

Meeting Notes - May 3, 2006

Technology Task Force Notes

Wednesday May 3, 2006

KC 112

Time: 3:00 – 4:30

1) Approval of Notes from April 19, 2006 Handout # 1

The notes were approved.

2) Quick Updates

CMS Approval: L. Elvin reported that College Council approved Moodle as the CMS for the college. De Anza has been invited to join a consortium to participate in training, etc. San Francisco State has offered the college Moodle installation worth \$2M. San Francisco State would meet with the college regarding installation and migration. A timeline for this project would be forthcoming.

J. Hawk recommended that at a future Technology Task Force meeting the team discuss and consider additional uses of Moodle outside of the just the course management aspect.

The team welcomed W. Pritchard as part of the Academic Services department as of September 2006.

Joint Technology Task Force and Planning & Budget Teams Meeting: W. Chenoweth reported that this meeting had opened a dialogue with the groups regarding budget impacts, DA Tech Plan, and SLAs. One of the major points from the meeting was the need to make smart choices about who to hire and where to place them.

Measure C does not provide money for staffing positions, other than for installation of technology. ETS has requested more staffing for their department to help support the needs of the campuses. J. Hawk reminded the group of the previous Maintenance & Operations discussion at Technology Task Force regarding the proposed tech positions requested to support the new tech classrooms/labs as a result of new buildings coming online. There was a discussion on the support needs of the faculty in classrooms.

3) Measure C re De Anza Tech Plan

J. Hawk passed out a handout named De Anza College, Measure C Prioritization Processes. She explained the handout in detail, highlighting the figures and the processes for the sections, and the timeline. She asked the team to decide on a process to evaluate requests in the likely event that more requests were received than there was money available.

During the discussion, the following questions, concerns, and points were raised:

- o Backup information should be made available if needed
- o Planning & Budget Team priorities are based on program reviews. Technology Task Force should look at the global picture
- o Participation of Planning & Budget Teams in Technology Task Force process
- o Could use DA tech plan goals to determine process
- o Based on previous experience with Measure E, there will be a negative impact to staffing resources if Measure C passes
- o Sequencing of projects
- o Expectations of users, behind the scenes tech requirements (routers, switches, etc.) and staffing requirements (faculty training etc.) would all need to be considered
- o ETS' participation
- o Only look at years 1 thru 3 rather than long term
- o Over \$100K already in requests just from IPBT, so there would be a need to be reasonable whilst remaining competitive.
- o Advise Planning & Budget Teams of rough dollar amounts to enable them to prioritize more effectively.

After some consideration, the team offered the following options for the process:

- 1) Technology Task Force to review
- 2) Some Technology Task Force members would go to each Planning & Budget Team to assist with information on technical issues
- 3) Representatives from each Planning & Budget Team would come to Technology Task Force
- 4) Joint meeting of Planning & Budget Teams and Technology Task Force

After more discussion, the final decision was to incorporate 2) and 3) into the process: K. Metcalf, E. Breault, D. Mitchell, and a rep from ETS would go to each Planning & Budget Team, and at least one Planning & Budget Team representative would participate in the Technology Task Force review meeting.

The Technology Task Force would like the Planning & Budget Team requests to be available a week prior to the Technology Task Force review meeting.

Requests must come in two sections: 1) replacement technology and 2) new technology.

The Technology Task Force review meeting would be scheduled for 4 hours on June 7th.

4) De Anza Tech Plan Process

W. Chenoweth reported that there had been inquiries on the process for the next steps of the DA Tech Plan. E. Breault recommended that De Anza identify a flow of communications between the clients, tech groups on campus, and ETS. E. Breault, M. Kahn and W. Chenoweth would form a sub-group to research processes at other colleges and bring a report to the Technology Task Force.

It was agreed that the Technology Task Force complete reviewing the goals during the meetings and then to break into sub-groups to review the strategies.

5) De Anza's Technology Plan V3 – Complete Goals - Cont.

Due to time restraints, this item was deferred until the next meeting.