

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, December 9, 2008  
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
A218C  
~ Minutes ~**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, D. Cooper, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, B. Partee, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: A. Scharper, L. Stark, L. Vasquez

ABSENT: C. Avendano, Associated Study Body President, S. Knotts, Student Trustee

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of the minutes of the December 2, 2008 CPC meeting (attached)

**M/S/C [M Guillen/K Molloy] to approve the minutes, with corrections, of the December 2, 2008 CPC meeting.**

**Action Items**

2. Approval of District Technology Plan (attached) – All

**M/S/C [I Alarcon/P Bishop] to approve The District Technology Plan.**

**Discussion Items**

3. Institutional Code of Professional Ethics (three versions attached: CPC Nov 17 version, Academic Senate Dec 3 version and Dec 8 version with EC input for discussion and finalization today) – Andreea Serban
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban opened the discussion stating that an Institutional Code of Professional Ethics is required by Accreditation Standard III.A.1.d: *“The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.”*
  - b. The discussion centered around the Academic Senate’s proposal for a Statement of Professional Ethics and the Executive Committee’s December 8<sup>th</sup> version of an Institutional Code of Professional Ethics. Academic Senate member, Kathy Molloy speaking for the Senate thought “Statement of Professional Ethics” rather than Code, is more dignified. Within the statement, the Senate changed the word “shall” to present tense because they assumed that we all already behave ethically and if not, *“...we strive to exercise judgments that are fair, consistent and equitable .....*” In the

- third sentence the Senate changed, "...serving the best interest of the larger Santa Barbara Community" showing support for the community.
- c. Superintendent/President Serban explained that the wording : "The Institutional Code of Professional Ethics" is exactly the language from the Accreditation Standards so the reason to maintain that rather than a "Statement of Professional Ethics" is that it enables the visiting Accreditation Team to easily see the connection between the particular standard and our code. In reference to the third sentence: "...best interests of the public served by the District" is because we are a California State Institution, serving far beyond the Santa Barbara Community. VP Ehrlich stated that the word "shall" implies a commitment not only for the present but also for the future and for current as well as new employees of the college. It indicates that this an expectation we have as an institution. It is a statement of guiding behavior and not something that in and of itself is a basis of discipline. It also serves to raise the issue of ethical behavior to our internal community too, that is extremely important.
  - d. Executive Vice President Friedlander thought that the use of the Professional Code of Ethics will determine which style will be better for expressing what ethical standards SBCC expects of its employees.
  - e. After further discussion, Academic Senate Member Molloy made a motion to approve the Senate version of the Professional Code of Ethics, with the change in the language that says the ".....the interest of the public served by the District."
  - f. Academic Senate Member S. Broderick seconded the motion and stated that we need to move it to an action item.
  - g. The motion was not moved forward and there were further questions and discussions clarifying: SBCC's agreed upon definition of a code, how will it be used, where will it be placed, how the employees will be presented with the Professional Code of Ethics, how one defines objectively what ethical behavior is, and what happens if we don't follow the code.
  - h. Academic Senate President Alarcon suggested changing "...they shall..." to "...we shall..." in the Executive Committee's version of the Code starting in the second sentence. Superintendent/President Serban, VP Ehrlich and Senator Molloy all agreed with his idea and so the wording will be changed.
  - i. Academic Senate Member Molloy asked that the word "Statement" be changed to "Code" in the Senate version of the proposal that is in motion: "Santa Barbara City College Code of Professional Ethics."
  - j. Superintendent/President Serban ended the discussion stating that when CPC reconvenes in February, CPC will reach a final conclusion. In the meantime, both updated versions will be emailed to all CPC members. The motion on the table will be moved to an action item and voted upon one way or another in February.

#### 4. Timeline for budget development for 2009-10 (attached) – Joe Sullivan

- a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that this Budget Development Timeline draft will go to the January 8 Board Study Session for discussion. This is a similar timeline that we have used in the past. One significant departure is the integration of the review of resource requests identified through program reviews in the timeline for the budget development and linking program reviews to planning to budgeting. VP Sullivan reported from the Draft Budget Development timeline attachment. Discussion

- ensued. Academic Senate President Alarcon asked if a summary of the Program Reviews would be available for viewing.
- b. Superintendent/President Serban answered that the Program Reviews will be all available in January in their totality, online. The detail of these reviews will be available to everyone. The Vice Presidents will first summarize and rank the Program Reviews from their own divisions. In February, the Program Reviews including resource allocation requested for 09 – 10 will come to CPC. Program reviews should also provide ideas for cost savings and revenue generation and we will also discuss those. As discussed over the past six months, we need to begin setting aside a certain percentage of the new revenue to fund resource requests identified through the program reviews and create a Program Review Fund.
  - c. Academic Senate Member Garey asked how far can we progress with our timeline when we have no definitive budget information coming from the State. Vice President Sullivan responded by saying that we progress as if we know that there is going to be realistically a significant reduction mid year adjustment. The discussion continued.

Superintendent/President Serban thanked all the CPC Members for a very productive semester and all their hard work.

Superintendent/President Serban adjourned the meeting.

**Next meeting**

Tuesday, February 3, 2009 3:00-4:30pm A218C