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

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

| EX-OFFICIO | RECORDER | GUESTS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Courtney Williams | [x]  Michele Martens | Jacob Angelo |
| [ ]  Janet Gelb |  | Catherine Webb |
| [x]  Aaron Starck |  |  |
| [x]  Dave Steinmetz |  |  |
| [x]  Carl Fielden |  |  |

| ROUTINE BUSINESS |
| --- |
| 1. Welcome
 | Done.  |
| 1. Open Comment
 | None. |
| 1. Additions/Deletions to Agenda
 | Catherine Webb is unable to attend today, but she will be here for the January meeting. Aaron would like to discuss replacement plans for all computers campus-wide. Student Services, in particular, is experiencing issues and would like new systems.Jacob mentioned that staff and other District IT supported systems are not part of a rollover process. The GC ICS team, on the other hand, has a rollover process in place and all lab systems are rolled over per the warranty schedule. GC ICS has a $200,000 budget for rollovers, but this amount has never increased, even with the proliferation of new labs around campus. The GC ICS supported systems have gone from 700-2000 with no increase in budget or staffing. John Stephens would like to see an overall budget for ALL systems replacements, Districtwide. Jacob went on to explain that student-use systems are supported by Andy Timm and John Stephens. Dave Steinmetz and his team support the classrooms. District IT provides the image for staff systems. District IT has informed buildings 10 and 60 that they are on their own as far as technology is concerned. In other words, they must use their department budgets for replacement systems. The Tech Committee would like to see a plan developed that includes regular replacements of out-of-warranty systems campus wide. What do we need to do to develop this plan? Bill McGreevy mentioned the VPAS office has received technology budget increase requests, but with 11 Technology Deans in 7 last years, nothing was followed through on. In addition, with PVAC coming on board soon, the ICS team has discussed saving for replacement systems for the new building in five years. Without a technology budget increase, however, this plan may be difficult to implement. The AUP will help with requesting extra funding, and the ICS Team and the Technology Committee wants to see one budget/plan for ALL technology needs and upgrades. Furthermore, the Committee would like to see this proposal come from this committee. The question of how the new AUP process will affect the huge increase in technology was raised. Will the AUP be a good tool to address the extra funds necessary to support the huge increase in technology and staffing? We simply cannot continue to support, maintain, and continue to purchase more without an increase in funding. Moreover, the funding should be centralized and housed in the ICS budget. Aaron Starck says the AUP will not be enough to predict rollovers every five years. Bill, on the other hand, thinks it can be built into the AUP. The AUP should be used to forecast each department’s needs over several years. Jacob said that Eric and his team will write up a plan for capturing the projected needs and how much funding we will need over the next few years.  |
|  4. Approve Meeting  Notes   | Vote to approve meeting notes from October 28, 2019. Carl motion to approve, Dawn second. Consensus.  |

| NEW BUSINESS |
| --- |
| 5.Select Co-Chair for  2020 | Michael Stewart has stepped down and we need a new Technology Co-chair. While many governance committees are waiting until the end of the fiscal year to elect new co-chairs, Michael was under the impression his tenure ends on December 31, 2019. Bill said voting membership has not changed, so we are good to change the length of term for the co-chairs. The committee discussed the possible choices for a new co-chair. We could elect another Academic Senate member to fill in through June 2020 or we can elect a Classified Senate member to be co-chair with a tenure through June 2021. Dawn mentioned that the Classified co-chair does not need to be a member of Classified Senate to participate. Dawn went on to say that she would like to see Pat Murray as the co-chair of the Tech Committee so Dawn could continue to sit on the District wide Technology Committee. Eric mentioned that he will work with the parties involved and develop a recommendation he will bring to the Committee in January. |
| 6. Technology Request  Forms | Eric said we need to decide how will we handle and route incoming Technology Requests. Bill McGreevy suggested we implement a Director’s Report to the Technology Request Form. This form is utilized by Loren with the Facilities Committee and has proven very useful. This report will be able to weed out the requests that are simply not feasible. This will save time, energy, and frustration for all concerned parties in the end. It makes sense for the Tech Committee to mimic the Facilities Director’s report, but the Facilities Committee has requestors fill out the *whole* form, and Jacob does not want this to happen. Jacob wants to see the technology vetted BEFORE all the accompanying paperwork is done. The committee agrees this is a good idea, but we will not move forward until we know how the impending AUP will affect the Technology Request Form. The next issue we need to solve is how to socialize and get the new process updated. Loren has very detailed instructions that may help us with this process. Once finalized, we can put the step-by-step process on the Technology website. Asma suggested that the Technology Committee Co-chairs reach out to the District’s Technology Coordinating Committee (TCC) re: current technology projects on the books with coordinating timelines. It would be beneficial for the college’s Tech Committee to know what is going on with the District’s Tech Committee and vice-versa. This knowledge will help our Committee with the prioritization of requests. Jacob and Eric have project prioritization meeting with District soon and they will broach this subject and report back.  |

| DISCUSSION ON PREVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS |
| --- |
| 7. Annual Unit Plan (AUP) | Catherine Webb to discuss continue discussion on the pending AUP.This has been pushed to the January meeting.  |
| 8. Continue Editing  Technology Request  Form | Pushed as well. Waiting until update on AUP form in January.  |

| FOR CONSENSUS |
| --- |
| Shall we meeting in January? | Yes, the Committee agreed to meet January 27, 2020. |

| FOLLOW-UP |
| --- |
|  |
| Who | Item | Timeline |
| Jacob and ICS Team, Eric | Work on a plan to forecast technology needs and associated funding.  | TBD |
| Eric | Work on finalizing the Committee’s options for a new co-chair and make a recommendation at January meeting.  | January 27, 2020 |
| Jacob and Eric | Discuss District IT sharing their technology plans and timelines with the GC Technology Committee. | ASAP  |

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

|  NEXT MEETING: January 27, 2020 |
| --- |