SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
January 12, 2001
8:30 to Noon
A218C

| MINUTES |

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, L. Rose, A. Serban, K. O'Connor, J. Lynn

EXCUSED: B. Cordero, K. McLellan, T. Garey

ABSENT: B. Fahnestock

1.   **Review of the outcomes of Thursday's CPC/DTC technology planning session
       with Collegis and the next steps to the planning process.**

      Dr. Friedlander reviewed the agenda and the desired outcomes for the meeting. He
      asked Bill Hamre to update the council on the outcomes of his afternoon meetings
      with the Collegis staff member and to identify the next steps in the technology
      planning process. Bill Hamre reported that his meeting in the afternoon with Gilbert
      Gonzales was much more productive than the morning session. Based on his
      discussions with Mr. Gonzales, Bill Hamre felt confident that Collegis would be able
      to assist the college in developing its web-based technology plan. Members of the
      council asked Bill if he felt the college would be getting its $30,000's worth in
      consulting from Collegis. Their concerns were based on the lack of preparedness of
      the representative from Collegis at the January 11th CPC/DTC session and the
      absence of concrete suggestions on how the college can improve its technology
      planning process. Bill responded by saying he is confident that Collegis would add
      value to the planning process and that the $30,000 consulting contract represents a
      bargain for the district. Bill Hamre further stated that he got satisfactory responses to
      the questions asked in all but the area of the financial analysis model that Collegis
      would be recommending the college follow in assessing the costs of each of its
      technology-related initiatives.

      Bill Hamre then presented a proposal for developing the college's web-based
      technology plan. The first step would be to sort the individual technology projects
      into each of the following four workgroups: (1) web-enabled instruction; (2) student
      portal; (3) Student Information Systems (SIS) conversion; and (4) intranet
      development.

      The web-enabled instruction proposals would be reviewed by the instructional
      technology cross-functional team. The student portal would be reviewed by the

Campus Pipeline pilot project faculty and IRD staff. The SIS conversion project would be reviewed by the team already in place working on Oracle conversion. The intranet development proposals would be reviewed by IRD staff.

Kathy O'Connor, Lana Rose and Karolyn Hanna recommended that the workgroups reviewing the web-enable instruction projects and the student portal projects make a special effort to invite additional faculty to participate in the workgroups. Dr. Friedlander said that was a good suggestion and that he would invite additional faculty members to participate. Mr. Hamre went on to outline specific tasks of each of the workgroups:

1. Each workgroup will examine the projects to be included in the workplan to ensure that no project was omitted;

2. Each workgroup will verify the validity of the intra- and inter-project dependencies identified by Collegis;

3. Each workgroup will refine the outcomes identified for each of the technology project initiatives;

4. Each workgroup will validate the resources needed to design, implement and maintain each of the projects. The initial identification of needed resources will be made by Collegis Staff; and

5. Each workgroups will be to establish the priorities of tasks to be completed in their particular area. The priorities would be based on the importance of the project, the inter-dependencies of the project and the cost consideration. The recommendations from each of the four workgroups in terms of priorities in which projects are to be achieved, will be submitted to CPC/DTC for review and final recommended prioritization.

CPC will provide information on the costs of each of the web-based initiatives identified by the college. The final outcome of this process is to develop a three-year web-based technology plan for the college. Bill Hamre stated that the goal is to have this process completed by the end of May 2001. Members of the council thanked Mr. Hamre for the excellent work he did in preparing the documents for the meeting with Collegis and acknowledged the value of the presentations made to CPC by Jack Friedlander, Keith McLellan, Brian Fahnestock and Sue Ehrlich. Despite the lack of preparation and unsatisfactory input provided by the member of the Collegis staff, the CPC members felt the learning from one another about the different aspects of the technology initiatives made the day worth while.

2. Process for reviewing and ranking resource requests

Dr. Friedlander reviewed the outcomes for the planning process for the PFE resource allocation process. Members of CPC reviewed the proposed process and timelines for ranking the PFE requests. The outcomes of those discussions are presented below:

Timeline	Activity
October 11, 2000	Request for proposals for resources needed to meet objectives in the College Plan, general program support needs and purchase of new technology and equipment will be distributed to all departments/units. Requests for one-time and ongoing funds will be invited.
December 22, 2000	All proposals are due in Dr. Friedlander's office by 4:00 p.m. on December 22, 2000.
January 22 to February 28, 2001	Work groups will sort proposals into top third, middle third and lower third groups and prioritize the proposals within each of the priority groups. The rankings will be sent to Dr. Friedlander, chair of CPC, by March 2, 2001.
March 6 – March 20, 2001 Dr. MacDougall will join the March 20th meeting at 2:30 p.m. to provide input to CPC on the proposals that he feels are most important to the college. (Note: *CPC meetings will begin at 2:30 p.m. on these dates*)	CPC reviews proposals, invites presentations from work group reps and sorts proposals into the top third, middle third and lower third priority groups. CPC's initial sort of proposals will be forwarded to the following consultation groups for review: Academic Senate, Classified Council, Student Services Advisory Committee and the Student Senate.
March 21 to April 30, 2001	Proposals are reviewed by the Academic Senate, Classified Council, Student Services Advisory Committee and the Student Senate. Each of these groups will be asked to focus their attention on the proposals CPC identified as being the top third list of priorities.
May 1 to May 22, 2001	CPC reviews and ranks proposals and forwards recommended rankings of requests to Dr. MacDougall for: 1. One-time PFE and general resource requests for 2001-2002 2. Ongoing PFE requests in support of college plan objectives 3. Requests for augmentations to department program budgets 4. New technology initiatives (CPC/DTC) Dr. MacDougall will inform CPC if he has any concerns with the recommended proposals submitted to him.
July 1, 2001, or after	Decision to release funds for approved PFE projects will be made depending on state budget and other college-related factors.

3

3.   **Review of proposals submitted**

CPC then reviewed the list of ongoing funding requests and one-time funding requests that were submitted for 2001-2002. Members of the council made several recommendations for formatting of the requests and for placing requests in specific workgroup areas for review. Dr. Friedlander said he would incorporate the suggests regarding formatting and distribution of requests made to the appropriate workgroups that were suggested.

4.   **Gap analysis between funded PFE projects and the attainment of the goals in the College Plan for 1999-2002**

The council reviewed the initial gap analysis that was prepared by Dr. Friedlander. The suggested changes made by the council are incorporated in the following table:

Goal & Objective	Goal/Objective Addressed	Needs Add'l Resources	Not Addressed
Goal 1	x		
Objective 1		x	
Objective 2[a]		x	
Goal 2	x		
Objective 3[b]	x		
Objective 4[b]	x		
Objective 5[b]	x		
Goal 3	x		
Objective 6	x		
Objective 7	x		
Objective 8[c]	x		
Objective 9		x	
Goal 4	x	x	
Objective 10		x	
Objective 11		x	
Objective 12		x	
Objective 13		x	
Objective 14		x	
Objective 15		x	
Objective 16		x	
Objective 17		x	
Objective 18		x	
Objective 19	x		
Goal 5	x	x	
Objective 20	x	x	
Objective 21	x		
Objective 22		x	
Objective 23	x	x	
Goal 6	x	x	
Objective 24	x	x	
Objective 25	x	x	
Goal 7	x		
Objective 26[d]		x	
Objective 27	x	x	
Goal 8[d]	x		
Objective 28[d]	x		
Goal 9	x		
Objective 29	x		
Objective 30	x		
Goal 10	x	x	
Objective 31	x	x	
Objective 32	x	x	

Objective 33	x	x	
Objective 34			x
Goal 11	x		
Objective 35	x		
Objective 36	Not applicable		
Goal 12			x
Objective 37			x
Objective 38			x
Goal 13	x	x	
Objective 39	x	x	
Goal 14		x	
Objective 40			x

Notes:

a. Addressed by Conversion Project
b. Addressed by PFE non-credit matriculation and CalWorks funds allocated to Continuing Ed
c. Private donation of $1 million endowment in support of college's Teacher Education Program
d. Addressed in SIS conversion project

5. Direction to be given to groups responsible for reviewing and prioritizing resource requests

The question was raised as to whether the workgroups should sort the resource requests into three top priority areas or to request that the workgroups rank the proposals in priority order within each of the three (1/3, 1/3, 1/3) priority groups). The council decided to ask the workgroups to prioritize the ranking of the proposals within the top third, middle third and lower third rankings.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Friedlander.