

Meeting Notes - February 6, 2008

Technology Task Force Notes

Wednesday February 6, 2008

ADM 109

Time: 3:00 – 4:00

1) Approve Meeting Notes from January 16, 2008

The notes were approved.

2) [Electronic Info Security Procedure VI](#)

Dolen had previously asked the team to review the document and bring their feedback to this meeting. This was a very preliminary document and there was already a newer version, based on input from ETAC, which would be posted on this site. Hawk asked if anyone would like to be the De Anza liaison on this project and asked those directly impacted by this document, to review the content conceptually.

There was a new Maui replacement system being tested which would improve security and make access to data easier.

3) Create Sub-committees to Develop Initiatives in: Technology Training, Process/Policy, and Feedback

The group would discuss this item at the next meeting.

4) Quick Updates

EIS update: Sherman reported that the steering committee had analyzed the results from various sources and recommended to the Board on February 4, 2008 that the District acquire and implement the Banner system by SunGard Higher Education. The recommendation was first ratified by the Vice Chancellor of Technology and then by the Chancellor's staff. At the March 3, 2008 Board meeting, Purchasing Services and ETS plan to present contracts to the Board for formal approval and request authorization to sign the contracts. The contract with SunGard would provide the application software, implementation services, training, and Oracle database software that supports the Banner application. The SunGard project performed better but also cost more. The entire system would cost approx. \$11.8M. The original estimate under Measure C bond funding was \$12M. FHDA was paying 25-30% less than it had cost other colleges. Due to the Measure C bond litigation there was only \$9M in available Bond funding and the balance would come from bond interest. The maintenance cost would be approx. \$0.5M over a 4-10 year period. The team made a good selection at a good price. Funding for two DBAs would come out of growth funding. Bond money cannot be used for staffing.

Hawk noted it was often stressful for people to learn new systems and that taking the time to explain the concept and how it would make their jobs easier was an important part in "selling" the college on the changes. When new technology is implemented, tasks may change but there would be tremendous benefits in efficiency and the features would make the system user friendly. There was a need for extensive training to help employees feel more comfortable and to support them in the transition. The timing of training was important. It was suggested that an "operations manual" be produced to orientate staff to the new systems. It was also suggested that we identify functional reps for each section and ask them to assist with the tech training. Hawk asked the team to identify people in their areas who should be involved and to forward names to Moberg.

Omni: Kahn reported the templates are moving forward and should be ready next week. The team would prefer

to have people go through the basic training first, rather than to teach themselves. There would be different levels of training to assist employees at all skill levels.

Podcast Producer: Kahn reported that this was a new Apple product that TRG were looking into. Research has shown other large colleges have had good results in student retention and test scores. An idea TRG were considering was to have volunteer faculty run some pilot classes to measure the results, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The project plan might determine what level of staffing and costs would be involved to make this a viable project.

Dolen, Elvin, Englen, Hawk, Heffner, Kahn, Metcalf, Mitchell, Moberg, Mowrey, Pritchard, Sherman, Wilkins-Greene