Tech Users Advisory Group
Minutes
Friday, April 1, 2011
1:00 p.m.
2-614

Present: Bill Becker, Jon Blumhardt, Brett Bulseco, Nida Chock, Rob Edmondson, Kyle Higa, Erika Lacro, Myrna Patterson, Scotty Rhode, Paul Sherard, Kelly So, Jeff Stearns, Rose Sumajit, Nova Suniga, Vern Takebayashi, Jonathan Wong

Absent: Stephanie Antolin, Howard Kam, Emily Kukulies, Sam Rhoads

Guest: Nick Harris, Mike Rota

I. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

II. Minutes

Minutes of the February meeting were approved as submitted by Kyle Higa

III. Reorg Discussion

The Reorg Subcommittee presented its recommendations for the reorganization of Technology Support. Bill Becker presented the majority opinion of the Subcommittee with Jon Blumhardt presenting the minority opinion. Report details were as follows:

Bill presented the original plans of the subcommittee (Plan A, B and C) for the reorg:

Plan A

Requires: CIO (E&M level), a Senior Academic Technology Officer (11-month faculty) with all technology support functions following down under the CIO

Plan B -- Premise:

Requires: Dean of Academic Support

SATO as an 11-month faculty to head an Educational Technology Group

Network Infrastructure and Help Desk functions -- placed under VCAA
Plan C -- Premise: IT is a support service

In light of a reorg meeting the VCAA held with the IT group the Plan was revised to a Modified Plan AB reflective of the resource limitations of the college:

Modified Plan AB

Dean of Academic Support

IT Leader position as an APT Band C

The Educational Technology functions will report to the proposed Dean of Academic Support with the IT functions reporting to an APT Band C

The main Organizational Structure includes for “groups”: an Ed Tech Group, a User Support/Help Desk Group, a Network Infrastructure Group and a Non-Academic Group

------

Jon Blumhardt conducted a presentation providing a minority opinion of the Reorg Subcommittee offering a slightly modified counter proposal of the Modified Plan AB. Some highlights of Jon’s presentation included:

Clarifying the differences between Educational Technology and Information Technology

The Instructional Design and Media Production processes

Workload issues and challenges facing the current EMC needing to provide services to everyone: academic/ETEC vs. media, a/v support, etc. Who do you say “no” to?

Jon’s recommendations that differ from the Modified Plan AB Bill presented include keeping the Print Shop function attached to the Ed Tech Group as opposed to placement in the Non-Academic Group. An additional recommendation from Jon is to possibly outsource A/V support for events.

Feedback from the group showed a general agreement of the four functional workgroups in the proposal. Concern was expressed by Paul that we need to start to figure out position counts and move folks to where they need to go to better see how the organization will function. We are currently working with assumptions and need to be provided more concrete data to determine how to proceed. There was also not full agreement on the placement of some of the functions within the four functional workgroups.
A motion was called for that **TUAG approve the preliminary reorganization proposal of the new support org the will encompass of the four high level functional workgroups: Ed Tech Group, User Support/Help Desk Group, Network Infrastructure Group and Non-Academic Support Group.**

1st by Jon Blumhardt  
2nd by Scotty Rhode  

Motion passed via unanimous  

The Reorg Subcommittee will continue its work by fleshing out the placement of specific functions within each high-level functional group (the lower boxes on the chart) and figure out the needed position counts.  

Members of the Subcommittee will be Bill Becker, Jon Blumhardt and Scotty Rhode

**IV. CIO Job Description**

At the February TUAG meeting, TUAG passed a motion recommending to the Chancellor that the proposed CIO position be recruited at the E&M level. Mike shared that there currently is no available E&M position available to solely dedicate as a CIO given other needs of the college in areas such as academic support or academic planning which also require management functions.

Given the resources available the position of CIO will be recruited at a Band C APT level. Discussion within the group then revolved that CIO may be a misnomer as it’s usually indicative of an executive and a better name, for now, would be “Tech Leader.”

Discussion then focused on issues of lines of reporting. We need to determine the lines of reporting. Does the Tech Leader report to the Chancellor? The VCAA? The VCAS? Does the line of reporting make sense?

It was agreed that job descriptions will need to be developed for both the Tech Leader and SATO positions.

A Subcommittee was formed to address this. The members will be:

Kyle Higa, Jeff Stearns and Brett Bulseco

**V. Unified Budget Update**

No update at this time as software costs were not submitted by the departments.
VI. Replacement Cycle

Bill presented a policy and concept for Replacement that builds on Vern's work from the PC several years ago.

Discussion will continue over Laulima

VII. Google Migration Update

Kyle reported that the anticipated time to complete migration will be the end of summer. A schedule of trainings will be published.

VIII. Delineation of Responsibilities for Labs and Classrooms

Jon shared and requested that the current delineation of responsibilities between classroom and lab support need to be settled in order for the necessary reset work that needs to be completed over summer can be scheduled and done.

It was agreed that the faculty will work with Jon and Frances so EMC and TDS and schedule appropriately for the summer.

Jeff and Rob, Scotty will solicit input from faculty in their divisions

IX. Formation of a Tech Mentors Group/Support for Non-Instructional Faculty Websites

Tabled to next meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.