CAC Technology Workgroup Meeting

Wednesday
23 April 2014
Lama 111A
10:00 – 11:55 AM

In Attendance

Cory Ando	Sheila Kitamura
Kevin Andreshak	Jessica Lum
Maria Bautista	Karl Naito, Chair
Hal Corcoran	Stephanie Nelson
Kelli Goya	Patricia O'Hagan
Carl Hefner	Trude Pang
Susan Inouye	Kawehi Sellers

Absent
Donna Demello
Susan Dik
Helen Hamada
Shannon Sakamoto
Jonathan Wong

What Are We Supposed to Do?

The purpose of the CAC Technology Work Group is to provide input and feedback on the Technology Plan, and to provide a recommendation to the Chancellor. The work group members represent their respective department or program. They are to report back to their respective units, and ask for feedback as needed.

Not all departments or programs are represented. The work group consists of volunteers from the CAC. Any report or recommendation coming out of the work group will be presented to the CAC for a review by all represented units.

A technology plan was submitted for accreditation. The visiting team did acknowledge that while the plan submitted did provide a good overview of technology and issues at the College, it did not have sufficient specific detail. ACCJC is now asking for a detailed technology plan that outlines what is to be done, by whom, and what the costs are. A draft of a new technology plan will be completed in one or two weeks for the group to review.

Selecting a Chair

Susan Inouye and Kelli Goya nominated Karl Naito to be the Chair of the group. A vote was taken. Karl Naito was elected Chair. Sheila Kitamura agreed to be the Secretary.

Centralized Technology

It was stated that much discussion was occurring around a centralized technology plan.

Currently department and programs purchase computers without notifying CELTT, but CELTT is expected to provide support. Departments and programs also purchase their own classroom technology. Many purchases are done at the end of the year when the mindset is to spend money before the fiscal year ends. This results in computers being purchased when it may not be necessary, and results in classrooms that are not technology equitable.

A centralized technology plan would mean that the purchasing of computers and classroom related technology would be centralized under CELTT. A standard would be devised for computers. A standard suite of technology would be devised for classrooms. A replacement cycle for computers and classroom technology would be created, and funding planned.

A vote was taken to determine if the working group would adopt and support a centralized technology plan. It was adopted.

Issues Brought Up for Discussion
One Size Fits All, Not
It was stated that a standard computer recommendation might not be the right fit for everyone. BLT may require computers that are different from the recommendation.

It was acknowledged that one solution would not fit everyone. Certain programs, such as BLT and New Media Arts, might require computer solutions outside of a standard recommendation due to workforce training needs and software. Also, the replacement cycle for these computers might be shorter than for other programs.

Personal Mobile Devices
It was stated the personal mobile devices were purchased against CELTT's recommendation. Why is CELTT against these devices?

CELTT is not against these devices. Rather, policy and procedures have to be created to manage support expectations. The devices can be used either as a personal device, or a device in a classroom setting.

> *Personal Device.*
> The nature of these devices is to be personal. The devices require a user account and, in most cases, credit card information. It is a question of whose user account will be used, and whose credit card information is provided.
>
> The consensus of instructors CELTT has consulted state that the College should pay for the mobile devices. The user account should be the instructors, and the College should provide the credit card information; the College should pay for the applications since it is work related. This proposes a dilemma.
>
> There is no oversight as to what application is purchased for download. After a purchase is made, the question remains as to who "owns" the application. The College may have paid for the application, but it resides under the faculty account. By a vendor's stated agreement the account holder (the faculty) is free to use the application on other devices,

either College owned or personal. The management of this "ownership" becomes difficult for the College.

Classroom Setting Device.
Again, the issue is whose the user account will be created, whose credit card information will be provided, and who will own what is downloaded. The question remains on to how to manage all of this.

What do Other Colleges do?
It was stated that for personal use other colleges will pay for the device, but the user is responsible for purchasing downloads. The college reserves the right to recall the device, but any purchased download will be available for the user to install on other devices. In a classroom setting, other colleges lock down the device so students can not freely download anything. However, this may defeat the purpose for using a mobile device. The question remains on how best to manage a mobile device in a classroom setting.

College Website
Several issues were raised.
- Why was an internal website not put up that will allow for College input prior to a public release?
- Why is the search engine at the bottom of the page?
- There is no MyUH or Laulima link.
- There is no UH directory link.
- There should have been more announcements.

It was stated that Raphael did make announcements and did solicit input from departments and programs. Very little input was given back.

At this point the website is released and the College needs to move forward. Feedback should continue to be sent to Raphael via the online request form. Administration will be making College decisions regarding the website. It is a work in progress.

Student Course Survey
An issue was raised regarding eCafe and the limited number of student responses. The limited nature of responses often result in a negative assessment of a faculty's course. It was proposed that iPads could be used. The iPads could be issued in class for the course survey.

It was stated that iPads could be used for this purpose, as long as there is enough funds available to purchase sufficient number of devices for all faculty to use during the end of the semester, and other uses for the devices could be found during the rest of semester.

It was stated that the issue is valid. However, to address the issue alternate strategies and forms of technology should be explored.