SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL and
DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
10-5-99, 1999
3:00-4:30 P.M.
A 218C

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, D. Oroz, B. Fahnestock, K. McLellan, L. Fairly, L. Rose, J. Kruidenier, K. Hanna, T. Garey, J. Lynn

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1.2 **M/S/C** To approved the minutes of the September 21, 1999 meeting

2. Update on decisions regarding FTES targets for 1998-99

Dr. Friedlander reported to the council that the decision was made to transfer 82 credit FTES from the 1999 summer session to last year's FTES. This will allow the college to capture all of the growth it is entitled to receive for last year. Dr. Friedlander told the council that we would have had to apply 68 additional FTES to capture full Basic Skills funding. Our FTES target is to achieve full growth and full Basic Skills which includes making up lost FTES from this past summer. Achieving our growth target for 1989-90, should yield about $600,000 in additional revenue to the district. It was decided not to use summer FTES to get last year's Basic Skills funding. The rationale for not trying to capture last year's Basic Skills funds is that it is one-time funding that doesn't go into the base-level of FTES and that the college would rather apply its FTES to capture all of its growth this year plus Basic Skills funds. The decision was made to ensure that the college has enough credit FTES this year to achieve its growth target and to capture Basic Skills funds. In addition, if the system doesn't reach it FTES target for this year, a portion of the Basic Skills funds we are able to receive will be added to the college's base.

If the college is able to achieve its FTES growth target in 1999-2000, it will receive approximately $860,000 in additional revenues from the state. This figure is based on the assumption that all of the growth will be in credit and that the non-credit FTES will be at the same level as it was in 1998-99. This is a conscious decision by the district to try to maximize the revenue since non-credit FTES is reimbursed at a significantly lower rate than credit FTES.

3. **Draft of mid-term accreditation report**

The report by the team that conducted the site visit to reaffirm the college's accreditation included a few items in need of some improvement. The college is required to provide a status report on each of these items in the mid-term accreditation evaluation of the college which requires a response by November 1st. Dr. Friedlander asked the council to read the mid-term evaluation report and to let Dr. Andreea Serban know if there are any inaccuracies or omissions in the draft of this document. The suggested changes will be conveyed to Dr. MacDougall and adjustments made accordingly.

4. **Presentation by Vice President Dan Oroz on request for funds to augment the Human Resources Division budget**

At the last meeting it was agreed that proposals that don't address the goals and objectives in the College Plan being considered by one of the work groups would be presented to CPC. College-wide technology proposals would go to DTC. Since there is no work group that is appropriate to the requests to augment the budget for Human Resources, the proposal will be presented to CPC.

Vice President Dan Oroz presented the proposal from Human Resources to the council. This proposal was presented to Dr. MacDougall a few months ago. The proposal requests increased staffing and an augmentation to the budget used to advertise faculty and staff positions at the college.

The staffing proposal calls for increasing Shar-Lynn Timm's position from 60% to 100% time for 12 months and to increase Shirley Brown's position from 60% to 100% time for 11 months. The rationale for this request is based on the fact that there has been no increase in Human Resources staff in the past 20 years to handle the tremendous growth that has taken place in the number of certificated, classified and categorically funded positions that has taken place during this time period. This, coupled with the need to implement new federal and state regulations pertaining to personnel, has resulted in overtime hours in the Human Resources department. The total cost to increase the position to fulltime for Ms. Timm is $16,000. The increase for Ms. Brown is $6,600. The augmentation to the advertising budget is $20,000, from $10,000 to $30,000.

Vice President Oroz stressed that additional advertising funds will be needed for Human Resources to compete with other colleges in obtaining new employees.

Dr. Friedlander felt that it is appropriate to bring the Human Resources proposal before CPC but questioned whether the proposal fits the guidelines for requesting Partnership for Excellence funds. Karolyn Hanna offered the opinion that Dan Oroz' request is a result of growth and that some of the growth funds should be used to fund this request. Dr. Friedlander said he would forward the requests presented by Vice President Oroz to Dr. MacDougall, along with the recommendation that they be supported with growth funds. The council acknowledged the need to augment the Human Resources' Department's staff and advertising budget. However, it did not make a recommendation as to the amount of the request that should be funded.

Bill Hamre said that CPC has not had discussions about the allocation of growth revenue. There have been discussions about using a portion of growth revenue to pay for technology that has been purchased to support growth. However, there are other new technology needs that are required to support the college's growth in FTES. The challenge for the college is to allocate growth funds to respond to the need for increased salaries and benefits as well as the need to augment the institution's infrastructure to support growth.

CPC and DTC

5. Presentation by Bill Hamre on resources available and additional resources needed to support the college's technology-related infrastructure

Bill Hamre distributed and outlined the proposal on equipment replacement and rehabilitation, maintenance and construction for funds 41 and 43. The focus is on the technology renewal fund and augmentations to that fund. The technology renewal portion and target is clear. We have $920 000 as our annual target for technology renewal. Also, we have an annual target of $800,000 for non-technology equipment replacement. That puts the college at about a 15-year replacement cycle for the non-technology equipment and a five-year replacement cycle for the renewal of technology equipment. We also have a commitment of $800,000 annually to the Rehabilitation, Maintenance and Construction Fund. This fund is used for classroom improvements and other projects. This is not all of the money that goes into the Rehabilitation, Maintenance and Construction Fund but that is the amount that is targeted for transfer from the General Fund to the Rehabilitation Fund on an annual basis. It is not intended to fund construction projects.

The total represents a little over $2.5 million a year and, by district policy, certain funds are committed to support those initiatives. For the Equipment Replacement Fund 41, the Lottery revenues minus 2% committed to salaries goes into the Equipment Replacement Fund. This year the income from lottery is $1.3 million. The anticipated salary costs of 2% are $700,000, which leaves $300,000 each for the technology and non-technology equipment funds. The breakdown of the Lottery funds outlined on the handout distributed by Bill Hamre was discussed.

The Chancellor's Office has guaranteed $543,000 a year in the college's base budget for equipment replacement. These funds are divided equally between technology and non-technology equipment renewal.

The one-time block grant for equipment and infrastructure is allocated this year at $123,000. Two years ago that amount was just over $1 million. Last year that amount was $600,000. The substantial drop in state funds for equipment and infrastructure is due in part to the Governor's use of Partnership for Excellence funds to meet the Proposition 98 threshold guarantee. As a result, the state doesn't need to put in as much one-time money to meet its guarantee of funding for community colleges.

Unless there is additional Lottery revenue that could be transferred to equipment replacement funds, the college will have a need of about $1.2 million from ending balances.

Bill Hamre informed CPC/DTC that Dr. MacDougall has asked that for each of these funds we have a two-year reserve of the target amount. For technology renewal, where we have an annual target of $920,000, a two-year reserve is $1.8 million. That would allow the college not to receive any lottery revenue for two years and still be able to fund our targets. This year the $3.4 million projected ending balance in equipment replacement would represent a two-year reserve for both technology and non-technology equipment. The end result is that the college needs at least $1.25 million for ending balances to meet its targets. If we want to expand our equipment inventory, we will need to identify new revenue sources to make that happen. The need for a two-year reserve is at the recommendation of Dr. MacDougall. That money will sit in the treasury and draw interest. The interest becomes part of the reserve amount.

6. Presentation of resource requests for new positions to support the college's technology-related initiatives

A. Bill Hamre

Bill Hamre provided a handout entitled, SBCC Information Resources Division Issues, which identified IRD organization and staffing needs. Some of these positions are more aligned with Partnership for Excellence objectives than others. The chart provided reflects the proposed organizational structure for information resources and includes two new management positions; a dean of educational technologies and a director of institutional technology.

The proposed SBCC technology organization chart provided was discussed as well as the responsibilities which would be undertaken by the proposed dean of educational technologies and director of institutional technology positions. These positions would support and absorb some of the responsibilities currently being held by other technology-related instructional positions and programs. The cost of adding these two positions would be about $185,000. Additional staffing is needed to support the college's growing emphasis in using the Web to deliver instruction and conduct its business. We currently have 3,000 web pages, which Katie Sweeney is managing.

In terms of network services, funds are needed to hire a network security specialist who can monitor the firewall technology that needs to be put in place on campus. GTE has been contacted about monitoring and hosting that firewall, which is beyond the capability of SBCC. There needs to be a person responsible to work with GTE to set our security policies as services such as video conferencing and satellite networking, which are being required by the state Chancellor's Office, are added.

Another issue from the consultant's report was the need for a database administrator position. Presently there is 30% of a person in time assigned to database administration. This persons works not only with the Oracle applications and implementation, but also with Dr. Andreea Serban in terms of building a research and decision-making server as well as a number of third-party applications that are being implemented. The cost of this position is $80,000. It is hoped that some restructuring and training of an existing person will fill this particular need.

In terms of user support, consideration was given to the need for technology training and an establishment of a training coordinator. The work group that is focusing on the staff development objectives in the College Plan will examine requests for this position.

Based on the earlier discussion surrounding Dan Oroz' request, growth revenue, aside from Partnership for Excellence funds, is the only source of new ongoing revenue for the institution. Part of the discussion in Cabinet was how to identify within growth dollars what are the specific needs for technology to support initiatives that generate new FTES. However, anything that is identified as needed operational expenses to be funded from growth revenues would reduce the amount of growth dollars available for salary increases. Growth presents a great opportunity to fund ongoing needed support costs. On the other hand it has an impact on salaries. The contracts with CSEA and the IA calls for

84% of the growth funds be applied to salaries after subtracting the amount needed to support the growth (e.g., new faculty position, TLUs, printing and duplicating).

Dr. Friedlander told CPC/DTC that we need to come up with an allocation using growth funds. One suggestion is to use the interest generated from the reserve accounts to help fund equipment-related needs. Another suggestion was to ask the Foundation to establish a technology fund endowment. Dr. Friedlander volunteered to discuss these recommendations with Dr. MacDougall.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:34 PM.

c:/keepers/word/committee/cpc/CPCMinutes10-5-99

cc: Cabinet, Deans/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate, Instructor's Association, CSEA, Classified Council, ASB President, College Information, *The Channels*