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|  ATC CommitteeMinutes |
| October 17, 2016 | 1:20-3:20 pm | L 238 N |
|  |
| note taker | respectfully submitted by angie Arietti |
| Attendees | Emily Lynch Morissette: Chair | JC Hernandez: ASO Representative |
| Scott Finn: Counseling & Student Support Programs | Vacant: Disability Support Services |
| Bernard Gonzales: Part-Time Faculty Representative  | Vacant: School of Language & Literature |
| Ari Hornick: School Business & Technology | Vacant: School of Wellness, Exercise Science, & Athletics |
| Joachim Latzer: School of Mathematics, Sciences & Engineering | ~~Dan Borges: Chief Information Systems Officer (Resource)~~ |
| Lauren McFall: Library Representative | ~~Al Garrett: Institutional Technology (Resource)~~ |
| Mark Meadows: Instructional Support Services & Continuing Education | Brett Jones: Institutional Technology (Resource) |
| ~~John Rieder: Academic Success Center~~ | ~~Paul Norris: Institutional Technology (Resource)~~ |
| Tracy Schaelen: Distance Education Program | Hector Reyes: Institutional Technology (Resource) |
| ~~Maria Elena Solis: Higher Education Centers (NC, OM, SY and CCAC)~~ | ~~Andre Ortiz: Training Services Coordinator (Resource)~~ |
| Micajah Truitt: School of Arts, Communication & Social Science | ~~Todd Williamson: Online Learning Center (Resource)~~ |
|  | Susan Yonker: Guest |  |
| **Call to order/Approval of Agenda** | emily lynch morissette |
| action item |  |
| Approval of agenda. M/S/C. |
| **Approval of Minutes from 10/03/16** | emily lynch morissette |
| action item | The minutes were approved as presented. |
| Approval of minutes. M/S/C. |
| **Public Comment** | group |
| information | * Emily introduced our new student representative, JC Hernandez. He is well versed in technology. His greatest asset is his enthusiasm. He is appreciated for his positive outlook and drive.
* Scott Finn is back!
 |
| 1. **2015-2016 Institutional Equipment Replacements**
 | emily lynch morissette |
| Discussion | Emily passed out a list of last year’s Replacement 2015-16 Academic Computers. The replacement is different than what comes to us for Program Review. We don’t prioritize it with the same prioritization rubric. We may just take a look to see what is next as far as the rotation. When we get to this year’s prioritization, Emily has moved things so that buildings and rooms are together. It has asked her to do this, so we can get all the rooms done at once. Last year, we had an important request to replace all the computer in the library. So, we bumped the library up and bumped Jay Henry’s Recording Arts down. It was necessary to get all the computers in the library done at once, so there wouldn’t be three or four different versions. |
| **Prioritize this year’s Instructional Equipment Replacements** | emily lynch morissette |
|  | Emily took the excel spreadsheet that she received from Paul Norris and ended up taking out some stuff that wasn’t important to us. The only thing that Emily moved around from the prioritization list was to put all the computers from a certain room in the same place. For example, Room 620 had computers at the top and the bottom of the list. She has gone ahead and put a total amount of what is asked for each room. Our budget is approximately $340,000. If we keep this list as is, we may go over if we do Room 205. Perhaps, we may need to skip Room 205. It looks like in order to meet our budget, this should probably happen. We may want to do room 33 and 35 instead. Emily recommended funding Jay Henry’s area because he has been bumped two years in a row. It might make sense to see where all rooms are connected on the list. Hector said that another photo lab has been skipped twice as well. Jay Henry’s requirement for his classroom that is on the sheet says $2,500 per machine and he doesn’t feel that it is actually enough and that more money would be required. Jay is asking for a minimum of 32 G of RAM. Keep in mind that IT wants our prioritization by November 1, 2016. Hector is actually having a meeting with Jay Henry, Dan Borges, and Bill Kinney this Wednesday, from Noon-12:30 P.M. Emily said that she would like to receive an invite to this meeting and perhaps get some questions answered that she can bring back to our meeting on October 31, 2016. The committee decided to table this discussion until October 31st, so we can hear back from Emily. We will also try to invite Jay Henry to come to our meeting as well. The specs that Jay Henry submitted was from 2009. Prices have changed since then. Jay has 42 computers, keep in mind that you would need to upgrade the software as well. There was also a suggestion to match up servers with rooms. There was a recommendation to have IT folks that we upgrade the software and institutionalize it. To be clear, we usually have about $340,000 to replace computers every year. We have about 1 million to update software. Do we want to put some of that money towards updating technology? We would have to prioritize this as a committee. There are a lot of site licenses. Jay Henry will also require additional peripherals. One of the reasons we passed him up for the last two years, is because we did not have the budget. Emily will report back after the meeting and tell us exactly it is what he needs and how much it will cost. Please take another look at the spreadsheet and send Emily any questions that you might have before our meeting on October 31, 2016. |
| **Institutional Technology Tech Definition** | emily lynch morissette |
|  | Emily handed out an IT Technology Definition worksheet. Micajah brought up a very good point. What is our purview? What do we prioritize? The second paragraph really applies to us. The committee discussed the definitions and discussed how we could change some of it to come up with our own definitions. What would we call a category for a keyboard? Perhaps, a peripheral that helps keep a computer run? Are microscopes connected to a computer? The Biology/Chemistry microscopes are.  |
| **ATC Prioritization Rubric v. Facilities Rubric**  |  emily lynch morissette |
| Discussion | Everyone here should have received Emily’s email with the 5 things that we are looking for when doing your technology request:* Urgency
* Collaboration
* Sustainability
* Growth
* Efficiency

Facilities Guidelines for Budgeting is based on:* Safety and Health (5)
* Academic Accreditation or Standard (4)
* Student, Program, or Department Achievement (3)
* Savings, Cost Avoidance, and/or Efficiency (2)
* Campus Environment, Community Aesthetics, and/or Legacy (1)

They are both a part of if you needs these things, then you will not be able to serve your students. There is curriculum developed specifically to teach flash photography, so a flash would be needed to teach this class. We are still trying to figure out what the difference is in equipment and technology. If it is over $5,000, then it is considered major technology. If it is under $5,000 then it is considered minor technology, etc. We could adopt IT’s definition of technology and take out the administrative stuff and be able to prioritize what we need. There was a suggestion to keep the definition general and vague. Perhaps we can speak with Susan Yonker and Linda Hensley to see what they have ran into in the past. We can all agree that a power drill wouldn’t come to this committee. Susan explained that the Institutional handbook would answer a lot of this committees questions.There are 8 categories for Resource Allocation:1. Major Equipment (over $5,000)
2. New Technology\*
3. Facilities (Not included in Bond Projects or Planned Renovations)
4. Uncategorized Requests/Needs
5. Human Resources Request for Classified, Professionals, Confidential
6. Human Resources Request for Faculty\*\*
7. Minor Equipment (Under $4,999)
8. 8 Replacement Technology\*

We need to come up with an Academic Technology definition. If we have questions, then we can have a discussion. There was a suggestion to have the latest version of this document posted. Emily will write up an academic technology definition and get back to us at our next meeting. You can send any suggestions that you may have to Emily.Susan is letting us know that Linda Hensley has told us that if we get something that we do not think belongs here, then we would send it to another place. Take a look at the 8 categories above. We do number 2 and number 8. For replacement technology, we only get $340,000 for the year. Susan let us know that #4 Overarching needs has been changed to Uncategorized Request/Needs. A question was asked if we could bundle items as long as it equals $2,500 in item #2. The answer was yes. |
| **Program Review Process** | Susan yonker |
| Discussion | Someone asked Susan how do we do our Form Stack appropriately, so it will get approved? An important factor would be to use our rubric. Susan also explained that overhead projectors would go with Facilities according to Everett. So, if we as a committee agree that something is not technology, then Emily would need to speak with other chairs of other committees to find out where the item needs to go appropriately. Susan usually tells people to use the rubric below and give as much detail as possible. * Urgency
* Collaboration
* Sustainability
* Growth
* Efficiency

You would start with the Action Step and use the data that you have. There is going to be a rationale area that allows 1,000 characters. The description should have some of the rubric in it as well. This committee will only get rationale and descriptions. According to the ITC committee, you don’t need to put an amount. It may be good to show how it aligns with the college. This committee only gets the rationale and the description. It doesn’t get to see a lot of the other information. Susan collects the program reviews and gives it to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. There is an hourly worker assigned 15 hours a week to get these sent out to the committees in an excel sheet. Then it would come to this committee. If people want to beef up their request, then it would go into their Action Step. Susan is meeting with Linda this week to discuss the handing over of the documents and she will let her know that this committee would like to see the data supporting the requests.In the rationale, explain as much as you can. There was a suggestion to ask ITC to put more fields in. There was also a suggestion that if an item had to do with minor equipment, then your rationale should include the Facilities rubric and if it had to do with technology, it should include the ATC’s rubric. It may make is easier for people to understand and not lose the detail. Susan is trying to get more faculty representatives to be on these committees. Susan explained that the form is not going to change this year. It could change for next year, but people really don’t seem to like change. Susan said that she is more than happy to work one-on-one with any individual who needs her assistance. Susan and Emily discussed that in the future, to have the rubric on the form so the faculty know what we are looking for. All the rubrics are available in the handbook. They also discussed how important it was for ATC to put our more information regarding the forms. Another confusion that was brought up from last year was how we are supposed to bundle things. The way one person read the snapshot was that you pick an action step and the resources supports that action step. It was his understanding that a bundle is all the things that takes to complete that action step. For example, if the goal is to be able to improve SLO’s and have students be able to use on location lighting. That would require resources such as: a laptop, camera, portable lighting set up, platform tripod. Would all of these items be bundled instead of being listed as separate things? It was suggested that if the item runs independently, then do it separately.Kathy Tyner actually sent out an email to let everyone know what was funded in the past. Having faculty representatives of the IPRC is very important. Susan is trying to get the word out for next year. So, the program review is due by November 1st. It will go to the deans by December 15th. Then it is supposed to go to Level 1 by February 1st. Susan is not sure of how much the snapshot information is going to make its way to the deans.  |
| **Adobe E-Sign** | emily lynch morissette |
| Discussion | Emily spoke with IT and they have not told her much, only that Adobe E-sign is probably the cheapest version to go with. It will cost $1.00 per signature. We spoke about DocuSign as being paid $4,000 a year, so they decided that might be more affordable. Emily has put E-sign or something like this into her program review. If you can put it in your program review, this would be helpful. We do have one million to upgrade software. It is really important to have items that can be electronically signed. It would make the signature process faster, because the average document requires at least five signatures. This process can take up to 2-3 days to collect all of the signatures. We need to impress upon ITC that this is something that we want as an institution. It should not just be considered academic technology, it should be considered institutional. It would be more helpful if we put it in our program reviews.  |
| **Blocked Websites** | emily lynch morissette |
| Discussion | Lauren gave Emily a list of the 10,000 websites that have been currently blocked. Most of them are indeed porn sites. Emily did find that YouTube LinkedIn, and Facebook are still blocked in certain classrooms. There really isn’t a procedure to get your classroom unrestricted according to Hector. There are still some faculty that are upset that some of these sites are still blocked from their classrooms. There are some legitimate sites that instructors use that are on the list. Do we want to as a group, advocate a procedure to remove YouTube, Facebook, and LinkedIn from that list? Are there 1st Amendment issues? The issue is that certain professors went to IT to have certain websites blocked in their classrooms. Now there are different professors in these classrooms and they want those websites back. There was a suggestion to speak with the Academic Senate about this issue. Emily will email Andrew to take it the Academic Senate and speak about the 1st Amendment issue and to have a standard option for blocked websites. She will report back to us at our next meeting on October 31st. |
| **Adjournment** | emily lynch morissette |
| The next ATC meeting will be October 31, 2016 from 1:20-3:20 p.m. in Room L 238 N. |