



**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, August 17, 2010
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
Luria Conference and Press Center
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, R. Else, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, A. Garfinkel, M. Guillen, K. Monda, K. Neufeld, D. Nevins, C. Salazar, J. Sullivan

ABSENT: P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich

GUESTS: M. Croninger, L. Griffin, J. Meyer, K. O'Connor, M. Spaventa, L. Stark, L. Vasquez

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

Information Items/Announcements

1. Full-time equivalent students reported for 2009-10 (attachment)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the narrative in the attachment regarding the FTES report explains the implications for SBCC 2009-10 and 2010-11 funding. The bottom line is that in 2009 – 10 the college served 1,158 more FTES than was funded for by the State. If we had been funded for all enrollments, we would have received \$5.2 million more than we have been funded. Serban stated that it is very important that the college keep serving as many students as possible because 1) students need us, 2) if too many sections are cut, it is very hard to recover later when we will need to have higher enrollment levels, and 3) in 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08, considered more normal times, the college was challenged in meeting its funded enrollment levels. Executive VP Friedlander spoke about what happened last fall. As a result of enrolling more students in some of the classes, these reached various levels of large enrollment classes and as a result some of the faculty received a higher TLU load resulting in higher costs overall. This Fall, faculty may accept only a certain number of students, thereby not exceeding the TLU load levels budgeted. Serban stated that when more students are served, there are added costs, and not only faculty costs, but operational costs such as grounds, maintenance, and admissions & records. Further discussion ensued.
2. Communication e-mailed on July 20, 2010 regarding the funding of program review resource requests for 2010-11 and the allocations for routine and non-routine equipment (attachments)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban said that all Department Chairs, Managers, Supervisors, Academic Senate, and CPC members received the attached memo from VP Sullivan on July 20th. This attachment gives directions on how to purchase the four categories of equipment and facility related items funded through the program reviews last year and the non-routine and routine equipment items. If there are questions, they can be discussed at the next CPC meeting or VP Sullivan and/or Controller Griffin can answer questions between now and the next meeting.
3. Revisions of program review templates completed
 - a. Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning Else reported that the new program review templates are ready for use. Jordan Morris, Information

Systems Specialist will give an instructional workshop on how to use and to answer any questions.

- b. Fall 2010 current enrollments, Senior Director of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning Else. This was not presented at this meeting.
4. August 25 at 10am there will be a signing ceremony with Brandman University for the Early Advantage Partnership (EAP). Signing will take place at the Luria Conference and Press Center.
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban stated that this is a college ceremony for signing this agreement that will help our early transfer students who chose this path.
5. On August 13, 2010, the California State Assembly Committee on Appropriations in a unanimous vote approved the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, [Senate Bill 1440](#) (attached). If the initiative passes the Legislature and is signed into law, community college students seeking to transfer to a California State University will have a streamlined process by fall 2011 that will save them time and money while generating resources for the two systems of higher education to serve more students.
6. Letter from Assembly person Pedro Nava (attached)
 - a. Superintendent/President Serban spoke about the attached copy of the letter she received from Assemblyperson Pedro Nava that he wrote in response to a community member complaining about reductions in course offerings in Continuing Education. Serban stated that It is a good letter because it explains areas that some community members still do not understand. It is remarkable for Assemblyperson Nava to acknowledge the efforts of a college the way he does in this letter. His letter confirms that the college has taken the right steps and has done a lot to preserve more classes than this current fiscal crisis would allow, including subsidizing classes that are no longer funded by the state, such as physical education for older adults.

Discussion Items

7. College priorities for restoration of some funding to critical areas in this fiscal year for inclusion in the adopted budget for 2010-11
 - a. Revised reduction in TLUs for Spring 2011
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the assumed reductions in TLUs in the tentative budget, adopted by the SBCC Board of Trustees in June 2010, will not materialize in Spring 2011. Serban stated that there are two reasons why: 1) It has been observed that by making these cuts for Spring, as they were assumed in the tentative budget, it will create a higher level of difficulty for our students than we want to impose at this time and 2) due to the college's prudent fiscal management, the College is in a position to absorb more classes than we are funded by the state.
 - ii. Superintendent/President Serban and Executive Vice-President Friedlander further explained why the College is now in the position to absorb more classes.
 - iii. There were questions and clarifications concerning tuition for international and out-of-state students and the involvement of the state. Superintendent/President Serban stated that there is a bill working its way through the channels in Sacramento to change how the fees for out-of-state and international students are calculated so that the California Community Colleges can benefit from these

fees. Serban stated that our commitment is to serve as many students as we can and to ensure the success of each student.

- b. Augmentation of funding for counseling
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban stated two areas that need some restoration are: 1) one-on-one counseling sessions that have been reduced, and 2) the hours the Student Services Building is open. Executive Vice President Friedlander stated that he and Dean McLellan are working on a proposal based on the analysis of usage patterns in the Student Services Building in order to recommend the new hours the Student Services Building should be open and one-on-one counseling available for the students. It is a high priority.
 - ii. Academic Senate Representative Nevins made an inquiry into what kind of adjustments were made to the budget. Superintendent/President Serban stated there were additional general fund expenses that have temporarily changed our cash balance to a lower amount. Serban stated that if for core purposes, we do dip into the reserves somewhat. Serban continued to say that the College needs to keep on its prudent track because there is still no state budget and there is no definite date as to when there will be. The College still has the long term problem of the categorical programs that were cut by the state and the College has made a long term commitment to keep them functioning. Serban said that we do not know when, if ever, funding for categorical will be restored, but at this point we want to make sure that we have these kinds of core services to serve the students who are here and the students who are here need to succeed and we need to make sure they do.
 - c. Augmentation to overall hourly budget
 - i. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we may want to augment the budget for hourly workers to some degree. However before that is done, Serban would like an analysis of where the hourly funds were allocated and what the different areas need before further funds are augmented. At the end of 2009-10, there was about \$300,000 in the unrestricted general fund unspent which was budgeted for hourly workers and students.
 - d. Augmentation to equipment and construction funds
 - e. Other?
8. Proposed increase in parking citation fees (attachment)
- a. VP Sullivan reported from a memo outlining a historical summary of citation fees due and payable to the Superior Court Administration for all citation fees paid to SBCC. SBCC charges \$10 less than what the City of Santa Barbara charges for their citations. Our parking citation fees will be raised \$2.00 in January 2011 and another \$2.00 in January 2012. There was further discussion on this matter.
9. Deferred maintenance projects proposed to be funded from Measure V – funds allocated no longer sufficient to cover the costs of all projects (handout)
- a. Superintendent/President Serban said that after looking at the deferred maintenance projects that were assumed to be done with Measure V funds, it has become clear that the \$17 million set aside from the Measure V bond will not be sufficient to cover all those projects. The actual costs of some projects, particularly the bridge, ended up being way over the estimates due to the unforeseen problems with the various projects. Serban asked that VP Sullivan give a brief overview of what this means at this point in time.

Sullivan reported from the handout that listed all the projects that were put together when the College estimated the need for going into the Bond. Sullivan explained the process of initially calculating the costs of these projects, after those calculations are made, then there are the unforeseen actual costs. Currently, the estimate for all deferred projects assumed to be completed with Measure V funds is about \$21 million, \$4 million than the amount allocated from Measure V for this purpose. Sullivan stated that this is an approximate, as the final number is not yet on the spreadsheet and he explained the details in the spreadsheet. VP Sullivan said that the college needs to rely on State funding for the Schott Center and the Administration Building remodel and that won't happen until the State starts passing bonds again. CSEA President and Chair of the Classified Consultant Group Auchincloss asked about whether the college needs to inform the bond investors of the fact that the college will not be able to spend 85% of the Measure V money before November 2011, resulting in the investors having to pay taxes. VP Sullivan stated that investors will not have to pay taxes on the bond. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the College's bond counselor has given information that changes that initial information the college was given. Serban reported that the college needs to write a report with documentation as to why we are not able to spend 85% of the first issuance of the Measure V bond money by November 2011. Further discussion of the details ensued. Superintendent/President Serban stated that it is important for the CPC members to understand this information and this is the place to discuss and ask questions. Each member then is able to take the information back to their departments and constituencies.

- b. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the college needs to start transferring more money into the construction fund to ensure that the college keeps its commitment to complete all these projects. VP Sullivan reminded the members that for the last two years, only \$640,000 has been transferred to the construction fund, down from what is normally transferred. This \$640,000 barely covers only the basic annual on-going maintenance cost each year. Superintendent/President Serban explained that adjustments to the budget continue to be made after the tentative or adopted budget has been passed by the Board. The adopted budget is a snapshot in time. There will be further discussions relating to restoration of funds and Serban reminded the members that again it depends when and what the state budget will eventually pass.

Superintendent/President Serban stated that Controller Griffin will report on the College General fund restricted and unrestricted cash flow. Serban reiterated that the importance of the college reserves has never been more critical than now. Controller Griffin walked the members through the four General Fund Cash Flow reports, 2008-09 Cash Flow Report, the 2009-10 Cash Flow Report and two possible Cash Flow scenarios for 2010-11, explaining in detail the inflows and outflows, deferred payments and the ending fund balance line by line. Griffin explained the importance of the reserves, stating that if we had not had the reserves we had during the three months we did not receive our payments from the State, we would have been \$13 million in the red. There were further questions and discussion.

Superintendent/President Serban pointed out that there were significant efforts to reduce expenditures across all areas in order to create an additional \$3 million in end balances last year to add to our already good reserves. Constant attention is given to maintaining the College's reserves. There are many colleges surviving on borrowing money for their cash flow and surviving on borrowing is not the way to function as an institution. If these other colleges were to go for a bond, they would have trouble getting it because of poor

credit ratings. In the future, the money from the reduction of expenditures will go to categorical programs: EOPS, Matriculation, DSPP, rather than savings, so we will no longer have savings from reducing expenditures. Serban reiterated that at this point in time the college is in very good shape and again, it is not by chance, but by diligent work.

10. Priorities for 2010-11 – All – Not discussed at this meeting.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 7, 3:00-4:30pm, A - 218

SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
General Fund - Unrestricted Sep 3, 2010

	2007-08 Audited Actual	2008-09 Audited Actual	2009-10 Unaudited Actual	2010-11 Tentative Budget	Changes	2010-11 Adopted Budget
REVENUES						
Federal	1,807	1,695	1,939	2,000	0	2,000
State General Revenue					0	0
General Apportionment	73,136,408	74,880,809	73,987,798	73,207,165	0	73,207,165
Other State Revenue					0	0
Part-time Faculty compensation	624,286	680,488	333,456	199,576	0	199,576
Lottery	2,038,971	1,977,517	2,072,104	2,011,000	0	2,011,000
Other	221,043	1,053,231	543,715	48,476	0	48,476
Local					0	0
Interest	725,722	479,945	309,667	300,000	0	300,000
International Student Fees	4,442,615	5,948,178	6,675,666	6,798,881	0	6,798,881
Non Resident Fees	2,916,150	3,236,684	3,341,925	3,255,783	0	3,255,783
Other	989,477	1,733,814	1,912,066	1,906,595	0	1,906,595
Total Revenues	<u>85,096,479</u>	<u>89,992,361</u>	<u>89,178,336</u>	<u>87,729,476</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>87,729,476</u>
EXPENDITURES						
Academic Salaries	39,650,106	41,465,814	40,735,841	39,573,342	772,434	40,345,776
Classified Salaries	19,605,622	19,976,004	18,640,606	19,796,667	168,386	19,965,053
Employee Benefits	12,774,374	13,201,662	13,307,127	14,060,471	191,947	14,252,418
Supplies & Materials	1,988,679	1,892,109	2,084,080	2,654,637	60,050	2,714,687
Other Operating Expenses	6,751,049	6,354,716	6,498,634	7,994,039	69,250	8,063,289
Capital Outlay	241,244	120,762	141,444	272,932	3,090	276,022
Other Outgo	35,047	55,774	203,380	216,385	0	216,385
Total Expenditures	<u>81,046,121</u>	<u>83,066,841</u>	<u>81,611,112</u>	<u>84,568,473</u>	<u>1,265,157</u>	<u>85,833,630</u>
Net Revenues & Operating Exp	<u>4,050,358</u>	<u>6,925,520</u>	<u>7,567,224</u>	<u>3,161,003</u>	<u>(1,265,157)</u>	<u>1,895,846</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses) - TRANSFERS						
Intrafund In	84,993	0	49,275	0	161,864	161,864
Intrafund Out - Categorical Backfill		(106,046)	(480,199)	(825,173)	0	(825,173)
Interfund In - Auxiliary	119,919	4,446	0	0	0	0
Interfund In - Bookstore		127,084	250,000	250,000	0	250,000
Interfund In - Construction (Aspect)		41,000	41,000	41,000	0	41,000
Interfund In - Equip				186,670	17,180	203,850
Interfund Out - Equipment Fund	(1,800,000)	(500,000)		(1,200,000)	(3,700,000)	(4,900,000)
Interfund Out - Equip copiers	(233,909)	(117,909)		0	0	0
Interfund Out - Equip Banner & Moodle	(161,120)			0	0	0
Interfund Out - Construction Fund	(1,200,000)	(600,000)	(640,000)	(640,000)	(2,090,000)	(2,730,000)
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Energy Proj	(204,786)	(250,000)		0	0	0
Interfund Out - Constr Fund - Loan Pymt			(191,846)	(197,065)	0	(197,065)
Interfund Out - Children's Center	(163,300)	(250,000)	(271,535)	(271,535)	0	(271,535)
	<u>(3,558,203)</u>	<u>(1,651,425)</u>	<u>(1,243,305)</u>	<u>(2,656,103)</u>	<u>(5,610,956)</u>	<u>(8,267,059)</u>
Excess of Revenues & Other Sources over (under) Expenditures & Other Uses	<u>492,155</u>	<u>5,274,095</u>	<u>6,323,919</u>	<u>504,900</u>	<u>(6,876,113)</u>	<u>(6,371,213)</u>
Beginning Fund Balance	10,716,965	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134		22,807,134
Ending Fund Balance	<u>11,209,120</u>	<u>16,483,215</u>	<u>22,807,134</u>	<u>23,312,034</u>		<u>16,435,921</u>
Memo:						
Undesignated Fund Balance	5,848,367	3,138,325	7,281,004	7,577,704	(7,228,813)	348,891
Mandated Contingency (5%)	4,240,500	4,239,200	4,135,700	4,343,900	352,700	4,696,600
Designation for Banked TLUs	1,120,253	1,137,366	1,188,630	1,188,630	0	1,188,630
Deferred Payments	0	7,968,324	10,201,800	10,201,800	0	10,201,800
Ending Fund Balance	<u>11,209,120</u>	<u>16,483,215</u>	<u>22,807,134</u>	<u>23,312,034</u>	<u>(6,876,113)</u>	<u>16,435,921</u>
Ending Fund Balance - Accrual Basis	11,209,120	16,483,215	22,807,134	23,312,034		16,435,921
State revenue deferral	0	(7,968,323)	(10,201,800)	(10,201,800)		(10,201,800)
Ending Fund Balance - Cash Basis	<u>11,209,120</u>	<u>8,514,892</u>	<u>12,605,334</u>	<u>13,110,234</u>		<u>6,234,121</u>

Program Review Timelines for 2010-11
Sep 7, 2010

August 23, 2010 - Fall semester begins

October 4, 2010 - Program Reviews Need to Be Completed by All Departments/Units

All areas of the program review need to be updated, as needed, and new information added, as applicable. The completion of the program reviews includes:

- New resource requests (if needed)
- Update on the status of goals and objectives for 2009-10
- New/revised goals and objectives for 2010-11
- Update information in program reviews submitted in 2009-10

The information included in the 2009-10 program reviews for each unit/department with a completed program review was rolled over into the 2010-11 templates for editing and updating purposes.

October 18, 2010 – Reports on resource requests provided to EC, CPC, DTC, ITC and Academic Senate and P&R

December 1, 2010 - DTC, ITC and Academic Senate (via P&R) rankings submitted to EC

January 28, 2011 - EC ranking completed

February 8, 2011 - EC will provide its rankings to CPC

March 22, 2011 - CPC completes its rankings

**College-wide priorities for 2010-11 – draft for discussion
August 23, 2010**

Although there are many important activities and projects that will be tackled during this academic year, below are some key priorities proposed for the year, which will require significant involvement and support from all college constituencies:

- During spring and summer 2011, develop the college plan for 2011-14. In conjunction with the development of the college plan, define and commit to a few, well chosen BHAGs
- Develop and prepare for the implementation of the degree/transfer express initiative to start in Summer 2011
- Develop transfer and career technical education plans for 2011-14, integrated with the college plan for 2011-14
- Continue the deployment of, training in and integration of interactive and human presence technologies for teaching and learning activities
- Review and begin implementation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan – requirement of the State Chancellor's Office
- Emergency preparedness and disaster recovery/business continuity planning
- Planning agendas identified in the self study
- Selected objectives from College Plan 2008-11; District Technology Plan 2008-11

COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL SUMMARY
DRAFT NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION AT THIS TIME JUNE 22, 2010

Total membership = 16

Number of survey participant = 15 (94%)

What is your understanding of the purpose of this committee?

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. Advise the president; ensure representation from major groups on campus in issues related to budget planning, college mission, college priorities.
2. College strategic planning
3. CPC is the college's consultation body charged with college planning, budget, resource requests, policies, and other college-wide issues. It makes recommendations to the superintendent.
4. To plan the direction for the college and the dispersal of funds from the district.
5. This is a college wide committee with representation from all contingency groups of the college. The committee deals with most college business including budget and policies.
6. Serve a advising arm to campus and/or president.
7. Top level committee for making/discussing college goals, priorities, and budget allocations supporting same.
8. Provide input and recommendations to the president regarding significant issues related to planning and budget for the district.
9. CPC is an advisory committee to the superintendent. CPC is the mechanism by which major campus groups are consulted.
10. Join consultation of administration, faculty, and staff. Recommendations about budget issues.
11. To provide a consultative forum representing all consultative constituencies for the purpose of making planning and policy recommendations to the college president and trustees.
12. Main governance committee advisory regarding planning, budgeting, evaluation, resource allocation. Advisory on college wide decision making; develops and/or evaluates the college plan and other plans and regularly monitors progress towards college goals and objectives.
13. Provide advice/recommendations to the president and through the president to the board of directors.
14. College wide advisory board to Superintendent/President, on matters related to budget, planning, and policy.
15. Consultation body to advise college president. Resource allocation is topic of particular focus

Did you receive an orientation on participatory governance when you began serving as a committee member?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Yes	1 (7%)
No	14 (93%)
Other	0

If you did receive an orientation, was it valuable?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Yes	1 (7%)
No	1 (7%)
No Response	13 (86%)

2010 EVALUATION OF PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE AT SBCC

If you did not receive an orientation, what would you recommend going forward in terms of helping new members learn more about SBCC participatory governance? (*Participants could mark more than one response; thus, no percentages are given here.*)

Item	Number of Respondents
Meeting Management	2
Parliamentary Procedures	6
Participatory Governance	9
Other	3 (*See below)

**(1) Budget principles and practices; (2) scope and purpose of CPC; (3) I would have benefited from printed material explaining the role of the committee; the components of the committee; a schedule of the years' meetings, the rules for conducting meetings.*

How often do (did) you attend committee meetings?

Item	Percent of Respondents
Perfect attendance	6 (40%)
Regularly	9 (60%)
Occasionally	0

What have you learned that you could be called upon to share with prospective committee members?

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. Important to attend every meeting; be patient – takes about a semester to get how it works.
2. No response
3. All topics addressed by CPC
4. No response
5. No response
6. No response
7. How the program review resource requests wind their way through college committees and eventually become budget recommendations from CPC.
8. Role of district constituents in participating in budget planning and development, leading to resource allocation.
9. CPC is not really a body which decides things with finality. CPC advises the superintendent who consults with the board. The board is the ultimate authority.
10. Need to attend and participate in important discussions and vote on important matters.
11. History of governance practices at CPC. Related governance practices at other institutions.
12. It is important to understand what participatory governance means; what are appropriate topics for consultation. Members of CPC need to communicate back to the constituencies they represent; need to come prepared.
13. No response
14. Role of constituency groups in participating governance.
15. I have some history and understanding of the committee's role.

2010 EVALUATION OF PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE AT SBCC

Please Note: If total response is less than 15, one or more survey participants did not answer that particular question.

Task	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. Agendas and minutes were provided electronically prior to the committee meetings.	9 (60%)	6 (40%)			
b. In general, the objectives of each committee meeting were clear and understood	7 (47%)	7 (47%)	1 (6%)		
c. The discussions usually followed the agenda.	8 (53%)	7 (47%)			
d. The committee completed the agenda in an efficient and timely manner	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	5 (33%)	1 (6%)	
e. Action items were clearly articulated	9 (60%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	
f. Parties responsible for follow up action were identified	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	2 (13%)		
g. Action items were assigned and completed in a timely fashion	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	4 (26%)	0	0
h. The committee members had appropriate information to make informed decisions	5 (33%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	0
i. Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	0
j. Constituent groups had an opportunity to participate on College participatory committees	7 (47%)	6 (40%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
k. All members attended regularly	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
l. All members were encouraged to be actively involved	7 (46%)	4 (26%)	3 (20%)	0	1 (6%)
m. All members participated in the discussion and decision making process	5 (33%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
n. Decisions were made by consensus	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	0
o. Different opinions and values were respected	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	2 (13%)	0	1 (6%)
p. Participation in the committee was important and valuable to the college.	13 (86%)	2 (13%)	0	0	0
q. The committee charge was understood and the members worked toward fulfilling the charge.	9 (60%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
r. Committees acted in accordance with Board Policy 2510 <i>Participation in Local Decision Making</i> .	9 (60%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
s. I regularly communicated with the members of the constituent group I represented regarding key items discussed and actions taken during committee meetings.	9 (60%)	5 (33%)	0	1 (6%)	0
t. Overall, I am satisfied with the committee's performance	8 (53%)	4 (26%)	4 (26%)	1 (6%)	0
u. I was an effective participant	7 (47%)	5 (33%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0

Open ended written comments about participatory governance and processes in general.

***Please note that all open-ended responses have not been corrected for grammar or spelling.*

1. SBCC prides itself, and rightly so, on the open, honest communication among its different groups. CPC is an important place to explore questions and concerns, and I am glad that this forum exists. I am not sure about some of the small decisions about budget priorities – it's hard to figure out a way

to allow for participation among all the groups on campus – but there are some decisions the president makes that could be shared more directly.

2. No response
3. No response
4. No response
5. This committee has considerably improved in all areas since the college president became the chair.
6. No response
7. No response
8. Congratulations to Dr. Serban for her effective leadership on CPC. She facilitated CPC effectively and with respect and open communication.
9. I think that sometimes questions are framed in such a way as to preclude truly effective decision-making.
10. No response
11. Consultative bodies that serve to advise particular individuals should not be chaired by the individual being advised. This is a basic principle of consultation, to insure candor and objectivity.
12. No response
13. The limited perspective from constituent groups. It is always the same representatives from CSEA, IA, Academic Senate, and management. This limits the input to a few individuals who seem to have their own agenda.
14. There is no feeling on campus that this is an effective committee. It is perceived as a rubber stamp of the president's wishes. I know this is not the case, but that is the general perception. We need more building of trust, so that hard questions may be asked without fear. More communication from CPC members to their represented constituencies is indispensable for this committee to be vital in the governance of the college.
15. The committee is significantly more efficient than in the past; I do wish that meetings always ended on time – in order to plan – but this observation is not in conflict with my assessment that overall efficiency has increased; This group should be headed by the college president as it is at present. This makes a significant difference.