

**Technology Planning Committee Minutes**

September 15, 2022
9:00am – 10:00am

**MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Sorensen, Paul Chown, Reno Giovannetti, Colin Trujillo, Tom Cossey, Brian Van Pelt, Jose Ramirez, Leigh Dooley, Darius Kalvaitis, Todd Olson**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Facilitator** | **Time** |
| **Welcome Julie**Erik called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Erik welcomed Julie Gilbride who will be taking the place of Cynthia Petrusha in taking the minutes of the Technology Planning Committee meetings.  | **Erik** | **9:00-9:05** |
| **TPC Survey** Paul reported that not many people had responded to the TPC survey but he wanted to discuss some of the questions presented in the survey with the group and get their feedback. Paul reported that the question with the lowest score was Question 6, “Campus location representation.” The Del Norte and Klamath/Trinity Campuses currently do not have representation on TPC. Paul asked the group for their opinion on whether representation by those campuses was needed. A discussion ensued and the committee agreed that it would be good to have representation from the DN and K/T campuses. Reno mentioned that there are certain issues that affect those campuses that are not necessarily as important of issues on the Eureka campus so it would be nice to hear their perspective. While the committee agreed it would be positive to have DN and K/T representation on TPC, they felt it may be difficult getting people from those campuses to commit to participation in the TPC. Tom suggested that it could be made a part of a specific position at each campus so that whoever held that position would attend the meetings. Darius expressed that he was glad this issue was being discussed because the low score on the survey showed it was something that needs to be addressed. Paul will bring this issue up at the Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting later today. Paul reported that the other low scoring question on the survey was question 13. The committee discussed what TPC’s role currently is in the planning and decision-making process. Darius and Brian both shared what TPC used to do and what TPC’s role had previously been in the planning and budgeting process. It was agreed that TPC previously had a much larger role in planning. The committee felt that TPC should be more involved in the decision-making process and that the planning function is clearly something that is needed. For a variety of reasons, the TPC has not been consistently consulted on technology purchasing decisions in recent years. Some of the reasons brought up by committee members were lack of communication with certain constituent groups, lack of knowledge about proper consultation process, administration not consistently enforcing consultation protocol, high turn-over in administration in recent years, processes not being followed while operating in “emergency mode” during COVID, increases in funding making more money available for technology purchases, and use of Cal Cards for technology purchases. Reno said that based on the discussion, the committee understands what the issues are and now needs to decide what the committee thinks will work and determine a way forward. Todd mentioned that the committee also needs to determine if the administrative leaders want TPC to play an integral role in planning. Paul stated that IEC has started to look at this issue already and discussed some proposals on how to ensure TPC is consulted on certain technology purchasing decisions. Paul will bring this matter up again at today’s IEC meeting.  | **Paul** | **9:05-9:20** |
| **Canvas Single Sign-On \ how “drops” are coded****Course cancellations deleted vs inactive**Leigh reported that the Canvas single sign-on must be rolled out soon. Leigh shared a Memorandum from the Chancellor’s Office discussing the Emergency Conditions allowance requirements. Among those requirements are that the District is a member of the CVC-OEI Consortium and has implemented the steps to become a HOME college by January 1, 2023. Single sign-on is necessary to meet this requirement. Erik said there is no technology issue in rolling out single sign-on, it is just a matter of communicating the message to faculty and students. Jose agreed that it is completely doable, it will just be necessary to coordinate with the technology center and make sure all of our ducks are in a row. The committee discussed the timing of the roll out and the pros and cons of waiting until the fall semester has ended. On the one hand, it would be less disruptive to faculty and students to wait until the fall semester has ended. On the other hand, the fall semester ends shortly before the end of the calendar year which is right up against the deadline. Darius stated that from a faculty standpoint, it would be much preferred to wait until the end of the semester if possible. Jose explained the single sign-on process and what it would mean for students and faculty. It will easier for students as they will only have one password to remember. Leigh stated that she could help with messaging and communicating with faculty. Leigh suggested that a joint communication be put out as the other TPC members have a better understanding of the technical details while Leigh has a better understanding of why it is necessary to do now. Jose reported that they did a test run that was highly successful and they do have a gameplan. The next item of business was how drops are coded. Reno reported that there are two parts to his issue. The first has to do with scheduling changes. When scheduling changes happen and a whole course is cancelled in the registration system or in datatel it is deleted out of the system entirely and the data saved in these courses is no longer available. Sometimes faculty have been working on these Canvas courses and they lose all of their work when the course is deleted. The other part of this issue has to do with how students are dropped. If a student is dropped from a course the student is completely deleted from the course on Canvas and the student and teacher are no longer able to access the student’s work. If a student is accidently dropped from class or is on a list for nonpayment all of their work disappears. Reno stated that looking through Canvas documentation it appears there is a way to inactivate students. This can be done, for example, if a student is disruptive to the class. The teacher can inactivate them and they can no longer interact with the class but the instructor can still message them and they can still maintain all of the work they have done in that course. Tom suggested that it be put into the ticketing system to figure out if students and courses can be inactivated rather than deleted entirely. Reno will write up a ticket with both issues separately stated and go from there.  | **Leigh/Reno** | **9:20-9:35** |
| **Office 365 What tools are available for instruction. Teams?**Erik reported that a workshop for students has been scheduled for September 23rd on Office 365 and One Drive and how they interact. He suggested the committee look into other trainings Microsoft can provide and said he would send Reno the guidebook on Microsoft workshops that are available. One area of interest may be how to interoperate between Canvas and Office 365. Jose reported that they had decided to wait on Microsoft Teams creation until after the fall semester. Reno agreed that it was best to wait until Spring semester but that it would be a great tool for instructors to use. Darius said he appreciates any training that is provided to faculty and students. The change from Google to Microsoft can be especially tough for students since most students used the Google platform in K-12 and are much more familiar with that platform. Canvas was also pretty well Google integrated. Leigh asked about Microsoft Forms and if it would be rolled out with Teams in the Spring. Erik stated that they were still exploring Forms but it could be rolled out separately from Teams and he would look into trainings available for Forms. Jose said that he has been in discussion with Paul and Erik about how to roll out Microsoft Forms. He needs to do some more research on the security of Forms and where the data that is input into Forms lives. Erik agreed that it is important to make sure data is secure. He said Forms is a great tool for simple surveys but we need to be confident on the security of Forms so we know if we need to create a policy on the use of Forms or if we just need to inform people it is a tool available for use.   | **Reno/Darrius** | **9:35-9:55** |
| **Future Agenda Items?**1. **Teleworking AP/BP.** Erik would like to discuss telework at a future meeting. CSEA recently added a clause that allows staff to enter into a Telework Agreement. However, there are currently no BPs or APs that address this issue so there isn’t a clear protocol in place.
2. **Website Access on Campus.** Reno would like to add Website Access to a future agenda. It has come up recently that instructors are not able to open up certain websites on campus and he was unsure of the best way to address this. Jose said opening a ticket would be best so they can see what people are struggling with and where the limitations are. Some sites are a security threat and can’t be unblocked. Sometimes it is just a glitch that can easily be dealt with.
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Adjourn |

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.