SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL

October 15, 1991

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Romo, M. Bobgan, L. Fairly, P. Georgakis, C. Kuster,

H. McCarthy, D. Oroz

RESOURCE: G. Gregg, B. Hamre

GUEST: J. Peterson

REPORTS/DISCUSSION

TLU Allocations

J. Romo submitted the latest *TLU Summary Fall 1991* and *TLU Summary Spring 1991* report reflecting TLU reductions. The College has succeeded in saving about \$128,730 from departmental cutbacks and from the \$32,500 One-Time augmentation to the English and Math Departments from 1991-91 surplus revenues. The report currently reflects a surplus of \$8,730 which may be used to offset the projected Spring 1992 shortfall.

The Spring 1992 summary data on program reductions is very tentative, according to J. Romo. All divisions except Math show a reduction in TLUs, and it's anticipated that additional cuts will be made.

Planning

- B. Hamre reported that the new planning process will continue to use the *Statement of Institutional Directions* as a focus, but it will give more flexibility to departments to develop their own planning processes while using established guidelines outlined below.
 - 1. "Emphasis will be on the SID, accreditation plans and team recommendations, program reviews and measures of institutional effectiveness.
 - 2. A two-year perspective should be given to plans.
 - 3. The overall time line must be followed.
 - 4. Planning goals should exploit college strengths and strengthen weaknesses.
 - 5. No department should automatically assume that prior year budgets carried over as a given. Resource re-allocation may be done to accommodate the highest priority goals.
 - 6. Institution-wide activities and plans should reflect consultation with others who participate in these activities.

College Planning Council Minutes, October 15, 1991 Page 2

7. Departments should be sufficiently explicit to justify requests for the resources needed to support them. New programs should reference the SID or other sources that gave rise to them."

The timeline identifies the planning activities and describes how department and division activities relate to resource development and college budget review.

There was some concern expressed regarding item #5: Members asked if this guideline should be interpreted as a change in procedure. The Chair assured members that the consultative process would be used in departmental budget allocations.

Tenure Track Procedures & Timeline

The Chair stated that October 15 is the deadline for faculty to announce their intent to resign or to retire. Departments which submit this information by the deadline will be included in the first round for consideration of replacement positions. A department may appear before the Council to make a special plea for a position at a later date, however, there are advantages to beginning the process as early as possible.

The hiring process would begin with departments submitting replacement requests to DCC in November and will continue with the submittal of requests for new and non-exempt replacement positions to DCC and CPC for review and prioritization. DCC will be given the timeline for these activities at the next meeting. Mr. Oroz presented the tentative timeline from Personnel:

December 6 - List of positions for advertising to Personnel

December 13 - Draft of job announcements to Personnel

January 17 - Job Announcements prepared and distributed

February 28 - Positions closed

March 4-20 - Paper screening/interviews/final interviews

March 24 - Three (3) finalist to Dr. MacDougall and Vice President Romo

Affirmative Action Report

D. Oroz and L. Fairly presented their annual summary report on Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunities requirements.

College Computer Coordinating Committee Report

G. Gregg reported that the CCCC has been given permanent status as a subcommittee of CPC and that it will meet on the 1st Friday of each month (also on the 3rd if necessary). He reviewed the actions taken at the first meeting:

- 1. Endorsement of the Academic Senate proposal to add another faculty member to the CCCC. This would establish parity between the administration and faculty.
- 2. Discussion of the dissolution of CCCA and restructuring of data processing services.
- 3. Discussion on software copyright issues and protection against the risk of being caught in violation of copyright.
- 4. Discussion of criteria and mechanism for the deployment of equipment.
- 5. Endorsement of the One-Time 1990-91 Fund Allocations for wiring the Administration Building, West Campus and the Interdiscollinary Building.

Since the CCCC is a subcommittee of CPC, members asked to receive copies of the minutes.

There was consensus that the CCCC should submit to the Council only those items which required action by the President or by the Board of Trustees.

jdm

cc: Dr. MacDougall
Deans/Assistant Dean
Academic Senate
Division/Department Chairs
Mr. Gregg
Mr. Hamre
Mr. Pickering

Instructor's Association CSEA Council Representative CSEA Representative