

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

March 21, 2000

3:00 – 4:30 PM

A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, B. Fahnestock, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, T. Garey, J. Lynn, L. Rose, K. Hanna, J. Kruidenier, G. Smith, K. O'Connor, M. Ferrer and K. Richards.

ABSENT: B. Cordero and Laurie Vasquez

GUESTS: K. Sweeney and Che Tubisola and Tim Pettit (*The Channels*)

1. Call to order

1.1 Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:08 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes

2.1 *March 7, 2000 CPC/DTC* M/S/C [Fairly/Kruidenier] to approve
[two abstentions]

2.2 *February 15, 2000 CPC* M/S/C [Hanna/Kruidenier] to approve
[two abstentions]

2.3 *December 21, 1999 DTC* M/S/C [Kruidenier/Hamre] to approve
with corrected typos

3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

Action Items

4. Approval of Academic Affairs/Student Affairs Reorganization

4.1 M/S/C unanimously [Rose/McLellan] to approve with the amended language as follows:

"The Executive Vice President of Educational Programs will establish a meaningful role for the participation of the President of the Academic Senate in discussions of policies and

procedures of the Educational Programs Division. this role will include the timely participation of the Academic Senate president in activities such as meetings of the Executive Vice President's administrative staff or other mechanisms in which the business of the Education Programs Division is discussed."

5. Approval of reorganization of Information Resources Division (IRD)

- 5.1 Bill Hamre, Associate Vice President of Information Resources Division, outlined the chart for the reorganization of his division and clarified the job descriptions and potential funding of five new positions. (*Agenda, Att. 2*).

Motion was made [Rose] to approve the structure of the IRD reorganization with the understanding that the five positions identified do not receive priority for funding by the fact of approving the reorganization. Furthermore, that these five positions must go through the mandated process for approval when funds to support these positions become available.

Discussion: Bill Hamre identified the two potential options for funding these positions other than from PFE funds; growth dollars and Tech II money from the state Chancellor's Office. Vice President Hamre also outlined the priority of the 5 new positions with the number one priority being the Director of Applications & Support. Superintendent/President Peter MacDougall explained that there is the capacity to internally redistribute dollars so that we can provide support in new areas.

Dr. Friedlander addressed the concern that by approving this reorganization, the council is not obligating itself to fill these positions. Hamre advised the Council that all of these potential positions would go through the normal channels for approval. The reorganization chart reflects the possible future needs for the organization as he sees it.

Motion was seconded [Hanna] with the amendment to the language that the reorganization chart denotes at the double asterisk "proposed new position" rather than "new position" and that where indicated as "PFE" be denoted as "NF" [not funded].

The amendment was accepted [Rose] and carried unanimously.

Discussion Items

6. Allocation of a percent of PFE funds to Continuing Education

Superintendent/President Peter MacDougall joined the meeting at 3:35 PM to further discuss the allocation of PFE funds. Dr. MacDougall stated that the PFE funds would be divided into three pools. One, a noncredit allocation and two, a credit allocation. The

third pool is taken proportionally from the two pools to fund those activities that are college-wide. PFE funds allocated to Continuing Education and to credit will be deducted proportionally to pay for expenses that might be linked to Business Services, Human Resources and IRD. These are district-wide functions that need to be supported proportionally by noncredit as well as credit.

The first year the college received PFE funds they were distributed from one pool. Shortly thereafter, it was learned from the Chancellor's Office that the funding from PFE for noncredit was considered to be part of the state's reimbursement for non-credit and therefore would have been looked at from the standpoint of equalization.

Dr. MacDougall stated the rationale that as long as the PFE allocation earned by noncredit FTES counts as part of the reimbursement for noncredit, it will be a base from which any equalization or any of the funding for noncredit is considered. Patrick Lenz, Executive Vice Chancellor who has had responsibility for fiscal services in the Chancellor's Office, said the approach is a prudent one.

The rationale for allocating the proportion of PFE funds provided to the college as a result of the FTES generated by noncredit rests primarily on its being configured as part of the overall allocation for noncredit. A paper from the state task force on funding was distributed that identifies how the noncredit FTES reimbursement figure is determined. The rationale is fair because the college wouldn't be receiving this funding without the FTES generated from noncredit.

Dr. MacDougall concluded by stating that if PFE money was not split proportionally, funding would be used for noncredit to increase the level of support for credit programs. The allocation of PFE funds will maintain the ratio of reimbursement of credit and noncredit FTES.

Information Items

7. College Plan

7.1 Review of proposals submitted by Continuing Education for use of its anticipated allocation of PFE funds (*Agenda, Att. 4*)

Lynda Fairly, Vice President of Continuing Education, discussed her proposals for the use of the anticipated allocation of PFE funds for her department. The first was a proposal to convert Room 7 at the Schott Center to a new "Learning Lab" similar to the Computers in Our Future (CIOF) lab. An area of concern was the funding for the replacement of these new technology initiatives. Bill Hamre explained that there would be funding "set aside" for technology replacement.

The second proposal would provide the computer labs and classes with an Instructional Computer Lab Coordinator and a Lab Teaching Assistant. These two new positions will make it possible to generate credit FTES with the higher

FTES reimbursement producing classes. The cost of the LTA position was corrected to \$35,502. Benefits for both positions will be approximately \$9,000 each.

DTC MEETING

8. Announcement of the Dell Computers contract

8.1 Bill Hamre announced that this week the college would be able to start purchasing Dell Computers under the agreement it has with the University of California. Community Colleges were identified in their bid documents as being able to purchase from that agreement. Mr. Hamre distributed an analysis of the comparison between Dell pricing from the UC contract to three other purchasing vehicles. As an example, the PC's are discounted 9% from the normal industry price. Dell will also do the setup and configuration of each of these machines.

8.2 Dr. Friedlander related that the savings from the contract with Dell Computers will not be applied to purchasing items from the list of new technology equipment that is not funded at this point. The money would first be used to assure we could fully fund our replacement cycle, especially as the college goes from a five-year to a four-year replacement cycle. The money remains in the equipment replacement fund until needed.

9. Update on the purchase of replacement technology equipment

Jack Friedlander gave an overview regarding the replacement of computer technology. Initially the expectation was to have the technology inventory automatically replaced on a five-year cycle. It then became evident that there was not enough money to fully fund technology that was due for replacement with the complication of not having an accurate inventory. The Instructional Technology Committee then asked departments to justify the items that needed to be replaced after 5 years. This was not the initial intent but was done because there was not enough money to replace all the technology that was due to be replaced.

Bill Hamre addressed this issue by first relating that there is still not an inventory of technology equipment which he can feel 100% confident but stating that he is committed to having it completed in the next several weeks. That is the fundamental starting point towards a discussion of the replacement strategy and timeline. One of the directions for the college is to reduce the replacement cycle from the five-year to a four-year replacement cycle and try to eliminate the mid-term redeployment of computers which are time consuming in terms of staff time as well as additional costs.

10. Discussion on the selection of a student portal

- 10.1 Bill Hamre presented a PowerPoint presentation on the StudentOnline portal. The company that owns StudentOnline will work with 10 colleges and universities as pilot institutions. The company will provide all of the hardware, software, technical support and consulting staff needed to implement this portal by fall 2000. There will be no cost to the college. Over time, through e-commerce, the use of StudentOnline will have a revenue-sharing model that provides the institution 25% of the profit amount from sales of items to SBCC students and staff. StudentOnline will front \$250,000 to \$500,000 for an institution the size of SBCC in terms of the servers, software, technical support and consulting. Vice President of Business Services Brian Fahnestock is working with the company in implementing a revised contract agreement that gives us very clear exit strategies including the ability to own and manage the software ourselves. We are looking at a 3-year agreement with only SBCC being able to renew annually based upon a 120-day notice to them. Continuing Education would also be able to participate in this project. The grant application for pilot status is due at the end of April with an announcement in June. However, the college would have an early indication of its selection to participate in this pilot program.
- 10.2 Katie Sweeney gave an impressive overview of the StudentOnline software for student portals and led CPC/DTC through a tour of the web site and how it could be utilized by the students.

11. Adjournment

- 11.1 The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Friedlander.