



Technology Committee
February 26, 2024
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

NOTES

ASGC Board Room—Preferred

Please note: We strongly prefer that members attend face-to-face, but we do offer a remote option for those who are not able to be present for any particular meeting.

Purpose: The Technology Committee identifies, prioritizes and advocates for the College’s technology needs and services. It makes recommendations to the College Council for the strategic direction and implementation of technology priorities. These recommendations address technology policies and procedures, prioritization of technology requests from annual unit plans*, infrastructure requirements for existing programs, and projected needs of the college for the future. The committee will ensure that its recommendations are consistent with the objectives established in the Technology Plan, Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan and other supporting plans (Human Resources, Facilities, etc.). In addition, the Technology Committee maintains currency in relation to technology changes and information from industry, the District and the State Chancellor’s Office.

Technology Committee

| CO-CHAIRS | ASGC | ADVISORY |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tate Hurvitz | <input type="checkbox"/> Gian Cortez | <input type="checkbox"/> Agustin Albarran |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam | <input type="checkbox"/> Open | <input type="checkbox"/> Marsha Gable |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> VPAS (Vacant) |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Sang Bai |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Stephens |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andy Timm |

| ACADEMIC SENATE | CLASSIFIED SENATE | ADMINISTRATORS’ ASSOCIATION |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Czworkowski | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam | <input type="checkbox"/> Wayne Branker |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leila Parello | <input type="checkbox"/> Karla Garcia Garduno | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Cooper |

| EX-OFFICIO | RECORDER | GUESTS |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Cooper | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michele Martens | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adelle Roe | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dean A&R (Vacant) | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Steinmetz | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carl Fielden | | |

Agenda

Routine Business (15 minutes)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Welcome | Done. |
| 2. Open Comment | None. |
| 3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda | None. |
| 4. Approve Meeting Notes | November 27, 2023 Done.(Did not have quorum at our January meeting) and January 29, 2024-Special Meeting Done. |

New Business (55 minutes)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5. Overview of Our Meetings This Semester</p> | <p>Upcoming dates we will focus on our action plan including SSO, access/wi-fi improvements, inventory and process for technology approvals.</p> <p>Our next meeting falls on Spring Break, so we will meet on March 18th..</p> |
|--|--|

6. Action Plan Update

Tate displayed the spreadsheet for the 5-7 year plan of rollovers, including hardware and software and estimated costs/plans for updating this equipment. The spreadsheet runs through the 2029/30 FY.

Spreadsheet also includes current tech in classrooms and labs, not totally a comprehensive inventory yet, but a good estimate. President Whisenhunt wants estimates to include staff and supervisors for computer rollovers. Many divisions do not have the funding to upgrade their employees' technology, so a lot of employees deal with failing computers and outdated software. This total is also included on the sheet.

One hyflex classroom costs approximately \$50K to get up and running. The labor, however, is not included in this number. It was noted that the spreadsheet is missing the "switch" for each classroom and this brings the cost per room up to approximately \$55K.

Lab utilization has changed drastically since the pandemic and our downturn in enrollment. We need to drill down on the true needs of our labs to maximize savings/cost. Should we reduce the number of labs? (Always basing these decisions on data and having no negative impact on students is mandatory.) This may be possible. Currently there are 42 labs total, including laptop carts. The average lab cost for a rollover is approximately 60K and this includes the smallest at 15K to largest (Mac labs) at 130K.

Should we outfit our mobile labs with Chromebooks? This would help with costs. If we can use Chromebooks and still meet students' needs, we must do so to maximize savings and efficiency. PC lab vs. Chromebook labs is a factor of 4- or 4 times as expensive for PC labs.

Moving to Chromebooks would automatically require more Wi-fi capabilities including cabling and more access points (infrastructure work as we wanted to focus on this year). This one-time output of infrastructure expense will not be included in regular upkeep. However, we need District on board and willing to do some of the work needed for this.

The last tab on the spreadsheet is a 3-year tech fund plan for dedicated monies. The funding shrinks over the next 3 years. Some funds come as an allocation via the LTR Tech Budget and the other portion comes from the new GB policy that earmarks 10% of rollover funding for technology upkeep. That is why the allocation shrinks over the three years as we will have less and less rollover funding. The plan this year is to get ahead of our rollover plan with purchasing for future needs over the next 3 years. After 3 years, the fiscal cliff will arrive and the unknowns will be big.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>We want a centralized, off-cycle technology request plan in place (this is outside AUPs).</p> <p>A task force could look at our pay printing vendor/technology and this includes the possibility of free printing for students. We will extend Wepa for an additional year while the task force does the work to investigate options/solutions.</p> <p>Another way to maximize our costs is virtual machines. We would pay for server space annually and all our software would be on these servers. The hardware costs would be dramatically reduced over the long run even with the initial costs to set up this service. We would pay based on usage of the software. The downside is basically unknown right now, but we will be doing a beta testing to learn the drawbacks vs. economy of scale savings. Palomar is currently using this virtual service</p> |
| 7. AUP Prioritization Reflection | <p>Bryan Lam mentioned a large portion of the current dedicated tech rollover usage has been sent forward by College Council and is now with President Whisenhunt's executive team. There were 9 technology recommendations forwarded.</p> <p>As for our process, there were some concerns about not being able to interact with the requesting department during one of our meetings. We looked at the AUP Tech Req Process Review and it includes a timeline and due dates (1-9) as well as "Process strengths," "Process Weaknesses," and "Suggested Revisions." This is homework for the Committee to populate with their ideas/suggestions. We want to streamline the process by truly understand the thinking behind each request.</p> <p>Carl mentioned that district and college have different rubrics and criteria for their technology processes. Should we look at combining our criteria so we are on the same page? Something may get recommended at the college level but once it gets to the district, their rubrics are different and some needed tech fall through the cracks as we are looking at the worth of each request.</p> <p>Adele wondered what other colleges do as far as tech requests. Should we make our criteria align with other colleges? Some colleges offer better tech, and knowing their criteria may be helpful. What about local high schools, too? AI is being used at many levels throughout the county ad we need to keep up. This info would be helpful to know what HS graduates are working with and will expect at the college level.</p> |

WORK AHEAD:

**NEXT MEETING: Monday,
Monday, March 18, 2024
11:00-12:30**