

## COUNCIL ON BUDGET & FACILITIES

February 8, 2016

### APPROVED SUMMARY

**Members Present:** Karen Cant, Jolena Grande, Tina Johannsen, Lorenze Legaspi, Cherry Li-Bugg, Rod Lusch, Sandra Palmer, Justin Richardson, Pete Snyder, Richard Storti, Tanya Washington

**Absent:** Barbara Bennett, Brian Fahnestock, Rodrigo Garcia, Ian Kolaja, Elaine Loayza, Irma Ramos, Olivia Veloz

**Visitors:** Adam Gottdank, Deborah Ludford, Fred Rocha, Nick Wilkening

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Acting Chair Rodrigo Garcia.

- I. **Summary:** The summary of the January 11, 2016, meeting was accepted as amended.
- II. **Information Services Infrastructure:** At the request of Brian Fahnestock, Deborah Ludford attended the CBF meeting to answer any questions members had regarding the network refresh project. Ms. Ludford explained that the current District network was put in place in 1999 and that the equipment is at end-of-life and will need to be replaced by 2017. It was recommended that the District investigate all options to refresh the network in light of the necessary upgrade and changes in available network technologies. The first step would be to issue an RFP for assessment and evaluation of the current network.

Ms. Ludford also stated that the model she would like to adopt would be similar to the District's large-scale internet service provider, Corporation for Education Network Initiative in California (CENIC) which provides a centrally coordinated state-wide network that serves the needs of institutions across the state including K-12, UC, CSU, Public Libraries, USC, Caltech and Stanford.

During a lengthy discussion, members voiced their concerns:

- Does not have the support of campus IT personnel from some at the colleges.
- Concern over the item being an "information" item vs "action" item at the District Consultation Council meeting and at the Council on Budget & Facilities meeting.
- Concern over the process being circumvented as this item was never presented to the CBF for buy-in but was going to the Board for approval the next day.
- Centralization of the network, loss of accountability, responsiveness and security.
- Originally told the expenditure would come from Bond funds but now it is coming from discretionary funds which could be used in other ways.
- No unanimous acceptance of the proposal at the District Consultation Council.
- Belief that an expenditure of this magnitude should come through CBF to be endorsed and forwarded to DCC. There was concern expressed about who was present at DTR when the white paper proposal was discussed.
- Feels like the item is being pushed through without discussion.
- Since there is no consensus, can we pull the Board Agenda item until CBF has had an opportunity to review, discuss, and approve.
- Claim of "approval" by DCC is overstating the discussion that took place. The Board Agenda item should have been clarified to indicate that there was support for the investigation of the need to replace/update the system.
- The agenda item on this topic at DCC was information only, yet it is being described as having unanimous support. If TCC takes items only to DCC for approval, then why wasn't it listed as an "action".
- The proposal is framed as solving the problem of network failures at one site affecting other sites. There was also discussion about the accuracy of this statement.
- There was discussion about the accuracy of the claim that not having global access delays the resolution of network issues.

Ms. Ludford responded to those concerns stating:

- This proposal has been on the table for a while and she is willing to continue to discuss it but doesn't want to slow down because there is a timetable because the existing equipment cannot be maintained, it can no longer take the upgrades that are required. But she agreed that the Board Agenda item didn't have to be approved on February 9. Mr. Rodrigo Garcia agreed to check with Fred Williams to see if the Board Agenda item could be pulled.
- This was first discussed at the District Technology Roundtable when they were discussing the items put forth by the Technology Coordinating Council to consider for the Bond measure. All campuses indicated interest at that time. It was unanimously approved at the Technology Coordinating Council and members present included staff from all campuses and the proposal was then sent forward to the District Consultation Council as an information item with no one voicing opposition.
- It is not normal for items to proceed from the Technology Coordinating Council to the Council on Budget & Facilities directly. All items go to the DCC from the TCC.
- Nothing changes at the campus in terms of staffing. In fact, it is likely that campus staff will be given advanced training in enterprise level networking which would elevate them. It gives the campus staff the ability to have visibility into the entire network as well as District staff. This gives both the District and campus staff the ability to solve problems without having to wait for the other to be available. It can be set up so that campus/district staff control their part of the network and allow others to just view the setup.
- There is frustration when a problem occurs which crosses District and campus lines. Right now everyone has to wait until all can work together to solve a problem. This would give ability for each unit to solve problems more independently. There was discussion about the accuracy of this statement.
- Security and confidentiality are not an issue as all units, District I.S. and campus ACT, have access to all the data that would be shared across this network already in order to perform business functions.
- Mr. Rodrigo Garcia stated that the money is coming from the one-time funds (mandated cost) and it would also be possible to pay this from the Bond funds.

Ms. Ludford went on the record stating that her vision is that this system will allow everyone on the campuses to actually be able to fix an issue without having to rely on District IS for campus operations; this is to create a cloud-based network that everyone can use and all the network staff will be trained to do their own troubleshooting without having to rely on other people.

Ms. Karen Cant went on the record stating that Cypress College administration and IT staff are not in favor of the centralization and the college does not agree to this; they want their staff to be accountable for their network and to be responsive to their network needs. They haven't had to rely on the District or Fullerton and what's happening on those networks to support our campus.

III. **Budget Update:** Mr. Garcia provided a brief budget presentation on the Governor's budget which outlined the State General Fund revenue assumptions, Proposition 30 Sunset and the decline in sales tax revenue, and Proposition 98 funding. He also shared the following budget figures:

<b>Program</b>	<b>State-wide</b>	<b>NOCCCD</b>
COLA	\$29.3 M	\$0.9 M
Growth	\$114.7 M	\$3.4 M
Basic Skills	\$50.0 M	\$1.5 M
Economic Development	\$200.0 M	\$6.0 M
Prop 39	\$45.0 M	\$1.4 M
Scheduled Maintenance	\$290.0 M	\$8.7 M
Mandate Reimbursement	\$76.0 M	\$2.3 M

- IV. **Bond Update:** Mr. Garcia reported that we are using the remaining funds from Measure X on the Anaheim Campus build-out of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, & 10th floor build-outs which will take approximately 2-3 years to complete. As for Measure J, we expect to issue bonds in May or June for \$100-\$150 million depending on need to fund the first phase of projects.
- V. **Other Items:** There were no additional items. The next meeting will be March 14, 2016.

**Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.