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|  ATC CommitteeMinutes |
| may 7, 2015 | 2:00-4:00 pm | L 238 S |
|  |
| note taker | respectfully submitted by angie Arietti |
| Attendees | Elisabeth Shapiro: Chair | Maria Elena Solis: Higher Education Centers (NC, OM, SY and CCAC) |
| Concetta Calandra:-School of Language & Literature | Michael Swingle: ASO Representative |
| Kathleen Canny Lopez: School of Health, Exercise Science, Athletics & Applied Technology | Melissa Williams: Disability Support Services |
| Russ Corpron: Part-time Faculty Representative | ~~Randy Beach: Institutional Program Review and Outcomes Coordinator (Resource)~~ |
| Scott Finn: Counseling & Personal Development | ~~Dan Borges: Chief Information Systems Officer (Resource)~~ |
| Emily Lynch Morissette: School of Social Science, Business, and Humanities | Al Garrett: Institutional Technology (Resource) |
| Lauren McFall: Library Representative | ~~Paul Norris: Institutional Technology (Resource)~~ |
| Jorge Pastrana: School of Arts and Communication | ~~Andre Ortiz: Training Services Coordinator (Resource)~~ |
| ~~Andrew Rempt: Academic Success Center~~ | Todd Williamson: Online Learning Center (Resource) |
| Carl Scarbnick: School of Math, Sciences & Engineering | Vacant: School of Continuing Ed., Economic & Workforce Dev. |
| GUEST/s | Vince Berling |  |
| **Call to order/Approval of Agenda** | elisabeth shapiro |
| action item |  |
| Approval of agenda. M/S/C. |
| **Approval of Minutes from 04/16/15** | elisabeth shapiro |
| action item | Postponed. |
| Postponed. |
| **Public Comment** | elisabeth shapiro |
| Discussion | No Public Comment was given as this time. |
| 1. **Replacement Technology**
 | group discussion  |
| Discussion | We had $75,000 left. Mike had a proposal, which he showed on the screen to the committee. Take funds and replace 5 Podium Computer ~and replace 22 computers for the libraryThere was a motion that this committee recommend that we take the funds that we have and replace the 2008 classroom podium computers and then replace all the library classroom computers at the same time for efficiency with the remaining money and other money which the institution can find from another source and to have the same image on all the library computers preferably before the fall semester. The motion was second and passed unanimously.There was a motion that when the block grant or other funds come through, to bring us up to compliance with modern standards regarding computer hardware. That all campus computers be replaced that are older than four years old. The motion was second and passed unanimously. |
| **Prioritization Rubric for next year** | Group discussion  |
| Discussion | Vince Berling was introduced to the committee as a future student representative. The committee introduced themselves and Elisabeth explained what the ATC Committee is responsible for. The ITC falls under the SCC. This committee focuses on and prioritizes on the academic technology side and makes recommendations to the ITC. We are also a sub-committee of the Academic Senate, which is the faculty who get together who decide on all kinds of academic issues. We are representing faculty from the Academic Senate regarding technology because technology impacts everything that happens for academics. The data should be kept all together. The more information that gets funneled through, that can’t get lost, the better. The vote needs to have more adequate time. We should be pushing to make sure that we have full discussion on what we spent all that time on and that we have sufficient amount of time to vote on as faculty and staff members on the ITC. The group discussed the rubrics that were used last year between the ITC and the ATC committees. There was a suggestion to vote to accept to have a unified rubric. There was a motion to accept the ITC 2014 rubric with the exception to change the numbering that 4 come before 5. The motion passed unanimously. This form will be the ATC’s 2015 rubric.There was a motion to have Carl and Elisabeth send an email to the ITC co-chairs to recommend that there be a link to the rubric to be within the application that exist in the form for the snapshot in the program review. The motion passed unanimously. We also want to brainstorm about directions that also can be included in the environment when filling out the snapshot to guide people to give us the information that we actually need because we actually didn’t get it in some cases. It was suggested to have a few examples included so it is easier to understand. Lauren volunteered to go through and pick out the top five examples to email to the committee so we can choose two or three models and then we can send them to Randy Beach, the IPRC, and Sam Chuey to include. For example, under direction, don’t put the same item in academic and non-academic, it has to be one or the other. If your item includes something that is technology, something that is facilities, and something that is a small equipment item, please make sure to break it up and put it in the right forms. There was also a suggestion to have character limits in required fields. We may want to send an email to the IPRC about the problem about redoing an entire room and how we might treat it separately. We should also bring this up to the SCC. It sounds like we should have a project manager who is controlling the project and then the individualized parts are parted out to the people who specialize to those things. The project manager would still retain control of how that gets put into place. We should have required training workshops available. We want to include definitions of what instructional and non-instructional are. Give examples: Technology includes: Printers, monitors, and software, etc… Facilities includes: Tables, chairs, etc…**Announcements:**\*Meeting-The committee agreed to have their meetings meet once a month on the 1st Thursday for 1 ½ hours.It came up in the ITC that CISO wants to change the global email. Elisabeth did not really understand want she was voting on. Elisabeth questioned about student groups on campus wanting to send out emails about speakers or fundraisers. She was told that this was not an appropriate use of global email. At that point, she felt uncomfortable about voting from a faculty perspective and wanted a face to face discussion. From a technology standpoint, we should probably make it less confusing. People get confused sometimes when they hit the “reply to all”, they really don’t mean to send it to everyone. It was suggested to give staff an education on how to filter out global emails and remind staff what is polite and effective use of global emails and set guidelines in a statement. We might want to ask our union representatives what our rights are.  |
| **Adjournment** | Elisabeth shapiro |
| The next ATC meeting will be March 19, 2015 in L 246 from 2:00-4:00 p.m.  |