| **.CO-CHAIRS** | **ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE** | **ADVISORY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [x]  Matt Calfin | [ ]  Mario Bojorquez | [ ]  Michael Reese |
| [x]  Michael Stewart, Faculty Co-Chair | [ ]  Blanca Valdez | [ ]  Marsha Gable |
|   |  | [ ]  Bill McGreevy  |
|  |  | [x]  Asma AbuShadi  |
|  |  | [x]  John Stephens |
|  |  | [x]  Sang Bai |

| **ACADEMIC SENATE** | **CLASSIFIED SENATE** | **ADMINISTRATORS’ ASSOCIATION** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [x]  Michael Lines | [x]  Dawn Heuft | [x]  Michael Copenhaver |
|   | [x]  Pat Murray | [ ]  Loren Holmquist |

| EX-OFFICIO | RECORDER | GUESTS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Courtney Williams | [x]  Michele Martens | [x]  Kerry Kilber-Rebman |
| [ ]  Janet Gelb |  |  |
| [x]  Aaron Starck |  | [x]  Wayne Branker-Courtney Proxy |
| [x]  Dave Steinmetz |  |  |
| [x]  Carl Fielden |  |  |

| ROUTINE BUSINESS |
| --- |
| 1. Welcome and Introductions
 | None. |
| 1. Open Comment
 | None.  |
| 1. Additions/Deletions to Agenda
 | None. |
| 1. Approve Meeting Notes & Follow-up
 | a. April 22nd meeting notes approved.b. Follow-up about the appointment of Ex-Officio and Advisory  Members. Specifically re: Dave Steinmetz. Matt spoke with Marsha Gable and she said Dave is an ex-officio member. Also, she clarified that advisory positions are filled by the co-chairs when specific expertise needed to round out the committee.  |
|  | New Business |
| 5.Technology Prioritization Request Process at Cuyamaca College (Kerry Kilber Redman, Dean of Learning and Technology Resources and Co-Chair of College Technology Committee at Cuyamaca). | Kerry presented and discussed the creation of the CC rubric and Technology Request Form.  |
| 6. The Development of the Technology Prioritization Process at Grossmont College.  | Should we do operational replacement needs first? (Those that should not go through this process.) Our technology plan has not been updated since 2014 and it outlines a five-year replacement timeline. The committee decided that we need to update the plan as a committee. We have not had a real plan in place for years. Network specialists have a list of all labs; Sang does faculty systems. District IT should have a list of staff systems, but they do not really have a shelf-life for these systems. Sang and ICS make recommendations based on longevity, but cannot always replace all expired systems as needed. Matt said he has received a couple technology requests this semester and they are waiting for an answer. We need to set the GC prioritization rubric and process soon.Asma does not like survey monkey or google doc; she prefers Remedy Force. John mentioned we are not using Remedy Force’s attributes that will help us with many of the issues we face, including work flows. Jerry “owns” remedy force. So he would be the one to go to. Asma volunteered to reach out to Jerry about using Remedy Force to develop the rubric. As Cuyamaca’s form was entitled: Tech support, hardware, software, etc., do we need to include tech support, cost, etc.? Matt displayed the charge for Technology Committee and mentioned the committee needs to focus on the prioritization of requests. He went on to say we need to ensure any priorities we put forward do not take precedence over projects already in the queue. The committee needs to work with District IT to ensure ALL projects are ranked accordingly-new and ongoing. Michael Copenhaver has no concerns with the CC rubric as such, but does not like the cost column weighted highly, if at all. Cost is not for this body to worry about. Dawn Heuft is concerned that we have not decided on anything this semester and we will not meet again until Fall. We should at least decide to advance the Technology Request form for College Council’s approval, and worry about updating the form later. The Committee agreed.Aaron is concerned about some verbiage and how the actual form will be filled out and ranked. He does not like how some points seem to overlap. He is not comfortable voting on the CC form. John Stephens says the modification of the form is easily modified once the fields are entered into remedy force. |

| COMMITTEE REPORTS |
| --- |
| 7. | None.  |

| DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS |
| --- |
| 8. | None. |

| FOR CONSENSUS |
| --- |
| 9. Minutes of May 13, 2019 | Approved.  |
| 10. Motion to give Asma the form to create in Remedy Force and update as we go. | Passed. |
| 11. Motion to advance the Technology Request form as is, sending on to College Council for approval. | Passed. We will work on updating the form next meeting.  |

| FOLLOW-UP |
| --- |
|  |
| Who | Item | Timeline |
| Matt and Committee | Send CC updated rubric for committee to work on and offer edits at our next meeting.  | ASAP |
| Asma | Check with Jerry Williamson about using Remedy Force for the Rubric.  | ASAP |
| Committee | Update the GC Technology Plan.  | ASAP |
| Matt Calfin | Send the Technology Request form to College Council for approval.  | Before next College Council meeting, September 26, 2019. |
| Committee | Update the rubric and Technology Request form at next meeting.  | September 23, 2019. |

| 1. WORK AHEAD
* Announcements
* Preparations for future meetings
 |
| --- |

| NEXT MEETING: September 23, 2019. |
| --- |