



**Technology Committee**  
**April 28, 2025**  
**11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**  
**ASGC Board Room – Preferred**  
**or**

<https://gcccd-edu.zoom.us/j/87682561583>

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kalia Nakamura	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agustin Albarran
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Czewkowski	<input type="checkbox"/> Sara Markowitz	<input type="checkbox"/> VPSS-Adrianne Garay-Lee
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sheree Stopper
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sang Bai
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Stephens
		<input type="checkbox"/> Andy Timm

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Czewkowski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Brlas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abby Algarin
<input type="checkbox"/> Leila Parelo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janet Shipstead	<input type="checkbox"/> OPEN

EX-OFFICIO	RECORDER	GUESTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Cooper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michele Martens	<input type="checkbox"/> Niko Crumpton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adelle Roe		<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> OPEN		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Steinmetz		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carl Fielden		

## **Notes**

### **Routine Business**

1. Welcome	Done
2. Public Comment	None
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	May meeting on memorial day. Can we meet second Monday? Will email doodle poll for either May 12 or other day on Memorial week.

### **New Business**

4. Finalize Tech Request  
Draft Rankings &  
Rationales

[Composite scores 2025.xlsx](#)

Tate read through the rankings, including the rationale section.

The committee discussed the nuances of the iSpring software. Like GoReact from previous AUP tech requests, iSpring, has come to this committee several times and ranked highly. With GoReact, the committee recommended a districtwide 3 year contract, and Tate asked the committee to consider doing the same with iSpring, even though it is for a single department and will be used less broadly than GoReact. The funding of iSpring is less costly than GoReact and without our recommendation to move iSpring to a 3-year commitment, the ASL department will continue to request iSpring year after year. Additionally, iSpring is a very useful tool for our ASL faculty and students and without a commitment from the district, ASL will continue to purchase iSpring for its full-time faculty. This would mean students who enroll in an adjunct led ASL class would not benefit from this useful software.

The Tech Committee will send the iSpring request forward to college council as a recommended purchase. At College Council, Tate will include a cost analysis with documents that will go to President's Cabinet where other factors will be considered as they work through the AUP funding set aside for Technology Requests.

Some departments noted they would be amenable to receiving fewer than the requested number of times or even less costly, similar items.

Carl moved to vote on the list presented, Lisa seconded. No discussion needed and will send the list forward as presented.

5. Review Committee  
Charge & Composition

[Governance and Decision-Making Handbook](#)

John C led a discussion on the tech committee charge and comp as listed in PG Handbook. It was noted in the “Responsibilities” section that the committee considers the cost of total ownership of technology recommendations. This is something that we have been told to disregard as we should focus on the needs, merit, etc. of requested technology. Agreed by the committee to strike.

**Committee & Monthly Reports**

6. Technology Updates from  
Other Areas (2 mins)

n/a

7. What Will You Report  
Back to Your Constituent  
Group? (3 mins)

n/a

**WORK AHEAD**

- **Announcements**
- **Preparations for future meeting: Stay tuned.**

**NEXT MEETING: Fall 2025**