

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Present: John al-Amin (co-chair), Kitty Merrill (co-chair), Rick Shaw, Jeff Erskine, Bola King-

Rushing, Elissa Caruth, Tom Stough, Richard Williams, Rick Carnahan, Ana Maria

Valle

Guests:

Meeting Date: 10/20/11	Minutes Approve	ed: 09/15/11 Re	ecorded By: Darlene Inda
AN = Action Needed	AT = Action Taken	D = Discussio	n I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

- I. Called to Order I The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m.
- II. Approval of Minutes

 I The Council reviewed the meeting minutes of April 21, 2011. K. Merrill moved to approve the meeting minutes, B. King-Rushing seconded, and the motion carried with comment consent and one abstention.
 - J. al-Amin stated that as part of the meeting today he wanted everyone to review the authority, purpose and goal of the committee and added that we need to have 2 or 3 measureable goals. He stated that this is his first meeting as co-chair and that K. Merrill has not been formally accepted but it has been recommended from Dr. Duran to Robert Cabral and should be approved by the Academic Senate. J. al-Amin asked the committee about the agenda and its format and R. Shaw replied that there are usually standing items from each department to report out. Everyone did a quick introduction so everyone knew who they were.
- III. Public Comment
- I No public comment.
- IV. Informational Item: Accreditation
- J. al-Amin stated that one of the items talked about was standardizing the agenda and minutes template for accreditation purposes so that when the materials are viewed each committee has the same format.
- I,AN J. al-Amin went through the Purpose of the committee and asked if there are any changes. He would like this finalized by the next meeting. As for the membership of the committee, he would like it spelled out on the agenda.

- I,AN J. al-Amin reviewed Goals 1 through 4 of the committee and stated the each goal needs to be measured. He added that a self-evaluation needs to be done. He read through all of the goals and the way that each goal could be measured.
 - R. Shaw asked if there was a point of process where technology is asked to review technology needs and J. Erskine added that more specifically related to software and licensing. R. Shaw added that it's been the program's responsibility to order the software and spoke about the SPSS software as an example of the delay in receiving it.
- I,AN R. Shaw stated that one of the items that need to be revised is the Strategic Plan for the college and that Marji Price wanted it to be a collaborative process. He added that he would work on the draft that he and Dave Fuhrmann have and work on it from there. He stated that he will have a draft of the next Tech Op Plan by March.
 - The issue of PEPC and Resource Request Forms were brought up and J. Erskine asked how PEPC decides what Is technology worthy and A. Valle answered that each group represents their needs to PEPC, they are ranked and sent to PBC. She added that we should have a Tech Rep at the PEPC meetings.
 - J. al-Amin said that he wants to make sure that everyone has up to date equipment and software and thought that this committee had a form for special software requests.

 J. Erskine responded that a work order needs to be submitted and it turns into a request. B. Rushing added that if there is an interest in a program, it unofficially comes to him and he recommends the program that would work best but he does not install the software.
- I,AN J. al-Amin stated that one of the goals is to create a list of tech related resources and then to streamline the order of how things are done and disseminate it to the campus.
 - B. King-Rushing stated that this committee should have a linkage with Professional Development Committee so that they know what they can contribute on because PDC may be providing training on items we are not familiar with.

Other Item

- I,AN J. al-Amin reviewed the Information Technology Plan 2011-12 handouts and stated that when we meet next month, we will go over any changes so that we can finalize the plan no later than November.
 - I R. Shaw addressed the other handout which was the OC Service Levels document. He stated that this document outlines what IT covers and the priority levels and purpose of this document is to outline how IT handles job requests. He provided some examples of tickets and response times.
- I,AN The question of having staff on campus until 8:00pm came up and the committee decided that it wasn't necessary at this time, however, R. Shaw stated that he would do some research to see how many times the help desk was called so he can analyze the demand. He recommended having a "good" student cover until 8:00pm and can be supervised by the on duty Dean.
 - R. Shaw spoke about the Thin Client experiment and said that 66 have been deployed with 16 more tomorrow and that there have only been a few issues. The first sets are going to the labs and customer service counters.
- I,AN R. Carnahan spoke of adaptive technology and R. Shaw provided some dialogue regarding this. R. Carnahan stated that we used to have a high tech lab for students with disabilities and there is no longer software accessible to them. A. Valle added that she needs accommodations as well in her lab that require special technology needs. R. Shaw responded to R. Carnahan that he would get him a Thin Client.
 - R. Shaw asked J. al-Amin how far in advance recommendations need to be made for Refresh and asked if two months before February would be sufficient. He recommended that they email the Deans before January regarding their technology needs. J. al-Amin responded that resource requests should be done in October and November and finalized in December.

V. Adjournment

- I The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.
- VI. Future PBC Meetings
- November 17, 2011

ı

- January 19, 2012
- February 16, 2012
- o April 19, 2012