SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
May 21, 2002
3:00-4:30 PM
Room A218C

MINUTES

PRESENT:	J. Friedlander, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, B. Hamre, K. McLellan, L. Rose, T. Garey, R. Launier and J. Chase
RESOURCE:	A. Serban
PRESENT DTC:	M. Ferrer, K. O'Connor, K. Richards and L. Vasquez
ABSENT:	B. Fahnestock, M. Gallegos and Student Representative

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 April 16th CPC.

M/S/C [Hanna/Garey] to approve the minutes of the April 16th meeting.
Bill Hamre and Sue Ehrlich abstained.

The minutes of the May 7th CPC/DTC meeting were not distributed and were tabled for approval until the next CPC/DTC meeting.

1.2   Announcements

There were no announcements.

DTC Meeting

3.0   Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0   Discussion Items

4.1   New technology initiatives &
4.2   Presentation of prioritized new instructional technology initiatives from Continuing Education (*addressed as one item*)

Dr. Friedlander stated that based on past practices in ranking new technology initiatives, the decision of Cabinet was that the request from Continuing Education would be ranked with those from the other divisions of the college. In other words, Continuing Education division would not automatically be allocated 19% of the funds for new technology equipment.

Dr. Friedlander went on to say that our procedure in the past for addressing new technology requests has been that with the exception of Educational Programs, each unit in the college submits its ranked recommendations to CPC/DTC for consideration and ranking as a first hearing. Departments and administrative units in Educational Programs submit their requests for new technology to ITC for ranking. ITC's rankings are then presented to CPC/DTC.

Laurie Vasquez informed CPC that ITC ranked $140,000 of the requests it received for new technology initiative dollars. ITC's criteria in ranking the proposals included the number of students that would be served, secondary monetary effects, personnel support and bunkered classrooms.

Lynda Fairly presented Continuing Education's new technology initiatives. The top-ranked item is for a portable digital presentation set-up for both the Schott and Wake Centers [total funding $27,000]. The second was for a portable data projector to be used for community outreach [$5,500].

M/S/C [Hanna/Fairly] unanimously to waive the rules and move item 4.1 to action.

M/S/ [O'Connor/Rose] to fund the first two priority items of Continuing Education, the portable data projectors for the Wake and Schott Centers and a portable data projector, and to approve the ITC rankings through the Math set aside [1st year] to a total of $140k and to fund any small items ranked in priority order with any cost savings.

Dr. Friedlander indicated that although we are not using proportions of funding for CE (19%), there is a degree of equity in the balance of funding for the technology initiatives proposed from Continuing Education and ITC.

Ray Launier added that he thought the next lower-ranked item on ITC's list, a remote mouse for the Psychology department, should be included. Dr. Friedlander suggested that if there are savings from the purchase of the top-ranked technology items that small items be funded in priority order. Tom Garey echoed this suggestion.

The motion was carried unanimously after discussion.

5.0   Action Items

5.1   Computer Use Policy/Procedures (*taken first, out of order*)

Dr. MacDougall addressed the Council to attempt to facilitate the process to complete the computer use policy/procedures so that they may be presented to the Board of Trustees before the start of the next academic year. He cited recent concerns that have arisen in regard to the computer use policy/procedures that have been reviewed in ITC and CPC/DTC in the past that need to be resolved. Dr. MacDougall indicated that he would like to address the following two issues: (1) the fundamental principle that must be included in the Computer Use Policy and Procedures; and (2) the steps that needed to be taken to complete the computer use policy/procedures in time to be included on the July 18 Board of Trustees' agenda.

Dr. MacDougall discussed the following four basic principles that must be included in the District's Computer Use Policy and Procedures:

1. **Privilege and whether that privilege is revocable**

   Dr. MacDougall indicated that there is no question that the use of college electronic resources is a privilege and this privilege is revocable. If there are students or staff who abuse the use of college-owned technology, they will forfeit their right to access this resource.

2. **Right to privacy**

   Dr. MacDougall acknowledged the sensitivity and importance of this issue. The right to privacy is not absolute. For example, if there is a complaint that the rights and privilege that individuals have in terms of using campus technology resources have been violated, there is a responsibility to investigate this allegation. The investigations could involve accessing an individual's uses of the college's technology resources, including materials they have developed, accessed and stored on their computers and networks. In terms of public records, electronic records can be subpoenaed and made available. It is important that individuals recognize that there is not an absolute right to privacy.

3. **Discipline that will pertain to violations of the policy**

   The critical element of the policy is that it will follow the standard processes of any violation of district policies and procedures that occurs in the institution. We are not developing a unique set of procedures for the use of technology. The due process rights for students, faculty and staff will have to be adhered to in the same manner as for any violation.

4. Additional software

The institution has clear standards in regard to the adherence to laws on the use of copyrighted materials. In addition, unless software is approved for use by IRD, the college is not in a position to support software packages.

Dr. MacDougall continued by saying the policy/procedures was brought before the Board's Educational Policies Committee last Thursday with the understanding that it had been reviewed and endorsed by the college community. There was no one present who spoke against it. He indicated one choice is to present the policy/procedures to the Board this Thursday. However, taking that course of action would be less than sensitive to some of the issues that have recently surfaced. The other option is to put the policy/procedures on the Board agenda but to defer action with the understanding that it would be an agenda item on either the June or July Board meeting. It is hoped that a timeline could be set to identify and address the key points to have a policy ready for the June or July Board meeting.

Dr. Friedlander suggested that if the item to approve the computer use policy/procedures is to be placed on the July 18th Board agenda, a work group should be formed to complete the computer use policy/procedures. Dr. MacDougall suggested that if CPC/DTC cannot reach a concensus on the revised computer use policy/procedures by July 14, the policy should be submitted to the Board with the understanding that there would be additional changes to it in the fall.

Kathy O'Connor questioned the urgency of having the policy/procedures in place this summer. Dr. MacDougall responded that we have been working on the policy/procedures for some time. There have had some computer violation cases that have arisen in the past year that are very serious. His feeling is the policy/procedures structure has not been as definitive or as comprehensive as it needs to be. Kathy expressed concern because we will have 16,000 students on Campus Pipeline next year and we will also be moving into a great deal more accessibility and utilization of our technology infrastructure such as the implementation of DARS and the implementation of the Oracle Student System in the spring. Bill Hamre indicated that USC and CSU systems each have procedures and guidelines for appropriate use of their technology resources. The college is at-risk not having clearly delineated policies and procedures about appropriate use of its technology resources.

Kathy O'Connor responded to the concern of Dr. MacDougall that the problems with the policy/procedures have just recently been addressed. She said she could not think of any other single issue that has consumed ITC more than this issue this year. Kathy felt that in fairness to everyone concerned that we should work on the policy/procedures this summer and ask the Academic Senate to approve it in September.

Dr. MacDougall said that at the most recent meetings where he has asked for feedback from different sources on whether there were issues or concerns with the computer use policy/procedures as presented, he did not receive any response. There was no one

present at the Educational Policies Committee to address any concerns which is a standard part of the policy review process.

Keith commented that from his perspective as a middle manager a policy and procedure is needed that is more specific than the one being proposed as it does not adequately address fundamental issues. He expressed concern that if the initial hearing at CPC on May 10th was considered the review and consultation process for the policy/procedures, then we need to reexamine the role of CPC. He did not think that any members of CPC/DTC believed that was the consultation process but rater a handout to be read and then discussed at the next meeting. Tom Garey commented that prior to the Board's Educational Policies Committee meeting, the document had never gone through the Academic Senate. There was no understanding among members that when this was distributed to CPC at its last meeting that it would be going before the Board at its June meeting.

Laurie Vasquez favored presenting the policy/procedures to the Board in July as she feels it needs to be reviewed by the Academic Senate. A tremendous amount of work has gone into the formation of this policy/procedures and to not take advantage of feedback to make sure the document put forward to the Board has been reviewed by the constituent bodies.

Dr. MacDougall expressed concern that if ITC began working on the policy/procedures in September then why wasn't the Senate informed and brought up to date as the process proceeded. Kathy O'Connor responded that she is the liaison to that committee and has informed the steering committee of the status of ITC's review of the policy. She added there was no point in bringing this document before the Academic Senate until there is a policy/procedure upon which all bodies could agree. Dr. MacDougall voiced his expectation that there be an articulation of what is not acceptable in the language of the policy/procedures and a suggestion for alternative language be made.

Dr. Friedlander suggested that a task force be formed to develop the policy and procedures so that it will be ready to present to the Academic Senate at its July 17th meeting and to CPC/DTC at its meeting on July 18th. It would be Sue Ehrlich's, Lana Rose's and his role to identify where we are not making progress and determine how we can resolve the differences.

M/S/C [Rose/Garey] unanimously to form a task force to meet during the month of June and the beginning of July to have a Computer Use Policy and Procedures document prepared for approval at the July Academic Senate and CPC/DTC meetings and to be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at its July meeting.

Dr. Friedlander will serve as chair of the committee. Bill Hamre, Sue Ehrlich, Lynda Fairly and Lana Rose will make recommendations by Friday for appointees to the task force which is to include at least one classified staff member. The task force will meet on June 18th at 3:00 PM in A218C. The recommended policy/procedures by the task force will be an agenda item for approval at the June meetings of the Academic Senate and CPC/DTC. It is anticipated that the policy will go to the Board for approval at their July 18th meeting.

`CPC MEETING

6.0 Information Items

6.1 Completion of institutional self-study for re-accreditation to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval on May 23, 2002.

Andreea Serban reported that the self-study will be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval at its May 23rd meeting. There have been some minor changes to the sections that have been reviewed by CPC and some changes to sections that have not been reviewed. The sections CPC has not reviewed are the rationale and process of obtaining the approval for the self-study and how it differs from the traditional accreditation process as well as our process for the verification of the 10 standards. Andreea indicated that the self-study is available on the college's website.

The Council stated its appreciation of the enormous task that Andreea undertook in compiling the information for the college's self-study and applauded her completion of this important task.

7.0 Discussion Items

7.1 Review of preliminary draft of Master Calendar for Planning & Budgeting

Andreea compiled a template of a master calendar for planning and budgeting. She is meeting with the vice presidents, Lana Rose and managers in various areas to provide specific elements that will go into the calendar. The calendar shows the major areas that should be brought to CPC as part of the college's planning and budgeting process. Dr. Friedlander said that when CPC/DTC convenes for the summer meeting, Andreea would have the calendar fairly well developed. As a council, we need to determine what comes before the Council in any given month and then to focus on those areas.

7.2 Request to use financial aid administrative overhead dollars provided to the college from the federal government to support a new financial aid special program assistant position.

Dr. Ron Baker and Brad Hardison, Director of the Financial Air Office (FAO), joined the meeting to address this request. Dr. Friedlander informed the council that the college has been entitled to receive Federal dollars for administrating the Financial Aid program. Currently, the SBCC Financial Aid Office (FAO) consists of seven full time staff who work 12-month positions. The job titles are as follows: (1) Director, (3) Special Program Advisors, (2) Financial Aid Assistants and (1) Computer Specialist. In addition to the permanent staff, the office also employs two classified hourly employees who work up to 19.5 hours per week at various times throughout the year. Currently, the office employs 10 student workers during the academic year that work up to 19.5 hours per week. The lack of adequate staffing in the FAO has prevented it from fully providing the level of service needed by

students and it has required that the Director of Financial Aid work many additional hours to help meet critical timelines and reporting requirements.

Based on the above analysis, it seems appropriate for the college to allocate the Federal funds to the FAO to help pay for the administration of financial aid programs and to hire needed staff. This funding would be used to hire one additional staff member who can assist in the operations of the loan program and provide administrative support. After careful review, Brad Hardison is proposing that the Financial Aid Office be given permanent funding for one position as follows:

> Financial Aid Assistant (Range 25, Step C) – Twelve Month Permanent position to begin July 1, 2002. Estimated Cost - $28,548 Salary + $10,300 Benefits = $38,848

In addition to allocating funding for a permanent position, it is proposed that the hourly classified non-instructional budget for the department be increased $3,861 from the current level of $8,541. This will assist the department in meeting the needs of increased service during the day and evening hours. This year, the department was only able to meet its obligation by a one-time transfer of $8,864. In addition to the permanent funding, one time funding would be needed to remodel space in the FAO for the new staff member and purchase an additional computer. It is estimated that these one time costs would be $8,000 ($5,000 for office remodel and furniture, $1,500 for computer and $1,500 for computer replacement as required by college). Thus the total cost would be as follows:

> One Time Cost for 2002/2003 - $8,000
> Increase to Regular Classified Non Instructional for New Position - $38,848
> Increase to Hourly Classified Non Instructional - $3,861
> **Total Permanent Costs - $38,848 + $3,861 = $42,709**

Source of Funding: Recently, it was discovered that the college had not been collecting the administrative allowance for campus based financial aid funds. This would result in new funds as follows (these are estimates based on current expenditures and Pell grant recipients):

Funding Source	Amount
FSEOG Expenditures ($168,704 + $42,176 (25% match) = $210,880 x 5%)	$10,544
FWS Expenditures ($379,653 + $126,551 (25% match) = $506,204 x 5%)	$25,310
Pell Grant Administrative Allowance	$6,855
Total	**$42,709**

Brad recommends that the administrative cost allowance be used to fund this request. The Financial Aid Office at Santa Barbara City College serves a vital function to students' college success. A small investment in additional staff would be an effective use of funds to ensure that students are given the access they need to achieve their educational goals. The calculation for this position does not reflect a negotiated salary increase of 7.14 percent.

Dr. Friedlander informed CPC/DTC of Brian Fahnestock's position as vice president of Business Services, to not spend these dollars. His perspective is that although these are dollars to administer the financial aid program, the growth in financial aid impacts the accounting office staff. Brian agreed that it would be beneficial to the institution to keep the dollars in financial aid but he is concerned that the new contracts with the employee groups have increased our expenditures fairly dramatically and that the state budget is uncertain. As a result, the college will also have a significant deficit in the budget next year. At this point in time, the $42,709 for the administration of financial aid programs has been placed in the college's General Fund and is needed to help balance the district's budget for 2002-2003.

Jack reported that Brian is asking CPC to vote whether or not to approve this position with the caveat that this position will not be filled until such a time that as he feels we can support it in terms of not needing these dollars to support ongoing operations. He said that Brian felt that given the condition of the budget, he might need this $42k to help balance the budget for next year. Jack indicated that once Brian knows what the final outcomes are from salary negotiations and the state budget, he can make that determination.

Tom Garey said CPC should approve a position on its merit and not because dollars have become available especially since these dollars are to fund the financial aid program. Had they been, the district's general fund contribution into the operation of the financial aid office would have been that much less. Keith respectfully disagreed. He said there has been a need for staffing in financial aid for many years. There has not been an opportunity to come forth and present a request for additional staff. In terms of student success and the College Plan, this position in financial aid is directly related to our ability to achieve goals within the College Plan in terms of enrolling and retaining students. This money is available and is designated basically for this purpose. If the district finds itself in a position in the future where it cannot meet its obligations, then the district needs to go through the process of identifying where it can made reductions.

Jack Friedlander echoed Tom Garey's remarks that CPC is a recommending body for a position based on its merits. The district can choose to receive the recommendation but put it on hold until we are assured of adequate funding to meet its obligations. Since CPC is meeting in July, Brian should have a much better handle on the budget and can provide an explanation as to whether or not the district feels comfortable going ahead with this position.

Ron Baker addressed the Council and said that when he assumed his position last year he realized that the financial aid department was understaffed. He and Brad began a process of determining how to reorganize this area. These dollars have now been identified and this position brought forward to CPC. Dr. Friedlander told the council he met recently with the financial aid staff to identify their responsibilities and their concerns. There is no doubt that there is a need for additional staffing in this area. Ron further indicated that the hiring process for this person is time sensitive as Financial Aid is in the process of the awards cycle. He recommended that a decision be made as soon as possible so that a person could be hired and trained in time for the fall financial aid award cycle.

M/S/C [Rose/Launier] to move item 7.2 to action. Tom Garey opposed the motion.

M/S Rose/Chase] to approve the categorically-funded financial aid special program assistant position [only].

Karolyn Hanna commented that it appeared that it was not only the position being requested but also a recommendation in the proposal to have additional classified hourly staff as well as a request for one-time funds for a computer and remodeling. Lana clarified that her motion is for the position only and not for the other two items. Dr. Friedlander added that for categorically-funded positions, whatever shortfall there is for the COLA becomes a liability for the district.

The motion was unanimously passed.

7.3   Membership of CPC

Dr. Friedlander commented that he would like to address this issue in the fall when John Romo takes on his leadership of the college as the new Superintendent/President.

8.0   Action Items

See item 7.2.

9.0   Other Items

There were no other items.

10.0   Adjournment

The meeting as adjourned at 4:50 PM by Chairperson Jack Friedlander.

The next CPC/DTC meeting is July 18th in A218C from 2:00 to 4:00 PM.