| **CO-CHAIRS** | **ASGC**  | **ADVISORY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [x]  Eric Klein, Co-Chair | [ ]  Tomas Lopez | [ ]  Michael Reese |
| [ ]  Michael Stewart, Faculty Co-Chair | [ ]  Open | [ ]  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 |
| [ ]  Michael Stewart | [x]  Pat Murray | [x]  Loren Holmquist |

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

| ROUTINE BUSINESS |
| --- |
| 1. Welcome
 | Done, with introductions all around.  |
| 1. Open Comment
 | None.  |
| 1. Additions/Deletions to Agenda
 | None. |
|  4. Approve Meeting  Notes   | Vote to approve meeting notes from November 25, 2019.Approved.  |
| NEW BUSINESS |
| 5.Co-Chair Transition | Michael Stewart stepped down as the co-chair of the Technology Committee and Pat Murray has agreed to fill that spot. Eric and Michael Stewart looked over the governance handbook and, as we discussed at the November 2019 meeting, it is okay for Pat Murray to transition as the Co-Chair; she will serve until June 2021, and the Committee agreed.  |
| 6. GCCCD Technology Plan | Eric asked the Committee members to share the District’s Technology plan with their constituent groups and solicit feedback on this draft. Michael Copenhaver reminded the committee that the GC governance structure allows all constituencies to get feedback from the groups they represent. Michael is concerned that district only shared the plan with the GC Academic Senate President but not the Administrator or Classified Presidents. This should have been shared with all the groups. Michael will send to the Administrator’s membership for feedback. Aaron mentioned that there is no budgeting or refresh plans mentioned in this document. An issue that many department face when purchasing new technology is the maintenance of the new technology. There is no refresh plans in place either. Aaron has some notes he will send to Eric on topics like the total cost of technology ownership. Catherine mentioned that our recent recommendation from Accreditation recommended we look at total cost of ownership when it comes to technology purchases. We need to work on this issue and develop good refresh/maintenance plans.  |
| 7. District IT Project List | The District updates this list monthly. Eric mentioned he would be happy to take any of our concerns to TCC (Technology Coordinating Council).Michael Copenhaver pointed out that there are important issues missing from the District’s IT Project List. One such issue is cyber security. Eric mentioned that he will ask Chris Tarman to come speak to us about the District’s Technology Plan and Project List.  |
| 8. Discuss Spring  Meeting Dates:February 24March 23 – Spring Break April 27 May 25 – Memorial Day | All committees are being asked to look over their meeting schedules and get them solidified. For the rest of the semester two of our four meetings fall on holidays. We decided we will not meet during Spring Break (March 23) or on Memorial Day (May 25).The question posed is: Does the committee want to reschedule these two meetings, or wait until we get closer to these dates to decide. Dawn wants to reschedule both so we do not go too long between meetings. Michael Copenhaver agrees with Dawn. Since attendance is low today we will bring up this question at our February meeting. Some suggested alternate dates include March 16 and May 18.John Stephens suggested we send out the meeting dates before each semester, with verbiage akin to:“We meet the fourth Monday of each month, except for the months that have Monday Holidays. During these particular months, the Technology Committee will meet the . . .” (first, or third or second Monday).  |

| DISCUSSION ONEVIOUS AGENDA ITEMS |
| --- |
| 9. Catherine Webb Visit--Continue our discussion on the Annual Unit Plan (AUP) and how the Technology Request Form will fit in. | Catherine mentioned all AUPs are due at the end of Feb.We previously learned all about the new AUP and how will it be rolled out. For today’s visit, Catherine discussed what it is and how it will affect committee work. We need to better align our planning in committees with the AUP. Some forms may overlap between committee request/prioritization forms, so we need to streamline, and, therefore, develop better planning campus wide. The current AUP (aka: BETA test) is in paper form and includes forecasting a unit’s needs for the year ahead. Once the AUP is completed, the unit needs to decide how and which committees need to be looped in to facilitate completing their plans to reach their goals. Catherine displayed the AUP Information flow chart and outlined the process which includes: 1. Unit completes the form.
2. Unit submits form to Dean/Manager for discussion and approval
3. Dean/Manager decides what resources, if any, are needed. If additional resources are necessary, then
4. Unit completes and attaches request form(s) and then,
5. Unit submits final AUP (w/ any necessary prioritization or request forms) to CPIE.

(For the balance of the process, please refer to the attached “AUP Process Flowchart.”)The CPIE Office is then responsible for ensuring all the paperwork is routed until, ultimately, the forms reach College Council. College Council considers the results and/or recommendations from all committees, along with the broad themes pulled from all requests through the CPIE analysis. In addition, CPIE communicates the results of the process back to the requesting units. Based on the discussion in College Council, the Council then recommends resource allocation priorities to the President. Finally, CPIE shares all results of their AUP analysis at the Annual Planning Forum and College Council.The question was raised: Who decides how and where approved requests will be paid for? Catherine mentioned that, ultimately, funding conversations take place within the College Council, the Budget Committee, and the President. Catherine displayed the “Annual Unit Plan Process Diagram” which outlines the timeline and flow of the AUP. (This, too, is attached.) Another issue the new AUP may help address is issues like the SPSS software the GC pays for. The college is hit with a $20,000 bill for this software and all three cites use it. Wouldn’t it be fair to have all three (GC, CC, and District) share in the cost? Catherine likes this idea and will take back to her team and discuss. The difference between “On Cycle” vs “Off cycle” was discussed. Off cycle requests are for unanticipated needs like a broken piece of mandatory equipment. The “on cycle” request is tied to the AUP The AUP will facilitate organizing the information needed and facilitate directing users for further information related to each resource needed. Asma asked if the AUP will address the redundancy within the various request forms. Catherine said we won’t be able to address this issue immediately, but we are in the beginning stages of both our new governance and our new AUP process. We will learn more as we go and adjust accordingly to make the processes smoother. Pat asked how the AUP will ensure all voices across campus are having input and aligning with our new governance process? Catherine shared that the AUP goes to department chairs and it is assumed all groups are being consulted while developing the plan. If this is not happening, we will fix it. Pat followed up with the question of: how will we measure this? Catherine says the expectation is that there are conversations happening with all the various groups on campus. If we learn this is not happening, we will address it at the annual planning forum as part of the follow-up evaluation. Catherine added that we need to have college wide conversations when similar needs arise in different departments. This may become evident within the Technology Committee and the requests we receive. We should not consider costs when prioritizing requests. We should rank all requests, not just the ones we feel the college can afford to fund. Another goal we should consider is looking to other rubrics used on campus and discern the items. We should also look at the questions asked within the AUP to see how we can better hone our request form. Ultimately, the Technology Committee would like to ensure all offices, faculty, staff, and administrators are included in rollover/refresh plans for technology. Many people and areas fall through the cracks, and we end up asking people to do their jobs with 10-year-old computers and equipment. |
| 10. Revisit/Finalize Off-Cycle Request Document  | Eric asked the committee whether we should continue to revise our “Off-Cycle Request Form.” The committee feels we should go with what we have now, and work out the kinks as we continue to learn. Dawn would like to see the committee set a date, perhaps in April, to look at how our forms dovetail with the AUP. In the meantime, we roll out the forms we have and review later in the semester.  |
| 11. Revisit/Finalize Rubric | Committee voted to go with off-cycle request and rubric forms as is, and revisit in a couple months.  |
| 12. Additional comments, Feedback and Suggestions for Committee | Pat would like us to take the “pulse of committee” occasionally. .  |

| FOR CONSENSUS |
| --- |
| Rubric | Committee voted to go with off-cycle request and rubric forms as is, and revisit in a couple months. |

| FOLLOW-UP |
| --- |
|  |
| Who | Item | Timeline |
| Aaron Starck | Send Eric his notes on maintaining and refreshing technology purchases.  | ASAP |
| Eric | Ask Chris Tarman to a future Tech Committee meeting to discuss the district’s IT plan and project list. | TBD |
| Eric/Pat | Consider adding agenda item to April meeting re: comparing AUP questions with Tech Request form.  | TBD |

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

|  NEXT MEETING: February 24, 2020 |
| --- |