



Members:

Terry Kornutiak
Linda Arnold
Barrie Brill
Sharon Chen (LSU – absent)
Christina Chow
Laura Cullen
Deanna Douglas
Rob Dykstra
Martin Gerson
Marg Heldman
Linda Holmes, Chair
Ken Jillings (absent)

Anne MacMillan
Ken MacMillan
Verna Magee Shepherd
Pam Novak-Cawley
Therese Paradis
David Pepper
Doug Soo
Dennis Steeves
Gloria Swadden
Lawrence Warren
Nancy Wickham
Jason Young (LSU)

Guests:

Terry Longair

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. REVIEW OF MINUTES AND BUSINESS ARISING

a. Draft Minutes of the Meeting held Tuesday, February 4, 2003

- On page 8, under L. Holmes requests to Langara Council, at the end of item 1, insert “agreed by unanimous consensus”.

It was moved by M. Gerson; seconded by D. Steeves

THAT the minutes of the Langara Council Budget meeting held on February 4, 2003, as amended, be approved.

Carried.

Budget Update – Enhancement Request Decision Making

The result of the vote on the February 6 document by the 19 voters was:

- Towel & Locker Service (19)
- Human Performance (19)
- Criminal Justice (19)
- Chemistry (19)
- Graduation (19)
- Athletics (19)
- Library Technician (18)
- Mathematics & Statistics (17)
- Langara Math Diagnostic Test (17)

One more item should have been on the list: the Facilities \$200,000 pay parking proposal.

This includes an increased daily parking cost from \$1.50 to \$4.00; a \$2.00 flat rate for 4 hours between 0700-1700 and in the evening and on weekends; with no more semester passes issued to students and will result in the reduction of the cost of a one-zone bus pass from \$63 to \$50. In addition, students can obtain a special sticker from the LSU that allows them a three-zone bus pass for the equivalent of one.

It was moved by L. Warren; seconded by J. Young

THAT the Facilities and Purchasing “increase of daily parking rates” enhancement request be approved and removed from the enhancement list.

Carried.

D. Douglas spoke to the handout “Enhancement Requests, by Function” and asked that Council members look at the list to determine their respective order of priority.

Concern was expressed that there were so many items on this list, randomly placed, that it might make a quick decision-making process more difficult. It was suggested that, for instance, all markers positions be put onto one line item, and similarly with the supplies budgets, as the premise is the same with all of them, in that all are required because of increased student demand.

This was countered by the comment that technology-related items could not work effectively if listed that way.

It was agreed that this concept would be more effective in dealing with some of the many small items of a similar sort than with some others.

It was suggested that the nine categories be voted on, but this was rejected in favour of taking another look at the list. For instance, when viewing the supplies items,

why were they not grouped more closely together? Why were the Foundation printing and postage items not included in the supplies section? It was agreed that this document needed to be examined further and reorganized.

It was noted that the coaches' honoraria was missing from the list, and it was agreed that it would be added.

In regard to the Lab Demo positions for Science labs, there was a concern that these are items that may be offset as a result of additional tuition and that Education Council would still have to look at.

M. Gerson indicated that it was not yet clear whether these positions would be absolutely necessary for the summer. Although they are desired, the need might not be as pressing as some.

L. Holmes suggested that each senior administrator look at this list, check that everything is included, and reorganize it in an alternative meaningful way so the items can be voted on.

D. Pepper suggested an alternative approach of reexamination of the requests:

a) The infrastructure needs to be built up first, so perhaps with that view there are some items on the present list that are not critical. For instance, furniture in the "A" building as opposed to raising money for bursaries last year (SOS campaign) is a good example of the critical needs of students being dealt with ahead of non-critical issues.

Therefore all requests could be revisited, to determine which are genuinely critical versus those that can be postponed or are more desired than needed.

- b) For all full-time position requests, could they be scaled back to one-half time or less, perhaps marrying with existing position(s)?
- c) Are some budget requests linked? This must be determined, because if one is funded then the other must be also, to be effective.
- d) Is voting appropriate for this process, or should the pie be split up first between instructional and non-instructional areas, at which point the departments would determine, within that parameter, what their priorities are, like the Capital process of prior years.

It was clarified that requests are no longer dealt with in the same way, in fact capital allocations are now part of the annual budget process and the same amount is being set aside as has been in the past.

L. Holmes clarified that, in other words, the relative importance of capital requests versus enhancement requests must be weighed, and the enhancement requests should therefore not be voted on until the operating capital requests are looked at. She

indicated that the senior administrators should take a look at further paring down the requests they had approved. They should ensure that all requests are listed, and group them into “packages” that make sense so they can easily be identified for voting purposes.

Q: What controls / checks / audits are currently in place to determine what is crucial? As some amounts are less firm than others, what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure a relative equivalence?

A: L. Holmes responded that the only controls currently in place are trust in the senior administrators, whose signatures verify all requests.

The LSU representative suggested that the criterion for voting be “Which are the areas that directly affect education and students?” and that the determinant of which are crucial or non-crucial is how they impact the direct delivery of services and support to the students.

It was noted that, although the quality of education cannot be ignored, and although some requests may not seem as though they directly contribute to that end, they might well do, such as employing support staff to expedite documents for students and provide other student-related aid. This process includes getting the message out to the students as to what is available to them at Langara.

L. Holmes indicated that material to guide decision-making would be developed by the Executive Committee.

R. Dykstra inquired about new program start-ups. In regard to Theatre Arts, “no money means no program”. He indicated that developmental funding for new programs be considered when examining the list, in terms of priority. In addition, the issue of approval of the extra credit in Sciences may be moot as additional lab aids may still be necessary for the additional sections. He outlined that extra markers could be considered as potentially self-funding by adding extra fees to courses and that would not be a favourable option from several points of view and that somewhere a line needs to be drawn regarding the concept of “self-funding”.

L. Holmes indicated that materials fees are different from tuition-generated funds, and that needs to be looked at. Increasing credits in a course and then making the assumption that the tuition brought in for it can be used to fund something else in that department is not the way we’ve treated tuition in the past.

M. Gerson responded that presently the number of Arts & Science transfer sections are being increased for the next year and the following year. As Science courses are expensive when compared to Arts because of the labs, sections haven’t been added to the Science courses. As other colleges and universities have increased their credits, or have always had more credits to reflect the labs for science courses, this may be an opportunity to get Langara’s credit system in line with the other colleges and

universities that most students transfer to, and at the same time create an opportunity that will allow Langara to balance the Science offerings with the number of Arts courses offered. There are presently long waiting lists for Science courses, and what is being heard more and more from students is that they are interested in applying for Associate of Arts degrees rather than the old Arts & Sciences diploma, thus the requirement for more lab science. The most popular course is Introductory Biology.

D. Soo indicated that additional issues are also critical, such as parking, directions around campus, and various neighborhood concerns, and these are considerations that need to be kept in mind while going through the decision-making process.

D. Douglas indicated that there are two items on the list, the College Annual Report and Copyright, which are not really enhancements as they are mandatory costs and this is the reason why these two items will probably be removed from the enhancement list.

Q: Will the International Education request be self-funded?

A: Yes, fees from students should cover costs, and more.

- Operating Capital Requests

D. Douglas spoke briefly to the Operating Capital Requests list, fielded questions and addressed concerns.

Concern was expressed about considering Operating Capital Expenses in the same breath as Enhancement Requests, in a unitary budget environment. In the past, it was understood that enhancement requests were determined before capital expenses were dealt with. With this system, it was feared that department(s) might find themselves with nothing after the voting process.

D. Douglas responded that that was not the intention – the difference between what is already in place and what will be required is what should be included on the enhancement list, so that departments will have access to more of what they need. She requested that Council members review the Operating Capital Requests list.

Q: Should items such as projectors be department-centered, or accessed out of Media Services?

A: They should be maximally accessible and thus the preferred placement is in IMS unless a department requires access during all class hours.

Creative Arts – R. Dykstra

R. Dykstra spoke to the Creative Arts Operating Capital requests, as per the attached documentation.

Q: In regard to the request for a digital projector, was the cost of converting slides to the digital form (discs) considered and what copyright costs / permission was included?

A: There would be a cost which has not yet been calculated.

- **Fine Arts:** needs a 24" planer, currently the department has a 12" planer, which is too small for a lot of projects. The price requested reflects the cost of a used model.
- **Photo-Imaging:** photography has been moving very quickly toward the digital medium in the last couple of years. The requests are listed by order of priority. The fourth item on the list is definitely the number one priority and the lenses are the number two priority item.
- **Display & Design:** items requested are required for student projects.
- **Publishing:** "Flightcheck Collect" is a piece of software used for the Pacific Rim magazine and some other ongoing projects. This software is used prior to sending copy to the printers. This item will be removed from the list, as it can be taken out of the Mac Lab sharing account. Subsequently, the 2004/05 items should be moved over into the 2003/04 column.
- **Journalism:** these requests represent the replacement of older equipment, used by students, plus accompanying software, and the priority for funding will be checked.
- **Theatre Arts:** permanent sound systems for Theatre Arts rooms would replace boom boxes or other small equipment currently in use that continually breaks down. The replacement of two sewing machines that are very old and require frequent repair is required. Four drafting chairs are required for the design and production of sets, etc.

General Questions:

Q: Can any of the digital equipment requests be shared with other areas?

A: No, these cameras are so heavily used by Journalism students that sharing would be counter productive.

Q: What about the possibility of being shared just within Creative Arts?

A: It has been tried in the past, but because one department's demand can be so much greater than another, sometimes this is not successful, and can adversely influence the outcome of timely student projects.

Two guidelines regarding capital arose:

- a) L. Holmes reminded Council members that, with each one of these requests, such as the installation of kiln(s), there could be cost ramifications for other areas. If such additional costs exist, they must be included in the request.
- b) There was a suggestion that the question of whether the cost of an item might decrease in price significantly over the next eighteen months and this information should be available before voting takes place.

Humanities – K. MacMillan

K. MacMillan spoke to the Humanities requests, as per the attached documentation, with additional comments as follows:

- Are there some problems with the figures as shown on the current list, for instance the price of the networked laser printer, CD burner and Scanner for A301 should show higher than \$400?
- The set of dictionaries are for ESL classes, teaching grammar as well as vocabulary and spelling.

In regard to the MS Works software request, the College may have a license that should cover this cost, which will be checked.

- For Interdisciplinary Studies, the digital video cameras may be something that can be shared with D. Pepper's area, so will be removed from the list.
- New tents and a PH meter are required.

Q: Is Fraser River Studies not a cost-recovery program?

A: The budget includes the cost of consumables, but equipment replacement has not been included. It was suggested that the concept of cost recovery be reexamined in this regard and the costs of the items should be rechecked.

Health and Applied Science & Human Services – P. Novak-Cawley

P. Novak-Cawley spoke to the Health and Applied Science requests, as per the attached documentation, with additional comments as follows:

- The digital camera requested is to be used for producing case scenarios for observational purposes for students and instructors, but it could be moved to IMS as the time demand is not that high.
- For Human Performance and Recreation, the motor learning lab apparatus is very much a priority item.
- The Delmar Institutional Package for Nursing is the first package required to

make any of the others run. Delmar's Anatomy & Physiology would be the last priority item on the list.

Social Sciences – Barrie Brill

Barrie Brill spoke to the Social Sciences requests, as per the attached documentation, with additional comments, as follows:

- In Anthropology, these items are related to the Archaeology Field School requirements.
- The polygraph machine requests for Psychology would be a used model.
- In Sociology, the academic journals are requested for a reading room that may be created from an existing office.

Q: What would the LCD projector be used for?

A: This piece of equipment is heavily used by the Psychology Department. In the past, too much time has been lost attempting to share it with other areas.

Business and Community Programs – D. Steeves

D. Steeves spoke to the Business and Community requests as per attached documentation, with additional comments as follows:

- The computer on wheels has already been mentioned, and will be switched over to IMS and removed from this part of the list. As David has asked for two, they can be shared.

Q: Why the request for bookshelves – aren't there any available elsewhere?

A: For a mini-lab, however this request is already being taken care of by J. Strachan in Facilities, and can be removed from the list.

Mathematics and Sciences – M. Heldman

M. Heldman spoke to the Mathematics and Sciences requests, as per attached documentation, with additional comments as follows:

- In Biology, compound microscopes are a priority item.

Concern was expressed about possible inaccurate costing for the microscopes, which will be checked.

- In Chemistry, the handi-presses are a priority, as are lab ovens. In regard to the request for a fridge, they just need an ordinary one, as currently there is a special explosive-safe fridge. With two refrigerators, materials can be separated

appropriately. The request for a scanner is because currently materials that should be scanned are being done by hand. The two Orion Ph meters requested are not the same as the one requested for the Fraser River Studies program – these models would be affixed to a bench in the lab.

- For Physics, the Franck-Hertz experimental apparatus, and other requests, are to be used in second year labs.

D. Douglas noted that the two computers should be removed from the list, as ICS has already dealt with these.

Q: Are the microscopes being replaced because broken or obsolete? Why, if that is not that case, is the \$6,000 cost for compound microscopes not in the second year column as well?

A: That concern will be checked on, including an estimate of future requirements.

Foundation – L. Holmes

L. Holmes spoke to the request for a donor recognition display, indicating that it should be considered a priority item.

Counselling – T. Kornutiak

T. Kornutiak spoke to the Counselling department's single request for a laser printer, stating that the entry should read "computer" rather than "printer".

Library – D. Pepper

D. Pepper spoke to the Library's requests, as per attached documentation, with the additional comments:

- Most of these items are to replace equipment or to accommodate extremely high demand. All this equipment is located on the second floor at IMS / Library.
- The fifth line item should read "TV/VHS/DVD station for Library and Writing Centre in Seminar Room".

D. Pepper also suggested that the Instructional Media Services (IMS) list be revisited, as there has been so much talk about that department providing the source for shared resources.

Q: How many Computers on Wheels (COW's) have been purchased?

A: There are currently three in use, but that is not adequate and two more are very much required.

Q: Do all COW's have to be of the same quality or would more COW's with alternative equipment of less capability be a better use of funds?

A: While this approach would probably just ensure that the best quality equipment would go out the door first, there should be an analysis of the needs of the user groups to determine the answer to this concern.

- On page 5, line 6, please note that the code "C" should be removed from the item "Portable Firewire hard-drive".
- Regarding the Adobe Acrobat software, the department may be getting a special deal through supplier, thus reducing the present cost.
- On page 5, line 11, the item that reads "VH head" should be "VR head".

**Facilities & Purchasing / College Services / Information and Computing Services
– D. Douglas**

D. Douglas spoke briefly to the Facilities and Purchasing, College Services and ICS requests as per the attached documentation, with the following comments:

- All items are self-explanatory except the dishwasher replacement for cafeteria. This unit must be replaced.

Q: Departments are charged an extra \$4 "for cleaning" when china dishes are required for a meeting. Would this charge be eliminated?

A: Dishes were actually bought so rental charges wouldn't be levied. The \$4.00 charge would be labour-related, however this issue should be investigated more thoroughly by informing J. Strachan of the issue.

- In regard to the filing cabinets for Facilities, the cost of \$16,000 is too low and will be adjusted accordingly.
- The second line item under College Services should read "ONS" card rather than "ONI".
- In regard to the ICS line item for computer maintenance, this addresses overtime requirements.
- Magnetic card dispensers (item should be changed to read singular dispenser rather than dispensers) will generate cards for photocopiers, vending machines, and are a student-related request. The dispenser will also replenish existing cards, and it was suggested that students could buy a card instead of using change.

L. Holmes indicated that because items have been moved, removed, and/or need clarification, the Capital list would be revised and distributed by Friday for next Tuesday's budget meeting, including identification of mandatory items. A revised Budget Enhancement list and suggested criteria and methodology for decision-

making will be provided.

The "Draft Copyright Ownership Policy Review" will be forwarded to the next meeting and P. Novak-Cawley will compile a report on Education Council.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:46 pm.
