Present: B. Baldwin, A. Callahan, N. Canter, C. Espinosa-Pieb, R. Griffin, J. Hawk, L. Jenkins, A. Khanna, K. Kyne, J. Miner, B. Murphy, B. Seabra, D. Shannakian

Absent: R. Covington, R. Hansen, L. Hearn, G. Ho, A. LaManque, O. Patlan, P. Setziol, M. Winters

I. Burning Issues & Quick News

♦ J. Hawk provided a Measure E update with regard to the campus entries project which went out to bid and returned over budget by $1.5-$2MM. The bid was declined and will go out again in May. Several items will be pulled to reduce the costs (signage, landscaping and service road work). The Science Center remediation bid was received and also $3.9MM over budget.

♦ A. Khanna requested clarification about the strategic planning sessions which are scheduled for May 11 and 12.

♦ B. Murphy reported that enrollment as of April 27 was up by 4.8%, but may be premature due to drop date of April 28. Enrollment will decline slightly but we will meet enrollment growth projections due to the increase in job corps enrollment.

II. Meeting Minutes of April 13 were approved by consensus.

III. Course Management System

L. Elvin presented information about course management systems and the work of the Technology Task Force subcommittee. There currently exist 7 different course management systems that students can use. The inconsistent use of the systems across campus prompted this review. Four systems including Angel Learning, ETUDES-NG, Moodle and WebCT were evaluated by the sub-committee. Moodle was selected due to: open source, collaboration with different schools on training, possible student services applications and the fact that it is not limited to distance learning. SFSU has been using Moodle for 2-1/2 years and is very interested in working with De Anza and other colleges in forming a consortium. In addition, Moodle was recently approved by the Academic Senate.

College Council approved Moodle as the course management system for De Anza. Migrating faculty will take place over the next year. Licensing with ETUDES classic and WebCT will continue through June 2007.

IV. Measure C Prioritization

A draft proposal was distributed to college council to review and identify viability, corrections and areas for change for Measure C prioritization. Discussion followed with regard to construction projects, replacement and new technology, furniture and the role of College Council in making final determinations. The recommendation proposed the Campus Budget group review monetary requests while the Technology Task Force and Facilities Committee would review technology requests for collaboration and efficiencies as the individual PBTs would not have access to all projects submitted. Issues arose with regard to College Council having technical expertise in making final determinations, and governance issues of the Facilities Committee, Technology Task Force and Campus Budget Team.
Discussion/suggestions included:
- Want a transparent, thoughtful process with checks and balances
- A similar review process for the three areas: construction, technology and furniture projects
- Include Plant Services/Facilities Committee in the new technology requests
- Include the Ergonomics Training or establish ergonomic criteria in the purchase of new furniture.
- Meeting short timelines based on July Board meeting

Proposal:

The Campus Budget, Tech Task Force and Facilities Committee will provide an analysis of the priorities submitted by the PBTs for purposes of establishing a comprehensive institutional review of requests. These groups would provide alternatives, feasibility and cost factor analysis, feasibility and cost factors with regard to the sequencing on projects, not a re-prioritzation. There is no way the PBTs can know how to sequence requests submitted by other PBTs. Nor does College Council have the time, expertise or inclination to deconstruct the competing, temporal or technology claims.

V. ’06-’06 Budget

J Hawk distributed M. Brandy’s Review of the 2006-07 Draft Budget document which he intended to present at the May 1 board meeting. The information presented should not be interpreted as final and the numbers will change as new information becomes available. We have yet to receive the May revise, due May 15.

J. Hawk highlighted key components of the budget including revenue, expenses, increases and decreases in the operating expenses, and equalization. The budget isn’t balanced next year; after ’06-’07 this will be more difficult. Equalization is not fully funded in the governor’s budget and about $300,000 less than projected.