



San Diego Continuing Education

Technology Committee
Minutes

Thursday, January 17th, 2019
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., ECC, Room 186

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	<i>Committee Members</i>	
	Jacqueline Sabanos, Co-Chair	Tim Saylor, IT Representative
	Aaron Iffland, Co-Chair	Mary Burns, Faculty, Emeritus
	Edith Quintero, Counselor	Esther Matthew, Dean, Student Services
	J. Luedtke, Dean Inst. Effectiveness	Michelle Fischthal, VPI
	Nathaniel Pitcher	Kathy Hornik, Faculty, DSPPS
	Stephanie Thomas, Faculty, ESL	
	<i>Absent Committee Members</i>	
	Anthony Vargas, Supervisory	
	Libbier Bakit	
	David Mudumbi, Associated Students	
	Rich McGirr, Classified	
	<i>Committee Guests</i>	

Agenda Item #1: Call to Order:

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was called to order by Aaron Iffland at 2:06 p.m.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item #2: Welcome/Introductions

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A brief welcome was extended to the members present. N. Pitcher was introduced as a new member of the Technology Committee Meeting. Nathaniel has been working with CE since last June as a Theater Technician. Mr. Pitcher will be serving as a representative of the classified senate.
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item #3: Approval of Minutes

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VPA Sabanos Motioned and J. Luedtke seconded motion to approve Motion carried
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item #4:

Update and Review of Request Scoring

<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● A. Iffland informed that the Technology Committee had a 100% participation in the scoring. Almost each request had four raters.● A. Iffland met with J. Rivas and J. Luedtke to analyze the preliminary results. Issues in the individual ratings were identified and reviewed. For example, if somehow there were five people scoring a request, or if some of the requests had only three scores, it can be marked as an error. Additionally, scores with high variances were identified.● A. Iffland suggested as a committee to review the average scores overall and average ranking. The committee members agreed.● E. Matthew inquired if possible to debrief the scoring process.● A. Iffland agreed to compiled a debriefing of the scoring process for the next meeting● A. Iffland presented and reviewed the average scores with committee members. He pointed out that the red scores would mean there was an issue with the scoring.● It was noted that not all of the points for each request have been provided, yet. There are still points from the Program Review Committee that need to be added to each request. Each of the requests might potentially get an additional 3 points depending on the scoring provided by the Program Review Committee.● Once the Program Review Committee is completed with this part of the scoring process, it will be added to the scores of the Technology Committee.● It was noted that the lowest possible score is zero, while the highest is 48.● It was agreed that the Technology Committee will send their rankings to the Budget Committee after the additional scores from the Program Review Committee are completed and added.● J. Luedtke’s group is working on cleaning what it looks like data entry errors but, the Technology Committee will need to decide what to do when there is a high variance among the scores of the Technology Committee.● M. Fischthal commented that while she was scoring one of the requests, she realized they were asking for Adobe Cloud and she was aware as a district there is an agreement with Adobe and there is no need to purchase another one.● A. Iffland pointed out that in the scoring rubric there is not a way to identify requests that are not feasible or could be attained without cost. Aaron
--------------------------	---

	<p>suggested that in such cases the request can still be scored and ranked with a recommendation that there is no need to purchase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● T. Saylar commented that going through the requests and seeing which ones can be flagged with some technical information would help facilitate the members with the scoring process. ● A. Iffland suggested creating a sub-committee to review the requests first. ● M. Fischthal moved to create a small sub-committee to view technical requests and identify any that is not support infrastructure or have other funding already available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E. Matthew Motioned and M. Burns seconded motion to approve ○ Motion carried ● J. Luedtke informed the consultant is working on a feedback survey of all the committees. ● A. Iffland offered to create a google document for the members to input general comments and feedback about the scoring rubric. ● A. Iffland questioned on how to proceed with the requests that presented a conflict due to the health and safety box in the scoring survey. ● Members of the Tech Committee agreed to change five out of six of requests that showed scoring conflicts regarding the safety, health and legal component. ● It was agreed that the overall ranking of the requests would be shared with the EGC, the Budget Committee, and the Technology Committee. The individual scores for each request would not be shared publicly. ● For the ratings with high variance (greater than .10 SD) the Committee agreed that four additional raters would score the requests. Names of volunteers to rescore these requests were identified. ● A. Iffland move to have three people score each of the additional eight requests that had high standard deviations. The three new scores will be added to the original scores, and then averaged. Volunteers were N. Pitcher, E. Matthew, J. Luedtke, E. Quintero, S. Thomas, and M. Burns. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. Saylar Motioned and M. Burns seconded motion to approve ○ Motion carried
--	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
--------------	--------------------	----------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a google doc where members can input their comments and feedback regarding scoring rubric • Sub-committee • Score additional requests that had a high standard deviation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Iffland • A. Iffland and T. Saylor • Reccoring volunteers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Ongoing • Thursday, Feb. 7
--	--	--

Agenda Item #5: New Business:

DISCUSSION	•
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item #6: Roundtable

DISCUSSION	•
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• None	• N/A	• N/A

Agenda Item #7: Roundtable

DISCUSSION	
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
--	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Agenda Item #8: Next Meeting

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 21, 2019 at 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. in room 186
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Agenda Item #8: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned by Aaron Iffland at 3:05 p.m.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Submitted by Patricia Lopez, Sr. Secretary, VP, Administrative Services

Approved on: _____