

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE  
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL  
DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
September 24, 2002  
3:00-4:30 PM  
Room A218C**

**MINUTES**

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Fahnestock, L. Fairly, S. Ehrlich, B. Hamre, A. Serban, L. Rose,  
T. Garey, G. Carroll, P. Haslund, L. Auchincloss

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

EXCUSED ABSENCE: K. McLellan

GUEST: S. Coffield

**1.0 Call to Order**

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the July 18 CPC meeting.

**M/S [Hamre/Garey] to approve the minutes with the following corrections:**

Indicate that Tom Garey *was* present at the meeting.  
Item 1.2: ~~Environmental Studies~~ to Earth & Biological Sciences  
Item 2.1, pg. 2: ~~respectively~~ to respectfully  
Item 5.1, pg. 3: ~~response~~ to responsive

**The minutes were approved as amended. Lana Rose, Gary Carroll and Liz Auchincloss abstained.**

1.2 Announcements

1.3 Resignation of Janice Chase from CPC.

Because of health considerations of a family member, Janice is resigning from CPC.  
Liz Auchincloss will represent the classified staff. This appointment is made by CSEA.

1.4 Dr. Friedlander welcomed Gary Carroll as an Academic Senate representative to CPC.

1.5 Enrollments

Dr. Friedlander reported that as of two days ago, the headcount was 4.4% higher in fall 2002 than in fall 2001 and the number of full-time student 10.58% or 528 students greater than last fall. We are well on our way to exceeding our target on growth. Lynda Fairly

indicated that Continuing Education had a very strong summer and is having an excellent fall term. Last year Continuing Education grew by 6.2%.

## 1.6 Annual Student Services Day

Jack Friedlander reported that the first annual Student Services Day was held on the West Campus today between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. He noted that it was well attended by students and was a wonderful event.

## 1.7 State Budget

Dr. Friedlander indicated that the state budget continues to deteriorate by the day. Revenues are 5% under what was projected. The state may go into next year with a budget deficit of \$20+ billion dollars. The consensus now is that after the November election the governor will call an emergency session of the Legislature to address the budget deficit. Bill Hamre indicated that this is the first year we have had to make a contribution to PERS in the amount of 2.897 percent. Dr. Friedlander summarized by saying it is fortunate that we are part of the Prop 98 guarantee of funding. Even though the state's deficit is going up, the revenue overall is up somewhat and will help fund the system as long as the Proposition 98 guarantee for K-14 education remains in place.

## 2.0 Information Items

### 2.1 Status of accreditation visit

Andreea Serban has distributed the brochure profiling the members of the accreditation team. She will also distribute a *new and improved* Institutional Effectiveness Report by the end of the week. She said it is likely that members of CPC may be individually interviewed and stressed the importance of being familiar with the report. One of the questions members of the visitation team may ask in their interviews is how the college assesses its institutional effectiveness. At a minimum, everyone should read the standard that addresses his or her respective areas. Andreea announced there would be open forums on October 1<sup>st</sup>, 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the EBS Building and from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the BC Forum. She encouraged members of CPC to be present at the exit meeting at 2:00 p.m. in A211 on October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

### 2.2 Nepotism Implementation Procedures

Dr. Friedlander discussed the Nepotism Policy that was distributed to the Council. The Executive Committee decided to leave this policy as is but develop procedures (*distributed*) for implementing this policy. The major change is that the college will be more flexible in how it interprets this policy. In the past, the district's interpretation of this policy did not allow anyone to apply for a position in which a member of his or her immediate family was a member or, for existing employees, be in the same department as anyone in their immediate family. The proposed interpretation of the policy allows for related family members to be in the same department as long as one is not in a supervisory or decision-making role over another. The proposed Administrative Procedures for Implementing the District's Nepotism Policy (BP 7310) are:

- 1.0 The District will allow flexibility in the application of its Nepotism Policy when relatives (or domestic partners as defined by Family Code Section 297 et seq.) would be in the same department.
- 2.0 If two persons in the same department should marry or enter into a domestic partner relationship while both are employed by the District, they may continue their employment in the same department provided that they not work in any position that would require one to be in a decision-making role relative to another.
- 3.0 In those instances where developments would result in a relative/partner to have recommending or decision-making responsibilities over another relative/partner, the appropriate Vice President or the Superintendent/President will intercede to ensure that there is no conflict of interest. Actions may include reassignment to another department.

Lana Rose indicated that when the proposed procedures was discussed at the Academic Senate, Dr. Friedlander indicated that there may be creative solutions by individual departments that would allow a related family member to serve as the department chair or supervisor of a unit in which the other member of his or her related family is a member. In such instances, the appropriate vice president and the college president would evaluate each proposal submitted by a department on a case-by-case basis. Lana indicated that under procedure 3.0 it should say, "...the appropriate vice president in consultation with the department chair and/or supervisor and Superintendent/President," so there is at least the reference that would include some discussion with the department. And, if that is the intent of the proposed language, then we should indicate so in the policy. Liz Auchincloss asked the question what if the department chair/supervisor is one of the people involved in the conflicted situation?

Lynda said that the intent is to involve the department chair and/or supervisor in trying to be more flexible to assist the employee. Lana indicated that the discussion at the Academic Senate was that if two people in the same department who are related to one another, then the department would be able to come up with its own solution to mitigate any potential conflict of interest. If the language of 3.0 is "Vice President and Superintendent/President" and there is nothing in writing about a consultation process with the department chair and/or supervisor, then the intent of involving the department may be lost in the future. Lana requested that language be added to the document that refers to more of a collaborative discussion.

Liz feels that the affected department should not be involved in the process to make the decision if there is a problem as it can cause serious morale problems. Jack agreed that a department might not be unified on a situation. Lynda indicated that is why the process would go through the vice president and Superintendent/President so it would have a larger review. Lana asked that since these are procedures, not policy, could the intent be written in the document. The intent is that the department chair and/or the supervisor be involved in the decision but this may not always be possible.

Liz wanted to be on record as indicating that she approves the language the way it is proposed since to change it would make it more liberal which would head the procedure towards a direction that would cause morale problems within a department.

## 2.3 Role of CPC in College Planning and Budgeting

As an information item, the role of CPC in the college planning and budgeting process was attached to the agenda. The document defines the roles and responsibilities of CPC in the college's planning processes during the academic year. The accreditation team will review this document.

### **3.0 Discussion Items**

#### **3.1 Review of Principles of Budget Development**

Brian Fahnestock discussed the budget principles attached to the agenda. He indicated that there are some principles in the budget that need to be reviewed. The Executive Committee reviewed the principles and made some recommended changes to increase the clarity of particular budget principles and, in other instances, consolidated the wording of two or more budget principles.

There was discussion on whether the budget principle that called for having a reserve of five percent meant that this was an absolute percentage to be achieved or whether it was a minimum amount to have in reserve. Brian indicated that the college's goal is to have a reserve of 5%. The state requires colleges to have a minimum reserve of 3%. Thus, the college's budget principle of having a reserve of 5% seems prudent.

Recommendations for proposed changes in the college's principles of budget development are to be made to CPC by December 3<sup>rd</sup> for a first hearing. It will be on for action on December 17.

#### **3.2 Implications for the college of the state's 2002-2003 budget**

Brian discussed the state budget that was signed by the Governor on September 5th and its implications for the community colleges statewide as compiled by the Community College League of California. CalWORKS services have been cut nearly by half and the credit and non-credit matriculation budgets by close to 30 percent. Dr. Friedlander indicated that the Matriculation Committee for the credit program has reduced its budget by close to 30% this year. Although the cuts resulted in the elimination or reduction of needed services, the effects of the state budget cuts were not as severe as they would otherwise have been had the college not been able to use its \$66,000 in Matriculation carryover funds from the prior year. The \$66,000 of carryover funds will not be available to the college next year. Unless the 30% in cuts to the Matriculation budget are restored for next year, there will be serious reductions of essential services provided to students. Lynda indicated that for the non-credit program the reduction in funding appears to be down from \$580k to \$220k, more than a 50% reduction. If this reduction in funding is confirmed, it will result in the need to eliminate positions that are paid for with non-credit Matriculation funds.

Bill Hamre reminded the group that because we knew the TTIP funds were going to be cut, CPC recommended using one-time reserve funds from Fund 41 for faculty/staff development technology training and to continue our contract with Sprint for the Online College hosting for this year.

Brian indicated that he would present to the Board in October a complicated and lengthy budget revision because the budget was previously adopted with a less than 1.67%

COLA which was an early number. However, COLA is in the budget at 1.67% so the salary line in the budgets will be increased. Dr. Friedlander indicated the AB 1725 staff development funds for the credit program were eliminated. Brian indicated that the college budget would reflect additional cuts that affect the college.

### 3.3 Enrollment Management Report: Why Growth in FTES is Important

This item was postponed until another meeting.

### 3.4 Membership of CPC

Dr. Friedlander reported that the Council reviewed the membership of CPC last spring. At that time it was decided to keep the present composition of the membership. Since that time he has received a request from Liz Auchincloss to consider adding one additional classified staff to CPC. Liz presented her request to have an additional classified appointment to CPC. Her opinion is that the classified staff seems to be disproportionately represented in shared governance and there is not much opportunity for classified staff to be members of committees on which they can vote.

Lana then requested that an additional faculty member be added so that it is a 5-5 ratio with administrators and faculty with the executive vice president, as chairperson of CPC, being the tie-breaking vote. Dr. Friedlander said he will discuss these requests with the Executive Committee and would inform the Council of its recommendation at the next meeting. This item will be an action item on the October 1st agenda.

### 3.5 CPC agenda for Oct 1 (accreditation team visit)

Dr. Friedlander applauded the beautiful job Andreea Serban did in completing the Institutional Effectiveness Report. On October 1<sup>st</sup> CPC will discuss the analysis of progress being made in achieving the goals and objectives in the College Plan. Brian will give an update of the facilities projects. The Council will meet in SS240E that day.

### 3.6 Master Planning & Budgeting Calendar

Dr. Friedlander indicated the Council was on target in addressing the items in the Master Planning and Budgeting Calendar for the month of September.

## 4.0 Action Items

There were no action items addressed.

## 5.0 Other Items

There were no other items.

## **DTC Meeting**

### **6.0 Discussion Items**

#### **6.1 Funds available for new technology purchases**

Bill Hamre reminded the Council that in the recent past we have been challenged to find dollars to support new technology but at the same time we are not in a position to stop new technology initiatives. There are changes in instructional delivery such as the mediated classrooms that were the focus of last year's new initiatives. We have more than a million-dollar deficit in our adopted budget yet we have an ongoing needs for new technology initiatives. For the last several years we have targeted \$200k to support new initiatives. We found those funds from one-time sources plus the equivalent of one-fourth (\$50k a year) for equipment replacement for new initiatives. This year to fund new technology initiatives we would have to again identify one-time sources that would further increase the budget deficit, or use reserves from our capital outlay to fund those new initiatives, and find the corresponding \$50k for ongoing renewal. Last year when we went through the planning process for new technology, we realized we were making significant additions to the computer inventory with the new EBS Building. In order to set aside adequate funds to replace the technology purchased for the EBS Building, CPC/DTC agreed to set aside \$40,000 for three years from the \$200,000 a year allocation for new technology initiatives. Thus, for the next two years there will be \$120,000 rather than \$200,000 to support new technology initiatives. CPC will have to make a recommendation as to whether to go out for new initiatives and, if so, to identify the source of funds to pay for purchasing new technology. The options are to identify one-time monies or to draw down reserves in instructional equipment. The question arises, how do we pay for the ongoing replacement costs?

Brian indicated that people/positions that have been recently added have totaled close to a half-million dollars in costs. He is now being very conservative in requests for any budget expenditures that would increase our deficit because of the very tight budget. In addition, there is a salary increase of 3% that will be in effect in January.

Bill said just as CPC made the decision and the recommendation to the President to use equipment replacement reserves to fund faculty and staff development in technology and the contract with Sprint, we could make that recommendation to the President to fund the \$156k of new initiatives from the one-time draw on reserves on equipment. Again, that needs to be a deliberative decision and action by this body. Brian said we should also recognize we do not have funding for new initiatives or the dollars to set aside to replace the equipment that would be added to the college's technology inventory. He said that is one of the reasons we built the reserve was so that when our budget is tight we can continue to replacement equipment. He said the fund is healthy and will have the figures on the fund for the October 15th meeting. Bill said the target amount is to have two years of reserves for the technology equipment replacement fund that translates into \$2.4 million dollars.

## 6.2 Proposed changes in Computer Use Policy

Dr. Friedlander indicated the Executive Committee reviewed the Academic Senate's proposed changes to the Computer Use Policy. The Executive Committee wants to have all the college's policies in one document and the procedures in another document. However, the position taken by members of the work group who worked on this document this past summer was that it was hard to disaggregate procedures from the policies in that in many instances the procedures are in fact policies. The Executive Committee is requesting that CPC/DTC form a workgroup to separate procedures from policies. Tom Garey asked that if the purpose of policies and procedures is to clarify and communicate what is expected in the way we do business, what is the value added of separating the two documents into policies and procedures? For clarity sake, if procedures are driven by policy, doesn't an integration of policies and procedures seem to make more sense?

Sue Ehrlich indicated there is a reason for having them separated. Policies are very general statements. That is the level at which a Board governs. The policies capture the essence or the principles related to certain topical areas. The procedures are more of a how-to and should be more flexible and do not need to go to the Board for approval. They take the general principles that are approved by the Board, put them into a functional working model that time and circumstances could change. If one needs detail in any particular area, then one can go to the more detailed procedures to get more of a sense of how something is currently being done. The separation makes it a more useful tool.

Tom indicated that his concern is that issues that have been policy issues that go through consultation and are approved by the Board are suddenly going to start drifting into so-called procedural decisions that are not only not going through the Board but are not going to go through consultation. Our shared governance policy refers to policies and not procedures. One of the reasons the Academic Senate requested adding the statement "...in a manner consistent with the District Policy #1200 on shared governance" in Board Policy 3720 (Electronic Communication Policy) was to ensure that those particular procedures be developed collegially. Tom went on to state that he knows that there have been difficulties at some other institutions when procedures were changed without appropriate consultation and he is concerned that this could happen at the college which may weaken our consultation and shared governance system.

Lana reiterated that we are being asked by the President to separate procedure from policy and we as CPC are indicating to the President that this should not be done. Kathy O'Connor asked if it would help the consultation process if our policy number 1200 included policies and procedures in consultation rather than having just the policies. Tom said that we then get into the problem of defining which procedures. The change requested is as follows:

### **BP 3720 ~~Computer Use~~ ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION POLICY**

Employees and students who use District electronic communication resources ~~computers~~ and networks and the information they contain, and related resources have a responsibility not to abuse those resources and to respect the rights of others. The Superintendent/President, in a manner consistent with District Policy #1200 on Shared

Governance, shall establish procedures that provide guidelines to students, administrators, faculty and staff for the appropriate use of information technologies. The procedures shall include provisions that users must respect ~~software~~ copyrights and licenses, respect the integrity of ~~computer based~~ information resources, refrain from seeking to gain unauthorized access and respect the rights of other electronic communications ~~computer~~ users.

Bill said that one previous distinction was that the procedures didn't require Board action. In fact, the Board did approve this document as policies and procedures.

### 6.3 Proposed changes in Electronic Communications Policies and Procedures

Dr. Friedlander reported that last spring CPC/DTC approved the Electronic Communication Policies and Procedures document. Since that time, there have been a number of editorial changes. Tom Garey indicated the most significant change was in *section 3720.61 Authorization*. After this body voted on the document that was approved by the Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees changed the language of this policy that in the opinion of some members of CPC, would allow a vice president to delegate to another administrator the authority to allow an authorized IRD staff member to inspect a employee's computer files without the individual's knowledge of or permission to do so. The Academic Senate has requested that the following changes in wording to this section of the policy be made:

Except in ***compelling circumstances***, or ***under time-dependent, critical operational circumstances***, or emergency circumstances as defined in Appendix A, Definitions, such actions must be authorized in advance and in writing only by the College Superintendent/President or responsible Vice President. ~~This authority may not be further delegated.~~ Authorization shall be limited to action no broader than necessary to resolve the situation.

Dr. Friedlander noted that the suggested changes in language to this section of Electronic Communication Policy was reviewed and endorsed by the Executive Committee.

### 6.4 Formation of an ad hoc work group to place policies in the policy document, procedures in a procedures document and review suggested changes in the wording in these documents.

Addressed in Item 6.2.

### 6.5 Review of proposed organizational structure for informational technology planning and decision-making.

Bill distributed the proposed approach for IT planning and decision making and said that there is a need to find ways for extensive and responsible discussion on technology initiatives from both the instructional and administrative systems points of view. We have not had in place a structure on administrative applications to bring in the perspectives of Business Services, Human Resources and Legal Affairs, Educational Programs, Continuing Education and the Information Resources Division as well as the relative priorities among these organizational units of the college. Likewise, there are a number of groups that are charged with educational technology planning, including the instructional technology committee, the cross-functional teams, the Online College and



the Oracle Student System implementation team. Bill said this proposed organizational structure is an attempt to put together a group that has overall responsibility for planning and making recommendations to CPC about prioritization and resource allocations for technology initiatives for the entire college. There is a need for a mechanism to bring together people who have the technology expertise to prepare the justification for technology initiatives to CPC. That was the notion of replacing the formally organized District Technology Committee with this ad hoc workgroup or set of workgroups that would prepare information to bring to this group.

## **7.0 Other Items**

There were no other items.

## **8.0 Adjournment**

On motion, Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

c:/Ed Programs/Word/CPC/CPC Minutes 09-24-02