

Meeting Notes - October 17, 2007

Technology Task Force Notes

Wednesday October 17, 2007

ADM 109

Time: 3:00 – 4:30

1) Approval of Notes from October 3, 2007

The notes were approved.

2) Approve Nomination of Co-Chair

Hawk thanked Chenoweth for his hard work as co-chair. Chenoweth introduced Dolen as co-chair to the group.

3) De Anza Technology Plan and De Anza Technology Vision Statement

Chenoweth was pleased to report that College Council approved the De Anza Technology plan and the De Anza Technology Vision statement, which was the result of 2 years of collaborative work.

4) Identify Three Specific Goals for 07-08

The team shared their ideas.

- Smart classroom analysis / review / training / communication
- New/existing employee tech/phone checklist/procedure/FERPA trainings. Identity management will help with this.
- Training: pedagogical tech training. How does tech training fit into classroom learning?
- Coordinate tech plan with strategic plan
- Coordinate ETS with campus priorities
- Faculty replacement schedule & process within divisions
- Identify/Survey: self-service services (students) & need for training.

From the discussion the following main threads were identified:

- Technology Training
- Process/policy
- Feedback

Under the technology training thread the following ideas were noted:

- Focus on classroom training
- Basic tech training
- Specific tech training for how to use technology to enhance the learning experience i.e. catalyst, OmniUpdate,
- @-one does training
- Faculty training faculty
- Develop experts with departments
- Full time tech training
- Mediated Learning Center

Under the feedback thread the following ideas were noted:

- Check to see if we are doing what we intended to do
- Survey the students & faculty to see what they want i.e. Podcasts. Distribute the results
- Needs assessment = needs based training.

The item was wrapped up with a proposal to develop a strategy on what the team wishes to accomplish at the next meeting.

5) Quick Updates

ETAC: Grobman reported on the following:

Security Issues: a several pronged process including best practices and survey of where confidential information resides.

MAUI: Hyperion is still under development. It should be ready by Winter. It would run from both Mac & PC. Presently it only runs

SIS and some “canned” FRS reports. They are still working on FRS and work has not yet started on HRS.

EIS: The vendor demos are on Oct 22 through 26th and Oct 29 through Nov 2nd in D260 at Foothill.

Castillo added that they are reviewing add-ons e.g. Catalyst, Resource 25, OmniUpdate, to see if they can be incorporated. She also noted that the new systems are much more interrelated. Hawk reiterated the importance of attending the demos, especially for power users. Everyone is strongly encouraged to attend and will be given a chance to rate the demos. So far, faculty attendance has been light and she asked that the team pass along the importance of faculty participation during the feedback stage of the process. Decisions would be made in the next few weeks. More information is on the [EIS](#) site.

District Standards: 20 inch iMac will be the district standard. No changes to PC as yet.

Smart Classroom L42: Grobman reported that no-one had asked what was needed in this classroom and no feedback was asked for. She said it is important to ask for feedback so faculty can assist with better planning of the smart classrooms. The problems she had specifically with L42 were the overhead camera, access to the video player, lack of blinds, and no-one asked if she wanted a Mac or PC. She suggested a survey be produced to ascertain what worked and how improvements might be made. Matsumoto had previously reported to Hawk that he has been working with the faculty in the departments. There is a template which can be modified to accommodate requests. Hawk noted that Matsumoto was the only person performing these duties district-wide. The ultimate goal was to have every classroom 'smart'. Measure C is a 15 year process with funding for refreshing and converting rooms. Presently approx. 74 of the classroom are smart. Capacity within ETS to do the work is restricted by staffing. Hawk encouraged faculty to work with the deans and/or department schedulers to request smart classrooms. It costs approximately \$18k to outfit a smart classroom. Projectors and laptops can be requested from ETS. Every classroom has an internet connection.

S42 computers in the lab take a long time to boot up.

Present: Castillo, Chenoweth, Creamer, Dolen, Elvin, Goodwin (for Heffner), Grobman, Hawk, Kahn, Metcalf, Mitchell, Moberg, Ong (DASB), Pritchard, Wilkins-Greene, 6 students from Speech 15.