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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Committee/Group/Division/Dept. Name: TECH Committee | | |
| Place: TAV140 | Date: 10/31/18 | Time: 11:00 – 12:00 |
| Committee/Group Website Link (if applicable): Tech Committee One Drive | | |

**In Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representing (dept./div./office)** | **Position** | **A** | **P** |
| Greg Shaw (Co-Chair) | ETS | Classified |  | X |
| Elli Constantin (Co-Chair) | Learning Services | Faculty | X |  |
| John Hritz | District Information Services | District | X |  |
| Lani Yoshimoto | ASG (Associated Student Gov’t) | ASG Rep | X |  |
| Vacant | ASG | ASG President |  |  |
| Inge Bond | Research & Planning | Administration | X |  |
| Vacant | Liberal Studies | Faculty |  |  |
| Mark Garrett | Business & Technology | Faculty | X |  |
| Gaye Dabalos | VP of Administrative Services, Interim | Administration | X |  |
| Nan Biltz | DSPS | Classified |  | X |
| Jeff Pallin | Dean, Business & Technology | Administration |  | X |
| Daniel Peck | President’s Office | Administration | X |  |
| Clint Poe | Math and Science | Faculty | X |  |
| Pat Hernas | Language Arts | Faculty | X |  |
| Vacant | Health Occupations | Faculty |  |  |
| Dat Nguyen | ETS | Classified |  | X |
| Pat Hudak | Business & Technology | Faculty | X |  |

**Guests in Attendance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representing (dept./div./office)** |
| Danny Nguyen | Dean, Instructional Support |
| Thanh Do | Classified Senate President |
| Mindy Carr | Mathematics Faculty |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic: Future Direction/Organization of the Technology Committee | Topic Leads: Greg Shaw/Jeff Pallin/Danny Nguyen |
| Discussion/Key Points Made/Data Presented:  This meeting is a special "Summit" of the Tech Committee which was called by Co-Chair Greg Shaw and all Tech Committee Members in regular attendance, to address the dysfunction of the committee that has come about because of multiple changes, such as the evolution of technology in education, college structure, and dwindling faculty participation. For the Tech Committee's effectiveness and relevance, the committee's purpose and structure need to be re-evaluated. Greg opened the meeting by explaining that the recent efforts of the Tech Cmte have been to change the Tech Plan to a visionary "Master Tech Plan" providing strategic direction, rather than what the Tech Plan has been in the past – a project management document with a laundry list of specific projects. The idea behind creating a Master Tech Plan is to give direction that will become part of the Program Review process, so that departments and programs planning tech requests may reference the Master Tech Plan to communicate alignment with the college's overall technology vision. This would make the Tech Plan a more functional document.  Jeff Pallin said that a main challenge (for technology) in Program Review is to coordinate all of the different tech requests for enhancements and improvements, and to align these against some kind of a master plan. Since there isn't a master plan, it's difficult if not impossible. The second thought is that faculty members should be allowed to request whatever they want, then it should be the purpose of the Tech Cmte to make sure those requests are aligned with the master plan. So rather than asking them, the faculty, to align, the Tech Committee would be the executors of the Master Tech Plan in terms of any kind of program requests that come in. This arrangement would also help to address part of the difficulty in Program Review, which is trying to centralize the technology requests. Also, technology requests coming through Program Review don't necessarily go through ETS. To make Program Review more effective, all technology requests need to go through ETS and align with a master plan.  Dat Nguyen explained that about 80 – 90% of requests go through the process. About 10% get funded through "Emerging Needs" funds, or a grant, and these requests come with time pressure. ETS is expected to act on it and not raise concerns, or ETS is the bad guy.  Thanh Do brought up that in Student Services, there hasn't been awareness of ETS's role in technology planning and purchases. One of the purposes of a Master Tech Plan would be to communicate the expectation of a centralized process. Dat added that through his work with ADA compliance, he's become aware of many small technologies on campus – for example Formstack, Wufoo – which have apparently been funded directly through a department, or credit cards, etc. But these have been unknown to ETS.  Discussion took place on the use of technology, such as Doodle Poll, which is not ADA compliant. Centralization of technology purchases is important for ADA compliance.  Danny Nguyen asked if we want a Tech Plan that is global - sort of at the EFMP (Educational Facilities Master Plan) level - or one that is more operational? In terms of implementing technology that aligns with a plan, we need to question whether this is more readily accomplished by a broader, visionary plan, like the EFMP, or by a more practical guiding document. The goals set forth in global level plans require a longer approval process, and all of those goals are subject to change with the State Chancellor's Office Vision for Success. He has seen Program Review goals aligned with Strategic Directions for the College, or Strategic Goals. Creating a tech plan with goals is good, as long its functional vitality is not lost – things like the implementation process, ADA compliance, an inventory of campus technology, interfacing with Information Systems. The Tech Plan needs these operational pieces to make it effective.  A challenge is allocating time for Tech Committee members to be project managers. This is an issue ETS has raised for years. There is a vacuum within the college and the district with respect to a Technology Office. Previously Fred Chow and Mina Jahan were Directors of Technology, and those positions, which are gone now, kept technology initiatives on track. Although there were downsides to the Chancellor's proposed top-down CTO position, at least it may have been a road to establishing a Technology Office. It's not understandable how a voluntary committee will have the time and resources to be an active, working project management group rather than an advisory group. The tasks the committee has to date are challenging, such as the technology surveys, contributions to program review and prioritizations, and updating the Tech Plan. So it has to be questioned how functional a project management style plan will be, given that the time and resources are not there for committee members to track projects.  There is also a question of submitting all technology requests to the Tech Committee for review. Would this task fall on the Co-Chairs, or all of the committee members? Where is the time and commitment to do this? It was pointed out that all shared governance committees are challenged by this. For example, Program Review and the Distance Education Committee – it requires a committed group of people and organizing the tasks into manageable pieces.  A question was raised about the role of classified staff relative to faculty and administrators, when there is an expectation of voluntary work?  Jeff Pallin suggested that the Tech Cmte's lack of operational focus contributes to the lack of participation. If the Tech Cmte had an operational focus, then participants may view it as a committee that gets things done, and so is a good investment of time and effort. But if the committee is advisory, then participation may slack off because it's perceived as a committee that's not accomplishing specific things.  In response to questions about the technology request process, Dat Nguyen said that communication has been lacking. The previous Co-Chairs and the Tech Cmte had created a process which was a closed loop involving Program Review , vetting, and processing of tech requests. The first part of the process in place has worked, but what wasn't done was the re-asssessment part -- looking back into the process to inform assessment, inform SLOs, inform the Tech Plan.  It was asked if the Tech Cmte addresses Banner, DegreeWorks, SARS, etc. The answer is no. ETS's involvement on the committee is a reflection of its *instructional* focus. However, there is a question of whether the lines between Information Systems (IS) and ETS are blurred when it comes to items such as Wufoo or Formstack being used, for example, by Student Services or Instruction. Should the scope of ETS be expanded, or the scope of IS?  Danny Nguyen pointed out that technology purchases have a review process. There is Program Review for individual requests. What seems to be missing is some overarching, coherent plan for technology at our institution. In previous Program Review models, there was an opportunity for tying it together with the college's Strategic Direction. There used to be a category of funding called "Big Ticket Items." Those were Strategic Directions and Goals, where the college would declare that this year, we want to do A, B, and C. To accomplish these, funds were taken off the top for the benefit of the whole campus. Whatever funds were left would go to individual needs, and those were evaluated. The Tech Cmte would get all of the requests, assess them to come up with next year's Goals. So what we're missing is the Strategic Direction/Goals piece, which is informed by Program Review, in that the individual requests are synthesized into a bigger picture which sets overall goals for the college.  Discussion took place on the expectation that District IS is supposed to produce a District Technology Master Plan that would be supported by the colleges. Is there a District Technology Plan? It was stated that the District Tech Plan does exist, but is thought to have expired in 2014-15. This brought up the problem of a lack of communication between District IS and college programs and offices.  Jeff Pallin commented that in districts he's familiar with where things worked, there was a robust District IS, and ETS functions at each campus were part of this. There was a monthly technology planning meeting, and information was shared *out*. There was a project plan, with a large budget, and the Vice Chancellor's office was going through those plans, as well as the colleges. Each college had a piece in the plan, but it was coordinated. There was a Master Plan which was well documented and up-to-date. It takes a central technology function to do that. So if we have a Master Tech Plan for the college which is not informed and supported by a District Plan, it's useless.  Thanh Do described that she has been going to the Data Warehouse, and had proposed a governance committee – a Data System Planning Committee at the district level. This is for the purpose of having control over our data and systems. This plan was supported pending the direction of District IS. Indications were that District IS management supported this, but it had not come about. There is hope that the new Research Analyst position at District will help drive the effort forward. Although Mission has five Analysts looking at the data, it doesn't make sense for Mission College to lead this process for the district, especially when West Valley College has more Analysts.  It was acknowledged that for our district, things are not IS-led, and such an expectation is misplaced as things stand now.  Jeff Pallin proposed that the way forward for the Mission Tech Cmte could be: 1) Adhering to general principles; 2) Reviving the practice of Strategic Directions to provide focus; and 3) Keeping the committee operational so that it achieves practical strategic goals for the campus. This means that the Tech Cmte is not vetting all tech requests, but rather that it analyzes all the individual requests to glean trends and needs, to set goals.  Thanh Do said in terms of project management, it's doubtful that we have the structure for this. We have limited resources and no overall project management, so that when certain projects are pursued, other people and their projects are impacted. ETS confirmed that they get onslaughts of projects piling up, and are missing higher-level coordination/prioritization of all these projects. For example, the SEC Building is opening, and there are Gillmor classrooms requiring top priority to get remodeled, while Hospitality Management has their own urgent needs.  In terms of action items going forward, do we look at increasing participation among all constituent groups? Do we first look at frequency and length of the Tech Cmte meetings? Or do we go to GAP (Governance and Planning Committee) or another high level body to get the word out that the Tech Cmte is still active and needs members?  Jeff said that he would like to see a list of all the technology problems here at Mission College. If we have such a list, this might help to solicit membership and support.  Danny Nguyen suggested mobilizing new membership around completing the Tech Plan, by holding a summit, invite District IS, and get input on finalizing the plan. We will spend one day or half a day just getting input. In this process, identify those individuals who would be interested longer term, get input on structure, etc. This would take some organization. Ideally the Tech Plan draft would be completed by the around the start of next semester. It should be ready to share with folks, then we can work toward finalizing it.  It was proposed that we need to meet more frequently in the coming weeks to have a draft ready by January 2019.  The Tech Plan is important for Accreditation. It was asked that since the Tech Plan is a living, evolving document, is it alright for us as a college to refer to a working draft? Danny responded that If there is a working draft, yes, it may be referenced; however, this is not ideal because for *evidence*, it should be a plan that has gone through all stages of approval and adoption. If the plan is not formalized, the Accreditation team could conclude that you are not doing it. Part of our self-evaluation work is identifying gaps, and taking deliberate steps toward fixing those things. If we have a working draft, we can write to it, but it means that it's not as strong.  With respect to the idea of a summit to complete the Tech Plan, Greg Shaw said that he didn't think it needed to go that far. The committee was planning on an evidence-collecting task force approach to complete the plan, but we simply didn't have the participation to do it. Working with people like Thais Winsome (Academic Senate) should help create a task force for those last pieces of information gathering. Greg would then synthesize the gathered information into the Plan.  Danny inquired, on behalf of the Distance Education Committee, what is the recommendation regarding a lecture-capture system tool? And generally within the Tech Plan, are specific tech recommendations made for faculty and student services? Integration with the Distance Ed Cmte is important because they do a lot of work on these things. Danny asked if we want the Tech Plan to be prescriptive, as a help to faculty who are putting together Program Review requests. Greg responded that there is a Standards Section which in essence lists the current state of specific technologies. He explained that the most recent direction of thought within the Tech Committee was to turn the Tech Plan into a Master Tech Plan, and it would include a yearly summary of what's been going on in technology, rather than a strategic plan with specific projects and timelines which need to be met. This thinking was because there was not enough participation for project management.  Dat suggested that if the Tech Plan incorporated Strategic Goals, perhaps we could add a broader timeline component to the current Tech Plan. For example, state that within a certain time period, such as three to five years, we need to add technologies to support Distance Education to enable these criteria. This will help us to capture the enforcement of the goals.  If we standardize recommendations for specific technologies, because these technologies have been vetted, and are ADA compliant, would it be a good idea for the Tech Cmte to take these recommendations to GAP for approval? How would the recommendations tie in with College Strategic Directions? Items so approved by GAP would take priority over individual requests that are not part of the larger Strategic Goals.  It was decided that having at least a draft of the Tech Plan ready is where to start, and this is a unifying goal which puts us in a place to move forward. The Tech Cmte would then take the draft to GAP to ask how we tie this into the Distance Ed Committee, etc. Rather than a summit, a task force approach will be used to complete the Tech Plan Draft.  The question was raised if the Tech Plan can be done without quorum? The consistent lack of quorum causes confusion about how to proceed. There is standing list of 18 members, which is category based –Faculty Representatives of all of the Academic Divisions, Two Classified Staff, Two Administrators, and Two Students. Regular attendance has dwindled to two faculty members, one District IS rep, and three classified staff.  A proposal was made to get four more faculty (ad hoc) to help just for right now (temporarily) to assist. Those four are proposed to be: Heather Rothenberg (Nutrition Science), John Beck (Physics/Astronomy), Mindy Carr (Mathematics), and a Counselor who has shown interest. It was noted that all faculty are overloaded, and committee participation is not easy for them. It was also discussed that for faculty who teach online or have difficulty attending, Zoom is available for remote participation. Danny suggested if we pick three things in the Spring and ask a task force to work on those specific things, that may garner some help. We need to get discrete timelines on specific things, and accomplish them by May 2019. In addition, the Distance Ed Committee may be able to integrate with the Tech Cmte.  It was clarified that the mandate of the DE Cmte is not technology focused. It focuses on Accreditation Standards, Regular Effective Student Contact, and training.  These action items were proposed:  The Tech Plan Draft is completed using a task force approach. To this end, faculty are contacted to assist with the final information-gathering needed to complete it.  We all review the Tech Plan (current draft on Office 365) and by a certain date we all submit questions, so that we then start hammering out some of the details of the Tech Plan.  It was asked when the last Tech Survey had been sent out? It was Spring 2018 (Student Tech Survey). It was explained that the Tech Cmte conducts two surveys: The Student Tech Survey and the Faculty/Staff Tech Survey. Each one is sent every other year (they alternate). There are plans to submit the Faculty/Staff Tech Survey to Inge Bond in mid-November. It is hoped that the results of the Faculty/Staff Tech Survey will be able to inform the Tech Plan, but it will depend on what timing works for Inge to send out the survey. The analysis of the Spring 2018 Student Tech Survey was folded into the Plan.  Danny explained an upcoming change in Program Review, and there are differing opinions on whether it's appropriate for requests under the category of "College Wide" to be anything (no restrictions), or if requests must relate to the analysis and reflection the requestor has done in their own program. So in addition to program specific requests, the Tech Cmte will be dealing with College-Wide requests. | |
| Motions/Approved/Unapproved: N/A | |
| Decisions/Action Items/Outcomes/Timelines: 1) Contact four faculty to ask them for ad hoc Tech Cmte participation, to help with information gathering which will enable completion of the Tech Plan. 2) Complete the Tech Plan. 3) Tentative timeline is to complete the Draft by February 2019, and the final Plan by May 2019. From the Task Force, a few specific items will be identified to work on during the Spring 2019 semester. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic: ADDENDUM | Greg Shaw (Email) |
| **From:** Gregory Shaw  **To:** [Jeffrey Pallin](mailto:Jeffrey.Pallin@missioncollege.edu); [Danny Nguyen](mailto:danny.nguyen@missioncollege.edu); [Thanh Do](mailto:Thanh.Do@missioncollege.edu); [Dat Nguyen](mailto:Dat.Nguyen@wvm.edu); [Nan Biltz](mailto:nan.biltz@missioncollege.edu); [Mindy Carr](mailto:Mindy.Carr@missioncollege.edu); [Elli Constantin](mailto:Elli.Constantin@missioncollege.edu)  **Cc:** [Daniel Peck](mailto:daniel.peck@missioncollege.edu); [Leandra Martin](mailto:Leandra.Martin@missioncollege.edu)  **Subject:** Tech Committee support  **Date:** Thursday, November 01, 2018 3:25:42 PM  All,  I appreciate your thoughtful participation in our ‘summit’ meeting. We talked around a number of issues such as project management, tech management organizational challenges, alternative tech committee structures and mandates, effectiveness of the Tech Master Plan, fuzzy objectives, etc.  The action plan to utilize this core group and possibly other direct recruits to get a final or near final draft of the Tech Master Plan done by a January/February 2019 deadline (to coordinate with/support the ISER timeline), is a good one. We will target a follow up focus on the committee’s structural issues for Spring 2019.  Throughout the discussion, I just couldn’t shake the feeling that something was missing in the suggestions that ‘better objectives’ or more ‘project management’ or better recruitment would result in renewed interest. Sleeping on it, literally, resulted in what I think was an epiphany in the early hours. We were looking at trees and missing the forest…missing the elephant in the room. We mentioned the Distance Learning Committee as a successful example. But what was unique about the DLC? TC seemed so similar. But here’s the difference: they are a dedicated group solving real issues ranging from pedagogy to technological tools, serving the very real needs of the members.  There is Ownership. They participate because there is tangible reward for the effort volunteered. I am going to posit that to be true for any successful committee.  The DISPAC (District Tech Committee) is another example. It was moribund until Ron Smith had a concrete need for a group vetting enterprise technology questions. He brought the committee back to life.  The Mission Tech Committee arose in a time when classroom and teaching technology was a record player and a transparency projector. The technology that is now in every classroom was but a vague dream. Faculty were excited to bring innovation to the classroom and the Tech Committee was formed as a forum for ways to make that happen that suited their needs. But that task has been realized. And in spite of what seems to be a blinding evolution of technology in general, changes in the classroom are slowing as the classroom tech matures. In general, current classroom tech meets the teaching style needs of most faculty. Certainly there are niche areas of experimentation and unique approaches, but that is handled through Program Review consultation. This is not to say there won’t be other seismic shifts around the corner. But for now, for most stakeholders, what we have works. There is not the pressing need for getting heard.  Sure there are institutional ‘needs’ for some of the Tech Committee activities, such as accreditation evidence, but that’s pretty esoteric and not too tangible to our traditional participants. So they have drifted away to more pressing concerns. Those of us who remain I assume do so more out of a sense of institutional responsibility than a need satisfied. To make matters even less fulfilling, we go through the traditional motions of surveys and MP revisions knowing that those documents don’t see much light of day, informing institutional decisions. A ‘thou must consult TC documents’ rule was considered and abandoned. You can’t push progress. It’s got to be a pull situation.  So, I realized it all comes back to Ownership. A committee has to serve a need for someone, and that’s the someone who needs to own it if the committee is to be successful. There is a vacuum (as ETS has belabored) in campus/district tech management. Whether it be an instructional designer or tech manager or director or VP or CTO, we do not have a person or office with real needs that a technology committee could be charged with addressing. GAP is nominally TC’s director, but that committee doesn’t seem to need it much, for all the interaction there is. For GAP’s purposes, a task force working as needed to create and analyze Tech surveys and update the Tech MP might better suit the bill. Coincidentally the heyday of the Tech Committee was during the era of the Fred Chow/Mina Jahan tech directorships. Just saying…  Faculty clearly no longer have needs that drive a need for TC ownership. As noted, they have the Distance Learning Committee which is serving the needs that the Tech Committee once filled for faculty. The Tech Committee has sort of become orphaned between the uniquely faculty specifics of the DLC and campus-wide needs, which have become more enterprise/District.  Identifying new needs, role, ownership for the tech committee didn’t come with my wee hours musings, so it is something I will need to defer to a group of better minds than mine.  Specifics can be debated, but I have little doubt that this analysis comes close to the heart of the matter. It’s going to be a matter of finding the Thanh’s, with real concerns and real need to bring areas of technology forward, and getting them engaged in driving the Tech Committee.  More conversation to come, perhaps, when the core group reconvenes in a couple of weeks to lay out the project plan for TMP completion.  Thanks, Greg | |
|  | |