WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT #512
COUNTIES OF COOK, KANE, LAKE AND McHENRY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of Wednesday, March 15, 1995.

CALL TO ORDER:

The Special meeting of the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 512 was called to order by Chairman Moats on Wednesday, March 15, 1995 at 7:18 p.m. in the Board Room of the Administration Building, 1200 W. Algonquin Road, Palatine, Illinois.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Members Barton, Born, Coste, Howard, Kolze, Moats, Norwood, and Student Member Lakowski

Absent: None

Also present: Paul Thompson, President; Ed Dolan, V.P. Academic Affairs; Bonnie Henry, V.P. Student Affairs; Vern Manke, V.P. Administrative Services; David McShane, V.P. Information Systems; Vic Berner; Vera Davis; Bill Howard; Karen Keres; Karen Lustig; Dominic Magno; Mercedes McGowen; Bill Neumann; Elena Pokot; Sheila Quirk; Pat Wenthold; Laurie Wren - Harper College; Terri Ellis; Mari Solarte; James Vitullo - Harper Students.

Chairman Moats announced that there would be an executive session to discuss collective bargaining and the appointment, employment and dismissal of personnel following the presentation of the Technology Plan.

TECHNOLOGY PLAN

Vice President David McShane stated that the Technology Plan represents a strategic direction for the College with technology as the main focus. The Academic Technology Committee and Administrative Computing Committee have spent a number of years working on this plan and gathering input from across the Harper community. Six of their members make up the Ad Hoc committee. Those individuals are Glenn Reich, Mercedes McGowen, Vera Davis, Elena Pokot, Bill Howard, and Dom Magno.

Mr. McShane stated that he would not review the plan in detail at this time as this was done at the October 11, 1994 Special Board meeting. In summary, there are 10 goals with 54 objectives. Mr. McShane called attention to the proposed budget for the plan. The total to complete all the projects would be approximately $14.4 million, but he noted that it is more important to focus on each individual year and analyze what the needs are from year to year. Some of these projects are already underway and are included in the 1994/95 proposed budget ($1,156,205), so that the net new dollars requested for the plan in 1995/96 total

$3,762,495.   The new dollars requested for the plan through 1998/99 total $11,947.095.   Member Coste asked if the proposed budget had been approved by the Budget Committee.   Member Barton replied that this part of the budget was being held until after this meeting.   Mr. McShane agreed with Member Coste that the $1.156 million would cover commitments that have been made in prior years so that the plan could proceed for 1995/96.   With the exception of the network, the campus needs to be wired in total.

There was discussion regarding the money requested for additional staff. It was explained that this was determined by calculating the number of hours needed to complete the activities for each particular project. The money will be used for additional staff as well as for extra hours worked by existing staff.   This will also include consultants who are hired for particular projects.

There was discussion regarding which of the initiatives related to the original TSI plan.   The majority of the projects were initiated under Mr. McShane's leadership.

Mr. McShane explained that the Advanced Technology Educational Grant (ATEG) dollars are deducted from the total requested dollars because this state grant is used strictly to acquire technology.   The yearly grant is built into the budget as revenue.   Member Coste contended that the grant money should be taken into consideration in the funding options.   Mr. McShane explained that the grant money is subtracted from the total request because it has already been included in the budget as revenue.

Member Born questioned the need for a full-time Grants Specialist. President Thompson stated that the position was filled by two part-time people in the past year, but it has been determined that a full-time individual would be more effective.   It is anticipated that a full-time Grants Specialist could bring in as much as $2-3 million per year in grants once he/she has had the time to explore the grant opportunities that are currently available.

Mr. McShane noted that the Distance Learning Initiative has come about as a result of the money put into the State budget by Governor Edgar to support distance learning.   Harper is now doing distance learning classes with CLC and Oakton as part of the North Suburban Higher Education Consortium (NSHEC) and will be expanding this operation.   He proceeded with a brief explanation of the remainder of the 10 top priority projects.

Member Kolze asked Mr. McShane to address the issue of proper supervision of personnel if a significant number of new employees are required to implement the plan.   Mr. McShane explained that the $299,000 spent for existing staff represents staff that are already in place. Member Born asked if Mr. McShane would be coming back to the Board to

request additional personnel. He stated that within the request for $3.7 million of new money there are requests for additional staff to support the technology plan. Mr. McShane reiterated that the requests are based on hours to take a project to completion rather than on number of employees. Member Born stated that because the College is looking at diminishing revenues in terms of decreased enrollment and tax caps, it is necessary that the total dollar commitment for these projects be known now rather than attempting to find the funds at a later time. Member Norwood noted that there will also be a trickle effect of personnel increases because of the associated benefits.

Mr. McShane stated that the TSI plan moved the College ahead as much as possible with the existing dollars, but that Harper is still far behind some of the other community colleges in terms of technology. One of the major initiatives for the coming year will be to get the campus wired in order to get the networks functional. This is necessary in order to tap into the Internet, as well as for staff members to work between themselves. Member Kolze asked why Harper is so far behind. Mr. McShane responded that there was not a solid enough plan in place, and that we lacked the involvement of the faculty. Member Kolze asked Mr. McShane if $3.7 million could be effectively spent while still keeping control of what is being done. Mr. McShane replied that this would be difficult, but stated that it was necessary to look at the plan as a whole. He reiterated that one of the major issues is to get the campus wired, and this in itself might require a good portion of the dollars requested. The issue is not one of managing a large number of people, but rather of managing particular projects.

President Thompson gave a brief history of the technology plan starting with the involvement of TSI and explained some of the reasons that Harper is behind in technology, such as lack of staff involvement, ineffective use of resources, etc. Chairman Moats asked what the status is of the technology development at other community colleges. Mr. McShane stated that this differs from college to college. He explained that one of the problems at Harper is that the labs are spread out across campus rather than being centralized, which makes it difficult for Information Systems to support the instructional needs. He stated that the proposed plan will integrate some of the labs, thus streamlining the technology support.

Member Kolze suggested that the Board discuss the funding plan, and noted that there are some very difficult choices that need to be made. Member Coste reiterated that the $1.156 million is in the proposed budget. Chairman Moats noted that this has not been approved by the budget committee. Member Coste recommended that the Board approve the $1.156 million that is already committed and refer the 10 priority projects back to the Technology Review Committee for further review. Member Kolze felt that it was important to go through the exhibits regarding funding options. Member Coste agreed, but felt that approving the $1.156 million would keep the program going. Mr. McShane stated

that this amount would not allow the network wiring to be done.   He explained that a great number of hours have been expended in cutting the total plan down to the 10 priority projects.   The new money requested beyond what is already committed in the proposed 1995/96 budget is approximately $1.9 million.

Member Kolze stated that if the $11.9 million of new money for the total plan is funded only from the fund balances, that will present a rather poor financial picture for the College.   The 10 priority projects have a cost of approximately $1.9 million in addition to the $1.156 million that is already in the proposed budget.   The funding options include 1) a technology fee of $3 per credit hour, 2) a tax rate referendum, 3) money received from the capital campaign, and 4) a building bond referendum.   Exhibit IV shows the revenue coming from the fund balances rather than the technology fee.   He noted that the exhibit does not address the possibility of funding anything less than the 10 priorities.

Member Born again addressed the issue of the Grants Specialist and asked if the anticipated grant revenues have been taken into consideration in the funding picture.   Mr. Manke stated that it is essential to consider only sources that are guaranteed because of the cost and scope of the plan.   The sources identified by the administration for funding this plan are feasible if the Board chooses to take advantage of them.   If the Board chooses otherwise, then it will be necessary to scale down the plan or implement it over a greater number of years.

Member Barton stated that if it is perceived that bringing technology up to date on the campus is of such importance, then other departments and programs should make cuts in their budgets to help fund the technology plan.   President Thompson replied that this is being done to a certain extent.   Member Kolze stated that whatever the Board decides to do in terms of funding options, the administration must know what their parameters are in order to proceed.

Member Coste recommended that the Board approve the $1.156 million and that the Technology Committee then come back with a list of projects that will keep the plan going ahead while staying within that budget constraint.   Member Barton expressed concern with going lower than 20 percent in the fund balances because of the projected reductions in revenue.   The Board members questioned the $3 technology fee in addition to the $3 tuition fee increase.   Member Kolze stated that the Technology Committee should know what to expect in terms of fee increases before they do any further revisions of the plan.

Member Norwood noted that the Board should be looking at the entire technology plan rather than limiting discussion to only the 10 priority items.   President Thompson agreed, and stated that the plan was formulated with the intention of implementing the plan within four to five years. Without additional funds, proceeding with only 10 of the 37

projects automatically extends the plan out to about eight years. He noted that college-bound high school students will have high expectations in terms of technology, and may choose not to attend Harper if we cannot offer them what they require in order to compete in today's workplace.

Chairman Moats stated that because this is the first time the full Board has seen the plan with the accompanying dollar requirements, their reluctance to approve the technology plan and the funding at this time should not be interpreted as a lack of support, but rather as an indication that more time is needed to study the options further. Member Howard agreed with Member Coste's recommendation to approve the $1.156 million that is already included in the budget so that the plan can proceed for the immediate future, especially in wiring the campus. She also agreed that while it is important to move as quickly as is feasible to implement the technology plan, she would also like more time to study the funding options so that the financial integrity of the College is not jeopardized. Member Kolze stated that a projection of the financial situation beyond 1995/96 with the different funding options would be helpful.

Mr. Manke explained the options of tax rate referendum and the building bond referendum. In 1996 the payment will be complete on a sizeable portion of bonds which will represent a reduction in the tax rate of approximately $.02. This would be an excellent opportunity to explain to the community that the tax rate will remain the same if a referendum is passed at that time. He added that the referendum would need to be on the ballot in November of 1996 in order to be included on the 1996 tax bill which will be sent out in 1997. He encouraged the Board to consider this option because it is an opportunity to get a tax rate increase without actually raising the total amount of the tax bills. This action would generate approximately $2.5 million annually.

President Thompson stated that the administration will work with the Technology Committee to see if there are other options, and to project out further the implications of the options. Member Howard stated that she would like to look at the capital campaign in terms of how soon significant dollars may be generated. She added that some of the companies in our area may be willing to make their contributions sooner in order to move forward with the technology plan. Member Howard asked Mr. McShane if there are some of the 10 priority projects that are more pressing than others in terms of timing. Mr. McShane replied that the priority projects were chosen in part because they are all intertwined in some fashion and are all priority items.

Member Norwood stated that she is not opposed to some type of technology fee, and asked what other colleges are charging for a similar fee. Member Born agreed with this, and asked if dollar amounts for these 10 projects could be established so that they could be sponsored by specific donors in the capital campaign.

Member Barton asked what the repercussions would be if the plan could not be funded past 1996/97. Mr. McShane responded that the 10 priority projects were chosen because they can be accomplished in that time frame. Subsequent priority projects would be determined depending on the dollars available at that time. Member Barton asked when this issue has to be resolved in terms of budget deadlines. Mr. Manke stated that the preliminary budget will go to the full Board in May with adoption in either June or July. If this is resolved at the April meeting, that will still allow enough time. He added that it is necessary to have a steady stream of resources to fund a plan of this nature, and felt that it is extremely important to consider the technology fee as a continuing source of funding into the future. The funds would be set aside in a Trust & Agency or Restricted Account to be used only for technology.

Member Kolze endorsed Member Coste's recommendation that the budget amount of $1.156 million be approved, and that the Technology Committee meet again to consider their options within those parameters. There was consensus from the Board members that this was appropriate. Member Coste stated that his proposal in no way should be considered to be automatic approval of the 10 priority items.

Mr. Manke stated that in terms of the tax rate referendum, the administration needs at least six to nine months before the election to prepare the documentation necessary to lend credibility to the request. He agreed with Member Kolze that the decision could be made around the same time as the levy request, especially in terms of media coverage. President Thompson stated that in terms of the proposed increases in various student fees, decisions would need to be made by mid-April to include the information in publications and mailings.

Mercedes McGowen commented that in terms of anticipated grant funding from the National Science Foundation, funding has declined in the area of hardware acquisition. However, grants are being awarded in areas of in-service, retraining and faculty enhancement, and an in-house Grants Specialist will be very helpful in acquiring these dollars. She concurred with President Thompson's statement that a Grants Specialist could bring in approximately $2-3 million annually in grants after approximately a year and a half of planning and seeding time.

Member Barton asked if the decision regarding the tuition and student activity fee increases was going to be delayed until the April meeting. Mr. Manke stated that if the preliminary budget comes to the Board in May, it will have to be approved in July rather than June. Dr. Henry reiterated that the decision needs to be made by mid-April due to registration dates. Member Coste stated that there needs to be a consensus regarding the fee increases, and it was his preference that there be either a tuition increase or a technology fee, but not both.

Member Barton moved, Member Born seconded, for the purpose of discussion, that the Board approve a $3 per credit hour tuition increase.

Member Kolze noted that the Budget Committee had requested information from Dr. Dolan regarding the impact on students, and questioned whether a decision should be made without that information. He stated that he would be in favor of both a $3 technology fee and a $3 increase in tuition.

It was agreed that there would be a Special Board meeting on April 12 following the Budget Committee meeting that same day.

Terri Ellis, Student Senate President, stated that the Student Senate is working with Student Member Lakowski to circulate a survey to the student body regarding the issue of fee increases. Their intent is to collect signatures from 15 percent of the student body. She stated that students are leaving Harper for other institutions in order to get the technology that they require. The opinion from students seems to be that students may very well be willing to pay a technology fee, but they do not want the technology fee, tuition increase, and student activities fee increase in the same year. In addition, they would like some input and some information regarding what they will be getting for the technology fee.

Chairman Moats thanked Ms. Ellis for her input.

Chairman Moats stated that a vote was still needed on the $3 tuition increase. It was agreed that this did not reflect in any way on the possible institution of a technology fee. The Board members agreed to a special meeting of the Committee as a Whole on April 12 for the purpose of discussing the budget and technology.
Member Barton and Member Born agreed to withdraw the motion.

Mr. McShane called attention to the sample of a technology plan initiative that is underway to consolidate the computer labs in Building I. He explained that 10 computer labs would be consolidated in one area and could be supported by a set of technology team members, even with seven-day operation, which is not offered at this time. Chairman Moats asked if this initiative is one of the 10 priority projects. Mr. McShane stated that is involved across a number of those 10 projects. This is only a conceptual idea, and will be brought to the Board as a building proposed modification before any implementation. President Thompson stated that in terms of the $1.156 million that the Board will be approving, it will help the administration to utilize the dollars much more effectively. It was noted that the administration will not be coming to the Board for full approval or funding at the March meeting, but merely for approval to move ahead according to policy. Member Coste stated that he felt this should go back to the Technology Review Committee before it comes before the Board.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

As there was no other business before the Board, <u>Member Born moved,</u> Member Barton seconded, that the Board adjourn into executive session for the purpose of discussing collective bargaining and the appointment, employment and dismissal of personnel.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Ayes:	Members Barton, Born, Coste, Howard, Kolze, Moats and Norwood
Nays:	None

Motion carried.   Student Member Lakowski voted aye.   The meeting adjourned into executive session at 9:05.

The Board reconvened the Special meeting at 10:22 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

<u>Member Howard moved,</u> Member Born seconded, that the meeting be adjourned.   In a voice vote, the motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

_____   _____
Chairman   Secretary

BOARD REQUESTS

MARCH 15, 1995 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

1)   Member Kolze stated that a projection of the financial situation beyond 1995/96 with the different funding options would be helpful.

2)   Member Born asked if dollar amounts for the 10 proposed projects for the Technology Plan could be established so that they could be sponsored by specific donors in the capital campaign.