

# SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

College Planning Council  
Santa Barbara City College

Tuesday, June 21, 1995

## MINUTES

Present: Dr. Peter MacDougall (Chair), Mrs. Lynda Fairly, Dr. Jack Friedlander, Mr. Tom Garey, Mr. Bill Hamre, Dr. Charles Hanson, Mr. Bill Hull, Mr. Dan Oroz, Mrs. Janice Peterson and Mr. John Romo

Absent: Ms. Cecelia Kuster, and Ms. Kathy O'Connor

Guests: Ms. Jo Bedard, Mr. John Marrazzo and Ms. Ana Wilson

### I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

### II. Approval of Minutes from June 2, 1995 Meeting

The Minutes were approved as read.

III. The Chair reviewed John Marrazzo's meetings so far and invited John to comment. John said he was pleased to be back in Santa Barbara. Ana Wilson summarized discussions and outcomes. John noted that the Credit Schedule Development Project was more appropriate for TQM than BPR. The Team will meet but with revisions to its approach. Dr. Friedlander noted that project would be slated for BPR next summer. The Chair expressed concern that the team must have clear outcomes. He also noted that an additional agenda item would be an update on the Pilot Project.

### IV. Finalize End Results for the Next Set of Projects

- A. Testing: Dr. Friedlander distributed copies of the responses to the eight questions. The Council discussed details of end results, constraints and team composition.
- B. Credit Schedule Development: Changed to a TQM Project.
- C. Marine Technology: Dr. Friedlander distributed copies of the responses to the eight questions and noted the addition of Karolyn Hanna as the team leader.
- D. Computer Allocation: The Council reviewed Mr. Hamre's material. This team needs a team leader and a faculty representative. Concern was expressed about the lack of administrative representation. Discussion suggested a possible need to reschedule this redesign project at a later date in order to secure the needed team member. The project was tentatively rescheduled for late-September/early-October with Janice Peterson as team leader and John Romo as a team member.
- E. Reprographics: John Marrazzo had some concern about clarity of end results. Dr. Hanson responded to questions and the Council suggested rephrasing of end

results: "How the College will provide services for printing, copying, duplication, publication, document transmittal/reception/creation and other reprographic services." Dr. Hanson suggested: "Develop effective and efficient reprographic services such as printing, copying, duplication, publication, document transmittal/reception/creation and other reprographic services." John Marrazzo suggested that this phrasing might be included in constraints in order to limit the project's scope. The project needs a team leader and possibly an external person who brings no baggage to the process. Kickoff date suggests need for training in early-September. Lana Rose was suggested as a team leader and she agreed to do it.

- F. Credit Registration: Mrs. Fairly discussed the project focus.
- G. Student Fee Payment: Dr. Hanson responded to questions and comments. It was noted that there is a strong link between this project and the previous one on credit registration. Mr. Marrazzo suggested that wording for outcomes should be rephrased to include "payment of all fees in a timely, accurate, efficient and easy to understand method any time, any place." Constraints need to be added such as auditability.
- H. Purchasing: The Council offered some suggestions on end results, constraints, and team composition. It was agreed to shorten the time to three weeks (November 1 - November 21).

V. Evaluation Factors for Outcomes of Project Redesign

The Chair referred the membership to the three resources we have to evaluate redesign: the Goals/Expectations, CPC responses to Question 10 and the Planning and Resources Committee criteria for Reviewing Redesign Project Outcomes. The key question for discussion was, "Do we have the tools needed for evaluating outcomes?" It was suggested that we have two issues: long-term and short-term. In the short-term are such items as team products, prioritization of resource allocations and implementation. In the long-term are criteria related to the redesign impact over time--client impact, savings, etc. John Marrazzo suggested that the phases should be incorporated into analysis and measurement. The Steering Committee should be a part of the evaluation. CPC, incidentally, needs to prepare an implementation outline to develop criteria for success in implementation.

Three types of evaluation:

- Process and Progress
- Decision-Making Evaluation Procedures (e.g., developing prioritization for resource allocation)
- Implementation Evaluation (TQM - CQI)

John Marrazzo noted that the Steering Committee should not take on the role of implementation evaluation. This stage is internalized into the College's operation.

The question was raised, "When are we finished?" John Marrazzo said that the end of BPR is when 20 processes have been redesigned--then TQM starts.

Concern was expressed that more processes will be suggested for redesign. John Marrazzo responded that we could then suggest additional processes which, by then, will be incorporated into our new culture.

We need a blueprint for evaluation.

VI. Review of the Blueprint, Draft II

Ana Wilson distributed copies of the Master Blueprint for CPC prepared by Ms. Lori Pearce. Ms. Wilson explained the iconography in the blueprint and the individual items. The Chair noted that implementation (resource allocation, prioritization) should be added as a blueprint item. Dr. MacDougall invited John Marrasso's critique. Mr. Marrasso said the benefit to come out of this will be calendaring events. The pre-30-day blueprint should be included under #10. Additional details were suggested and noted by Ms. Wilson.

VII. Master Plan for Redesign, Draft II (Attached to 06/21/95 Agenda)

John Marrasso will review.

The next College Planning Council meeting has been scheduled for August 15, 1995 from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:35 a.m.