QCC COMMITTEE on COMPUTER RESOURCES
An Academic Senate Standing Committee

Minutes
Meeting of April 25, 2012 at 1:15 pm

Chair: Amy Traver, Secretary: Nidhi Gadura
Minutes recorded by Amy Traver

Members Present: Amy Traver, Tina Bayer, Vazgen Shekoyan, and VP Sherri Newcomb.

The committee reviewed the minutes from the last meeting. The minutes were approved with edits to note nine.

Present members discussed their individual committee projects. Amy told Vazgen that she would send him the documents that she has that are relevant to his projects. Tina reported that most of her projects were complete, but that she cannot find the blank ballot that she originally thought the Nursing Department produced. As a result, this item was removed from her list of projects. Committee members were reminded of the June 15 deadline.

The committee then turned to reading across the collected data (CLT comments and Chair comments) for themes. Amy began by reading the thematic comments submitted in absentia by Wendy and Nidhi. Wendy's comments recognized two themes: the importance of local control and faculty/student involvement in technology decision-making; the need to improve communications related to technology to students and faculty. Nidhi's comments recognized the importance of user-friendly and reliable technologies (like Apple products), the centrality of early-adopters in the use of new technology, and the benefits of CLT feedback/communication/community development in tech decision-making and use.

Tina mentioned the themes of IT support and the lack of computers available to students. She noted the lack of IT support for the various technology initiatives in the Nursing Department, as well as the Nursing Department's need for additional computers for testing. Amy asked VP Newcomb about how departments might apply for tech fee funds to satisfy some of these needs. VP Newcomb stated that Department Chairs need to advance proposals through the regular budget process; these proposals might then be forwarded through the tech fee or tax levy process. There is a template for these proposals. These proposals are often followed up with a conversation/meeting.

VP Newcomb stated that we need Departments to think about how they will pay to support equipment when they order and or fund it. Departments need to have budget lines in place for such support, and for maintenance and replacements.

VP Newcomb also mentioned that support for the Nursing Department's simulation efforts would most appropriately fall under the auspices of the ACC. She also that such

support can be organized as overtime work with IT. Amy made a connection between this knowledge and the need to clarify the purview of the ACC and IT.

Amy mentioned the theme of CLT's, in particular, having limited control over ordering tech components for their labs/departments. The CLT's present at the focus group mentioned that their orders are often changed, and that they are not often informed of these changes prior to receipt. VP Newcomb mentioned the need to simplify technology maintenance by standardizing the items ordered, but stated that the process of ordering should not impede the functionality that's expected. The committee should look into a process that keeps CLT's informed of any changes made to their order.

Amy mentioned that the CLT's were also concerned about levels of student vandalism and eating in the computer labs. Vazgen stated that there is policy in place on both issues, but instructors need to enforce these policies. VP Newcomb recognized the role that lack of public space for students played in this phenomenon. There is hope that the development of the science courtyard might help alleviate this issue.

VP Newcomb addressed the topic of unnecessary printing, which came up with the CLT's. She mentioned that this might be taken care of with the ID card system, as students' cards could be allocated a certain number of "free" prints and then be charged for any additional. She stated that the committee might consider recommending this to the Senate.

Amy indicated that she had heard that the CLT's found the focus group, particularly the support available through communication, to be valuable. VP Newcomb indicated that the committee might support the CLT's efforts to formalize the act of meeting each semester to talk across departments; share resources, skills, best practices, and insight; collaborate and troubleshoot. Amy mentioned that CLT's were noticeably and significantly absent from the committee and that every effort should be made to integrate them as representatives on the committee.

The committee decided that the College's 2010 tech survey questions required edits in format, structure, and content. Such should be a project in the year to come.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05pm.