

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
February 5, 2008
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Romo, J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, B. Partee,
I. Alarcon, S. Broderick, T. Garey, K. Molloy, G. Thielst, M. Guillen, L. Vrazilek

ABSENT: L. Auchincloss, P. Buckelew, D. Cooper, C. Ramirez

GUEST: C. Salazar (for L. Auchincloss)

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order. He introduced Lauren Vrazilek, the new Student Senate representative to CPC. She is the vice president of Senate Affairs and is a Political Science major.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the December 12th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Guillen/Garey] to approve the minutes of the December 12th CPC meeting. Susan Broderick and Cindy Salazar abstained.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 SBCC's Gateway to Success Program has won the Two-Year College English Association Award as the exemplary program in the category of "Enhancing Developmental Education".

2.2 Update on applications for faculty positions

Sue Ehrlich said that the applications closed yesterday and that there is a large pool of candidates for the faculty positions. In regard to the Presidential search, she said that people who are going to be interviewed have been notified and that process will take place on February 22nd and 23rd. Ignacio Alarcon gave accolades to the HR/LA staff for the outstanding and effective job they continue to do at the job fair. In addition, Jack Friedlander acknowledged Mr. Alarcon, other deans and faculty, as well as the HR/LA staff for taking the time to participate in this event.

- 2.3 It was announced that Liz Auchincloss will be on medical leave of absence for 6-8 weeks. Cindy Salazar, on behalf of Liz, thanked everyone for their well wishes and concerns and informed the Council that Liz is doing well.

3.0 Information Items

- 3.1 Update on the Governor's proposed budget for 2008-09

Jack Friedlander said the Governor's proposed budget does not include a COLA for next year. He allows for a one percent growth, and a reduction of 3.6 to 10% in funding for categorical (i.e., EOPS/Care, Matriculation, Basic Skills/ESL, CalWORKS, Cal-SOAP) which would be devastating to the operation of those programs. The Governor's Economic and Workforce Development proposal would reduce the overall funding for community colleges by 10%. He said the Governor's philosophy is to ask the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office to determine how to make these cuts. USC and CSU indicated they would take in fewer students and increase fees. Dr. Friedlander recommended that the system take the position that cuts in the core categorical programs be restored before it agrees to serve moiré students. It makes no sense for colleges to accept more students at a time they are being asked to reduce core support services they need to succeed. There hasn't been agreement or disagreement on that argument but it is being discussed. Our position the last time we had cuts in categoricals was that these programs are core components of our educational programs and, as such, should not be singled out for the purpose of reducing spending. He said John Romo wants to adhere to this principle. There will be further discussion in the Council as to how to absorb the proposed budget cuts costs once we have more information.

The Governor also proposes a mid-year cut this year of \$40m to make up the shortfall in expected property tax revenues that were counted on to help fund the community college. Fortunately the Chancellor's Office thinks it can find money in the system's unallocated budget to absorb most if not all of the \$40 million.

- 3.2 Spring semester enrollment update for credit and fall quarter enrollment update for non-credit

Jack Friedlander reported enrollments as of yesterday:

Overall cumulative units: +3.83%

CA resident: +1.43%

Non-resident (out-of-state and international students): +22.12%

These numbers do not reflect the Dual Enrollment or late start figures. What is critical is what is reflected on Census day February 11th. Dr. Friedlander said we are still trying to determine where we are in terms of FTES for this past summer and fall.

- 3.3 Information about the bond measure (*discussed first on the agenda*) – John Romo

President John Romo distributed a handout that included the language for the bond that will appear on the ballot in June. Also included was the document submitted to the Board which is the delineation of long-range facilities projects that would be funded should the bond be approved. He discussed the educational aspects of the bond and the Board's decision to proceed with placing the bond measure on the June 3, 2008 ballot. This action was taken at the January 24th Board meeting. This list of projects was compiled from the consultation process over the past two years. Not every project was included in the bond measure as consideration was given to priority needs, the projects that will resonate with the community, and the amount of increase in property taxes the community would support. The text that has come out of the document has been worked on by CPC and extensively by our consultants. The Board's decision to go out for a bond followed a professional survey of the community of approximately 500 people with a series of questions as well as personal follow-up interviews with 25 community leaders. The feedback in the survey was very positive and demonstrated a great deal of appreciation of the college. President Romo said the requirement to pass this kind of bond is 55%. When the question was asked during the survey if you would vote for a bond, the response was 57%. The poll was done with a potential bond in the amount of \$160m although our bond will be \$77,242.12. The cost to the taxpayer will be approximately \$8.50 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation. The consultants we are working with believe that asking for a \$77,242 million versus \$160 million bond would increase the chances of the bond being approved by the voters.

John Romo said we will be pursuing two strategies to get this bond passed: one will be an educational effort; internal and external, which we can do as District employees and which we can do with District resources and time. There will also be a political campaign for District resources cannot be used. All documents that are public documents have the kind of language that the public will respond to, rather than community college "jargon". John Romo said the message of this campaign is that it isn't about building, it's about maintaining quality facilities so that we can do the best possible job in carrying out teaching and learning. There is only one new project, and that is the SoMA building. Another theme is that by going out for a bond and asking the voters to assess themselves at \$8.50 per \$100k of assessed property valuation, we will generate over \$92m in state funding for these projects. It should be noted that the Foundation has committed to raise \$5m for the SoMA Building and to date they have committed pledges, without going to the public phase of its campaign, of close to \$1.3 million dollars.

John Romo said that we cannot use any District dollars to fund the political campaign. The Foundation has agreed to contribute from their quasi-endowment \$300,000 to fund the campaign. From the long-term perspective, this is one of the most important things for our college overall, maintaining and strengthening the quality of what we do.

President Romo said that Jack Friedlander is developing an outline of our framework for our internal educational program with our faculty and staff. He said he will be

speaking to the Senate and the IA. The students are very much engaged and have kicked off a registration effort.

4.0 Discussion items

4.1 Preliminary Goals and Objective for the College Plan 2008-2011 & SBCC College Plan: 2008-2011 Challenges and Priorities

The Council reviewed and discussed these drafts and made minor changes. The members will discuss these documents with members of the constituency groups they represent. The latest draft of the Challenges and Priorities was not attached to the agenda and will be e-mailed to the Council at the end of the meeting.

Item 4.3 (Goals and Objectives) was changed to reflect that the employee surveys will be implemented in Fall 2008 instead of 2007-08. The correct language will be reflected in a new draft to be distributed to the Council.

4.2 Proposed timeline for developing the college budget for 2008-09

Joe Sullivan went over the timeline with the Council.

4.3 Review draft of the revised college mission statement

The draft will be distributed and reviewed at the next CPC meeting.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion [Ehrlich/Garey] the meeting was adjourned.

Student Learning Outcomes

Lake Tahoe Community College

Fall Convocation Presentation

September 13, 2006

<http://www.ltcconline.net/green1/SLO/Resources/06Convocation.htm>

Presented by Steve Fernald and Kurt Green

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Reaffirmation Report

Recommendation 1: In order for the college to achieve substantial compliance with Standard I, the college must *begin developing and implementing student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all of its courses, programs, degrees, and certificates.* The team recommends that the college *adhere to the October 2005 Academic Senate Resolution that mandates responsibility for the development and oversight of SLOs to the Academic Senate for all instructional units of the campus.* The team further recommends the college *develop mechanisms for measuring student learning outcomes and demonstrate how it uses these findings to improve student learning.*

Recommendation 2: To obtain substantial compliance with Standard I, the visiting team recommends the institution revisit its established and published planning cycle and *demonstrate the extent to which the planning process and cycle includes the establishment and measurement of SLOs and how these are linked to the mission statement, institutional research, planning, resource allocation and evaluation.*

Do we need a formal document that links the Mission Statement to ISLOs? Do we need a statement from the Senate, from CPC?

Recommendation 3: In order for the institution to demonstrate substantial compliance with Standard II, it is recommended the college *develop SLOs and a systematic process for the assessment of those SLOs, at the course and program level, and use the outcomes of that process in course and program improvement.* Furthermore, it is recommended greater emphasis be placed upon documenting dialogue taking place in all the other aspects of the campus and making it more readily accessible to internal and external constituencies.

We need to put all agendas, notes, handouts on the SLO site. (As well as all meetings, individual, group, and large group?)

Recommendation 4: To ensure substantial compliance with Standard II, it is recommended *Student Services develop and implement SLOs for all its component units, assess those measures, analyze the data, link the process to planning and budgeting, and use the results for continuous program improvement.*

Do we need to put budget expenses on the SLO site? (The Senate allocation...?)

Recommendation 9: To achieve substantial compliance with Standard IV and to increase the effectiveness of the institution's commitment to college wide dialogue and consultation, the team recommends that an *institutional commitment be established to the development of Student Learning Outcomes from the course level to the institutional level.* The team recommends that the administration, as part of the institution's overall assessment of its own quality and effectiveness, provide the appropriate

level of resources and support to accomplish this task in a timely manner.

The Commission notes with concern that Lake Tahoe Community College has made little progress in moving the institution forward in the area of establishing Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program levels. This concern is validated by the team's observation of an almost complete absence of institutional activity to define learning outcomes and to develop authentic assessments of learning. Assessment also needs to become part of program review, planning, and resource allocation processes at LTCC."

Is our course embedded assessment sufficiently "Authentic"?)

Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.

President, Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges

Listed below are the accreditation standards
that Barbara Beno references in her letter
to the college if anyone is interested.

Accreditation Standards

Mueller's* Glossary of Authentic Assessment Terms
<http://jonathan.mueller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/glossary.htm>

Authentic Assessment: A form of assessment in which students are asked to perform real-world tasks that demonstrate meaningful application of essential knowledge and skills. Student performance on a task is typically scored on a rubric to determine how successfully the student has met specific standards.

Some educators choose to distinguish between authentic assessment and performance assessment. For these educators, performance assessment meets the above definition except that the tasks do not reflect real-world (authentic) challenges. If we are going to ask students to construct knowledge on assessments, then virtually all such tasks should be authentic in nature or they lose some relevance to the students.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

Do we communicate the Mission externally?

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes. The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

Our Mission Statement and ISLOs seem to cover this adequately

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Our Tasks

I see eight tasks before us, as a faculty, to complete within a “reasonable amount of time.”

1. Accept the responsibility of the oversight of SLOs for all instructional units of the campus including Student Services. (Recommendation 1 & 4)
2. Develop mechanisms for measuring SLOs outcomes on both the course and program level. (Recommendation 1)
3. Demonstrate the use of these findings to improve student learning. (Recommendation 1)
4. Demonstrate the extent to which the planning process and cycle includes the establishment and measurement of SLOs. (Recommendation 2 & 3)
5. Demonstrate how SLOs are linked to the Mission Statement, institutional research, planning, resource allocation and evaluation. (Recommendation 2)

Do we need a formal set of statements and links?

6. Establish a systematic process for the assessment of SLOs. (Recommendation 3)
7. Establish a process of implementing the recommendations. (Recommendation 3)

We need to raise this at CTL.

8. Commit to the development of SLOs from the course level to the institutional level. (Recommendation 9)

I've summarized some books and articles later in this document regarding the task, and for easy reference, I've listed the title of the article or book following the numerical sequence of the above tasks.

1. *Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at the Institutional Level*, page 7; *The Outcomes Primer, Part I Confronting Confusion*, page 15
2. *A Perspective on Good Practice in Community College Assessment*, page 6; *Assessment at the Program Level*, page 10
3. *The Role of Student Learning Outcomes in Accreditation Quality of Review*, page 12
4. *Implications of State Performance Indicators for Community College Assessment*, page 11; *Assessment at the Program Level*, page 10
5. *Learning Outcomes for the Twenty-First Century: Cultivating Student Success for College and the Knowledge Economy*, page 14
6. *Assessment at the Program Level*, page 10
7. *A Perspective on Good Practice in Community College Assessment*, page 6
8. *The Outcomes Primer*, page 15

The New Direction

Rather than revisit and repeat last year's convocation's presentation on SLOs, I feel we should address our specific concerns and needs. During the summer, I read and reviewed a number of publications, visited a number of web sites, and plan on attending an accreditation visit training on September 12. The following is a summary of two of the books I read. I think they offer direction and advice for us. I attempted objectivity, but I know I lapsed at times, so please excuse me.

Developing and Implementing Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes,

Andrea Serban and Jack Friedlander

1. *A Perspective on Good Practice in Community College Assessment,*

Trudy W. Banta, Karen E. Black, Susan Kahn, Julia E. Jackson

Observations and Reflections

1. University level faculty focus more on research and other priorities within the academy than on high-quality education for students (Massy,2003).
2. To gain our constituent's support, we must gain their trust by emphasizing service, innovation, and flexibility in the education we provide.
3. Early attempts to assess student learning in community colleges (1990s) often relied on standardized instruments (ACT). Faculty at both the 2 and 4 year institutions found such instruments to be of limited value.
4. Faculties have begun to align assessment approaches with locally developed, campus-specific goals for student learning and accomplishment.
5. Butler Community College (Kansas) developed an ongoing, systematic assessment program for general education.
 - a. Faculties develop their own course-based assignments designed to assess specific, desired outcomes such as critical thinking skills.
 - b. Students complete the assignments and receive grades on them.
 - c. During the following semester, samples of the student work are analyzed by interdisciplinary groups of faculty using a common scoring rubric.

We are happy with course based assessment. Do we need to hedge that with some assessment teams reading and scoring essays collected across a range of classes?.
 - d. Findings are submitted to an assessment team that aggregates the data and reports institution-wide results.
 - e. These data are discussed and further analyzed in departmental faculty meetings.
 - f. During the third semester of the assessment cycle, the director of assessment and a faculty representative from the assessment team meet with faculty and administrators to review findings and discuss needed

Would our larger work group including CTL, CAC, SSPS, Admin. ... serve this purpose? We would be using scores from courses mapped to ISI Os, but wouldn't have the comments available from

improvements in curriculum, planning, budgeting, or the assessment process.

- g. To begin the next cycle, the director of assessment identifies for each department the courses from which samples of student work will be drawn.
- h. Faculties then generate the assignments that will be assessed, and the process continues.

6. Characteristics of good practice in the three phases of assessment.

a. Planning

- 1. Involves stakeholders from the outset to incorporate their needs and interests and solicit later support.
- 2. Begins where the need is recognized.
- 3. Has a written plan with clear purposes that are related to goals that people value.
- 4. Bases assessment approaches on clear, explicitly stated program objectives.

b. Implementing

- 1. Has knowledgeable, effective leadership.
- 2. Recognizes that assessment is essential to learning.
- 3. Includes faculty and staff development to prepare individuals to implement assessment and use the findings.
- 4. Uses multiple measures.
- 5. Assesses process as well as outcomes.
- 6. Occurs in an environment that is receptive, supportive, and enabling.
- 7. Incorporates continuous communication with constituents concerning the activities and findings.

c. Improving and Sustaining

- 1. Produces credible evidence of learning and organizational effectiveness.
- 2. Ensures that assessment data are used to improve programs and services.
- 3. Provides a vehicle for demonstrating accountability to stakeholders.
- 4. Encompasses the expectation that outcomes assessment will be ongoing, not episodic.
- 5. Incorporates ongoing evaluation and improvement of the assessment process itself.

It is unknown why faculty didn't comply earlier with WASC's requests, Summa-Wolfe said, but she speculates that some faculty members may not have been willing to participate in program review because it could reveal low student enrollment in certain programs.

"We know enrollments have been declining for 20 years until recently," she said. "If you're doing a program review and the programs are losing students maybe a program review would not be a welcomed process. Maybe people would be concerned about layoffs or program reviews."

John Sutherland, Chair of the English Department at College of Marin, blames White for College of Marin's current status, claiming that faculty members had already put together a master plan for the college that included a program review.

Sutherland alleges that White ignored the plan and faculty recommendations until it came time to create a master plan for the college modernization bond measure.

"She hired a consultant and paid him \$160,000. This is outrageous because we already had a master plan," he said.

Then White then shelved the plan after it a faculty member suggested a management evaluation be included in the review.

"They didn't want to have a management component where management could be held accountable," Sutherland adds. "She's not taking responsibility for it. If you're a CEO of a company you don't let your company flounder."

College of Marin will be up for another review by WASC in 2010.

<http://www.novatoadvance.com/nrticles/2008/02/13/nAws/nor.47h350cci61a7f384120703.txt>

HEADLINE...College of Marin on probation

**By Jamie Oppenheim
Novato Advance**

February 13, 2008

College of Marin faculty members are scrambling to submit a progress report to the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of School's and Colleges (WASC) by April 1 in hopes of ridding the college of its recent probationary status. WASC evaluates all California community colleges and other institutions of higher learning every six years,

The college received notification from the accreditation organization on Jan. 31 stating that it is on probation until it submits a qualitative and quantitative program review, a request that the college has been delinquent in submitting for several years.

Yolanda Bellissimo, College of Marin Academic Senate Chair, is responsible for ensuring the program reviews get completed.

"We're working incredibly hard. WASC told us in November that it had to be done by April," Bellissimo said. "Our original plan was to do the program evaluations in phases over a few years and learn from our templates. WASC's notion was that it had been there done that.

"Our tendency as researchers is to work slowly and not make any mistakes," Bellissimo continued. "So this is not the perfect method of doing research, but we'll get it done, and it's going to be good."

Cathy Summa-Wolfe, College of Marin Communications Director, said that if the college fails to complete WASC's request it could have its accreditation revoked.

"To lose accreditation is very rare," Summa-Wolfe said. "There's only one public school that has had its accreditation revoked, and that's Compton in 2005."

In the case of that college, it became absorbed by a nearby school, El Camino College, and served as a satellite campus.

According to college officials, the unmet requirement had been outstanding since 1987. Some attempts were made to fulfill this requirement; however they did not meet WASC's standards.

Dr. Frances White, College of Marin President said, "It's been a long time coming to get this off the institution's back. Until about a year go senate leadership did not take this seriously. They were more focused on student learning at the department level."

In order to clear its probationary status, faculty from the college's 28 programs must submit data reflecting student enrollment, student success rates, how facilities are used and how programs meet the college's and students' goals.

"It's a good opportunity for the school to look at what it does and how it can do better and what resources we have to accomplish that," Bellissimo said.

WASC had previously asked the college to comply with a total of five recommendations, four of which were completed.

"The last request requires faculty leadership and participation and until recently we haven't had a group that embraces this project. Now we do," Summa-Wolfe said.

ARCC 2008 Report: College Level Indicators Self-Assessment Santa Barbara City College

Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) is pleased with the improvements seen in the current year's data. This year, the college's performance is above the peer group average on all seven accountability measures, whereas last year we were higher only on four of the six measures. The college is particularly proud that our greatest success comes in the areas of Basic Skills and ESL with improvement rates that far exceed the peer group averages.

When examining the college's performance over the three-year period, there is much variation across all seven measures, with no truly meaningful patterns emerging. Much of the differences seen reflect our recent efforts to submit more accurate data and changes in our curriculum, particularly in ESL, resulting in not all ESL students being captured in the first two cohorts thus distorting the rates for those years. As a result, only the last year of data in this report is a true representation of our students. It is also worth noting that the data in this report are for students who entered the college six or more years ago and the college's recent efforts to improve student success are not reflected.

The college's efforts began well before the ARCC initiative when the college noticed the declines in student success, particularly among our basic skills students. In response, SBCC launched its Partnership for Student Success (PSS) initiative in 2006, with the full support of the Board of Trustees, President, and College Planning Council to make this effort the college's number one priority. The focus of the PSS is to provide assistance that helps increase success among all students, but especially those in need of remediation.

An evaluation conducted at the end of the initiative's first year showed a significant positive impact on student success. The cornerstone of the PSS, the Gateway program, places instructional aides in the classroom to work directly with students needing assistance. Success rates among students enrolled in Gateway courses exceeded those of their peers in comparable non-Gateway courses. Even more importantly, basic skills students seem to have benefited greatly from the Gateway program as evidenced by their considerably higher success rates compared to students in comparable non-Gateway courses. In addition, through the PSS, improvements were made in the writing center and math lab and the results show that students who used these services had higher success rates than students in the same classes who did not.

After only one year of existence, the PSS has been honored twice with the 2007 State Chancellor's Award for Best Practices in Student Equity and the 2008 Diana Hacker Two Year College English Association National Award for Outstanding Program in English in the category of Enhancing Developmental Education. The college is extremely encouraged by the results shown with the PSS and will continue to implement programs and services that help students achieve their educational success. We fully expect to see the true impact of these recent efforts in future ARCC reports.

Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Community College District
College Performance Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Degree/Certificate/Transfer

Table 1.1:
Student Progress and
Achievement Rate

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a Certificate (18 units or more); or achieved "Transfer Directed" status; or achieved "Transfer Prepared" status. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	1999-2000 to 2004-2005	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007
Student Progress and Achievement Rate	63.1%	59.4%	59.4%

Table 1.1a:
Percent of Students Who
Earned at Least 30 Units

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	1999-2000 to 2004-2005	2000-2001 to 2005-2006	2001-2002 to 2006-2007
Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	75.9%	72.5%	71.4%

Table 1.2:
Persistence Rate

Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system. (See explanation in Appendix B.)

	Fall 2003 to Fall 2004	Fall 2004 to Fall 2005	Fall 2005 to Fall 2006
Persistence Rate	70.3%	68.3%	71.6%



Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Community College District
College Performance Indicators

Student Progress and Achievement: Vocational/Occupational/Workforce Development

Table 1.3:
Annual Successful Course
Completion Rate for
Credit Vocational Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Vocational Courses	80.0%	77.7%	78.6%

Pre-Collegiate Improvement: Basic Skills, ESL, and Enhanced Noncredit

Table 1.4:
Annual Successful Course
Completion Rate for
Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Basic Skills Courses	62.0%	61.7%	62.5%

Table 1.5:
Improvement Rates for ESL
and Credit Basic Skills Courses

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2002-2003 to 2004-2005	2003-2004 to 2005-2006	2004-2005 to 2006-2007
ESL Improvement Rate	75.0%	63.5%	56.9%
Basic Skills Improvement Rate	59.3%	54.9%	56.6%

Table 1.6:
Enhanced Noncredit
Progress and Achievement Rate

See explanation in Appendix B.

	2006-2007 to 2008-2009	2007-2008 to 2009-2010	2008-2009 to 2010-2011
Enhanced Noncredit Progress and Achievement Rate	%	%	%



Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Community College District
College Profile

Table 1.7:
Annual Unduplicated Headcount and Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Annual Unduplicated Headcount	24,923	25,767	27,190
Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)*	14,983	15,340	15,569

Source: The annual unduplicated headcount data are produced by the Chancellor's Office, Management Information System. The FTES data are produced from the Chancellor's Office, Fiscal Services 320 Report.

*FTES data for 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007 are based on the FTES recalculation.

Table 1.8:
Age of Students at Enrollment

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Under 18	10.2%	11.1%	11.4 %
18 - 24	50.2%	49.7%	48.3 %
25 - 49	31.6%	31.0%	31.6 %
Over 49	8.0%	8.2%	8.7 %
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0 %

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System

Table 1.9:
Gender of Students

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Female	52.3%	52.5%	54.3%
Male	46.9%	46.5%	45.5%
Unknown	0.9%	0.9%	0.1%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



<p>Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Community College District</p>
<p>College Profile</p>

Table 1.10:
 Ethnicity of Students

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
Asian	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%
Black/African American	2.4%	2.6%	2.6%
Filipino	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%
Hispanic	26.9%	26.9%	28.0%
Native American	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Other Non-White	2.4%	2.2%	2.2%
Pacific Islander	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%
White	59.0%	58.6%	55.4%
Unknown/Decline to State	0.7%	1.0%	2.8%

Source: Chancellor's Office, Management Information System



Santa Barbara City College Santa Barbara Community College District
College Peer Grouping

Table 1.11: Peer Grouping

	Indicator	College's Rate	Peer Group Average	Peer Group Low	Peer Group High	Peer Group
A	Student Progress and Achievement Rate	59.4	53.4	42.3	64.3	A1
B	Percent of Students Who Earned at Least 30 Units	71.4	70.9	66.8	77.6	B2
C	Persistence Rate	71.6	68.9	61.6	76.1	C2
D	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Vocational Courses	78.6	74.9	66.4	85.5	D2
E	Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	62.5	57.2	49.4	66.1	E1
F	Improvement Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses	56.6	47.1	31.5	58.7	F1
G	Improvement Rate for Credit ESL Courses	56.9	39.3	14.4	67.3	G6

Note: Please refer to Appendix B for the specifications of these rates. The technical details of the peer grouping process are available in Appendix D.



Santa Barbara City College

Mission Statement

Santa Barbara City College is dedicated to the success of each of its students. Its primary mission is to provide instructional and support programs that enable students to reach their specific goals: that lead to an Associate Degree or a certificate in a career-technical area; that prepare students to transfer to baccalaureate institutions; that provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to enter or advance in their careers; that prepare students for college level reading, writing, speaking and mathematics; that promote regional economic development; and that foster lifelong learning.

The promotion of student learning and development through the attainment of SBCC's Institutional Student Learning Outcomes is central to the mission of the College. These Institutional Student Learning Outcomes are comprised of the competencies its students will acquire in critical thinking, problem solving and creative thinking; communication; quantitative analysis and scientific reasoning; social, cultural, environmental and aesthetic perspectives; information technology and media literacy; and personal, academic and career development.

SBCC is guided by core values in its institutional decision-making: a commitment to excellence in all that it does; the development of student-centered policies, practices and programs; the promotion of educational innovation that increases quality, efficiency and effectiveness; an environment that is psychologically and physically supportive of students, staff, and faculty; the exchange of ideas in an open and caring community of learners; the engagement of all segments of the college in dialogue and shared governance; and an inclusive environment that embraces the full spectrum of human diversity.

**Santa Barbara City College
Accreditation Self-Study
Spring 2008 - Fall 2009
TIMELINE OF ACTIVITIES**

DRAFT
Attachment 5

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
SPRING 2008	
By March 10	Select faculty co-chair
By March 31	Establish steering committee structure and membership
By April 30	Have first meeting of steering committee
By May 15	Steering committee establishes standard committee structure and membership and finalizes timeline for preparation of Self Study Report
May 22	Present to Board of Trustees full committee structure and finalized timeline
SUMMER 2008	
June - August	Co-chairs prepare materials for standard committees in preparation for the Self-Study
FALL 2008	
August xx	Make presentation at in-service
September	Conduct training for all standard committees (at in-service?)
September - October	Standard Committees write First Draft
October 31	First Draft due to Co-Chairs and distributed to Board of Trustees and campus community
By December 1	Constituency groups, Board of Trustees, EC and CPC review First Draft and submit feedback to Co-Chairs
December xx	Steering Committee reviews First Draft at meeting
By December xx	Standard Committees receive feedback regarding First Draft
December - February	Standard Committees write Second Draft

DRAFT 2/11/08

Self-Study Faculty Co-Chair Job Description

Responsibilities

- Along with the administrative co-chair:
 - Oversee the completion of the college's self-study report
 - Co-chair the accreditation steering committee meetings
 - Attend all necessary trainings conducted by the accreditation commission
 - Become familiar with the accreditation process, standards, themes, and expectations for self-study report
 - Prepare all materials needed by the standard committees to help them prepare the self-study report
 - Train steering committee and standard committees membership on all aspects related to the preparation of the self-study report and the accreditation process
 - Make presentations to the Board of Trustees, EC, CPC, faculty, classified and student senates as needed on matters related to the accreditation process
 - Monitor the college's progress on completing the self-study report and ensure that all deadlines are met
 - Review and edit all drafts of the self-study report
 - Disseminate self-study report drafts to the campus community
 - Review and process all feedback from the campus community and distribute to appropriate standard committees for inclusion
 - Prepare final report for submission to accreditation commission
 - Serve as a resource to the campus community on matters related to the college's self-study and site visit
 - Help with preparations for team visit in Fall 2009

- Give regular progress reports to the academic senate
- Serve as the chief representative to the accreditation process for the faculty

Term of Service

From Summer 2008 through Summer 2009
(approximately June 2008 through August 2009)

Compensation

xx% release time in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009
\$xxxx stipend for Summer 2008 and Summer 2009

**Accreditation Self-Study
Committee Structure and Membership**

DRAFT

Attachment 7

Accreditation Steering Committee

Responsibilities

- Oversee the completion of the self-study report
- Review all drafts of the report and provide feedback
- Attend all steering committee meetings
- Become familiar with the accreditation process, standards, themes, and expectations for self-study report
- Serve as a resource to the campus community on matters related to the college's self-study and site visit

Membership

Administrative Co-Chair: Darla Cooper

Faculty Co-Chair:

Administrators/Managers: Jack Friedlander

Classified Staff:

Faculty:

Students:

Accreditation Self-Study Committee Structure and Membership

Standard Committees

Nine committees corresponding to the nine primary areas within the standards, along with two standard oversight groups for standards II and III.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services (Oversight Group)

Administrative Co-Chair: Jack Friedlander

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIA: Instructional Programs

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIB: Student Support Services

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIC: Library and Learning Support Services

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard III: Resources (Oversight Group)

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIIA: Human Resources

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

**Accreditation Self-Study
Committee Structure and Membership**

Members:

Standard IIIB: Physical Resources

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIIC: Technology Resources

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IIID: Financial Resources

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Administrative Co-Chair:

Faculty Co-Chair:

Members:



American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment

We, the undersigned presidents and chancellors of colleges and universities, are deeply concerned about the unprecedented scale and speed of global warming and its potential for large-scale, adverse health, social, economic and ecological effects. We recognize the scientific consensus that global warming is real and is largely being caused by humans. We further recognize the need to reduce the global emission of greenhouse gases by 80% by mid-century at the latest, in order to avert the worst impacts of global warming and to reestablish the more stable climatic conditions that have made human progress over the last 10,000 years possible.

While we understand that there might be short-term challenges associated with this effort, we believe that there will be great short-, medium-, and long-term economic, health, social and environmental benefits, including achieving energy independence for the U.S. as quickly as possible.

We believe colleges and universities must exercise leadership in their communities and throughout society by modeling ways to minimize global warming emissions, and by providing the knowledge and the educated graduates to achieve climate neutrality. Campuses that address the climate challenge by reducing global warming emissions and by integrating sustainability into their curriculum will better serve their students and meet their social mandate to help create a thriving, ethical and civil society. These colleges and universities will be providing students with the knowledge and skills needed to address the critical, systemic challenges faced by the world in this new century and enable them to benefit from the economic opportunities that will arise as a result of solutions they develop.

We further believe that colleges and universities that exert leadership in addressing climate change will stabilize and reduce their long-term energy costs, attract excellent students and faculty, attract new sources of funding, and increase the support of alumni and local communities.

Accordingly, we commit our institutions to taking the following steps in pursuit of climate neutrality:

1. Initiate the development of a comprehensive plan to achieve climate neutrality as soon as possible.
 - a. Within two months of signing this document, create institutional structures to guide the development and implementation of the plan.
 - b. Within one year of signing this document, complete a comprehensive inventory of all greenhouse gas emissions (including emissions from electricity, heating, commuting, and air travel) and update the inventory every other year thereafter.
 - c. Within two years of signing this document, develop an institutional action plan for becoming climate neutral, which will include:
 - i. A target date for achieving climate neutrality as soon as possible.
 - ii. Interim targets for goals and actions that will lead to climate neutrality.
 - iii. Actions to make climate neutrality and sustainability a part of the curriculum and other educational experience for all students.
 - iv. Actions to expand research or other efforts necessary to achieve climate neutrality.
 - v. Mechanisms for tracking progress on goals and actions.

(continued...)

2. Initiate two or more of the following tangible actions to reduce greenhouse gases while the more comprehensive plan is being developed.
 - a. Establish a policy that all new campus construction will be built to at least the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED Silver standard or equivalent.
 - b. Adopt an energy-efficient appliance purchasing policy requiring purchase of ENERGY STAR certified products in all areas for which such ratings exist.
 - c. Establish a policy of offsetting all greenhouse gas emissions generated by air travel paid for by our institution.
 - d. Encourage use of and provide access to public transportation for all faculty, staff, students and visitors at our institution.
 - e. Within one year of signing this document, begin purchasing or producing at least 15% of our institution's electricity consumption from renewable sources.
 - f. Establish a policy or a committee that supports climate and sustainability shareholder proposals at companies where our institution's endowment is invested.
 - g. Participate in the Waste Minimization component of the national RecycleMania competition, and adopt 3 or more associated measures to reduce waste.
3. Make the action plan, inventory, and periodic progress reports publicly available by providing them to the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) for posting and dissemination.

In recognition of the need to build support for this effort among college and university administrations across America, we will encourage other presidents to join this effort and become signatories to this commitment.

Signed,

President/ Chancellor Signature

President/ Chancellor Name

College or University

Date

Please send the signed commitment document to:

Mary Reilly
Second Nature
18 Tremont St., Suite 1120
Boston, MA 02108

or fax to: 321-451-1612
or scan & email to: mreilly@secondnature.org



To: John Romo

From: Darla Cooper

Date: November 26, 2007

Subject: American Colleges and Universities Presidents Climate Commitment

CC: Ignacio Alarcon, Liz Auchincloss, Adam Green, Julie Hendricks, Leif Skogberg, Beverly Stephen, Joe Sullivan

The study group you requested be formed to review the feasibility of the college's participation in the Presidents Climate Commitment (PCC) met on November 1. After reviewing the requirements of the commitment and the current status of the college's efforts in sustainability, the study group concluded that it would benefit the college to sign this commitment. The group's recommendation is based on the following factors:

- 1) The college's desire to be a leader in the community for practices and teaching in sustainability and to minimize its negative effect on the environment.
- 2) The actions required for the commitment are significantly minimized by the college's efforts to date. The PCC requires colleges to complete **two** of the following six:
 - a) Establish a policy that all new campus construction will be built to at least the U.S. Green building Council's LEED Silver standard or equivalent.
 - b) Adopt an energy efficient appliance purchasing policy requiring purchase of ENERGY STAR certified products in all areas for which ENERGY STAR rating exist.
 - c) Establish a policy of offsetting all greenhouse gas emissions generated by air travel paid for by the institution.
 - d) Encourage use of and provide access to public transportation for all faculty, staff, students, and visitors at the institution.
 - e) Within one year of signing this document, begin purchasing or producing at least 15% of the institution's electricity consumption from renewable sources.
 - f) Establish a policy or a committee that supports climate and sustainability shareholder proposals at companies where the institution's endowment is invested.

Currently, the college is well on its way to meeting the following **three** of these six requirements:

- a) If approved at the November Board meeting, the SoMA building will be built to meet LEED Silver certification.

- d) The college's arrangement with MTD to provide free access to public transportation for students. In addition, the college's efforts related to telecommuting, college-sponsored vanpools, alternate work schedules, and carpooling incentives all work to reduce vehicle traffic to and from the campus.
 - e) The installation of the solar panels next year will generate an estimated 10% of the college's energy use, representing a significant portion of the required 15%.
- 3) Colleges signing this commitment will be eligible for grants and other funding that has recently become available to support efforts to implement sustainability practices. Access to these funds will help the college achieve its goals related to sustainability. Please see the attached article regarding the partnership between the PCC and the Clinton Foundation.
 - 4) As of November 26, 2007, a total of 434 colleges and universities throughout the country have signed the commitment, including 16 California community colleges and/or districts, the entire UC system, five CSU campuses, and several private institutions. In addition, the City of Santa Barbara has signed a comparable agreement called the Mayors Climate Commitment.

The immediate next steps proposed by the study group are to:

- 1. Take the PCC through the consultative process to gather support from all the different constituency groups.
- 2. Present this information along with the approvals from all the constituency groups to the Board to obtain their approval for you to sign the commitment.
- 3. Have the study group begin meeting early in the spring semester to begin to design the structure for how this effort will be implemented at the college, including the creation of a college-wide committee that is linked to existing college committees and processes. This new committee would include members representing the different constituency groups, staff from the Center for Sustainability, and staff in Business Services whose work relates to or is directly affected by the college's sustainability efforts. This committee would be chaired by an administrator/manager from the Business Services Division.

The proposed implementation timeline including the potential costs is attached, along with a brief history of the college's efforts in sustainability thus far and an overview of the goals for the next two years, the article about the Clinton Foundation, and the list of institutions in California that have already signed the commitment.

Attachments

Presidents Climate Commitment California Signatories

As of November 26, 2007:

Total Signatories = 434

Total California Signatories = 37

Total California Community Colleges and/or Districts = 16

(See list below where California Community Colleges/Districts are in **bold**)

Alliant International University
Geoffrey M. Cox, President

Antioch University Los Angeles
Neal King, President

Butte College
Diana VanDerPloeg, President

Cabrillo College
Brian King, President

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
J. Michael Ortiz, President

California State University, Bakersfield
Horace Mitchell, President

California State University, Chico
Paul J. Zingg, President

California State University, Monterey Bay
Dianne Harrison, President

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District (2 colleges)
Joel L. Kinnamon, Chancellor

Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science
Susan Kelly, President

Claremont McKenna College
Pamela Brooks Gann, President

Coast Community College District
Kenneth Yglesias, Chancellor

Presidents Climate Commitment California Signatories

College of Alameda
Cecilia Cervantes, President

College of Marin
Frances L. White, President

College of the Sequoias
William Scroggins, President

Foothill-De Anza Community College District (2 institutions)
Martha J. Kanter, Chancellor

Laney College
Frank Chong, President

Los Angeles Community College District (9 institutions)
Darroch F. Young, Chancellor

Loyola Marymount University
Robert B. Lawton, President

Merritt College
Robert A. Adams, President

Mills College
Janet L. Holmgren, President

Monterey Institute of International Studies
Clara Yu, President

New College of California
Martin Hamilton, President

Ohlone College
Douglas Treadway, President

Palo Verde College
James W. Hottois, President

Pitzer College
Laura Skandera Trombley, President

Point Loma Nazarene University
Bob Brower, President

Presidents Climate Commitment California Signatories

Pomona College
David W. Oxtoby, President

Presidio School of Management
Steven L. Swig, President

San Bernardino Community College District (3 colleges)
Donald F. Averill, Chancellor

San Francisco State University
Robert A. Corrigan, President

Santa Clara University
Paul L. Locatelli, President

University of California (10 institutions)
Robert C. Dynes, President

University of Redlands
Stuart Dorsey, President

Victor Valley Community College
Robert Silverman, President

West Valley College
Philip Hartley, President

Whittier College
Sharon D. Herzberger, President

Santa Barbara City College
Institutional Commitment to Sustainability
History and Goals

HISTORY

Fall 2005

- Associated Student Body unanimously passes “Resolution on Sustainability and the Design and Construction of High Performance Schools”.
- President Romo requested a Campus Sustainability Assessment to benchmark current practices and build on what is already being done.

Fall 2006

- Student Sustainability Coalition completed Campus Sustainability Assessment of SBCC’s main campus, in addition to a student led Campus Ecological Footprint Survey.
- President Romo requests an Executive Summary of the Sustainability Assessment and the Footprint.

Spring 2006

- Campus Sustainability Assessment and Ecological Footprint Survey presented to President Romo and the Board of Trustees by Student Sustainability Coalition representatives.
- President Romo requests a list of environmental recommendations, based on the research and finding of the Campus Sustainability Assessment, for the “potential” 2008 Capital Construction Bond Measure.

Summer 2006

- 2008 Capital Construction Bond Measure Environmental and Sustainability Recommendations completed and given to president Romo.

Spring 2007

- Newly formed SBCC Center for Sustainability presented to the community by the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College with a presentation by the Director, Dr. Adam Green.

Fall 2007

- American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment study group formed to assess feasibility take the commitment through college consultative process.

GOALS

Spring into Fall 2008

- President Romo signs Climate Commitment, joining over 330 college presidents across America.
- Establishment of an official College Sustainability Committee (CSC) to guide the development and implementation of a college sustainability action plan; including all three SBCC campuses.
- CSC begins to develop an Institutional Action Plan for achieving campus climate neutrality.
- Incorporate “green” language and goals for building performance, resource conservation, renewable energy and sustainable practices in “potential” 2008 Capital Construction Bond Measure.
- Center for Sustainability staff begins comprehensive inventory of all greenhouse gas emissions while participating in Pilot STARS (Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System) program.
- Completed installation of highly visible 200 kW photovoltaic solar panel array on Sports Pavilion roof.
- Media, education & community outreach campaign regarding greenhouse gas inventory, climate commitment and Institutional Action Plan in concert with “potential” 2008 bond campaign.

Spring 2009

- Complete green house gas emissions inventory. Register and publicly announce inventory results.
- Complete first draft of Institutional Action Plan for achieving climate neutrality in collaboration with established goals set by UCSB, the City of Santa Barbara and the Community Environmental Council.

American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment
Implementation Timeline including Potential Costs

Key Steps	Dates	Potential Costs ¹
• President Romo signs Presidents Climate Commitment.....	Spring 2008 ²	N/A
• Create Institutional Structure to guide development and implementation of the sustainability action plan (E.g. Campus Sustainability Committee).....	Spring 2008	N/A
• Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory , facilitated by Center for Sustainability Program Coordinator in collaboration with College Sustainability Committee Members.....	Spring 2009	(see options below)
○ <u>Emission Inventory Option 1:</u> California Climate Action Registry , an EPA greenhouse gas emissions inventory which requires registration and an official certification by an independent third-party to verify accuracy and authenticity of inventory.....		\$500 - \$2,000
○ <u>Emission Inventory Option 2:</u> Clean Air Cool Planet Campus Carbon Calculator , a non-profit organization, campus greenhouse gas inventory which meets all requirements of the Climate Commitment and no independent certification is required.....		Staff Hours ³ 5-10 hrs/wk
• Institutional Action Plan for climate neutrality developed and written by Sustainability Committee and the Center for Sustainability staff, incorporating sustainability into Master Plan and Strategic Plan.....	Spring 2010	Staff Hours 1-3 hrs/wk
• Tangible Actions, two or more from list provided in the commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while the more comprehensive plan is being developed (4 “low-hanging fruit” examples listed below).....	Fall 2008	Staff Hours 2-3 hrs/wk
○ Establish a policy for new construction to meet minimum LEED Silver or equivalent.		
○ Adopt an energy-efficient (ENERGY STAR) certified appliance purchasing policy.		
○ Encourage use and access to public transportation for all staff, faculty & students.		
○ Within one year of signing, begin purchasing and/or producing 15% renewable energy.		
• Make Publicly Available , action plan, inventory & progress reports, specifically by providing them to AASHE (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) for posting and dissemination.....	Fall 2009	N/A
• Encourage Presidents to Join , in recognition of the need to build support for this effort among college and university administrations across America, we will encourage other presidents to join this effort also by becoming signatories of this commitment.....	Always ☺	N/A

¹ Potential costs range from \$500.00 to \$2000.00 in certification and review costs if we use EPA registry in addition to approximately 8 to 16 hours of staff time per week once inventory has begun.

² Document signature date will determine deadlines for all other requirements (e.g. within one year of signing).

³ Staff Hours refers primarily to the Center for Sustainability Program Coordinator, interns and CSC meeting participation.