



## MEETING MINUTES

Technology Planning Committee: a Sub-Committee of  
the District Planning and Advisory Council

12/17/2010 10:30 AM-12:00 PM

Library Conference Room (275)

### Members Present

Julie Yarrish, Matt Hotsinpiller, Wendy Parise, Lee Johnston, Christine Miller, Jocelyn Chong, Sal Veas, Bob Dammer, Tom Peters, Steve Peterson

### I. Call to Order – 10:30 AM

- a. Minutes from November 19, 2010 meeting reviewed and approved pending assigned corrections.

### II. Action Items

- a. Wendy and Bob to meet during Winter semester to refine and clarify IT mind map
- b. Tom to look into possibility of SMC obtaining a 1 million dollar per year grant for 5 years to scan textbooks onto CD's for accessibility purposes.
- c. Randy Lawson/Eric Oifer to be invited to meeting (after construction of IT mind map) to offer feedback on committee goals.

### III. Announcements

- a. Tom announced that the Chancellor's Office is soliciting proposals from colleges to take on the project of scanning textbooks onto CD's for accessibility purposes. The selected college would be given a grant of 1 million dollars a year for five years for scanning the textbooks. Tom mentioned that if SMC was selected for this grant (current grantee is Ventura College), then Tom would need to order technology equipment as part of the effort to fulfill the requirements of the grant.
- b. Jocelyn announced that she has been working with Southern California Edison and the Chancellor's office to secure a grant for 453 smart power strips designed to save power usage by providing power to one primary plug (for a computer CPU, for instance), and only providing power for other plugged-in devices (monitors, printers, scanners, etc) when built-in motion detectors sense nearby activity. If testing works out well with the initial 453 power strips, 2500 more power strips will be made available by Southern California Edison.

#### IV. Reports

- a. Steve reported on his report to DPAC about TPC's response to suggested amendments in the TPC charter.
- b. Jocelyn reported on the Google Apps project. A "GAPPS.smc.edu" domain has been created wherein the pilot project faculty and their student groups would be populated. Goal is to have 10 to 12 faculty as well as IT staff testing the available Google tools. Training resources will be brought in during the month of January. Spring plan is to have faculty from various disciplines using different methods (on ground, online, hybrid). With the domain created and the student work groups populated in January, the pilot faculty should be ready to go. Many details such as how the system will tie in with eCompanion, or which Google tools will be used, or how student groups would be populated will have to be worked out and experimented with by IT and the pilot faculty.
- c. Jocelyn also reported on the potential CR-48 laptop agreement with Google, which had not been openly discussed previously because Google had required IT staff to sign a non-disclosure agreement. The program involved the potential donation by Google of hundreds of laptops for use and evaluation by SMC faculty and students, and it had been hoped that this program could be tied into the Google Apps project. However, there will be no CR-48 laptop program because all 60,000 of the laptops have already been allocated by Google to other recipients.

#### V. Discussion Items

- a. Wendy asked about the time line for TPC planning. Jocelyn explained how ISC and TPC timelines have in the past been synced to build a technology plan for the year.
- b. Sal noted that the current procedures used in deciding how to allocate money do not necessarily constitute "technology planning" in the same way Sal would define technology planning. Sal suggested that time could perhaps be better utilized by holding off on soliciting proposals from departments (which would normally be done before Christmas break), especially considering that there is currently zero funding available to satisfy such proposals. Sal also suggested that when soliciting is done, it might better be done by asking departments to describe their needs for the next 1-2 years, and that the TPC should focus on making its plans on more of a macro rather than a micro basis.
- c. Jocelyn said that soliciting technology proposals from departments might be deferred until spring, though that might not leave much time for departments to respond.

- d. Wendy noted that TPC planning should be completed by May so that TPC plans can mesh in with plans of other committees and departmental needs. Also there are various procedural issues as well as constituent needs that should be addressed, and clarifying the mind map will be important in this regard.
- e. Bob suggested that the TPC plan should have perhaps more of a narrative attached to it, where the plan's goals are tied to SMC's mission and goals, and the impact of choosing not to implement a given goal is described.
- f. A sample Technology Objectives Plan from a prior year was projected on the screen for the committee's perusal.
- g. Jocelyn had merged her own document of technology resources and services into the committee's list (not the committee's pictorial representation, but the committee's written list). Jocelyn's spreadsheet emphasizes the multi-dimensionality of IT resources and services, and suggestions were made that it might be useful to illustrate these dimensions more effectively with color-coding or by plugging the spreadsheet information into Adobe AfterEffects software. Bob suggested that he and Wendy meet over the course of the Winter semester to further refine the mind map, with the goal of sending out the results to the rest of the committee before the next meeting on February 18.

VI. Adjournment – 12:00 PM