

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
October 15, 1996

MINUTES

PRESENT: Dr. MacDougall, J. Friedlander, L. Auchincloss (for B. Hull), D. Barthelmess, L. Fairly, B. Hamre, K. Hanna, C. Hanson, K. O'Connor, D. Oroz, J. Romo, L. Rose
GUESTS: L. Tennatt

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 The meeting was called to order by Dr. Friedlander at 3:04 p.m.

2. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

2.1 Accreditation

Janice Peterson and Bill Hamre provided a brief update on the Accreditation Site Visit. The 13-member accreditation team will be on campus from October 28 through October 31. Ms. Peterson distributed materials on the site visit, including the Accreditation Team Schedule, Team Roster and Team Assignments for the Eight Accreditation Standards. She reported that most appointments between team leaders and members of the accreditation team have been scheduled. She asked that standard leaders review the Self-Study in preparation for their interviews with the members of the team. Bill Hamre reminded standard leaders to submit reference materials to him by October 18 if they have not already done so. A CPC meeting has been scheduled on October 29, from 3-4 p.m. Janice Peterson will invite accreditation team members to this meeting. The primary item to be discussed at the October 29 meeting is the procedures for identifying resources needed to implement the goals and objectives of the College Plan.

Dr. MacDougall reminded invited guests that the breakfast with the accreditation team is scheduled on Tuesday, October 29, at 7:30 a.m. in the Gourmet Dining Room. The President asked that all college staff respond to team members' requests for information and documents as promptly as possible. He also asked members to review the Self-Study in order to be prepared to answer questions from the accreditation team.

2.2 Data Processing Systems Conversion

Dr. MacDougall outlined the need for a major conversion of the college's data processing system in order to more fully integrate the processes that support the delivery of college services (i.e. business, student services, continuing education, academic affairs). Dr. MacDougall noted that it is becoming

increasingly apparent that the existing structures for the college's computer operations will not support the kinds of activities planned in the future. A solution to this problem is to look at different ways in which information is received, stored and applied to carry out transactions that support the business operations of the college. This means converting from the existing storage and application systems to a new system.

Bill Hamre then provided background and rationale for this proposal. He noted that the redesign teams have provided additional evidence of the need for an integration of the processes which provide information on student records, financial and business services records, human resources, and academic affairs (e.g., schedule development). The existing software systems and applications systems are more than 13 years old and are costly to update and maintain. The deployment of personal computers to faculty and staff has provided the capability for office automated tools; however these are not integrated into our basic applications systems. For example, faculty are not able to easily transfer electronically grade book software information to the student records systems.

Mr. Hamre noted that the college has two options for systems conversion: build or buy a new set of applications based on the needs of the college. He cited the experiences of some college districts which have opted to build their systems, noting that the costs has been very high and the products from these investments have not yet materialized. Recently the college has explored the possibility of purchasing the hardware and software applications from major vendors. SBCC is looking at a relatively new initiative being formed by the Maricopa Community College District (Arizona), the City Colleges of Chicago and Saddleback College (California). This new and integrated system for higher education is expected to be in place by the end of the year at these colleges. Oracle Financial System is the baseline product for this system.

Another possible collaboration would be with San Joaquin Delta College's System 2000, a student records system which SBCC participated in developing several years ago. This system will be integrated with Oracle Financial and Human Resources databases. Either of these two systems appears to offer more flexibility in terms of customization of particular institutions. On the build side, SBCC would partner with a third party by providing the collaborative design and development for the new systems with some shared risk and some shared revenue-generating potential. Should the college enter into this collaborative arrangement, it would receive a portion of any revenue based on sales to other colleges.

During the next several months, Cabinet will be reviewing and evaluating all of these options. Cost is a major part of this analysis in that it will have a significant impact on the college budget. The cost of individual systems ranges from approximately \$500,000 to 1.7 million dollars. The College Planning Council will be participating in the on-going review of the analysis of the proposed data processing systems conversion.

Dr. MacDougall outlined some important questions which the conversion raises: (1) What are the expectations for this system based on the individual unit technology plans, e.g., Academic Affairs, Student Affairs?; (2) What are the limitations on existing systems during the period of conversion (estimated at possibly two years)?; (3) What are the costs of the systems conversion and how can the costs be supported?; and (4) How does the evaluation of this project take place? In the discussion that followed members emphasized the importance of bringing the initiative to governance bodies for review and discussion, securing CPC's endorsement of the project, and keeping CPC informed of how the project is funded. Dr. MacDougall stated that although the project would be partially funded from the \$850,000 allocated for computer equipment, the assumption is that a one-time infusion of funds will be necessary. CPC members agreed to take this proposal back to their constituencies for further discussion prior to CPC action.

2.3 CPC's Role in Project Redesign

Dr. MacDougall provided a brief history of the changing role of CPC in Project Redesign. He noted that in 1994, CPC provided excellent and effective leadership in the development of Project Redesign. In 1995-96 CPC's role was significantly reduced while redesign projects were being developed and implemented by various college units. The role of CPC during 1996-97 will be to reconnect with Project Redesign by (1) finishing the redesign projects currently in place; (2) implementing the project through a computer systems conversion; and (3) looking at other processes that could be redesigned (Reinvention Phase II) to further implement the College Plan. CPC will be instrumental in communicating to the college community the initiatives planned in support of Project Redesign.

2.4 Leadership Section of the College Plan

This item was introduced as a result of a discussion at the last CPC meeting on Goal 1 of the Leadership Section of the **College Plan** which states: ***Redefine and expand new leadership roles and organizational structures which complement Project Redesign's movement from a function-based to a process-based model.***

Objective 1a) In order to work toward a process-oriented model of administration and governance, implement a redesign project to restructure the College's administrative structures, governance systems and leadership roles. (September 1997). Dr. Friedlander indicated that there was some concern among CPC members regarding the intent of the goal and the established timeline for its implementation.

Dr. Friedlander noted that the goal and objective 1a were based on the assumption that the existing leadership roles and organizational structures needed to be redesigned and that a process-based model would be more effective than a function-based model for providing administrative, governance and leadership functions of the college. Dr. Friedlander noted that analyses of the existing methods of performing these functions have not been conducted. Thus, in the absence of any analysis, it is premature and, possibly, irresponsible

to conclude that a process-oriented model for governance and leadership is better than the existing function-based model. Dr. Friedlander also noted that changes in our approach to administration, governance and leadership should correspond to changes resulting from the redesign projects on how the college conducts its business. He expressed concern that it may be premature to change the administrative, governance and leadership functions in advance of knowing what is needed to support new procedures resulting from Project Redesign.

Dr. MacDougall responded that the intent of this goal, in his view, is that as the college moves toward a process-based organization, the leadership and governance should move in the same direction as well. Members felt that an analysis of Objectives 1a and 1b should be conducted before CPC undertakes this goal as a Redesign Project. Members felt that the entire administrative structure should be reviewed in the process. It was recommended that an inservice with George Tamas would be useful.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

cc: Cabinet, Deans, Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate, Instructor's Association, CSEA, Classified Council, College Information, *The Channels*, Rob Reilly.

The next meeting of the CPC is Tuesday, October 29, 2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. in SS240.