CPC as a confidential advisory group to look at and discuss alternatives and begin to formulate some recommendations to respond to the various contingencies and involve various individuals in that process.

Richard Sanchez explained the Program and Evaluation process to be implemented this fall. It was pointed out that the procedure had been developed during the past college year with consistent input by faculty representatives. Members of the CPC were informed that a fourth category (Institutional Strategies) had been added at the request of Dr. MacDougall. Results of the pilot study involving the Sciences Division are expected soon. The intent originally was to evaluate one-third of all departments each year for three years. However, there is need to develop baseline data for all departments this semester, fall, 1983, (reference Item #3 above). A timeline was presented whereby each division would be evaluated:

October 2-7	Sciences Division
October 10-14	Business/English Division
October 17-26	Applied Sciences & Technology Division
October 27 - November 3	Fine Arts/Communication and Earth Sciences/Computer Sciences Divisions
November 3-10	Health Technologies and Physical Education Divisions
November 11-18	Social Sciences/Foreign Language/ Library Division

The procedure to be followed is that once the quantitative information is gathered by the Instruction Office, it will be sent to each division for review and validation. Departments within the division will next evaluate themselves on the qualitative elements appearing under Items 3 and 4 of the evaluation matrix. (See attached.) The department may use any process they choose so long as a composite figure for each criterion is averaged and noted. The Division Council will also evaluate the department by engaging in a typical process. A third evaluation will be conducted by the Instruction Office. The final tallies will show each of the three discreet evaluations superimposed on one another for each criterion in the spaces provided.

3. Contingency Planning If Appropriate (continued)

A concern was expressed that perhaps all qualitative evaluation elements may not be necessary. A subcommittee consisting of A. Flinck, P. Freeman, M. Mallen and R. Sanchez was established to review the existing elements.

4. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING/DIRECTIONS FOR 1984-85

Dr. MacDougall distributed and summarized the six major components of the "Role of CPC in Institutional Planning and Budget Development." He informed members that CPC will be asked to accomplish two tasks by November 4: 1) react to the outline of and recommendations for the planning process (to be distributed by October 11) and 2) review the Statement of Institutional Directions and recommend revisions, if necessary.

Dr. MacDougall stressed that one of the important functions of the CPC is institutional planning and that it was as important to plan for "lean" years as when resources are stable or increasing. He said that the college should identify what is taking place in "our external environment and the role of the college in responding to it and providing leadership for it."

ba

cc: Division Chairs  
Departments Chairs  
Rep. Council