

**High Tech Center Training Unit
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Friday, May 3, 1996, 10:00 AM**

Present:

Kaylene Hallberg, Ellen Cutler, Laurie Vasquez, Rebecca Stone, Carolyn Fiori, Steve Sellitti, Bill Ponder, Carl Brown

Absent:

Carol Toppel, Tina Andersen-Wahlberg, Judith Schwartz

Meeting Opened

Review and adjustments to previous minutes:

- A copy of the last Advisory Committee minutes for the February 2, 1996 meeting was given to each member to be read for approval. No adjustments were made.

General Information/Handouts:

- AC reviewed a copy of the performance tasks that the HTCTU will be reviewed through. AC also reviewed the most current list of all accounts being supported on ginko. A revised software/hardware guide was also given to AC members. This guide will soon include a core cluster of LD software, including reading, writing, and math. Those AC members involved in ABI may make suggestions for software in this category.
- There will be a major overhaul on the ABI/LD training this summer. There will be no more DOS based software-only MAC and WIN will be included.
- The HTCTU will not upgrade its MACs due to the uncertain future of Apple Computer.
- About 3 days ago the HTCTU got a beta of the access plug in from Adobe Systems that allows PDFs (Portable Document Format) to be read. The program is Adobe Access and can be downloaded from the Adobe website. The program allows you to take any document from any application, run it through the PDF converter,

and change the document into a universal format. The tool you would use to look at the document and read it is Acrobat Reader (from the Adobe website, download Amber). If the document is editable, you would need Adobe Exchange Tool on your end. The document can be read by Screen Readers. Adobe Access will be incorporated into the ACT for Internet Training.

- The AC reviewed the letter from BAMTA (Broad Alliance for Multimedia Technology and Applications). They are located in Santa Clara and have extraordinary funding, including NASA, National Science Foundation, Time Warner, National Geographic, Sun, Silicon Graphics, IBM, Apple, and Macromedia. They are a huge cooperative for the development of multimedia applications and for the training of professional staff from private corporations. They've spun off the Digital Clubhouse which is designed to provide access for underrepresented groups. They would like the HTCTU to become a player with their organization to make sure that all their multimedia technology is accessible.

Resna:

- Shortly after the CSUN conference Carl heard from a number of HTC specialists about a proposal from Resna to develop a testing procedure through which licenses would be issued to persons involved with assistive computer technology. He wrote a letter to Resna in response to the various questions of HTC staff and hasn't received a response yet. Kaylene hasn't heard from Resna either. Carl mentioned putting out a formal letter to community colleges in the event that Resna moves forward and they actually put some sort of license process in place. When Kaylene sees Tom or Ralph on Monday morning, she will have one of them put a call back to Resna. Her understanding is that Resna can do anything they want, but they can't add any standards beyond the minimal qualifications under Title 5.
- On a similar note, Carl mentioned one of the things we don't have a handle on is the level of instructional ability of new hires that are running HTCs. The tendency for colleges has been to hire instructional associates or even students as lab assistants. It may be an interesting study to identify those HTCs that use IAs and those that use professional staff and determine how their students are doing in mainstream courses.

Providing assessment through HTCs:

- Laurie reviewed the Technology Evaluation Service provided by Diablo Valley College. There is a flat fee of \$75.00 for assessment, the report is one page, and the money goes back into the HTC where there is a separate account for it. It is listed in the school catalog as a Learning Skills course for 1/2 a unit. Steve asked what the difference was in charging \$75.00 for the service and/or the person enrolling in a 1/2 unit class which is probably \$9.00 a unit? Becky and Ellen mentioned the problem with the workload and whether the person doing the evaluation is working outside her regular hours. Kaylene mentioned a possible problem with using a facility that's categorically funded and limiting student's use of the facility.
- Laurie said the main question is can this be done in other HTCs as a source of revenue? Kaylene's concern about any categorical program which looks for revenue is that if you're funding technology and staff and within that range of funding and staff time you're using it to generate revenue, then that's illegal. But, if these are non-enrolled students and they're in a contract with Rehab and it's being offered outside the scope of their regular employment and the facility is not in use, then it's perfectly legal.

Augmentation of HTCTU budget:

- The operating costs of the HTCTU have increased by about \$20,000 a year over the history of the program. This year the HTCTU no longer has any staff positions that can be re purposed and no surplus funds. Kaylene met with a fiscal group last week and went over growth and COLA. Their view was that the Chancellor's Office puts money in the budget for programs at a fixed amount and such programs do not receive growth and COLA. What you have to do is look at the total dollar amount you're allocating for programs and within that range, take from one program to give to another. The second way to do it is submit a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) which goes through consultation to be approved, then put in a rank order of priorities to be presented. A third way is try to change the language in the legislation to include COLA and growth for the 97-98 budget. Kaylene's argument has been that the HTC is categorically funded and therefore should get growth and COLA. The difference with the

HTC is that it is grant funded with fixed dollar amounts. There is not going to be any new dollars through 1997.

- Becky asked what it would take to be removed from grant status. Kaylene mentioned sending an RFP through the contract process which is very different from the grant process. There are pluses and minuses to both sides, but it is much easier to get something done through a grant than through a contract.
- Carl said he read the RFP language and it said that at the end of the grant cycle that both parties have the opportunity to renew the grant. There is nothing in the language about having to be an RFP. Kaylene mentioned that in order to avoid soul-sourcing (continuing the grant without competition) the grant has to be put out as a competitive bid.
- Kaylene hopes that with the evaluation there will be recommendations for increasing the level of funding by taking a good look at all fiscal aspects of the HTCTU.
- Carl said the only realistic areas that can be tampered with is equipment and supplies. Kaylene suggested limiting the usage of the Internet. Laurie and Ellen would rather have the HTCTU evaluating the cutting edge of technology and have the community colleges be responsible for their own access to the Internet, rather than see the HTCTU make any cuts for equipment. Carl argued that the Internet is the cutting edge of technology and would like to expand the capacity of the HTCTU to deliver more services. Kaylene asked if it is required that the HTCTU pay for people to come to trainings. Carolyn mentioned paying for travel is a good way of equalizing the expenses for those coming from Southern California. Carl hopes that the HTCTU will be able to move onto campus when the library expansion project is complete.
- Kaylene mentioned going after faculty grant dollars because the technology here should be mainstreamed and the HTCTU can begin to train non-DSP&S faculty. Laurie mentioned it would be nice to have some things stated in the next RFP that work with integration of learning communities on campus. Kaylene mentioned moving faculty thinking by integrating the concept of the training by having joint faculty dollars, Chancellor's dollars, HTC dollars, and DSP&S dollars. Carl questioned the usage of

categorically funded equipment by non-categorical programs. His understanding is that you can't exceed 50 percent. Kaylene said if we had matching grants, we may begin to integrate and expand the budget so we're serving a larger population and really educating the community colleges.

Status of HTCTU evaluation:

- Albert contacted the LD field advisory, the HTC advisory board, the DSP&S coordinators, and CAPED and asked the organizations to select the individuals for assessment. There are four people that will be serving on the evaluation committee: Janice Emerzian, Diane Ramirez, Ray Lovell, and Rosemarie Menager-Beeley. Sticking to the language of the grant, they are designing a survey for the 106 community colleges. The evaluation committee wanted until the end of October for a complete report. Simultaneously, a letter of intent is being put out to campuses stating that an RFP will be sent. Those campuses interested will have the RFP due to the Chancellor's Office by around November and it will be awarded in February. The Chancellor's Office wants to build into the RFP the results of the evaluation.
- Carl asked what would happen if the evaluation committee recommends there ought to be two HTCTUs? Kaylene said there has to be support and money for the recommendations that the evaluation committee makes.
- Kaylene didn't think it would be appropriate to have an AC member on the evaluation committee because then all advisory boards would want representatives on their evaluation committees. Ellen asked if the AC would have the opportunity to contribute to the survey or at least be able to review it. Kaylene will find out, but she is trying to keep AC out of the loop. Carl suggested using the AC as a mechanism for disseminating a draft copy of the survey out to their region. Kaylene thought that was a good idea. Laurie asked if it is feasible to put together a listserve for the evaluation so that questions and ideas can be posted that may help them to have a well-rounded survey. Carl said yes.

What do we do with old technology?:

- Carl asked what kind of latitude do colleges have to redistribute outdated equipment within the community college system when a

college purchases equipment through HTC funding? Ellen said her college funnels old equipment back to their Instructional Computing Department. Carl suggested using the Web to redistribute equipment. Steve said to just keep track of who and where the equipment went to.

HTC allocation:

- Kaylene asked Patrick the other day if the dollars that are going to the campuses are going to be distributed through the apportionment process or are they going to go into the DSP&S programs? Steve said they go into the pot and then they're distributed based on the DSP&S formula. Carl feels this is based on past practice rather than policy. Kaylene will check to see if there is anything in writing. Laurie said if there's language present we need to at least be aware of that and if there's not, maybe there's room to negotiate still. Kaylene said we have to change the language so that we can be much more flexible and give \$7500 and more.
- Carolyn asked if the colleges that have HTCs get a piece of that money that's going into the whole pot. Kaylene said it depended on how your district does the apportionment. It's up to the district to remember it as being folded into your base. Kaylene said the formula works this way: The Chancellor's Office breaks down what they figure out each campus should receive. It is then distributed through the districts where they can choose to give the campus their amount or reallocate it accordingly. But that's an individual decision and all districts do it differently.

Can the HTCTU get a COLA rolled into its base?:

- Carl asked if the 114 colleges that are getting support from the HTC could allocate .25% of their allocation to augment the operation of the HTC. Kaylene said that would take changing the budget language. Steve said he would rather fight the battle to justify an increase in allocation and to have growth and COLA put in for the HTCTU.
- Steve suggested pulling the maximum amount for PADS and then redirecting some of the PADS moneys to the HTCTU. He said not to allocate it based on unused dollars, but to actually budget for it to use for the HTCTU.

- PADS moneys go to a variety of projects. The Chancellor's Office decides what programs the moneys are allocated for based on advisory from DSP&S. The money in a PADS account varies from year to year.
- Carl suggested allocating a block of money, say \$20,000, to provide internet access for DSP&S programs and staff. This will cover electronic communications for DSP&S. Kaylene will call up someone on the evaluation committee and bring up the email issue.

Communication item:

- During the evaluation process, letters will be sent to the field announcing the formation of an advisory board. It will list those currently serving and ask the regional rep to nominate someone from their region. Carolyn said the letter should inform possible advisory candidates that to serve on the committee requires a commitment.
- People seem really happy that the advisory board is back in place and very impressed with who's on it, but the regional rep is supposed to nominate the candidate for the advisory board. There are 10 regions and this board does not represent all regions. If current advisory members want to continue serving in 1996-1997, their regional reps will have to nominate them.

Mentoring new sites:

- Carl said at first the HTCTU imposed a fair amount of structure, form, protocol, and procedure and it worked extremely well. We would require that people come for trainings and gave them a bundled kit of equipment. We trained them on the equipment and then delivered it to their site. But, in the first year of this last cycle, things got pretty loose and colleges were basically buying what they wanted with their money. Last year it got a little bit better when the HTCTU gave colleges suggested lists of things to buy. We are doing site visits for those locations and helping them get up to speed.
- Kaylene's concern is that these HTCs have been funded and students are not being served. Basically, they've lost a year. The

\$25,000 is unused funds. They should be accountable to the HTCTU. They need to come to trainings and buy the correct equipment. Kaylene asked Carl to give the names of those HTC's that were funded, but haven't attended trainings. She wants the AC to write a letter recommending that these trainings need to be attended. Carl will construct a letter suggesting the critical trainings needed in order to use the assistive technology that colleges have purchased (ABI/LD, ACT for Mac, and ACT for Win.)

- Carl said that funding for a HTC should require these trainings:
 - ABI/LD
 - ACT for Windows
 - ACT for Macintosh
 - Screen Readers for Windows
 - CD-ROM Resources
 - Internet
- Steve suggested recalling the unspent \$25,000 from colleges and redirecting it to the HTCTU since it is technology money.

Update Instructional Guides/Carl's idea:

- Laurie wants Instructional Guides that look at the newer technologies. Carl wants to put the Instructional Guides on line rather than on paper to save the cost of a mass mailing.
- Carl mentioned a number ISPs (Internet Service Providers) are setting up relationships with colleges in which they come in, put the hardware on campus, and colleges sell accounts to students for \$15-\$19 a month. The ISP administers the account, maintains the equipment, and provides the internet access. Colleges get a small return from the ISP for each student account that they sell, but the colleges are also able to sell internet service to the community. This is a legitimate, voluntary fee you can charge students.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM