

**Technology Committee**

October 26, 2020

**11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/99966414264>

**MINUTES**

**Purpose:** The Technology Committee identifies, prioritizes and advocates for the College’s technology needs and services. It makes recommendations to the College Council for the strategic direction and implementation of technology priorities. These recommendations address technology policies and procedures, prioritization of technology requests from annual unit plans\*, infrastructure requirements for existing programs, and projected needs of the college for the future. The committee will ensure that its recommendations are consistent with the objectives established in the Technology Plan, Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan and other supporting plans (Human Resources, Facilities, etc.). In addition, the Technology Committee maintains currency in relation to technology changes and information from industry, the District and the State Chancellor’s Office.

**Technology Committee**

| **CO-CHAIRS** | **ASGC** | **ADVISORY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Eric Klein, Co-Chair | King Wong | Marshall T. Fulbright III |
| Pat Murray, Co-Chair | Zhihan | Andy Timm |
|  |  | Bill McGreevy |
|  |  | Asma AbuShadi |
|  |  | John Stephens |
|  |  | Sang Bai |

| **ACADEMIC SENATE** | **CLASSIFIED SENATE** | **ADMINISTRATORS’ ASSOCIATION** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nicholas Gekakis | Dawn Heuft | Michael Copenhaver |
| Desmond Morente (sub for  Jessica Owens) | Pat Murray | Loren Holmquist |

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

Routine Business

| 1. Welcome | Done. |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Open Comment | None. |
| 1. Additions/Deletions to Agenda | None. |
| 4. Approve Meeting Notes | September 28, 2020 minutes were approved. |

| 5.Biology Laptop Technology  Request -- AUP | Eric shared the new spreadsheet he created that outlines all the Technology Requests this committee has received from September 2019 through today. There are four requests total: Biology Student Laptops; Cranium Café; GoReact; and CCC MyPath. Both Cranium Café and GoReact have been recommended for purchase using the CARES Act funding. Additionally, CCC MyPath has made it through all recommendations and is currently on the District IT Project List.  Eric mentioned that the AUP (Annual Unit Plan) process is underway and departments had the opportunity to request technology through this process. The only department to do this was Biology. It should be noted that the Biology Department had submitted an “Off-Cycle” Technology Request for these student laptops more than a year ago, and our committee had recommended this purchase. Unfortunately, the process was not flowing smoothly at the time and then COVID hit. The Biology department opted to update their request and fold it into their AUP this year. This updated request will be sent to our committee members for scoring this week. Eric wanted to make sure the Committee understands the reason for this *duplicate* request.  Aaron asked if these laptops would be loaned out to Biology students and Nick said that these will be used on campus in the Biology labs. |
| --- | --- |
| 6. Tech Request Spreadsheet  Eric | See # 5 above. |
| 7. Check-in with Online Teaching Committee | Janet mentioned that to date, 152 full-time faculty and 289 adjuncts have completed their online teaching training. Over the summer, 133 participants earned their full DE certification and 109 received their Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) certification.  Janet also shared that the GC Online Teaching Committee is working with Cuyamaca to update the DE Proposal Form. Cuyamaca is eager to develop a similar form like ours. Using the same DE Proposal Form at both colleges will positively impact our online education moving forward.  Both Janet and Dawn are working with the Deans on how to evaluate an online course. The Online Teaching Committee continues to work on Zoom bombing, developing new workshops, as well as RSI (Regular and Substantive Interaction) for online courses.  Aaron asked about the process and/or approval of the minimal technological requirements for students to be successful in class. There seems to be a great variation in these requirements across campus. Janet said we do not have a process in place yet, but students can take advantage of training on how to use Canvas. This link is located at <https://www.grossmont.edu/student-support/tutoring/canvas-student-support/canvas-student-training.php>. Some solutions offered are including the technology requirements in the syllabus and/or the introductory letter each instructor is encouraged to send to their students. The obvious issues with those solutions include the fact that students need to be made aware of the requirements before they register for a class. Carl said that he is on the Curriculum Committee and this topic has been discussed there. Some other issues discussed in the Curriculum Committee include notations of synchronous vs. asynchronous meetings in the schedule. However, making the technology requirements known before a student registers is a more complex issue. Eric shared that this discussion has been ongoing since we went remote and there has not been any real decisions made yet. Janet said she will add this topic to the next Online Teaching Committee agenda and report back. |
| 8. TCC/TAC Meeting Updates | There is no update for TCC as the previous meeting was cancelled.  Pat shared that TAC discussed refilling positions that will be vacated due to the SERP (early retirement) offered by the District. If the SERP goes through, there is a potential for several retirements for Cuyamaca IT and perhaps some at District IT. Another discussion was the possibility of moving all IT departments under one umbrella. In other words, an end user would not need to know which IT Department they should contact based on what issue they are reporting. This would create one IT Department for all three sites and end users would have one number/contact for all technology needs. Pat noted, however, that there was no outcome or decision made on this issue.  Pat went on to say that Michael Carr shared a District IT Project List that includes ALL approved technology projects. Ideally this list would be easily accessed and have pertinent information such as projected date of completion. |
| 9. Rapid Response Tech  Teams | Eric shared the goal of the reconvened Rapid Response Tech Team and asked the Technology Committee members for their input. The goal of the Rapid Response Tech Team is to conduct an assessment of what has already been done to provide technology support for students and employees, and identify gaps/needs that remain.  Aaron said it will be critical to understand how all the Technology teams will work together. This includes the revived Rapid Response Tech Team, the GC and the CC Tech Committees, TAC (Technology Advisory Committee), TCC (Technology Coordinating Council), District IT, etc. History has shown that there is very little meaningful interaction between the myriad technology bodies. TCC was created to solve the lack of prioritization of technology requests, and TCC has done nothing to solve this problem. Eric’s understanding of the process was that requests would begin with each college’s Technology Committee, then to College Council (for GC), then on to TAC, then to TCC for prioritization. (Eric mentioned that TCC has only met once since February.) It is apparent there has been a breakdown in our processes. Aaron added that it would be helpful for us, the Technology Committee, to look over the District IT Project List to get a better understanding of the projects. Prior to TAC’s formation, it was clear to Aaron that there were two separate paths for technology requests. These paths created a divide, depending upon which side of the house the end user lived on. Student Services’ technology requests were never handled by the college. Their requests/needs went straight to District IT while other departments’ needs were handled by the campus. It is Aaron’s understanding that TAC was created to help better organize technology needs across campus. Aaron would like to see the campuses have a say in how projects are prioritized. Pat added that she would like to see a flow chart of how needs are communicated across the various committees. Does TAC communicate with the Technology Committee, the President, College Council, etc.? How is technology information/status communicated?  Asma wonders why we have so many technology committees. It seems to her that this is redundant and all these committees only serve to impede the flow of communication and completion of projects. Janet shares Asma’s concern. Janet went on to say that the initial Rapid Response Tech Team developed a comprehensive list of all the projects and ideas, and no one seems to know where this information went. It seems to her that one place for the reconstituted Rapid Response Tech Team to start would be with the original list. To Asma’s point, Janet is concerned that we are going to start back at square one, and all the work the first team did will be lost. The first team spent weeks developing a plan to deal with our remote situation. In response to Asma’s question, Aaron said that one of the challenges we had in our district was the lack of prioritizing technology requests. This problem brought about the creation of TCC. Unfortunately, it appears that TCC has not been successful in solving this problem. Furthermore, Aaron hopes that the first order of business for the resurrected Rapid Response Tech Team will be to look over the list created by the first team.  Asma went on to share her positive experiences at other institutions. In her experience, the prioritization of requests is done by the group who handles and/or experiences the issue at hand. In our case, this would be the college Technology Committees. Perhaps it is time for our district to look at how we prioritize the technology requests. Asma referred to the District IT list and said she would like to see more information shared with the end users. For example, when was the project requested; what is the projected start date of the project; which group/department has been assigned the project; who is the direct contact for questions regarding each project; what is the projected completion date, etc. Without these parameters, we will never know the status of each project.  Aaron mentioned that our main issue is that the college’s do not have the ability to control District resources. This creates a disconnect between the colleges and the District. That is what brought us to our current situation. Jacob shared his concerns regarding these issues. He agrees that our current processes are not working and agrees that the relationship between the district and the colleges does not work well. The main issue with prioritization is the fact that we, the college, does not know the capacity and the resources of the district. Even if the prioritization was done at the college level, it is the district that assigns the project(s) according to their available staffing and resources. Given our current structure, district resources are always the unknown piece of the puzzle. Jacob agrees that once the projects leave the college, we are not notified as to timelines or planning. Jacob is also concerned with the huge project list the district has shared with us. If the district continues to utilize this type of system, projects are continually added to the project list and we have no control over where new projects fall. Do new projects simply get added to the bottom of said list? This seems to be an ineffective way to manage the many projects that funnel up to the district. It would be more efficient to have different prioritization lists that include categories such as simple updates to existing technology vs implementation of brand new technology. Furthermore, it appears that prioritization depends upon who is requesting a new project. For example, is more weight given to a project submitted by the Chancellor’s Office? Bottom line, Jacob would like to see conversations around the IT on both campuses and the district and how we interact with one another, and who is responsible for what. At the college level, Jacob would like to see our projects prioritized by one body instead of having various committees and offices hold sway over where projects are placed on our internal project lists. We need a centralized college IT prioritization body, perhaps managed by the LTR Dean or this Technology Committee. Aaron reiterated that the way technology is handled at the college level is confusing. As he mentioned before, Student Services’ projects are not even seen at the college level as this division funnels through the district. The college needs to have a better grasp on the many projects and how they are facilitated.  Lastly, John shared that one solution to this huge problem is outsourcing projects and maintenance for technology. We should consider folding in the upkeep and servicing of our technology when we purchase them. |

| FOLLOW-UP | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Who | Item | Timeline |
| Eric | Send out updated Biology Laptop Tech Request for scoring. | ASAP |
| Jacob | Create site for committee members to view and score Technology Requests. | ASAP |
| Janet | Add student readiness and technology requirements to the upcoming Online Committee agenda and she will report back. | Next Online Education Meeting |

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

| NEXT MEETING: November 23, 2020 |
| --- |