

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

**April 17, 2001
3:00 – 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

CPC PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Fahnestock, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, A. Serban, L. Rose, T. Garey, K. Hanna, K. O'Connor, J. Lynn,

DTC PRESENT: M. Ferrer, M. Gallegos, L. Vasquez, K. Richards

EXCUSED ABSENCE: B. Hamre

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.2 The approval of minutes of the March 20, 2001 CPC meeting was tabled until the next meeting because members needed additional time to review them.

1.3 Announcements

Dr. Friedlander announced that Dr. Ronald Baker has accepted the position of dean of educational programs to replace Bill Cordero. He is currently responsible for the student services programs at Monterey Peninsula College. He will officially start on July 1st but will be on campus on June 6th & 7th for an orientation with Bill Cordero and will attend the June 8th management retreat.

Dr. Friedlander announced that the faculty hiring was going well and the candidates to whom positions have been offered have accepted. He also said that he is very pleased with the quality of the people that have been hired. Final interviews are still being conducted for several of the positions; HRC, Associate Degree Nursing, History, French and Administration of Justice. The English position has been offered to an individual but that person has not as yet accepted. The preliminary interviews for the dean's position to replace Sanchez will take place on May 4th & 5th.

2.0 Information Items

2.1 Establishment of an assistant dean position for Physical Education/Athletics Division and the elimination of the position of Director of Athletics.

Dr. Friedlander distributed a proposal from the Physical Education/Athletics Department to establish a position of Assistant Dean of Physical Education, Health, Athletics/Athletic Director and eliminate the position of Athletic Director. The present position of Athletic Director involves close to 100% release time plus extended days to administer the athletic program. The proposal would move it to a 12-month administrative position. Dr. Friedlander continued by saying that the physical education and athletics programs are so integrated that it makes sense that one person have overall administrative responsibility for these areas. The council was provided the job description for the proposed assistant dean position. The PE/Athletic departments, Dr. Friedlander and Dr. MacDougall are in support of the proposal. Kathy O'Connor spoke in support of the position stating this is something the department wanted when they recruited for the Athletic Director position and they are very happy with the planned reorganization. Kathy also said that the Academic Senate supports this proposal and indicated that the department has agreed not to ask for a replacement for this faculty position next year.

Dr. Friedlander explained that a Memorandum of Understanding between the Physical Education, Health, Recreation and Athletic Division and the Santa Barbara City College administration outlines the job description and responsibilities of the department chair and the Assistant Dean/Athletic Director to eliminate any confusion. This has been agreed to by members of the department and the administration. The additional cost of this position will be paid from the Educational Programs budget.

- 2.2 Dr. Friedlander next informed the council of the proposal to establishment of a new assistant dean position, Educational Programs [Dual Enrollment/Professional Development Studies] position and the elimination of the Coordinator II, Dual Enrollment/Professional Development Studies position that is currently held by Diane Hollems. The program began with funding from a Tech-Prep grant and developed into the Dual Enrollment and Professional Development Studies programs thereafter. Each of these programs has expanded dramatically in the past year. Dr. Friedlander also provided documentation on the growth of this program. He added that the college is going to be offering courses for the first time at the high schools this summer and the number of SBCC summer session classes offered is expected to expand substantially in the future. The program has gone from a small to a large FTES generator with a lot of complexity in terms of dealing with five high schools and all of our departments. This encompasses a major breadth of responsibilities and complexity as well as the scope and size of the program, which has grown in enormity since it was first initiated. The high schools are starting new academies such as the Health Academy and the Information Technology Academy at San Marcus High School in the fall and an Engineering Academy that will start in fall 2002 at Dos Pueblos High School. Dr. MacDougall, Dr. Friedlander, Dean Buckelew, Diane Hollems and Pat Canning met with the high school principals this morning and discussed a number of new initiatives which SBCC and the high schools could offer that would be of much benefit to the high school students.

Dr. Friedlander went on to say that the Professional Development Studies program started modestly and has grown substantially in terms of the number of courses offered, FTES generated and businesses and non-profit agencies served. The assistant dean would also be responsible for this rapidly growing program. The range of responsibilities for this proposed position are detailed in the proposal distributed to CPC members. This

program is also expanding on a daily basis. The rationale for having an assistant dean for these programs is to be able to attract and maintain the sort of person who can handle these high-level and complex responsibilities.

Dr. Friedlander informed the council that there is a \$13,000 difference between the coordinator II position and the assistant dean's position. The initial proposal was to take the \$13,000 remaining in the ongoing Tech-Prep grant which will more than adequately cover that difference while we try to identify General Fund dollars to support this position when the Tech-Prep funding is gone.

In response to a question from Kathy O'Connor regarding the PFE request for a classified position to support the Dual Enrollment/Professional Development Studies program, Dr. Friedlander responded that the request would be withdrawn because other funding had been found to support that position.

Karolyn Hanna stated that even though she supports the requested positions, over the course of the past year there have been positions or changes in positions have been submitted to CPC and there is not a formal agreed-upon procedure in place to review and recommend approval for new positions. Karolyn felt that CPC needs to develop such a procedure for approving new as well as proposed reclassification of positions.

Dr. Friedlander responded that this issue was raised in Cabinet along with the issue of items brought forth for reclassification. He said that he, or Dr. MacDougall, through him, would come back to CPC with a proposed procedure for approval as well as the reclassification of new positions and the role of CPC in reviewing these positions.

There were some questions and discussion about these two proposals being information items as opposed to items on which the council should vote. It was felt that in the future, CPC should vote on the approval for these positions in situations where new allocations were being requested for reclassification items and new positions with the understanding that this issue of the role of CPC in reviewing proposals for new and reclassification of positions would be clarified in the near future. There were no objections in allowing the proposed two assistant dean positions to be forwarded to Dr. MacDougall and the Board of Trustees for approval.

2.3 College Plan 2002-2005 – Presentations

It was suggested that it would be advantageous to invite other members of the academic, classified and student community, as well as members from each of the college's consultation bodies to attend these presentations. This would elicit more input for the College Plan.

Dates of the presentations and presenters are:

April 25th

Michael Couch, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education,
Santa Barbara School District;
Don Olson, Director, City Special Projects; *and*

Michael Brown, County Administrator Officer

May 9th

Steven Velasco, UCSB Director of Institutional Research and Planning *and*
Dr. Bill Watkins, Executive Director, UCSB Economic Forecast Project

Presentations on both dates will take place from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in SS250.

3.0 Discussion Items

3.1 Concerns of deans of Educational Programs regarding the vision statement.

Dr. Friedlander reported that the deans had some concerns about the vision statement being too general. Andreea Serban replied that she and Dr. MacDougall had a phone conversation with David Wolf, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Mr. Wolf made the point that a vision statement should guide the focus of the self-study for accreditation and not attempt to cover the entire range of goals for the college. Andreea reiterated that Mr. Wolf said the vision statement was fine, but she felt the implication was that it did not have a focus.

Kathy O'Connor added that perhaps there should be a vision statement for the self-study and one for the vision statement for the college. Dr. Friedlander interpreted Mr. Wolf's statement by saying that the vision statement does not capture anything that is particularly unique but rather an overall mission of what all community colleges do. Andreea replied that Mr. Wolf implied that the vision statement should have a focus as it is not suppose to be a restatement of the mission of the college..

Keith McLellan noted that the vision statement has to do with the practical focus of how the college will go about effecting its mission and the areas of emphasis within that mission. This is sort of a quasi mission statement that parallels our current mission statement. The question asked is what is a vision statement versus a mission statement. The conversation was summarized by saying the vision statement is for the self-study and will drive the college plan.

Dr. Friedlander concluded that the vision statement would be revisited at the next meeting and the council could decide upon what action to take at that time. He will get some clarity on David Wolf's comments and bring a framework back to the council.

3.2 The proposed outcomes and format and procedures for achieving those outcomes at the CPC planning retreat on June 5th through 7th (8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon, A218C).

Andreea Serban addressed the council on what is to be achieved at this retreat, that mainly being a draft of the college plan that will be part of the self-study proposal and the college plan for the next 3 years.

Dr. Friedlander noted that in the past the council devoted the first session of the planning retreat to identifying trends that are likely to influence the ways in which the college will carry out and fulfill its mission, goals and objectives during the next three years.

Between sessions, the ideas were categorized. At the second session a determination was made on which areas to focus in the next three years as priorities to address. At the third session, the reasonable outcomes in each of these areas were discussed. By fall of that year, a draft and framework to begin developing objectives for each of the major areas in the college plan was put in place. The draft of the outcomes and objectives to be included in the college plan were refined by CPC and then sent out for consultation and feedback.

Dr. Friedlander went on to say that the initial brainstorming session to identify planning assumptions would be influenced by:

- (1) the presentations on events taking place in the community, as Andreea has arranged;
- (2) the presentations by each vice president on trends taking place that may have a significant impact on their respective areas; and
- (3) the extent to which the goals and objectives in the current college plan are being achieved.

Prior to the June 5th through 7th meetings, each vice president would come to the council and address the issues/changes that are affecting the educational programs for their respective areas. It was decided that vice presidents Ehrlich, Fairly and Friedlander would give their presentation at the May 1, 2001 CPC meeting and that vice presidents Fahnestock and Hamre would give their reports on trends taking place in their respective area at the May 15, CPC meeting.

Lane Rose suggested that at the next Academic Senate meeting, she get feedback from faculty on areas they would like to see in the college plan as goals and objectives and bring that back to council. This would allow the faculty to feel they had more input in developing the college plan. Kathy O'Connor suggested inviting the deans and other representatives to the retreat for their initial input, possibly on the first day. Lynda Fairly added that this would enrich the process. Dr. Friedlander will consult with Dr. MacDougall and Cabinet as to who should be invited.

4.0 Other Items

At the request of Bill Hamre, Kent Richards distributed a matrix questionnaire prepared by Collegis and asked that it be completed by Friday. In response to Collegis asking CPC to complete this questionnaire, Tom Garey commented that the companies generating computer products are so far out of the periphery of businesses for which they are providing their products. The council felt that the matrix questionnaire approach to asking for information was difficult to understand and complete and it violated basic fundamentals of survey design. The members of the council decided to return the questionnaire to Collegis noting that the survey design is cumbersome.

DTC Meeting

5.0 Discussion Items

5.1 Laptop Computer Policy

The laptop Operational Practices (OP) was distributed with the agenda. Kent Richards told the members of the council that he is receiving numerous e-mails from faculty asking when they will receive a laptop computer. Jack Friedlander remarked that the OP does not indicate the procedure for requesting a laptop. Karolyn Hanna responded by saying that there is a procedure and form on the campus' website for requesting a laptop in lieu of a replacement machine upon which faculty can justify their needs for a laptop. As soon as CPC/DTC approves the Operational Practices, it will be put in place on the website. Kathy O'Connor said that the determination of whether a person gets a laptop would be made on an individual basis and with the recommendation of the department head or vice president of their respective areas. The Operational Practices is for replacement computers.

Kent Richards informed the members that the replacement for a desktop is about \$1,000 less than what a laptop would cost. Additionally, a laptop is about a year behind desktops with respect to CPU capacity. The question arose about the source of funds for the additional \$1,000 cost of a laptop and if replacement money should be contributed if a laptop is requested. It was agreed that it is ITC's responsibility to make sure there is money available for replacement and it is not DTC's responsibility to determine whether someone will or will not be allowed a laptop. Lynda Fairly will work with Kent Richards to develop a procedure that will work for Continuing Education.

Jack Friedlander stated that each of the vice presidents will work with Bill Hamre or Kent Richards to develop their own procedures for the purchase of laptop computers for their respective areas. It was suggested that a laptop procedure needed to be developed for administrators.

Keith McLellan questioned what it is meant by "responsible for the security of the laptop computer" as stated in the OP, and does that encompasses a financial responsibility. Kathy O'Connor said the replacement for a lost or broken computer would be determined on a case-by-case basis since there is no insurance for the loss of a computer.

5.2 Update on integration of Campus Pipeline and WebCt

Michael Gallegos gave an update on Campus Pipeline and WebCT. He reported that we have received a test version of WebCT 3.5 which is going to allow the integration with Campus Pipeline. It is currently loaded on a test server. The FRC has enabled some accounts so the test version can be tested for reliability. The current courses are not going to be converted to the new version of WebCT, however, the summer WebCT courses will be converted to 3.5. In addition, the new version will be going on the Sprint server this summer. At the end of April, we are scheduled to get the 3.0 Beta version of Campus Pipeline which is suppose to allow for the integration with WebCT. When that

is received, we will be able to do a Beta test for a month with Campus Pipeline. We will only have the Beta version for a month as a test for Campus Pipeline. There will be some faculty testing the Beta version during the months of May to June while the FRC does some Campus Pipeline training with the integrated WebCT and Campus Pipeline software. The new version of Campus Pipeline will allow us to integrate it with WebCT 3.5 so that students will just log into Campus Pipeline which would allow them to link into WebCT. It will also provide a more robust e-mail system and a calendaring function. This integration will require a new messaging server obtained from Sprint.

Jack Friedlander inquired at what point would the integration of WebCT and Campus Pipeline take place. Michael responded that part of the Beta test of Campus Pipeline this summer would be an integration with WebCT. The Beta testing will allow us to determine how well the integration and messaging system will work. If the functionality of the messaging server is adequate, "IPlanet" will replace GroupWise. "IPlanet" is a combination of Sun and Netscape products, but is basically Netscape's e-mail server that has been in place for some time. It is a proven product that is presently being used by other colleges.

Michael went on to say that there would be no Campus Pipeline available for faculty in the summer. It will be in the process of testing and configuration with the hope that the full version of Campus Pipeline 3.0 will be integrated with WebCT at the beginning of August. If faculty requests it, two days of training will be available before the fall semester begins for those unable to train in May to June. In addition, we are trying to set up a process to where we can get students trained prior to the beginning of the semester. Students would be sent their login and password at the same time they are receiving confirmation for their registration. They will also be sent instructions for them to try to get into the system and then e-mail the system's administrator. When we receive an e-mail from them, we will know that they have been successful in logging into Campus Pipeline.

Jack Friedlander asked how many students would be involved in this pilot for fall semester. Michael responded that 5,000 students and 80% of the WebCT faculty will participate in the pilot project this fall.

Kathy O'Connor indicated that her class would not be ready for WebCT 3.5 in fall. Michael indicated that links could be turned off if a faculty member does not feel his/her class is prepared for WebCT 3.5.

Lana Rose asked if the two days of training for faculty in August are for those who are currently piloting Campus Pipeline. Michael indicated that this is for faculty who did not have the opportunity to train in May to June. Further, faculty who will be piloting the program would be identified by July 1st.

6.0 Other Items

Kathy O'Connor questioned whether enough money has been allotted for computers for new faculty. Kathy said that they had requested \$200,000 for new technology equipment of which \$162,175 is for new initiatives and the remaining funds for new faculty

computers. Lana asked if the approximate \$37,000 balance was enough for the number of new faculty being hired. Kent Richards responded that for the replacement faculty positions, computers are already in place and the cost of new ones for new faculty positions would not exceed \$2,000 each, and that the \$37,000 should be adequate.

7.0 Adjournment

On motion by Karolyn Hanna, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.