|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ATC Committee Minutes | | | | | |
| september 4, 2014 | | | 2:00-3:00 pm | | L 238 S |
|  | | | | | |
| note taker | | respectfully submitted by angie Arietti | | | |
| Attendees | | Elisabeth Shapiro: Chair | | Andrew Rempt: Academic Success Center | |
| Concetta Calandra:-School of Language & Literature | | Randy Beach: Institutional Program Review and Outcomes Coordinator (Resource) | |
| Kathleen Canny Lopez: School of Health, Exercise Science, Athletics & Applied Technology | | Al Garrett: Institutional Technology (Resource) | |
| ~~Russ Corpron: Part-time Faculty Representative~~ | | Christine Meholic: Interim Director of Institutional Technology (Resource) | |
| Scott Finn: Counseling & Personal Development | | Paul Norris: Institutional Technology (Resource) | |
| Kesa Hopkins: Higher Education Centers (NC, OM, SY and CCAC) | | Vacant: ASO Representative | |
| Emily Lynch Morissette: School of Social Science, Business, and Humanities | | Vacant: Disability Support Services | |
| ~~Lauren McFall: Library Representative~~ | | Vacant: School of Math, Sciences & Engineering | |
| Jorge Pastrana: School of Arts and Communication | | Vacant: Online Learning Center (Resource) | |
| GUEST/s | |  | |  | |
| **Call to order** | | | | | Elisabeth shapiro |
| **Members introduce themselves** | | | | | elisabeth shapiro |
| Discussion | The committee introduced themselves and told who they represented. We may have an action item to remove having a representative from Continuing Education at our next meeting. Please let Elisabeth know if you know of anyone who could fill the vacant positions.  Elisabeth explained that this is a unique committee because it has two specific roles. It is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. In that role, we deal with any kind of issues that are reported to faculty that relate to technology and online learning. We have another role because of shared governance and the needs that came through with accreditation. We also are working hand in hand with the Institutional Technology Committee. In that role, we prioritize with whatever budget we have, what we think is most important of the items that come out of program review relating to academics. | | | | | |
| Action items | | | | | | |
| The minutes from 03/06/14 & 03/20/14 were approved. Minutes from 04/03/14 were postponed. | | | | | | |
| **Current Activities with Program Review and SLO’s** | | | | | randy beach | |
| Discussion | Randy is the Institution Program Review and Outcomes Coordinator. He would like to get feedback and ideas from this committee on how to make it easier for this committee to use program review to guide its goals and recommendations. The ACCJC has made it clear how they expect us to link student learning outcomes with program review and our self-evaluation.  One of the jobs that ATC does is take program review and look at all the information that is coming through to determine if there are any technology need trends that could be included in future technology need planning. Specifically, our campus-wide tech plan which is part of the ITC and a new plan is due next year. The ATC will try to reverse the communication to faculty on how they can work with the technology that we have already. There should be some dialogue going on within program review from this committee. ATC prioritizes all of the items that are put into our academic program reviews by faculty in order to determine what are the most urgent needs for technology to directly support instruction. We define that in ITC as something that students actually get their hands on, which is technology that is directly aiding curriculum. The tech addendum has been removed. It was highly unpopular for various reasons. In the final analysis of it, it seems that the information coming through the tech addendum was not quite getting to the heart of what was really needed in order to make the priority decisions. The tech addendum was also unpopular because of the formatting and it was hard to work with and people really didn’t know how to fill it out correctly.  Randy showed the prioritization survey from last year. All of the items came out of Level 4 of Program Review. There are four levels. Level four is when everything that is a technology need that the department chairs, faculty lead, or whomever did the program review were placed on the spreadsheet. There were 70+ items. Two things needed to happen with that list. ATC needed to look for trends, analyze it to decide was needed to take to ITC in terms of technology planning and prioritize the list. That prioritized list was taken to ITC where they took their non-academic items and blended it all together.  It was suggested to have a link on each item to give the group more information. IPRC creates a spreadsheet which Paul did last year. This spreadsheet had all the information from every tech addendum in that spreadsheet. It had included all the information including the rational, description, and all other information. A third of all the Academic Program Reviews require a comprehensive. That would probably be the only reason to go deeper into the program review. Having a more structured template was requested. Randy has met with Pati Hinck to set up various workshops for program review. One of the workshops will have the attendees understand how our facilities and technology planning works and what is the best way for them to give information about their needs into their program review. They would find out who they need to call if they have questions and how they get their questions answered.  It was suggested that it may be beneficial if everyone knows our rubric in advance of doing their program review so they are aware of what we are looking for and are able to answer the questions easier.  IPRC voted to purchase a program review module last year. This program review model was vetted over the course of six months by looking at a couple of different proprietary software. It was deemed by Ben and several others in the IT area and the IPRC at the time, that having a home-grown system that Sam would create was not a good idea because the creation and maintenance of the system would cost more in people hours than would be worth it. This summer Linda Hensley and Patti Flores-Charter went up to San Joaquin Delta College where they have Curricunet’s online program review module called PR Net. Their attitude was that it was okay to run away from it. IPRC had already voted to approve to buy this. In order to even begin to install PR Net, we needed to have Meta Curricunet. This would mean that it would take another year to install it. The IPRC is pulling back from Governet because their customer service is horrific. IPRC is going to look at two other online program review potentials. They are going to go back and take another look at eLumen. ELumen has within its current existing system what they call strategic initiative. It is designed to create program reviews that link goals and outcomes. College of the Canyons has a homegrown system that they created and are willing to give it to any college that requests it for free. The goal is to have an online working program review module in place no later than fall 2016.  There was a suggestion made that when we do the program reviews that this committee goes through it together as a group instead of individually. Paul and Al suggested that if people need to request information, that they should send them an email instead of contacting the helpdesk. A request was made to have the ATC get information out to the Academic Senate and the Department Chairs. | | | | | |
| **ATC Chair** | | | | | elisabeth shapiro | |
| Discussion | There is a hiring committee for Ben’s Chief Information Systems Officer position (CISO).  We work with ITC and typically the co-chairs of the ITC are the CISO and the Senate President. The ATC Chair is usually on the committee as a representative with another member of the ATC, which is Scott Finn. Patricia Flores-Charter, Academic Senate President is not available to attend the ITC meetings. She asked Elisabeth to be the ITC Chair. Elisabeth agreed, but that would mean that the ITC Chair is not a voting member and the ATC Chair would never get a chance to vote. Legally, it would change the structure that we set up and would have to get approved by the SCC. This would mean that we have one less voice to represent us. Elisabeth has asked this committee if there are any recommendations. | | | | | |
| **Members’ ATC Priorities for this year** | | | | | elisabeth shapiro | |
| Discussion | This will be the first item on the next agenda. Please keep in mind that we have multiple opportunities because we represent the faculty, we have a role with the Senate, and we prioritize. | | | | | |
| **Adjournment** | | | | | randy beach | |
| The next ATC meeting will be September 18, 2014 in L 238 S from 2:00-3:00 p.m. | | | | | | |