

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

November 19, 2002

3:00-4:30 PM

Room A218C

MINUTES

CPC PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, L. Rose, G. Carroll, T. Garey, E. Frankel, P. Haslund, A. Serban, L. Auchincloss and J. Jackson

DTC PRESENT: M. Gallegos, L. Vasquez, K. O'Connor, K. Richards

EXCUSED ABSENCE: B. Fahnestock, K. McLellan, M. Ferrer

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the November 5, 2002, CPC/DTC meeting.

M/S/C [Garey/Frankel] to approve the minutes as amended of the November 5, 2002, CPC/DTC meeting with the following corrections. Lane Rose abstained:

Item 3.1, pg. 3, 2nd paragraph: Peter Haslund ~~recommends~~ recommended....

Item 4.1, pg. 4: Minutes to reflect that Liz Auchincloss voted no on the motion to approve the Nepotism Policy and Procedures.

Item 7.3, pg. 8, last paragraph: It is more costly for every percentage point ~~percentile~~ above that.

1.2 Announcements

Dr. Friedlander announced the nominees for the following awards:

Tom Garey for the Hayward Award for Excellence in Education;
Laurie Vasquez for the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award; and
Health and Wellness for the exemplary program award.

Dr. Friedlander also announced that Dr. Jack Ullom and Keith McLellan received an outstanding program of the year award from the California League of Community Colleges for the Gateway to Success Program at SBCC.

DTC Meeting

2.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

3.0 Discussion Items

There were no discussion items.

4.0 Action Items

4.1 IT Planning and Decision Making

M/S/C [Hamre/Vasquez] to approve the proposed approach for Information Technology Planning and Decision Making

It was discussed that the text of the planning and decision-making document, page three, should be corrected to reflect that there are *four* faculty members [instead of three] from ITC on DTC.

Dr. Friedlander reported that the question arose at the last meeting on whether departments within Educational Programs with non-classroom faculty should submit their IT resource requests to ITC or to the Administrative Applications Workgroup. Dr. Friedlander stated that both Jerry Pike and Mark Ferrer indicated to him that ITC's structure works very well for the LRC and the FRC. At the last CPC/DTC meeting, Keith McLellan indicated that the IT-related interests for counseling, financial aid, admissions, student activities and other student support areas are more closely aligned with the focus of the Administrative Technologies Workgroup than those of ITC. Keith stated that in past years, the needs of departments with non-classroom faculty were not adequately represented on ITC. For these reasons, Dr. Friedlander indicated that Keith is requesting that proposals from Counseling be submitted to CPC instead of ITC. Kathy O'Connor said that ITC has asked the Instructional Support Division to send counselors as representatives to the meetings. She said that the Instructional Support Division in general, and the Counseling department in particular, should have their requests ranked by ITC. Kathy indicated that in past years when ITC asks for clarifications of the proposals, representatives from the Counseling department have chosen not to attend the meetings to discuss their proposals. Thus, their proposals were not ranked as high as they might have been had more information been provided to members of ITC.

Dr. Friedlander reminded the Council that the motion on the floor is on the organizational structure for IT planning and decision-making. He stated that since the question of where some of the departments within Educational programs should submit IT resource requests is an internal Educational Programs issue rather than one dealing with the overall IT planning structure, he said he would work with appropriate faculty and administrators to resolve this matter prior to the next CPC meeting.

Bill Hamre announced that DTC would meet the 2nd Tuesday of December.

4.2 Recommended priorities for technology replacement

Kent Richards distributed the proposed computer replacement list for 2003-2004. The most significant recommendation under CPUs is changing the 3-year replacement cycle to a 4-year replacement cycle for PCs. MACs have been on a 4-year cycle. This will reflect savings of approximately \$700,000 on approximately 450 computers. We will spend approximately \$40k, or less, on memory upgrades over the year where it is needed to properly run the applications. We will not be replacing any computer monitors unless absolutely necessary.

M/S/C unanimously [Carroll/Haslund] to move the replacement cycle for PCs from a 3-year to a 4-year cycle.

Gary Carroll recommend that because this is an ongoing policy that the text "2003-2004" be deleted from the IRD recommendations document as well as the first paragraph which identified the recommendations for the "03/04 fiscal year".

M/S/C [Carroll/_____] for a friendly amendment to the previously-make motion to delete "03/04" from the IRD Recommendations for Computer Replacements – 03/04.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

CPC Meeting

6.0 Information Items

Kathy O'Connor inquired as to the timeline for the building projects on campus since the passage of Prop. 47. Dr. Friedlander responded that Prop. 47 will fund construction of physical education gym remodel. Construction will begin in spring 2004. The bond measure also funds the preliminary working drawings for the seismic upgrade and remodel of the PS Building. It is a one-year project that will begin in either fall 2004 or Spring 2005. Dr. Friedlander will ask Brian Fahnestock to provide the Council with the timeline for both the Gym and the PS building remodels. Dr. Friedlander went on to state that unfortunately, the bond measure did not include funding for working drawings for the construction of the new School of Media Arts (SoMA) building. That funding goes on a companion bond measure in March 2004. If the bond measure is passed, there is a good chance that it will fund the SoMA building. If that bond measure should fail in March 2004, it automatically goes back on the ballot in November 2004. Tom Garey questioned whether the Foundation could raise funds for plans and working drawings so the planning phase could move forward. Dr. Friedlander said he would discuss this idea with members of the Executive Committee.

6.0 Discussion Items

6.1 Fundraising priorities

David Dietrich, Director of the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College, addressed the Council and explained that the Foundation follows a three-year cycle with its strategic plans

and fundraising priorities. The Foundation has asked for input from the college community in a variety of forms. The Executive Committee, the Deans Council and the Academic Senate reviewed the fundraising proposals. A set of priorities were developed that will guide the Foundation in terms of its conversations with donors. He cautioned that this is not an exclusive document because most donors have specific areas in which they would like to direct their gifts.

Liz Auchincloss commented that classified staff had not been contacted for their input. David indicated that this list can still be modified and that he would be happy to have her input about classified needs. Sue commented that there is a need for the orientation video for new classified hires. The funding priorities are categorized as: direct support of students; direct support of instructional and support services programs; support of department outreach activities; support of faculty and staff instructional improvement initiatives; capital needs (approved); and capital/program needs (concept stage). This would be the blueprint to move forward in speaking with donors about campus needs. Dr. Friedlander told the Council that this has been a very good process in terms of how we solicited requests and ideas for fundraising priorities. Case statements will augment and support the fundraising priorities. David Dietrich stated that the document will be reviewed once again by the Executive Committee and it will be placed on the next CPC agenda as an action item.

6.2 Focus of the Equal Opportunity/Diversity Committee

Sue Ehrlich reminded the Council that in the past topics addressed by the District's Affirmative Action Policy could be characterized primarily as compliance issues. The Board created the Affirmative Action Committee years ago to provide advice to the Superintendent/President on such issues as discrimination, access for people with disabilities, and sexual discrimination. John Romo and the Executive Committee would like to bring vitality and energy to this process that goes beyond this committee serving as a compliance committee. The Chancellor's Office has indicated that by December 31st they would like to have a copy of our Board approved modified Affirmative Action Policy. Sue commented that it is not feasible for us to meet this deadline. Some modifications have been suggested to the process for requesting accommodations for individuals for disabilities. She suggested that we ask this newly constituted committee to expand its thoughts about how issues of non-discrimination and inclusion could be more creatively explored at the college. Sue summarized that we have an immediate need for an agreement regarding a work group that can immediately address the two compliance issues. This would also be the group to determine how the committee would address the issues of compliance as well as recommendations for the ultimate structures of the committee.

Liz asked to whom the committee would report its findings. Sue responded that the committee historically has reported to the Superintendent/President but does not necessarily need to be structured in that manner. Liz asked that the committee go through the consultation process rather than directly to the Superintendent/President. Sue responded that the committee might want to make recommendations or changes to the process. The recommendation is to have the proposed membership of eight people appointed by: the Academic Senate (2); CSEA (2); Student Body President (1); and the Superintendent/President (2). Liz Auchincloss asked that three people be appointed as classified representatives. Sue indicated that the committee would address at least the compliance issues and recommendations about structure and

process. Initially we should have a core group, or taskforce, to identify the composition of a committee and/or process immediately.

M/S/C [Auchincloss/Carroll] to move item 6.2 to action.

M/S [Hamre/____] recommended that we appoint a taskforce with appointments by the Academic Senate (3), CSEA (3), Superintendent/President (3); and Associated Students (1). Sue Ehrlich would chair the taskforce. The first task is to address the non-discrimination policy (the Chancellor's Office deadline of December 31, 2002) and the accommodation policies and procedures for disabilities as well as develop the framework for a long-term ongoing committee structure.

Hamre offered to extend the motion to include that this group continues to work through the current academic year and make its recommendations no later than the end of the academic year.

Peter Haslund told the Council he does not see the value of having 11 over 8 members.

An amendment to the motion [Haslund/Garey] was made to revise the makeup of the taskforce to eight members to be appointed by the Academic Senate (2), CSEA (2), Superintendent/President (2); and Associated Students (1). Sue Ehrlich will serve as chair.

The amendment was carried with 7 yeas and 4 nays [Hamre, Auchincloss, Jackson, Ehrlich].

The original motion was carried with 9 yeas and 2 nays [Auchincloss/Jackson].

Tom Garey asked when this taskforce would present a formal proposal for a permanent committee. The Council agreed that it would be by the end of the academic year but hopefully sooner. The next step is for Sue to make the appropriate contacts for the appointments of members to this taskforce.

7.0 Action Items

There were no further action items.

8.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

9.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.