Community College *of* Philadelphia

Minutes
Technology Coordinating Committee
09.21.2016 2:30 p.m.
B2-26

2016-17 Committee Members Present (P):

Federation Delegates & Alternates	
Heidi Braunschweig	P
Will Esposito	P
Sarah Iepson	P
Dawn Janich	**P-Virtual**
Nikki Karam	P
Amy Lewis	
Fran Lukacik	P
Craig Nelson	P
Sean Sauer	P
Ron Shamwell	P
Ed Baker (A)	P
Will Miller (A)	P
Administrative Appointees & Alternates:	
Nicole Armezzani	P
Jody Bauer	P
Gary Bixby	P
William Bromley	P
S.K. Calkins	P
Pam Carter	P
Ellen Fernberger	P
Susan Hauck	P
Jason Stein	P
Jameas Zelenak II	
Rikki Bardzik (A)	
Allan Kobernick (A)	P
Gim Lim (A)	P
Peter Margolis (A)	P
Jim Spiewak (A)	

Community College *of* Philadelphia

DRAFT Minutes
Technology Coordinating Committee
09.21.2016 2:30 p.m.
B2-26

I.   **Call to Order**
    a. **Called to order with a quorum at 2:30pm**
II. **Attendance**
        See page 1 of this document.
III. **Welcome Remarks**
        <mark>Thank you to Heidi for baking today.</mark>
        Introductions around the table and a welcome to new members of the TCC.
        Ms. Bauer gave a brief history of the committee and reminded everyone
        that we abide by Roberts Rules.

IV. **Election of the 2016-17 Chair**
    a. **A call for nominations**
        i.   **Jody Bauer nominated and a second was provided**
        ii. **Ms. Fernberger reminded that a co-chair, if elected, should
             plan on participating via minutes etc.**
        iii. **Vote Jody Bauer Chair**
            1. **Unanimously elected – none opposed**
        iv. **Ms. Braunschweig recommended the appointment of a
             secretary**
        v.   **Ms. Calkins nominated Sarah Iepson as Co-Chair which was
             seconded by Ms. Braunschweig.**
        vi. **Vote Sarah Iepson for Co-Chair**
            1. **Unanimously elected – none opposed**

V.   New Business
    a. **TCC meeting time/place**
        i.   **Agreed that 2:30 on the 3rd Wednesday of Month in the FLOAT
             Conference Room B2-26**
    b. Conduct a classroom technology survey (HBraunschweig-
        Discussion/Action)
        i.   Ms. Braunschweig discussed the topic of scheduling of smart
             classrooms. How do you obtain a room and if so what is the
             process? It has been observed that some faculty assigned to a
             smart room may not be utilizing the technology.
        ii. General discussion
             Other issues detailed the lack of maintenance in some rooms;
             i.e., projector bulb replacement.

Community College *of* Philadelphia

Can the TCC conduct a survey of faculty assigned to smart rooms to determine the utilization? Can the TCC also survey those faculty members not assigned to determine the need?

Mr. Kobernick stated that maintenance issues that remain unresolved should be routed to him. He continued by explaining the age-range of equipment and the difficulty in maintaining these devices long-term; i.e., no replacement plan. Allan suggested we form a sub-committee to examine the issues and bring back finding to the TCC. Talking with the Academic Scheduler would be one target.

Mr. Bixby stated as in past years "we have no plan". We need a plan that details the current needs, the future needs, and a vision for the future.

Dean Hauck stated that in 2012 she put a plan together detailing the academic technology classroom needs. She noted that to-date all funding has been grant or operating allocations for specific projects; nothing in the FLOAT budget has been allocated to build classroom technology.

Mr. Baker asked can we update the 2012 plan? Is there a refresh cycle?

Dean Hauck responded by stating we can survey the faculty and talk with John Jones on the scheduling process.

Mr. Kobernick recommended a subcommittee can address the scheduling issue.

Ms. Janich added that the department chairs may be aware of the technology needs of the faculty.

Ms. Braunschweig stated that the survey should ask what technology do 'they' use and what would you use if available. She added that the ceiling light(s) over the screen(s) is an issue in some rooms.

Mr. Bixby stated we should be asking:
 "what do they need"
 "what do they want"
 "how can we support them"
 "how do we determine the real need".

Dean Carter, being new to CCP, stated that we should have a presentation on how scheduling is done at the College and explore options for changes. If department heads are not able to prioritize how feasible is it that the Scheduler would be able to do so?

Ms. Iepson agreed that as a department chair she is aware of her faculty needs but a large department like English could never do so.

Ms. Bauer stated the ACTION ITEM as
A sub-committee of the TCC will be formed to examine classroom technology.
Members/volunteers: Allan Kobernick (Chair), Gary Bixby, Ed Baker, Dawn Janich, Sue Hauck, Sean Sauer, Pam Carter, Sarah Iepson
1. **Invite John Jones for a discussion the academic scheduling process**
2. **Develop a survey for faculty currently assigned to smart rooms. Ms. Bauer can pull that data.**
3. **Develop a survey for faculty not currently assigned to a smart room to determine the need, desire, future expectation.**

c. Technology Plan development (Informational)
   i. Ms. Bauer stated that a new process of plan development was underway at the College. The current Technology Plan will be replaced within the cycle by a new plan developed under the direction of the 5 Pillars and Guided Pathways associated with the Strategic Plan development. The draft plan will be presented to the President's Cabinet at a later date then to the Trustees at the November Retreat.

d. Information Security Policy (Informational)
   Ms. Bauer updated the committee that a small group is working on an Information Security Policy to ensure protection and privacy of PII in all school systems.

VI. The meeting adjourned at 3:45PM
   a. The next meeting will be on 10/19/2016 at 2:30 in room B2-26