

Modesto Junior College
CTC Meeting Minutes

November 9, 2011

Approved Minutes

Co-chairs: John Zamora, Nadia Vartan

Present: Michael Guerra , Arnold Chavez, Carol Ellis, Dale Phillips, Francisco Banuelos, Michael Smedshammer, Will Lotko, Ellen Dambrosio, James Clarke, John Zamora, Nadia Vartan, Pamela Aguilar, Shamiran Pourellyas, Yoseph Demissie, Nora Seronello

Absent: James Palmer, Josh Hash, Larry Scheg, Mel Ainsworth, Michael Sundquist, Pedro Mendez, Scotty Gonser, Shelton Patterson, Nancy Backlund, Timothy Vaughan, Jenni Abbott, Laura Maki

Welcome

At the last meeting, we discussed the possibility of emailing out our unapproved minutes to everyone at MJC. However, we would send out the approved set of minutes soon after, which would have two versions circulating, and could be problematic. It would be best to approve the minutes as a group then send out the approved minutes to MJC.

Approval of the Minutes

Nora mentioned that she had not been researching technology plans of other colleges, but social media used in other colleges. Other colleges offer courses in social media and implementation of technology in classrooms for credit. The changes will be made to the minutes.

With these changes, the minutes were approved without objection from the November 1, 2011 meeting.

Program Review: Extracted Data

John and Nadia requested the extracted data from the Program Review resource requests. We received all the resource requests; 658 requests in total. We anticipated receiving only the ranked requests by the deans/managers, but the only ranked requests were the personnel requests.

We reviewed the format of the requests extracted from PRNet which came to us in an Excel document. We will place our ranking in the column marked "Council." During the Program Review process, we will be acting as a council as we rank resource requests and make a recommendation to Planning and Budget.

John has asked Brian when we will be receiving the ranked requests for equipment/technology, but he has not had a response yet. He will ask Brian again.

Ellen mentioned that she noticed some Library items were mislabeled as essential or mission critical, when they are not. She also asked if the deans were going to be attending our meetings to state their case for their resource requests. The deans did this at IAC, which is another group who will be ranking these requests. We also noticed that not all budget codes were marked appropriately for personnel and that many of the item titles for the position requested are not on our approved list of classifications for the District. This could be due to entry error or PRNet glitches.

Review of the Extracted Data

We started by filtering the extracted data by personnel, since this was the only category ranked by the deans and managers. We went through every personnel request and highlighted those relating to

technology. The list of personnel requests that would impact or require technology ended up being 22 positions.

As a group, we took our rubric and individually scored Database ID# 171, for an example. This position is for an Information Systems Specialist in the Media and Technology Services department. We then broke into groups of three or four and discussed our ranking method and then shared with the group.

There were some issues with the rubric. The first section needs additional text so that personnel can be addressed, along with the technology. The first two lines should read: "Replacement of current technology/personnel" and "Expansion of current technology/personnel." Also instead of using the "Program Name" as an identifier, we should use "Database ID#." Another section requiring some attention is the Infrastructure ranking. It was unclear when to give a high score or low score based on the text in this section, so John will reword it to make clear.

Action Item:

- Amend rubric language based on above discussion

WHO: John Zamora

WHEN: As soon as possible

HOW: Email to everyone in CTC

Next Steps

Jennifer will create a spreadsheet you can use to rank each personnel request that relates to technology. We will also send out the revised extract that only lists these specific personnel requests. You can use the updated rubric to individually score each request before our meeting on Monday. Please send your completed spreadsheet ranking these personnel requests to Jennifer before our Monday meeting.

Action Item:

- Create and email a spreadsheet for the council to rank personnel requests individually

WHO: Jennifer Ahlswede

WHEN: As soon as possible

HOW: Email to everyone in CTC

Action Item:

- Individually rank the personnel requests using the amended rubric and send to Jennifer

WHO: CTC

WHEN: By Monday, 11/14/11, 2 p.m.

HOW: Email to Jennifer Ahlswede

Other Items

There are a few requests that require a bit more research in order to determine if they are technology related personnel. Those have been highlighted on our list in orange. All other technology related personnel are yellow.

The scoring rubric is not perfect, and not everyone doing their Program Review had the chance to use our rubric as a guide when making their resource requests. As long as we are consistent in our scoring, it should all balance out and provide similar scores in the end. Remember this is our first attempt using the rubric to score these requests. We will refine the process for the next Program Review.

Next Meeting: Thursday, November 10, 2011, 10 a.m. – 1 p.m. in Yosemite 213, to rank resource requests.