

# Meeting Notes - October 4, 2006

## Technology Task Force Notes

Wednesday October 04, 2006

LCW 26

Time: 3:00 – 4:30

### 1) Approval of Notes from August 2, 2006 Handout # 1

The notes were approved.

### 2) Quick Updates

The team welcomed Fred Sherman, Vice Chancellor, Technology, as a guest at the meeting.

*Measure C litigation:* The hearing is set for November 20, 2006. The Bond Council determines if the litigation has merit. It will be heard at the Santa Clara court. There is a 60-day appeal period. There have been other similar cases heard by the Court. The main litigation points are: 1) project list was not specific enough and not included in ballot. 2) the litigant owns property in the district but does not reside within the district so was not able to vote. The board authorized M. Brandy to issue two series of certificates of participation (COPs) totaling \$25 million. Series A, in the amount of \$9.8 million, will provide partial financing for previously approved projects at both colleges' campus centers as well as fixtures for the Foothill Bookstore. The approximately \$13 million in Series B COPs would serve as short-term bridge financing for several critical Measure C projects at both colleges. The funds will be held in escrow until such time as the bonds are sold.

*Measure C Bridge Funding for Furniture Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) - \$600k:* C. Espinosa-Pieb and student services will begin discussions how best to distribute/spend the money.

*Portal:* C. Bruins reported that the portal was up and running. So far, there has been positive feedback from users. ETS was working on improving and fixing problems. C. Bruins manages content for campus and needs guidance on useful content. A quick count at the end of the first week showed about 250 users. The system was scaled to handle thousands of users. No monitoring tools were built in. The Library is reissuing library cards to employees, as most don't know their library cards numbers and PINS. The District has designed a new staff card based on the DASB card.

*Catalyst Update:* K. Metcalf gave an update of the progress so far and distributed an overview of the automation problems and potential solutions. The team discussed the problems and gave input on the potential solutions. It was noted that faculty participation was very important; students were confused when some faculty use catalyst and others do not; and that an automated system is vital as there was not enough manpower available.

*Training:* Manila/dreamweaver/web sites. M. Kahn would work with faculty to provide trainings. Tentative trainings have been scheduled but the details are still under review. The announcement would be forthcoming once the trainings are finalized.

*EduCause study of students use of technology:* W. Pritchard would summarize the document and distribute the main points.

### 3. Membership

The taskforce reviewed the membership for 2005-06 and 2006-07 and discussed the participation of the members. Members are asked to attend the meetings. The Technology Task Force is a sub-Committee of College Council and is charged as a taskforce but often performs as a committee. In a discussion, the following

point/comments were made:

- o Shared governance group - taskforce vs. committee
- o Participation
- o Technology Task Force makes governance type decisions
- o Keep the team as a taskforce
- o Need to have senate confirm participation – take back to senates for review
- o Academic senate was approached for participation
- o Functional groups should be represented
- o Need for the group to be purposeful and efficient and be able to make decisions and move forward in a timely manner.

#### **4. DA Technology Plan Discussion**

W. Chenoweth reviewed the work done during summer 2006 by a small group from Technology Task Force. He asked the team to go to the website and review the plan. The plan should be integrated and relevant and there needs to be closure. Many faculty and staff requests will have technology components and there is a need to move forward on implementation. The college currently has resources, but competition for these resources is high. Permission was granted by Berkeley to base our plan on their template. The Goals were converted to Critical Issues. Work has started on the first few critical issues.

#### **5. Manila**

D. Mitchell highlighted four areas: 1) course management system, 2) content management system, 3) file storage, 4) stand-alone courseware package.

Discussions would commence on the integration of technology. Students want to go to one place for all the tech tools, such as iTunesU/Catalyst.

The discussion included:

- o Integrate 'virtual' campus as an administrative tool.
- o Will Manila / Catalyst be integrated?
- o Concern over possible budgetary restraints
- o Integration
- o Silo analogies
- o No support hence many web sites are stagnant
- o Great need to update the web pages within the site
- o More resources needed to update the virtual De Anza face

Present: C. Bruins, R. Bryant, C. Castillo, W. Chenoweth, T. Dolen, L. Elvin, C. Espinosa-Pieb, J. Hawk, S. Heffner, L. Jeanpierre, M. Kahn, S. Luciw, K. Metcalf, D. Mitchell, J. Mowrey, D. Nickel, C. Owiesny, O. Patlan, W. Pritchard. Guest: Fred Sherman