

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

**November 6, 2001
3:00 – 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, B. Hamre, L. Fairly, A. Serban, L. Rose, T. Garey, K. McLellan, M. Gallegos, R. Launier, J. Chase, L. Vasquez, K. O'Connor, K. Richards, M. Ferrer

EXCUSED: S. Ehrlich, B. Fahnestock

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the October 2, 2001, CPC meeting. Members of the Council requested that the approval of the minutes be postponed to the November 20 meeting.

1.2 Announcements

2.0 Information Items

2.1 Institutional Research Committee

Andreea Serban informed the council that the Institutional Research Committee has not been needed since the creation of the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning in September 1999. This committee is to be deleted from the list of SBCC committees. For grant applications and other reports where traditionally there was a reference to this committee, the name of the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning should be used instead.

3.0 Discussion Items

31. Accreditation and Planning

A. Industry Trends and Directions Scenario (*Gartner Group*)
(addressed in 7.1)

- B. Status report on completing drafts of the verification sections of the institutional self-study. Dr. Friedlander announced that the first draft of the verification sections for the institutional self-study report be submitted to Andreea Serban by November 14th.

Dr. Friedlander reported that the verification sections for the institutional self-study report are nearly completed. He asked the question what process should be used to review the drafts of the verification sections. Andreea Serban suggested that all the drafts be compiled into one document prior to being distributed to the appropriate constituent groups for review. Karolyn Hanna suggested that the Academic Senate, ITC, CAC and other appropriate campus constituency groups review the verification section of the self-study report. Dr. Friedlander will distribute the completed verifications with the agenda for the CPC meeting on November 20th. He also extended to Friday, December 14th the deadline for campus groups to provide feedback to CPC on the draft verification section of the self-study report.

- C. Proposed modification in categories used to describe SBCC as a model community college

Tom Garey stated there is a presumption by saying, “we are a model community college,” which could hold the college to a false standard. A better language would be “Creating a Model Community College”.

- D. Additional items pertaining to the self-study report.

Dr. Friedlander asked Jane Craven to write a brief report describing a model for the Admission Office for the 21st Century, which he distributed, to the council. Jane wrote the model following the drivers but indicated she felt that it made more sense for her to use the drivers as a guide to preparing her report rather than addressing each driver.

Lana Rose stated that there was a need to have some uniformity for the final document. Bill Hamre said that given the scope of the drivers, it seems that they are not likely to be consistently applied throughout each of the areas. It would be better to use the structure of our definition of the model and bring these pieces in as they fit into the model for each section. Dr. Friedlander will address the approach taken in addressing the role of the drivers in our defining a model community college in the preamble that he will write for the proposed format for writing Section V of the self-study.

Dr. Friedlander asked the council for feedback on whether to write descriptions of our approach to becoming a model community college for each major section of the College Plan or to include descriptions of

specific programs within each major section of the College Plan such as the Transfer Program, Occupational Education Programs, Financial Aid.

Bill Hamre recommended that we adhere to the approach the council agreed to several months ago which is to use the drivers as the basis for defining the components of a model community college for each of the major sections of the College Plan. The consensus of the council was to describe the components of a model community college for each major section of the College Plan rather than describe a model for specific programs and services.

Keith McLellan added that some of the objectives in the College Plan for 2002-2005 could change as we begin defining a model community college. When the objectives were written, we were not considering them in the context of our definition of becoming a model community college. We need to be prepared and willing to adjust some of those objectives. They may not be sufficient or as relevant.

Lynda Fairly commented that as we write Section V we need to address a model that goes beyond the three-year time frame of the College Plan. The College Plan is a three-year document where the model may be 10 years out.

Dr. Friedlander informed the council the only change that was made to the drivers since the last meeting was changing "Regionalization/Globalization" to "Globalization" and moving language in the description of this driver pertaining to regionalization to the description of the Collaboration driver. The drivers will be described in the preamble to Section V. The preamble will introduce the concept and the approach we are taking to this portion of the institutional self-study.

Bill Hamre suggested that "Resource Availability" be added as a driver in light of our current economic state and access to funding now and in the future.

3.2 Proposed changes to College Plan

The Academic Senate made a number of suggestions to the draft of the 2002-2005 College Plan. Tom Garey, Karolyn Hanna, Ray Launier and Lana Rose met to make changes and additions to the language based on the Senate's recommendations. Karolyn articulated the recommendations to the council. One of the major recommendations was changing "Human Resources" to "Faculty and Staff", with possible language to incorporate administrators into the title. Lana said that the Senate felt the language in the plan did not motivate or energize and should be rewritten. In some areas, goals were rearranged or a goal changed to an objective. Karolyn informed the committee that there would

be more refinement to the plan. Andreea Serban agreed to incorporate into a revised draft of the College Plan the proposed changes made by the Academic Senate. The council is asked to make any comments or suggestions for change and submit them to Dr. Friedlander by November 15th. Jack will compile suggestions in advance of the November 20th CPC meeting and distribute them with the agenda.

Timeline:

November 15 th	Submit comments/changes to College Plan to Jack Friedlander
November 20 th	Further discussion at CPC
December 5 th	Academic Senate will finalize their approval of the revisions to the College Plan
December 18 th	CPC will approve the College Plan

4.0 Action Items

There were no action items.

5.0 Other Items

DTC MEETING

6.0 Information Items

6.1 PFE funding for the pathfinder.

The pathfinder will be funded separately and in addition to the \$84,000 for technology.

6.2 Review of criteria for approval of mixed platforms for computer labs

Michael Gallegos reported that he and Kent Richards were requested to develop criteria for assessing the need for mixed platforms in computer labs. The criteria are designed to take into account the instructional needs for software that runs on both a PC and Mac platform guide. Michael Gallegos reviewed the following criteria to be used in determining the degree of importance of installing mixed use platforms in instructional labs:

1. Programmatic Need
 - A) Define need
 - B) What software tools are available to address the need?
 - C) What platform is needed to use the needed software?

2. Compatibility/Application Support
 - A) Software availability, future development and support

- B) Compatibility of future iterations of software
 - C) Cross-compatibility in dual platform environment
3. Support
- A) Availability of additional support needs (easier to support one platform) for dual platform
4. Cost
- A) Hardware
 - B) Software

Lana Rose asked for clarification on the point at which pedagogical needs identified by the department requesting a dual platform lab outweigh the costs of supporting a dual platform environment. Dr. Friedlander said the criteria are intended to identify the software needs of the department(s) using the labs to help in determining whether they warrant the increased cost and staff time required to support two platforms. Bill Hamre added that the instructional needs identified by the department will be the primary factor in the decision in selecting the platform or platforms for the computer lab. He noted that many of the software packages are available on both a PC and Mac platform. There are emerging directions in software that are going to influence the decision making of the platform in that arena. There needs to be a structured way of assessing the implications of the decision to use a Mac or mixed- use platforms for lab support, including IRD staff members' ability to make needed software changes to the computers in the instructional labs from the college's network server. Jack Friedlander indicated that the decision on what platform to purchase will be influenced by the software needed by the department(s) using the lab, how students and faculty members use the software and the consequences of not having the software that is available on the platform that would not be purchased. Kent Richards added that mistakes could be made when the decision is made on the platform prior to considering pedagogy or, to look to one platform and not both. Mike Gallegos said that the value of this approach is to allow a department to systematically plan. Kathy O'Connor said that she agrees from the technological and support standpoint. The problem goes beyond this in the Foreign Language/ESL lab. She went on to say that sometimes it is more important to be politically correct rather than caught up in the support issues. She indicated that there has been a serious communication problem in this area. It has been discussed in ITC for the past year and the most agreeable solution is that for at least one more cycle to use a dual platform. The state Academic Senate has also taken a stand on a situation where the needs and desire of the faculty from a pedagogical standpoint need to be ranked higher than merely the financial and support issues.

Dr. Friedlander asked for clarification on who is responsible for making the final decision on the selection of the platform to be purchased for an instructional computer lab. Bill Hamre stated that the final decision is to be made by the Executive Vice President of Educational Programs.

Members of the committee asked if the process for determining platforms for computer labs presented by Mike Gallegos was a new policy. If so, it should be submitted to ITC for review and its recommendations need to be forwarded to the Academic Senate. The Senate would give its recommendation to CPC/DTC. Bill Hamre stated that the proposed procedures should be viewed as a framework for making decisions on the selection of the appropriate platform(s) for computer labs. The Senate can bring its input to CPC/DTC. Bill Hamre and Michael Gallegos will redefine the framework and add an introductory statement. The framework will be submitted to ITC for review. The Academic Senate can bring its input regarding this framework to CPC/DTC.

Kent Richards added clarification on the meaning of the word “support” in the criteria for selecting platforms for computer labs. The term support refers to the support to be provided by Educational Programs staff (i.e., the ICLCs and the LTAs that support the computer lab in question), *not* IRD. The platforms are a non-issue to IRD; it’s the day-to-day support of the labs that is of concern to Kent Richards and Mike Gallegos. Kent went on to state that Educational Programs has set up a number of labs that have been under-staffed or not staffed at all.

Karolyn Hanna suggested that under “Support”, lab support should be included in the language as 3 B.

7.0 Discussion Items

7.1 Emerging trends in technology – *Bill Hamre*

Bill Hamre distributed an outline of the *Gartner Group’s* “Industry Trends and Directions Scenario”. The purpose of the discussion is twofold. As we move into the accreditation process and develop our statement of our future directions, some of the impacts of the technology trends identified by the *Gartner Group* will be very important to consider in terms of the development of the College Plan as we go forward with long-range planning for instructional technology within the organization. The major themes of the presentation were 1) the collapse of distance and time, (2) ubiquitous computing, and (3) risks and rewards of instructional technology.

Dr. Friedlander asked Mr. Hamre to continue his important discussion of the new trends at the next CPC meeting as several members had meetings to attend at 5:00 p.m.

8.0 Other Items

9.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.