Meeting Minutes

Technology Planning Meeting

Date: Wed., June 11, 2008
Time: 9:00 AM
Room: 209
Phone: N/A

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doug Meline</th>
<th>Kevin O’Rorke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Albright</td>
<td>Cindy Sandhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Crandall</td>
<td>Lew Schmitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Jackson</td>
<td>Delores Servidio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lutkemeier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes:

- Meeting called to order at 9:05 a.m.
- Approval of minutes of meeting of 5-28-08
  It was moved by Janet Albright and seconded by James Crandall approve the minutes of the 5-28-08 meeting. The motion carried.
- Chair Update –Covered in Discussion/Action Items.
- Standing Reports:
  - Enterprise Systems – No report.
  - Technology Infrastructure—No report.
  - Instructional Technologies—No report.
- Discussion/Action Items
  - Committee 2008-2009
    Doug Meline cited the Task Force bylaws which provide for co-chairs for the three subcommittees where at least one of the subcommittee’s chairs sits on the task force. The current Task Force consists of co-chairs Doug Meline and Lew Schmitt; two representatives from each subcommittees—Instructional Technologies (Janet Albright & Cindy Sandhagen), Technology Infrastructure (John Lutkemeier & Lew Schmitt) and Enterprise Systems (James Crandall & Kevin O’Rorke); and one ex officio member (Catherine Jackson). Catherine Jackson asked if there might be additional faculty members from the Instructional Technologies subcommittee who were interested in serving on the task force. Faculty members’ focus would be on the tools used to deliver instruction to students from a technical standpoint—Microsoft products, Angel and its predecessor at Shasta College, Blackboard (WebCT). Catherine Jackson also commented that if faculty were made aware that the Technology Plan was approved by the College Council, to see that the Task Force had produced something, it might encourage more involvement. Doug Meline concurred that such information could encourage participation on the subcommittees.
  - Review of Structure and Nominations for Positions
    Doug Meline asked the current participants for their willingness to continue to serve.
    A motion to accept the current committee chair structure in place and to nominate all those who are in current positions to serve the next year was made by Catherine Jackson and seconded by James Crandall. The motion carried.
    Following the motion, Doug Meline suggested that John Lutkemeier take his place as co-chair on the Technology Infrastructure subcommittee. He suggested sending out communications (via the faculty distribution list) as well as going to division meetings to report on the Technology Plan progress.
  - Suggestions for the Team That Follows
    Doug Meline stated that the subcommittee chairs need to schedule meetings to build their teams for the upcoming year, noting that meetings will resume when the faculty return from the summer break. Catherine Jackson asked for clarification on the charge for the Enterprise Systems group, and Doug Meline responded with summary points—matriculation and accessibility, HR, marketing, district communications, and enterprise systems (formerly administrative computing services).
Doug Meline reminded the group that the survey response window would soon close, and that it was time to begin another assessment cycle. He noted that the group could (1) identify new issues and (2) determine what could be improved on, for current processes. Cindy Sandhagen suggested sending the survey out earlier in the year, perhaps early April as a delivery target, in order to obtain a better response rate. Doug Meline also suggested simplifying things the group is trying to do. Kevin O’Rorke stated the Task Force could offer solutions to problems that arise, using the phraseology, “Information Technology will create a solution…” He referred to the college’s planning process, noting that representatives from other committees should take their proposals involving technology to the Technology Planning Committee for review. Doug Meline agreed, noting that suggestions from committees such as matriculation could be funneled to the Technology Task Force. He added that the various groups should take their goals and initiatives to the Technology Planning group and then the Technology Planning Committee would evaluate it from a district perspective—the impact on the district.

Janet Albright then asked about comparable planning from the instructional side, noting that the divisions were asked to submit Action Plans by the middle of April, some of which would have had technology components. Doug Meline responded that he would research whether these Action Plans are available electronically, to be reviewed for Technology impacts. John Lutkemeier commented that the Action Plans with technology aspects needed to be reviewed by the Technology Infrastructure subcommittee. Doug Meline added that the Action Plans should be obtained to review for Technology items, comparing those items with the results of the survey (the assessment process), and then a recommendation could be made to the College Council regarding which of them are doable. He stated that the five-year capital outlay plan would affect the implementation of certain proposals. He summarized that the main suggestion from this meeting was to get back to the group’s original focus and to work towards integrating other planning efforts into the Technology Task Force’s planning process. He felt that most of the activities would tie into the group’s principal issues. He proposed making a recommendation that other groups involved in planning have a mechanism to capture and share technology-related items, suggesting that a minor modification to the Action Plans could be made to integrate other planning groups that might be involved.

Janet Albright also inquired whether there was a set number for membership on the subcommittees. Doug Meline replied that it is open, as long as there is representation—it could be as few as five members or as many as fifteen.

- **Other Discussion**
  - Catherine Jackson suggested that the subcommittee meeting announcements be sent to the full Task Force so that any members could attend, if they wished.

- **Next Meeting Date/Agenda Items**

- **Adjourn**
  - A motion to adjourn was made by Catherine Jackson and seconded by John Lutkemeier. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 A.M.