



Meeting Minutes

Technology Planning Meeting
Date: May 3, 2022
Time: 2:00-3:00 PM

Duration: 1 hour
Room: Via Zoom
Phone: N/A

Attendees:

Will Breitbach, Co-Chair	X	Amber Perez	X
Brianne Brichacek		Randy Reed	
John Lutkemeier	X	Steve Kim	
Becky McCall, Chair	X	Isabella Greenleaf	X

- Call to Order
 - Meeting called to order at 2:03 PM
- Minutes of Previous Meeting
 - No corrections were noted
- Area Updates
 - IT (Infrastructure/Software) Update – Becky McCall
 - The software/applications team is now almost fully staffed, pending a few formalities.
 - IT (Hardware) Update – John Lutkemeier
 - A new Technology Support Technician has been hired.
- Discussion/Action Items
 - Accreditation
 - Strategic Plan 2021-2024 Status Update
 - Will Breitbach stated that the document has been posted.
 - Technology Standards: Assignments and Evidence Collected
 1. Assignment 1: Technology Services and Support: Becky McCall, John Lutkemeier, and Isabella Greenleaf
 2. Assignment 2: Technology Refresh/Replacement Planning and Process: Becky McCall and John Lutkemeier
 3. Assignment 3: Technology Resources Reliability, Safety, and Security at All Locations: Becky McCall, John Lutkemeier, and Isabella Greenleaf
 4. Assignment 4: Evaluation Criteria: Brianne Brichacek, Randy Reed, and Steve Kim
 5. Assignment 5: Policy and Procedure: Becky McCall
 - Discussion
 - Becky McCall stated that Will Breitbach reviewed her submissions to date, and

that as Will observed some areas which needed improvement, she was working on additions and revisions.

- Will commented that the work was a good start. The goal for revisions is primarily to ensure that an external reader would be able to fully grasp the content. Only three minor areas from the notes require improvements: items 1-3. The problem is that the guide changed in January, and the narrative does not reflect that new criteria as closely as it should.
- Becky asked whether one person used to write all of the narrative, for purposes of continuity and cohesion.
 - Will stated that the narrative had always been completed in sections by those who could speak to an area.
 - John Lutkemeier shared that he and the former department administrative secretary would compose the bulk of the IT narrative. He recommended that Becky speak with the Director of Systems Engineering, John Westlund, regarding some of the topics assigned to her.
- John noted that the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) had requested that no evidence be repeated from prior years, and asked how firmly that would be enforced.
 - Will replied that while they requested that that not occur, it may happen, simply as a byproduct of continuing successful practices. Therefore, it should not be a significant issue or concern.
- John asked about the number of pages noted in the guidelines for certain subjects, and whether those needed to be strictly adhered to when putting together the document.
 - Will answered that the ACCJC included the page numbers as rough approximations, and recommended that the focus be on the scope of the standard. Should he feel something requires additional explanation or elaboration, he will reach out. Evaluators will be operating from a content-based rubric focused on the five standards. He suggested that John review examples 1A2 and 1A3 as examples from the Institutional Success Evaluation Report, and 3C4 in technology section, although it also needs some paring down.
- Will stated that the Professional Development Committee performs a needs assessment for tech training for faculty twice per year, but no such needs assessment is performed for administrators. If the Professional Development Committee could schedule a consistent, annual needs assessment cycle, it would be helpful. He noted that being able to review the data gathered so far this year would also be helpful, and that he would have Brianne Brichacek request that data.
 - Another task that needing completion would be to finalize plans for a student technology needs survey. Potentially that could be done through Canvas, or included in the class registration confirmation email.
 - Becky observed that there is an annual staff and faculty technology survey and asked if this fulfilled the survey needs.
 - Will explained that those are about levels of satisfaction with available

- resources, not about needs.
- Becky reminded Will that a survey regarding student needs was sent out near the beginning of the pandemic, and asked if that could be leveraged, which he confirmed positively.
- Will recommended leveraging the Help Desk with satisfaction survey of IT and Ed Tech support tickets. Physical Plant could utilize that for their tickets as well for facilities assessments, although that may require different survey questions.
- Becky asked whether we should include areas of potential improvements in the narrative. Will again confirmed, and indicated that we would address the gaps and include the work as “continuous improvements.”
- Next Steps
 - Will reiterated that the team can use the notes already created, but to be sure to review it bullet by bullet in comparison with the review criteria.
 - Becky stated that she would be sure to post the updated review criteria in the Teams folder and asked for assistance with review and editing of the document.
 - Will stated that two things changed since work on this began: the accreditation timeline, which has moved by a year, meaning that it is now time to begin the self-evaluation.
 - John commented that some colleges are being placed on warning, and that there may be something to be gleaned from their assessments.
 - Will noted that his only area of concern was gaps in area planning for some areas, although failures of planning processes do not necessarily translate into failure to meet necessary standards in regards to outcomes and observed that it was opportunity to improve and demonstrate improvement. Section 3C4 needs completion, and the other areas simply need to be fine-tuned based on review criteria and supporting evidence provided.
 - Becky stated that accreditation takes priority over the technology master plan document. She will try to have a draft prepared prior to the next meeting for review.
- Planned meeting schedule 2022/2023: Sept, Nov, Feb, March, May
- Adjourn