

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

**April 18, 2000
3:00 – 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, B. Fahnestock, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, B. Cordero, L Rose, K. Hanna, K. O'Connor, T. Garey, J. Lynn, J. Kruidenier, G. Smith, M. Ferrer, L. Vasquez and Alex McKee, Student Representative

ABSENT: Andreea Serban

1.0 Call to order

1.1 Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM.

1.2 Approval of minutes of March 21, 2000 CPC/DTC meeting was tabled until the next meeting.

1.3 Announcements

Dr. Friedlander announced the hiring of Sue Ehrlich as the new Vice President of Human Resources. She was congratulated by the Council.

The following new staff positions were also announced:

Tara Thirtyacres	<i>Fulltime in English</i>
Sheri Shield	<i>Associate Degree Nursing</i>
Allison Bostwick	<i>Mental Health</i>

2.0 Discussion Items

2.1 Dr. MacDougall has requested CPC's input on the proposed budget for California Community Colleges for 2001-2002. Dr. Friedlander summarized and led a discussion of the Academic Senate's recommendations on the proposed budget. These recommendations will be given to Dr. MacDougall this week.

Academic Senate President Lana Rose conveyed information she received from an Assembly person at the meeting of the Statewide Academic Senate that the colleges will in the future be held more accountable for the funds they receive from the state.

Keith McLellan added that Item 2.2C (*Agenda*) "...funding should not be earmarked for categorically funded projects" is applicable for our college historically. Dr. MacDougall has supported special programs effectively as an integral part of the college. That is not the case in many colleges. This particular recommendation would be counter-productive to other colleges. Lana Rose clarified that the intent of Item C was to say that, as much as possible, funding from the state should not be restricted.

2.3 Status of the State Budget for 2000-2001

Jack Friedlander reported that the Assembly Budget Committee has recommended substantial augmentations to what was initially proposed by the governor for California Community Colleges. If the Senate agrees and the governor signs, the allocation for PFE will be 95 million dollars. This will result in an allocation of approximately \$950,000 for SBCC.

Unfortunately, at present, the Assembly Budget Committee is recommending 95 million and the Senate 25 million dollars. A concerted effort is needed to encourage the Senate to increase its support for the PFE funding. When the Senate and Assembly meet in conference, whatever number they determine will not exceed the highest number on the table. At this point, the most available statewide is 95 million, translating to \$950,000 for SBCC. That will most likely be the upside to consider when ranking PFE requests.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Outcomes of Board study session of April 30

A. Facilities

The college is putting in up to three temporary office buildings which each house 10 offices. It is anticipated that the first temporary building will be installed by September and the second sometime this year. It will be a challenge for the college to have the temporary office buildings in place in advance of the fall semester.

B. Cafeteria Remodel

Alan Sherwin, Chair of HRC and Food Services Director, is proposing contemporary changes in the cafeteria area to make it more inviting for students, staff and faculty. A coffee bar will be installed to create a "coffeehouse" atmosphere in a section of the cafeteria. It is anticipated that the cafeteria will be open from 6:30 a.m. to 9:30 or 10:00 p.m. to provide a meeting place for the students. There is also a proposal to convert the student meeting room into a HRC demo-cooking lab. An atrium is proposed to be built on the patio area to accommodate the students. There will be a pizza and bread oven built in the food service

area. Estimates will be forthcoming from the architect on that aspect of the remodel. Bill Cordero voiced concern on behalf of the students not being adequately informed about the remodel and closure of the east campus snack shop. He stressed the importance of keeping the students advised and included in discussions regarding changes to the campus. Student representative Alex McKee echoed this concern.

DTC MEETING

4.0 Update on Technology 2 Plan

- 4.1 Bill Hamre distributed a proposed model on "The Cost to Implement Technology II Strategic Plan". This is the framework for funding the Technology II plan that has been under development for the last one and one-half years by the State Chancellor's office to provide an ongoing mechanism of support of technology within the California Community Colleges. The Chancellor's Office contracted with the Gartner Group to do an evaluation of what would be appropriate technology funding for the California Community College system. The Gartner Group issued a report to the Chancellor's Office who, in turn, developed the Technology II plan that is now in consultation.

The model is based on a total cost of ownership not just one-time funding for technology equipment. It will provide ongoing support for the renewal of that equipment, the funding for staff to support and maintain the equipment, and to guarantee levels of access for faculty, staff and student access to technology within the California Community Colleges. The estimated funding is \$3,149 per PC on campus. It is based on assumptions of faculty and staff accessibility to computers and one computer for every 20 FTES students. The money would come unrestricted to the campus on a per FTES basis and we would have the ability to direct the funding to either renewal, staffing, training or support.

A model was distributed of the 5-year view of funding. The plan would request approximately \$1.1 billion dollars over a 5-year period for the community colleges.

Kathy O'Connor reported from her attendance at the DETAC meeting that she was informed that colleges will not receive Tech II money until they have submitted an up-to-date technology plan. She felt that DTC should expeditiously update the technology plan, in consultation with the Instructional Technology Committee, so we are ready to proceed when the Tech II money is available. Bill Hamre noted that the Chancellor's Office staff would be designing the format for colleges to follow in preparing their technology plans. Therefore, it would make sense to have the format for the plan available prior to writing our plan.

Dr. Friedlander clarified that in the state budget recommended by the assembly for next year are dollars earmarked to provide campuses with support for that template. There will be an RFP for colleges to build the template or to contract with Gartner or another firm to provide the template.

5.0 System-Wide Initiatives

5.1 A. Common College Applications and Transcripts

Bill Hamre updated the Council on the number of projects that have been funded through the Tech I initiative that the Chancellor's Office and the DETAC committee have agreed to move forward into the next stage towards system-wide implementation. The first was a project out of Yuba College for using common community college applications and transcripts. The basic premise is that there would be a single electronic application for all California Community Colleges. A student would apply once to this central repository and would be able to release that application to multiple community colleges. Yuba will receive funding next year to do a pilot project implementation. The second component is electronic transcripts. The SPEEDY format is the national standard for electronic transcript exchange. There is an advantage to California to extend the format and tie it into Project Assist articulation information. The second phase of the transcript project is to build the design and layout of that electronic transcript exchange into Project Assist.

B. Digital Signature

Bill Hamre reported that San Joaquin Delta College is using digital signature and is proposing California Community Colleges get certification for using digital signature which would allow any student, faculty or staff member to be able to use a secure e-mail encrypted public key infrastructure. The implication for SBCC would be that online students would be able to submit work to the instructor and the instructor would know that that student is sending that information from a specific key.

C. California Virtual Community College Consortium (CVCCC) Policy Study: Review of initial recommendations

Jack Friedlander gave an overview of the statewide grant to do a feasibility study on the role the Chancellor's Office could play in supporting distance learning. The outcome of the study will determine the role of local campuses to play a constructive role that would foster development of distance learning and reduce duplication of effort on the various campuses. There are a number of options available to California Community Colleges. These options are based on the findings of a study which identified what the states were doing to promote distance learning.

Nearly all of California's 180 community colleges are involved in offering online classes. The concept is to create a state entity that would provide utilities to learning online instruction that would benefit all colleges. Such utilities would range from a catalog and schedule of all the distance

learning classes offered to the provision of a hosting service for online courses, to provide an e-mail library. It would have referral services to direct students to where they might go for more help at the state or local college campus (e.g., orientation of distance learning, virtual library, transfer information). Another concept is that colleges could be provider colleges. If a college wanted to offer a distance learning course, it would be the provider of that course. The college would be responsible for providing services needed to support the classes. The problem arises as to where a student receives services when s/he is taking classes at multiple locations. The question becomes who maintains the student transcript; who is responsible for monitoring the student's progress. Thus, the concept of a "home college". The "home college" is the college that is in the student's geographic region from which special services would be obtained. A source of concern is reimbursement for the "home college" and the source of reimbursement for that funding.

6.0 Presentation of PFE proposals by workgroup co-chairs

A. Student Outreach: *co-chairs Buckelew and Cordero*

Pablo Buckelew gave an abbreviated overview of the highest ranked proposals submitted to his work group to be considered in the final ranking by CPC for PFE funding.

B. Institutional Support: *co-chairs Fahnestock and Hamre*

Bill Hamre addressed the top ranked items from his workgroup for the same consideration.

C. Student Learning: *co-chair McLellan and Ullom* (Will be presented at May 2 meeting)

Keith McLellan, in his capacity as chair of the Student Services Advisory Committee, expressed concern about the Committee not being informed that they could consider items other than the ones ranked the highest by the respective work groups. The Academic Senate had made such consideration and had included two items in their final rankings that were not in the top ranked items by the work group. A discussion ensued with no definitive resolution.

7.0 Next Steps in PFE Ranking Process

May 2 CPC continues its review process and completes its final ranking of the resource requests to be supported with the college's 2000-2001 allocation of PFE funds.

8.0 Adjournment

8.1 The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.