

Meeting Notes - May 2, 2007

Technology Task Force Notes

Wednesday May 2, 2007

ADM 109

Time: 3:00 – 4:30

1) Approval of Notes from April 18, 2007

The notes were approved.

2) Open Educational Resources

W. Chenoweth advised the task force the Academic Senate had formed a subcommittee on open educational resources after Brian Murphy spoke about a possible funding source for an institute at FHDA. He would bring back more details on this legislative proposal and also more information on a separate Carnegie Mellon grant as it became available.

3) TTF Co-chair & ETAC Members

ETAC Members:

W. Chenoweth advised he would like to discuss the lines of communication between Technology Task Force, ETAC, and De Anza entities. He proposed having a specific Technology Task Force representative on the ETAC group. It was noted that ETAC is a formalized governance group but the Technology Task Force group is a subcommittee of College Council. The faculty reps on ETAC are B. Grobman and A. Swanner. Other reps on ETAC are L. Elvin and J. Hawk. The team discussed a cross-representation approach and also an option of requesting more regular reporting back and forth. It was agreed W. Chenoweth would approach the ETAC reps and ask them for more regular feedback.

TTF Co-chairs:

W. Chenoweth noted that he would be stepping down as co-chair after a two-year term and wanted to open up discussions on his replacement. Specifically, he recommend the Technology Task Force co-chairs be 1. an administrator/classified employee or designee and 2. an Academic Senate officer or designee. The team discussed having the VP Finance as a permanent co-chair and either a faculty or a classified rep as the second co-chair. One recommendation was to alternate the second co-chair between faculty and classified staff.

4) Tech Plan Implementation & Strategic Planning Integration

W. Chenoweth advised that after attending the recent Town Hall and the joint Planning & Budget Team meetings he had reviewed the De Anza Technology Plan and the Strategic Planning action plans for commonality. He also reported he felt the technology implications of the action plans had not been discussed in sufficient detail. He said he had expected the four institutional initiative teams to consult with the Technology Task Force on their action plans, but so far they had not. M. Kahn was concerned that the Technology Resources Group (TRG) would be significantly impacted by the tech requirements in the actions plans and recommended that the four institutional initiative teams meet with the TRG at the same time to review their technical requirements. In a lively discussion, it was generally agreed that more integration between the four institutional initiative teams would be beneficial and there was still more work to be done on defining the action plans. M. Spatafore advised the group that the Strategic Planning process was not yet finalized and the four institutional initiative teams were still working on their action plans. The Strategic Planning project was moving forward according to the timeline and the technology portion, although an important aspect, was only one component of the overall plan. She also reminded the team that Strategic Planning dollars would carryover.

No recommendations were made.

5) Web Content Management System (WCMS) / Manila Support

M. Kahn opened the topic by giving an overview of why De Anza originally started using Manila. He then stated that ETS supports the Manila server and De Anza is dependent on them to continue to do so. He asked F. Sherman if the district would still support Manila when a new WCMS system is chosen.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- o Manila is a lower end system with limited functionality and the district would be better off with a more sophisticated system
- o The district would not require immediate transfer to a new system
- o There would be support issues with any new WCMS system (e.g. staffing and training)
- o Would the college support two WCMS systems?
- o Would current support issues, such as lack of training, be exacerbated by having a new WCMS system?
- o F. Sherman is working to get Foothill and the district involved with the De Anza WCMS research project
- o Manila is not under consideration as the De Anza WCMS
- o The alternative to Manila is not know yet.
- o Until the alternative is know, decisions cannot be made regarding Manila
- o There is currently no intent to replace Manila district wide
- o Assistance with any transition is critical
- o Outsourcing of Manila services is a possibility
- o Support of web presence is important
- o The WCMS project's initial primary thrust was for the web team to have a WCSM system
- o Concern that users have built complex Manila sites e.g. Language Arts
- o A good WCMS would draw faculty to the new system
- o ETS should talk to users and agree if they would support Manila indefinitely
- o The college should be involved in any such Manila support decision
- o Faculty are invited to each demo session
- o Users of Manila should be specifically invited to the final WCMS decision process
- o Suggestion to move the discussion up to College Council

No recommendations were made.

6) District Email Use Campaign

The resolution was approved to forward to College Council.

7) Quick Updates

None were reported.

Present: C. Bruins, C. Castillo, W. Chenoweth. B. Creamer, T. Dolen, S. Heffner, L. Jeanpierre, M. Kahn, K. Metcalf, K. Moberg W. Pritchard, F. Sherman.