

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

November 5, 2002

3:00-4:30 PM

Room A218C

MINUTES

CPC PRESENT: J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, K. McLellan, P. Haslund,
G. Carroll, T. Garey, E. Frankel, L. Auchincloss, J. Jackson

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

EXCUSED ABSENCE: A. Serban, L. Rose, B. Fahnestock

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the October 15, 2002, CPC/DTC meeting.

M/S/C [Carroll/Fairly] to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2002 meeting.

Abstentions: Bill Hamre, Peter Haslund and Esther Frankel

1.2 Announcements

Dr. Friedlander announced the appointment of Esther Frankel, chairperson of the CIS department, as the 5th faculty representative and welcomed her to CPC.

Peter Haslund announced that the first annual Global Studies lecture by professor John G. Stoessinger, Distinguished Professor of Global Diplomacy at the University of San Diego, would be held on November 21st at 2:30 p.m. in the BC Forum.

Dr. Friedlander reported that last week the Academic Senate voted to recommend that the 16-week calendar for the 2003 fall semester to begin the day after Labor Day and end December 20th. The spring semester 2004 start time will begin on January 20th, the same time as this year, but will end on May 15th. Summer session 2004 will maintain its normal start time to coincide with the high schools' schedule. Dr. Friedlander stated that he would consider recommending offering an intersession from May 18 to the Friday prior to the start of summer session if the college was not meeting its FTES target and it was cost effective to do so. Considering our FTES cap for next year and the fact that we are putting into place a 16-week calendar, Dr. Friedlander felt confident that the college would achieve its FTES target for 2003-2004 without needing to add a spring/summer intersession.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the decision to begin fall semester after Labor Day would make it difficult to meet the deadline for paying adjunct instructors on September 30. He is working with Rosie Tower and Leslie Griffin to develop a plan for meeting the September payroll deadline for adjunct instructors. We are mandated by the state to pay faculty within 30 days. We presently have an exemption from the IA from meeting this 30 day requirement since the start of the fall semester has been the third week in August and the first pay period has been on September 30th. Tom Garey commented that this will also be a problem in the spring semester when classes end mid-May and our current payroll is at the end of June. There was also a question as to whether a 9-month pay cycle would affect STRS. Dr. Friedlander agreed to investigate the implications of going from 10 to nine pay periods for faculty, including what, if any, effect this change would have on STRS contributions.

2.0 Information Items

2.1 Identification of funds to support a full-time secretary position in Health Technologies

Dr. Friedlander reported that at the last CPC meeting there was a discussion of the proposal to upgrade of the staff support position in the Health Technologies office and the need to identify the funds to upgrade the vacant position to a secretary. Erika Endrijonas has identified and documented that funds from the Cottage Health Care Systems 10-year grant to the college are available to pay for the upgraded position.

3.1 Proposed Modifications to the College Affirmative Action Committee, Selection and Name.

Sue Ehrlich informed the Council that a precedent-setting lawsuit that was filed against the State Personnel Board had the effect of invalidating several *Education Code* sections and certain *Title V* regulations dealing with the topic of affirmative action. The community college system is being asked to review and adopt affirmative action [term now in question] policies that are consistent with new *Title V* regulations. The Chancellor's Office has come forward through the consultation process at the state level with a model policy that is now consistent with the new regulations. The essence of the lawsuit was the use of quotas and goals for hiring individuals as well as student outreach categories. Sue indicated our objective at this juncture is the selection of committee members for this College Equal Opportunity and Diversity Committee and that the Executive Committee has put forth a recommendation as to the composition of the committee. The goal is to have this committee represent all ethnic groups as well as the disabled and females on campus. The appointment process formerly was that recommendations were made to the Superintendent/President who then made the final appointment. The suggestion is for a committee consisting of eight members whose appointments would be made directly by the President of the Academic Senate (2), CSEA (2), President of the Student Body (1), and the Superintendent/President (2). Sue Ehrlich, as Vice President of HRLA, would chair the committee. The committee members would serve for a period of two years. She suggested that alternates be named in the event that a committee member cannot attend so there is an automatic process for an alternate. The proposal that was provided to CPC

addresses only the composition of the committee not with any other issues. Once formed, the committee would be charged with the task of recommending to the Board through the consultation process policies pertaining to equal opportunity and diversity that incorporates the tenants of the new *Title V* regulations and procedures subsequent to addressing policy issues such as recruiting, student outreach, discrimination, sexual harassment and proactively achieving diversity within the workforce and student body but without setting quotas or goals. Sue discussed the proposed changes to the language for the composition of the Affirmative Action Committee. Kathy O'Connor raised the question that since the role of the committee is not defined, how broad would the functions of this committee spread throughout campus? Sue answered that this would be a legal policy committee that would try to put forth some process for involving different groups on campus and make recommendations for more proactive involvement whether it is training, staff development, presentations, etc. She would like to involve the committee before we go into faculty hiring for ideas and suggestions for outreach. Dr. Friedlander inquired as to the best approach to organize this committee and asked whether ideas should be brought forth to CPC for the functions of the committee prior to the committee meeting and the members selected. Sue indicated she wanted as much input as possible and wanted the mission of the committee to be more than the legal minimum that is expected. Jack recommended that Sue come back with some initial suggestions and a rationale as that might influence who is appointed to this committee once there is a sense of its focus. Tom Garey recommended it go before the Academic Senate for suggestions as well.

Liz Auchincloss recommended that instead of alternates, we increase the size of the committee to eleven members. Jack said once we have a sense of its mission we would be in a better position to discuss the appropriate size of the committee. Sue indicated that this committee would be a steering committee and not necessarily the work group doing the committee's work. Jack suggested we postpone the decision on the number of committee members until the committee's mission is defined. Peter Haslund recommends that once the committee is formed it come up with its own job description. He further supported the intent of having a smaller committee. Tom reminded the Council that the first job of this committee is to make the legally mandated recommendations for revisions to the present policy that may well include recommendations for the composition of the committee. He suggested an ad hoc committee be formed for the purpose of drafting this new policy. Sue indicated that this is a workable suggestion but there are pressing personnel problems that could not wait for a long organizational process. Sue said there is a master three year plan that specifies responsibilities at the local and state level of responsibilities of Academic Senates, classified employee groups and state-wide governing groups and sets some very specific goals in behavioral terms for dealing with these issues within the new guidelines. Jack suggested that at the next CPC meeting we examine, using those papers as a guide, the focus of the committee to move this process along.

4.0 Action Items

4.1 Revised Nepotism Policy and Procedures

M/S/C [Haslund/Garey] to approve the Nepotism Policy and Procedures.

5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

DTC Meeting

6.0 Action

6.1 Electronic Communications Policies and Procedures

M/S/C [Garey/O'Connor] to approve the Electronic Communications Policies and Procedures.

Dr. Friedlander commented that this is an excellent document and was a great example how the collaborative process can operate effectively. Dr. Friedlander noted that this policy is serving as a model for other community colleges.

6.2 Funds available for new technology purchases

Bill Hamre said in regard to TTIP funding that there are no funds this year for the total cost of ownership or for faculty and staff technology training other than the \$30k given to us to connect to 4Cnet for videoconferencing. Bill said the issue before CPC is the new initiatives coming from instructional and administrative departments. A number of years ago, we predicted that the need to fund new technology initiatives would diminish. However, this has not proven to be the case given the growth in programs, changes in technology and the application of technology. For the past several years we have tried to fund at a level of \$200k a year for new initiatives. Recognizing that because of the commitments made to adding technology equipment to the EBS building and the renewal of this equipment, \$44,000 for last year and \$44k again for this year is required to fund the replacement of that equipment. The only way we will be able to fund \$200,000 (this figure includes the \$44,000 to replace the equipment in the EBS Building) to support new technology initiatives for this year is to take that money out of the technology reserve account. This account has a balance of over \$2.4 million. It has been our target to fund two years worth of replacements with no new funding from state or other resources. Bill said we are in good shape in terms of our ability to replace our existing technology equipment. We are receiving some lottery revenue and some instructional technology replacement funding this year. The recommendation on a one-time basis is to use \$200k from the technology replacement reserve account.

M/S/C [Fairly/Ferrer] to approve the use \$200k from the technology replacement reserve account for technology replacement.

Peter Haslund asked whether the reserve account was restricted funds and whether they can be used for any other purpose. Bill Hamre responded that as the funds reside in the equipment replacement fund, they can only be used for replacement of equipment. It would take an action from the Board to move them out of that fund. Jack Friedlander added that there is no state rule that we have to use those monies for the purpose we have designated. Nevertheless, he supports using these funds as designated by the Board. Bill Hamre added that this approval by CPC/DTC to use the \$200k is a stated intention to fund new technology initiatives for this year and that the process can begin for individual departments to submit requests for new technology initiatives. Instructional requests from departments and units within Educational Programs would be reviewed in ITC and brought back to CPC. It will be three or four months before we would be making a decision about the level of funding. Kent indicated that we might be able to have some substantial savings if we don't replace some of the technology on a three- or four-year cycle given the capacity of this equipment to run needed software.

7.0 Discussion

7.1 Feedback from ITC on the proposed changes in the college's organizational structure for IT planning

Dr. Friedlander indicated that a number of months ago we decided to look at our IT planning process. The Executive Committee proposed a structure wherein there was an instructional technology workgroup and an administrative applications workgroup. The Instructional Technology Committee felt it could accomplish its objectives in a more streamlined measured way if DTC was restructured. Dr. Friedlander said he met to review the ITC proposal for restructuring DTC with Michael Gallegos, Laurie Vasquez, Bill Hamre and Kathy O'Connor and then with the Executive Committee. The chart provided as Attachment 4 to the agenda shows the proposed approach for IT planning. The proposal would broaden the mission of the District Technology Committee making its focus on IT planning priorities, resource requests and IT policies as well as serving as a technical resource. There would be several workgroups that would do the work of DTC. Dr. Friedlander described the flow chart and then discussed the following suggested membership of the reconstituted DTC:

- VP, IRD (Chair)
- 4 Faculty Members from ITC, including Director of FRC
- Continuing Education
- Student ~~Development~~ Support Services
- Business Services
- IRD
- Dean, Education Technology
- Assistant Administrator, SBCC Pipeline
- Coordinator, Instructional Labs (ICLCS)
- Student Senate
- CSEA Appointment (2)

Keith McLellan expressed concern that there has been some question as to whether non-teaching departments within Educational Programs should submit their resource requests to ITC. When the initial proposal for reorganizing the committee structure for IT planning was discussed, it was suggested that non-instructional educational programs operate under the administration applications workgroup as opposed to ITC. For example, in the traditional Student Services areas we have both teaching and non-teaching faculty represented programs. Kathy O'Connor said that she understood Keith's concerns but it is difficult to separate faculty initiatives. She would like to see all faculty requests whether they are teaching or non-teaching come through ITC. ITC would determine on a case-by-case basis if it made more sense to refer requests from non-teaching departments such as EOPS, Financial Aid and Student Activities to be referred to the administration applications group. We do have representatives on ITC for all those areas, as well as the library and academic support. Kathy felt that perhaps a communications issue has been the problem. She said it has been discussed in ITC to ensure that resource requests from all areas within Educational Programs be given adequate representation and fair consideration. Keith said that this approach doesn't adequately address his concern of ITC not giving adequate consideration to non-teaching departments requests for IT resources. Keith stated that there is a consensus within the non-teaching programs that the issues ITC deals with continue to marginalize those of the non-instructional departments. Laurie Vasquez said that what we are talking about is representation from classified staff and faculty in non-teaching departments who are directors or managers of those areas who have concerns when allocation issues arise. Keith made the point that when one looks at the agenda that is going to ITC, 90% or more is course related. Dr. Friedlander said that given the dependence of non-teaching departments on administrative software applications it made sense for these departments to submit their resource requests to the proposed administrative applications work group rather than ITC. However, since ITC deals with technologies-related planning, resource allocation and policy-related matters, it is essential that a faculty member from the Student Support Services Division serve as a member of ITC. Based on the discussion, Dr. Friedlander concluded that there was agreement with the approach that he just articulated. Dr. Friedlander proposed that CPC continue to meet on the 1st and 3rd Tuesdays and DTC would meet on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays. DTC will have a full agenda to warrant its own meetings.

Liz Auchincloss recommended that more classified staff be represented on DTC. This is a district-wide committee on which classified can vote. Several members of CPC/DTC made the point that several of the positions would most likely be filled by classified persons. Liz said she would still like to see one more classified staff member serve on this committee and that this person should not be a classified manager. Sue Ehrlich said that she felt this was a reasonable request since there is so much use of technology by classified staff.

- 7.2 Funds available for new technology purchases
(Should have been an action item. Addressed as action item 6.2)

7.3 File server and email system issue

Bill Hamre opened the discussion in the larger context of IRD resources and support for the college operations. Several weeks ago there were a number of mornings when the email server was not up until 7:00 or 7:30 a.m. He said he heard very clearly from members of the campus community that they expect email to be available anytime, anywhere. Bill said that the problem lies with the vendors not providing the backup software in a timely manner. Bill stressed the importance of having additional support staff in IRD to meet the campus' expectations for the operation of IRD supported IT resources. Currently there are four people managing 20-some servers on campus plus the storage area network. Clearly the priority of IRD is to support classes when they are offered during normal hours when instruction is offered until 10:00 p.m. Monday-Thursday, Saturdays, as well as on Sundays to support the Life Fitness Center. The college is thinly staffed to support the level of operation the college expects and demands. The college needs to take a serious look at the applications service provider model. We learned quickly with the Online College and Campus Pipeline that IRD is not adequately staffed to manage and maintain a 7/24/365 operation to support these instructional initiatives. For the past several years we paid \$180,000 a year to Sprint to host several of the college's applications programs, including the Online College and Campus Pipeline. Bill feels it is part of the overall technology planning for the institution because of the very clear demands on the part of our instructional systems. As soon as student registration is available over the Web, the students' expectation of anytime/anywhere registration is going to be just as demanding as it is for the Online College. We are considering having our network servers move to a clustered environment so that if any single server fails, the other servers will take up the applications load. We are trying to build in redundancy on both the storage and server side.

In response to a question from Tom Garey regarding outsourcing of additional applications such as e-mail, Bill responded that is possible for an applications service provider such as Sprint to host the college's email and messaging applications. This alternative would free IRD staff to deal with other issues. Esther Frankel asked if Bill is looking at options that would provide the level of support and campus coverage needed for classes and instructional computer labs in the evening and weekends. We need to look at two possible separate solutions, one that deals with the administrative systems and one that deals with the instructional systems. Jack Friedlander indicated that the college's IT Plan must include the methods for providing adequate technical support for administrative and instructional programs and systems.

Kent Richards cautioned that outsourcing would not necessarily free staff time to work on additional technology initiatives. We have to increase IRD staff to provide support for unmet and expected demands of faculty and staff. IRD staff is presently working during holiday times. With 24/7 there is not time when we can have any system down yet there is ongoing maintenance that needs to be done on the systems. The college has grown faster than we have staff to support this growth. Liz Auchincloss interjected that when considering contracting out work, the college needs to adhere to new state laws that specify the conditions in which it is permissible to contract out work that classified staff can perform. She noted that for the amount of money spent on

outsourcing, the college might be able to hire additional staff. The college needs to look at the total cost of contracting out and what job duties are being replaced from classified staff before we go forward.

Peter Haslund questioned whether it is essential that the networks operate 24/7/365. Could the college stipulate that it will announce and publish predictable hours the systems are not on? If that could save money and help address the challenges faced by IRD staff, we should consider this option. With the current condition of the state budget, we need to look at ways to reduce the costs of providing services that are deemed essential.

Bill Hamre responded by stating that we need to have a discussion about what is an adequate service level. The college for the last six years has said that it wants "anytime/anywhere" access to the web-based services and we hear very clearly and quickly anytime the Online College is down. He said it is fairly easy to achieve 95% availability. It is more costly for every percentile above that. The system would be on 24/7 but the support would not be there for the entire time. Kathy O'Connor would support this idea of having less availability of the networks as long as support for educational programs and services is given top priority. Dr. Friedlander said that OTC would focus its efforts on developing the district's IT Plan that can be supported from both a cost and staffing perspective.

7.4 Funding for new technology initiatives and replacement

Kent Richards reported that his replacement list shows that 460 computers are in the cycle to be replaced this year at a cost of approximately \$800,000 to \$900,000. He indicated that a lot of the monitors and computers in this cycle do not need to be replaced other than an upgrade to the memory and to Windows 2000. Dr. Friedlander inquired that with these savings would it enable us to replace all computers that need to be replaced or is that a way to save funds for a different reallocation. Kent said that any savings would go into the reserves fund. He said that the software used to drive the technology but now the capabilities of technology is ahead of the software and is adequate for our needs. Kent indicated he would bring back to the next meeting of CPC/DTC recommendations for the replacement of computers and related technologies as well as proposed changes in the technology equipment replacement cycle.

8.0 Action Items

There were no DTC action items.

9.0 Adjournment

Dr. Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.