| **CO-CHAIRS** | **ASGC** | **ADVISORY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Eric Klein, Co-Chair | Open | Michael Reese |
| Michael Stewart, Faculty Co-Chair | Open | Marsha Gable |
|  |  | Bill McGreevy |
|  |  | Asma AbuShadi |
|  |  | John Stephens |
|  |  | Sang Bai |

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

| EX-OFFICIO | RECORDER | GUESTS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Courtney Williams | Michele Martens | James Cho |
| Janet Gelb |  | Andy Timm |
| Aaron Starck |  | Martin Phillip |
| Dave Steinmetz |  | Jacob Angelo |
| Carl Fielden |  | Natalie Rey |

| ROUTINE BUSINESS | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.Welcome and Introductions | | Co-chair, Michael Stewart, introduced the new LTR Dean and Co-Chair of the Technology Committee, Dr. Eric Klein. Eric told the committee a bit about himself and mentioned he will be in learning mode today. |
| 2.Open Comment | | None. |
| 3.Additions/Deletions to  Agenda. | | None. |
| 4. Approve Meeting Notes  & Follow-up | | Vote to approve meeting notes from May 13, 2019—Approved. |
| NEW BUSINESS | | |
| 5.Establish Technology Request Review Sub-Committee (Establish review timelines) | Michael suggested we form a subcommittee to go through and rank the technology requests received. After some discussion, the Committee decided the ranking should be done by the entire Technology Committee. It is important that all members participate in the process as we move forward with approvals. It was suggested we reevaluate this process at a later date to see if a subcommittee might be warranted. | |
| COMMITTEE REPORTS | | |
| 6. | NONE. | |
| DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS | | |
| 6. Revisit Off Cycle Request Document/Edit | Jacob Angelo, the GC Director of Instructional Technology, offered to collect the requests as they come in. Jacob also agreed to create an excel spreadsheet to make it easy to rank and total the scores for the requests.  The committee looked over Cuyamaca’s Technology Request Form and made changes. On page 2 under the “DESCRIPTION” field, the committee would like users to provide contact information for the company and/or manufacturer of the proposed technology.  Under the “PROPOSAL JUSTIFICATION” field labeled “A. College and District Strategic Plan,” the committee would like to add a link to the Strategic Plan or a note listing the URL. Dawn Heuft mentioned we need to be aware that a new website is coming and any links provided will need to be updated.  In field “B. Statewide Initiatives / Mandates” the committee would like to see the word Mandate defined properly. Along those same lines, the committee would like to see the terms in the next field, “Criticality and Urgency,” defined as well.  In field “D. Supporting Data,” both “Program Review” and “Categorical Funding” should be added to the choices.  For line “E. Funding and Staffing,” an additional choice needs to be added: “iv. Ongoing Support.”  In item “F. Resources Factors,” line “i.Is this hardware, software or both?” was removed as it is defined elsewhere in the form. Also, the committee suggested a “Feasibility” option be added, noting whether or not a funding stream has been identified. The committee would like to see the following addressed here as well: How does this impact other departments such as Facilities and District IT?  Line “G. Cost” was discussed and many questions arose around the ability for the end user to know and calculate these costs. Asma pointed out that many of these issues would be covered under a “Scope of Work” (SOW), but, again, the end user probably would not know this and, furthermore, would not even know if/when an SOW is required.  Michael Stewart will make the requested updates on the “Technology Request Form” up through line E. The committee will finish updating the form at our next meeting.  The committee also discussed some other factors that should be addressed in the Technology Request Form. Carl Fielden mentioned that accessibility needs to be covered; he said we should consider the VPAT (Voluntary Product Accessibility Template). A note should be added to the form such as: Please attach your accessibility documentation. Regardless of how we address this issue, it should be vetted by subject matter personnel such as ARC (Accessibility Resource Center).  John Stephens reiterated that it is important we have vendor contact information on the form as well. We should also be mindful of FERPA regulations. | |
| 7. Revisit Rubric/Edit | Michael displayed Cuyamaca’s current rubric and mentioned we are going to use it as a starting point to develop our own. Michael also shared that District IT will not allow us to utilize the Remedy Force ticketing software for this purpose.  There was discussion on the need to include the “Cost Analysis” portion on the prioritization rubric. This is found on rows E, F, and G. While funding is part of the process, it should not affect the ranking/scoring of requests. These issues will be removed from the rubric and covered in the Technology Request Form where the Committee will identify whether or not sufficient funding has been allocated.  John Stephens mentioned it is important to see if the requestors are including the costs that, on many occasions, end users do not consider. Two examples of the various additional costs would include yearly upkeep and warranties. Bill McGreevy shared that the GC Budget Committee would not know be aware of all associated costs and, therefore, the Technology Committee should look at the overall costs of any technology request. On the rubric itself, the cost may not be as important as it would be on the Technology Request Form. Feasibility needs to be addressed and overall costs will help address this. The Technology Committee should discern whether or not the equipment is appropriate, and the requested monies is sufficient to cover the requested equipment. Cuyamaca does allocate funding to their tech committee and that is why it is on their rubric; however, the GC Technology Committee decided the costs should be removed from the rubric and only addressed in the Technology Request.  For column B, the “Mandate OR Support State-wide Initiative” piece, the discussion was around simply pushing through any requests tied to a mandate. However, it is important that the Technology Committee discern whether or not a request is truly a legal/legislative issue or simply a *department* mandate/need. The committee decided to split up this row and have separate lines for the “Mandated” and “State-Wide Initiatives.” It was decided that confirmed mandated requests will be pushed through the prioritization process as highly recommended.  With the changes made to the GC rubric, the Committee agreed to remove the weighting column and rate each remaining criteria on a scale from 1-3.  Mike Reese pointed out the row “C,” labeled “Criticality/Urgency” needs to be changed as these terms are not synonymous. As such, this row will be made into two lines, ensuring each term is defined.  Michael Stewart assured the Committee that he will make these changes and send them the updated rubric as soon as possible. The Committee agreed to approve the updated rubric, understanding the updates will be made as requested. | |
| 8. Biology request | In the essence of time, Mike Reese suggested that the Biology request be emailed to the committee with the updated rubric. The committee can look them over, rank the request, and email the Co-Chairs the completed, scored request. | |

| FOR CONSENSUS | |
| --- | --- |
| 9.Approve Meeting Notes From May 13, 2019 | Approved. |
| 9. GC Prioritization Rubric—Should costs be removed from the rubric and addressed in the Technology Request Form? | Agreed. |
| 10. Edited/updated Rubric—Should the committee approve the updated rubric given the changes are made accordingly? | Agreed. |

| FOLLOW-UP | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
| Who | Item | Timeline |
| Michael Stewart | Update the GC Prioritization rubric and send to Committee members. | ASAP |
| Jacob Angelo | Jacob will be the point person to receive the Technology Request Forms. | Ongoing |
| Jacob Angelo | Create excel spreadsheet for ranking technology requests. | ASAP |
| Michael Stewart | Update the Technology Request From through line E. | Before next meeting on October 28, 2019. |
| Committee | Finish updating the “Technology Request Form” at the next meeting. | At the October 28th meeting. |
| Committee | Once the updated rubric and Biology request are emailed, the committee will look them over, rank the request, and email the Co-Chairs the completed, scored request. | ASAP |

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

| NEXT MEETING: October 28, 2019 |
| --- |