

## ATAC / ITAC Working Group Status of Recommendations from 5/16/16

Members: Dave Dillon, Janet Gelb, Donna Hajj, Nicole Jones, Kerry Kilber Rebman, Katrina VanderWoude

1. Combine ATAC and ITAC to encompass all technology. We believe this will foster better communication and planning between student services and instruction. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
2. Restructure campus technology committees to include all technology to mirror district committee. *Both colleges are working on this and will need to vet through campus processes.*
3. Format of campus and district technology committees should be to ask for a call for agenda items so that active discussion can take place and recommendations can be made; reporting out should be avoided. Project status can be provided via a list/matrix. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
4. Committees should have the ability to make decisions via email, if timely. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
5. Update the Composition. Two suggestions are to add the SSSP Technology Coordinators from both campuses and the Instructional Design Technology Specialists from both campuses and district. The working group will provide a draft updated composition and charge for consideration. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
6. Reinstate the chair being from one of the campuses as per current charge. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
7. Extend the meeting time of new combined committee to 1.5 hours. *DONE per draft TAC charge*
8. Change the time of the meeting to ensure VPs from both colleges can attend. If they cannot attend, an appointee who has the authority to make decisions must be designated.
9. *Agendas and Minutes should be posted for each meeting. This is being done already.*

Considerations for the Technology Coordinator Council (TCC):

1. Add the SSSP Technology Coordinator from both campuses. The current charge allows for one faculty and it will most likely be an instructional faculty member. We feel it important to have a student services representative from both college as well. While this request is being considered, we would like to request that Dave Dillon and Donna Hajj be invited *to future meetings.*
2. Add a DSPS Representative from each college to the TCC.
3. Provide transparency on how items are placed on the IS Action List and how they are prioritized. *This can be handled via the Proposed Process for Placing Projects on the Matrix (see Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16).*
4. Create process with criteria, structure and categories for approval and prioritization of the IS Action List, including the allocation of resources. Example: Student Services would like to hire the consultant back for Accuplacer (Emily) to make some additional updates. How would this be requested and approved? *This can be handled via the Proposed Process for Placing Projects on the Matrix and the Proposed Criteria (see Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16).*
5. Consider using a matrix format for the Action List, so as to include progress, any barriers to completion and campus and district leads for the project. *This is recommended on the draft TAC Charge.*
6. Current IS Action Item list should be prioritized using the newly established process.
7. Leave more operational decisions to campuses and avoid requiring approval from district committees. This would need to be defined. Example: whiteboard for Nursing at Grossmont. *Addressed by explanation on the Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16.*
8. Identify project managers / leaders on each campus for each project and clearly define their roles. *Addressed by Proposed Standard Operating Procedure for Implementation of New Products in the Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16.*

9. Ensure District IS has appropriate funding to manage projects in a timely manner. For instance, if appropriate in-house staffing is not available, allow for purchasing outside support from the vendor or other resource. Addressed by explanation on the Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16.
10. Currently, ATAC and ITAC charges indicate they should be making recommendations to Chancellor's Cabinet, including priorities and resource allocation. Will they continue to do this and instead make the recommendations to the TCC? Addressed via draft TAC charge and clarified in the Working Group Recommendations dated 7/25/16
11. If the TCC only meets quarterly, there is a concern that progress on projects will be delayed. Consider setting regular monthly meetings or allow for decisions to be made via email, if timely